



**Western
Bay of Plenty**
District Council



Mā tō tātou takiwā
For our District

Plan Change 92
Ōmōkoroa and Te
Puke Enabling
Housing Supply and
Other Supporting
Matters

**Summary of
Submissions and
Further Submissions**

Summary of Submissions Points by District Plan Provision

Section 3 Definitions.....	3
Section 4B – Transportation Access and Parking & Section 4C – Amenity	18
Section 8 – Natural Hazards	24
Section 10 Infrastructure Network Utilities and Designations & Section 11 – Financial Contributions.....	35
Section 12 – Subdivision and Development.....	43
Section 13 – Residential & Section 14 – Medium Density Residential	69
Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	71
Section 16 – Rural Residential, Section 19 Commercial, Section 20 – Commercial Transition & Section 21 – Industrial.....	172
Section 24 – Natural Open Spaces	183
Appendix 7 – Structure Plans	190
District Plan – Planning Maps	202
Other – Not Specified.....	227

Section 3 Definitions

Submitter Ref no.	Sub Point No.	Name	Section/Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/s support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
29	29.7	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 3 - Definitions	General	General		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora notes that there are definitions specific to Ōmokoroa Te Puke Medium Density Residential (“OTP MDRZ”) introduced which results in the use of different definitions that are used to describe the same ‘term.’ This is confusing for users and inconsistent with the National Planning Standards (where such a definition is included in the Standards). Definitions within Section 3 specific to the OTP MDRZ are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building, Building Coverage, Building Footprint, Construction, Developable Area, Dwelling, Front Boundary, Ground Level, Height, Height in Relation to Boundary, Impervious Surfaces, Minor Dwelling, Net Site Area, Outdoor Living Space, Residential Activity, Residential Unit, Showhome, Site, (Front) Yard. <p>For example, ‘Residential Unit’ is introduced in PC92 but only in the context of the OTP MDRZ. For other parts of the district, ‘Dwelling’ continues to be used. ‘Residential Unit’ is defined in the National Planning Standards: Definitions Sections to replace dwelling. Other examples of two different definitions for the same term are ‘Building,’ ‘Building Coverage,’ ‘Construction,’ ‘Ground Level,’ ‘Height,’ ‘Front Yard’ and ‘Net Lot Area’/‘Net Site Area’. Kāinga Ora considers there should be one definition used for each term throughout the WBOPDP for clarity and consistency. Amendments sought.</p>	<p>1. Delete repetitive definitions (refer to ‘reasons for submission’ for the list); or</p> <p>2. Move all definitions specific to the OTP MDRZ to Section 14A until WBOPDC gives effect to the National Planning Standards in the WBOPDP (refer to ‘reasons for submission’ for the list).</p>
FS 71 [29]	5 [29.7]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	<p>KiwiRail agrees that a consistent application of definitions is appropriate for clarity of the applicable provisions in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone section of the District Plan. KiwiRail supports the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora, to the extent that any amendments to those definitions are still workable and do not alter the intent of the provisions sought in KiwiRail’s primary submission, including the definition of noise sensitive activity and buildings or structures.</p>	<p>Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail’s primary submission.</p>
32	32.4	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	“Building Footprint” within the definition of “bui		Support in part	<p>To be consistent with the existing definition of “building coverage”.</p>	<p>Amendment the definition of building coverage to allow exclusions similar to existing building coverage definition</p>

										"Building Footprint" within the definition of "building coverage" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means the total area of buildings at ground floor level together with the area of any section of any of those buildings that extends out beyond the ground floor level limits of the building and overhangs the ground, <u>but excludes eaves or entrance canopies less than 1m wide</u>
FS 70 [32]	17 [32.4]	Kāinga Ora [New Zealand Housing Foundation]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 32.4 which seeks to provide alignment and consistency between terms defined in the plan.		Allow
FS 78 [32]	1 [32.4]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [New Zealand Housing Foundation]					Support	Support the amendment to Building Footprint provision		Include amendment as proposed to building footprint definition by submitter
39	39.2	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	"Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financ		Support in part	This is consistent with the current practice of excluding all forms of reserves from the calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions under Section 11.		We support the proposed definition but seek that the following be added to the exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested</u> • <u>Pedestrian accessways to be vested</u>
FS 70 [39]	23 [39.2]	Kāinga Ora [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers it appropriate that retirement villages should remain as a restricted discretionary activity in line with other larger scale residential development (which is proposed as a restricted discretionary activity).		Disallow
FS 74 [39]	29 [39.2]	Omokoroa Country Club [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support amendments to definition of "developable area" to exclude: - local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested. - Pedestrian accessways to be vested.		Adopt submission; however do not necessarily confine amendments to reserves to be vested. As the submitter says, all forms of reserves should be excluded from the calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions.
FS 78 [39]	2 [39.2]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support exclusion of stormwater reserves, neighbourhood reserves and pedestrian walkways from developable land area when calculating financial contributions		Include amendment as proposed by submitter
40	40.2	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	"Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financ		Support in part	Reserves should be excluded from then calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions under Section 11.		We support the proposed definition but seek that the following be added to the exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested</u>

									• <u>Pedestrian accessways to be vested</u>
42	42.2	Brian Goldstone	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	"Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financ		Support in part	Reserves should be excluded from the calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions under Section 11	We support the proposed definition but seek that the following be added to the exceptions: • <u>Local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested</u> • <u>Pedestrian accessways to be vested</u>
26	26.1	Classic Group	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	"Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financ		Support in part	This is consistent with the current practice of excluding all forms of reserves from the calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions under Section 11.	We support the proposed definition but seek that the following be added to the exceptions: • <u>Local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested</u> • <u>Pedestrian accessways to be vested</u>
FS 74 [26]	4 [26.1]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Support	Support amendments to definition of "developable area" to exclude: -local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested. -Pedestrian accessways to be vested.	Adopt submission; however do not necessarily confine amendments to reserves to be vested. As the submitter says, all forms of reserves should be excluded from the calculation of developable area when calculating financial contributions.
19	19.19	Pete Linde	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	"Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financ		Support in part	Generally support the definition, although would prefer it be consistent with what is used for Tauranga City Council. The note at the end has a presumption that land areas are unsuitable for residential units by being zoned Natural Open Space that is not accurate, and not appropriate to include as part of the definition of Developable Area and should be deleted.	The note at the end has a presumption that land areas are unsuitable for residential units by being zoned Natural Open Space that is not accurate, and not appropriate to include as part of the definition of Developable Area and should be deleted. "Developable Area" when used in Section 11 (Financial Contributions) and Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means all land zoned Medium Density Residential except for the following: · Road reserves of Ōmokoroa Road, Prole Road and Francis Road (including its extension to Ōmokoroa Road); · Identified structure plan link road between Prole Road and Francis Road; · Identified structure plan active reserve. As part of a resource consent, areas identified as unsuitable for the construction of a residential unit by a suitably qualified and experienced:

									<p>- geotechnical engineer or equivalent, or</p> <p>- stormwater engineer or equivalent due to the land having stormwater management as its primary function, or</p> <p>- natural hazards engineer or equivalent due to the land being subject to one or more natural hazards.</p> <p>Note: Other areas in Ōmōkoroa unsuitable for the construction of residential units have already been excluded through the creation of a Natural Open Space Zone.</p>
26	26.2	Classic Group	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	"Front Boundary" when used in Section 14A (Ōmōkoro		Support in part	Inconsistent with other Councils, including Tauranga City Council. Also, this definition is not effects-based. The Council should either seek for the Access Lot to be addressed the same way as road would be, or not. The definition should be the same regardless of whether a property has another frontage or not. We seek the Council remove Access Lot from definition of road boundary. This aligns with other Council's interpretation.	<p>We support the proposed definition but seek that the following be deleted:</p> <p>"Front Boundary" when used in Section 14A (Ōmōkoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) and within the definition of "Front Yard" means all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road boundary (including the boundary of any structure plan road or designated road or paper road); • Privateway boundary (for a privateway that serves three or more sites); • Access lot boundary (for an access lot that serves three or more sites). <p>Except that:</p> <p>Where a site has a road boundary, any other boundary of that site which is adjacent to any privateway or access lot shall be a side or rear boundary (see the figure below).</p>
FS 78 [26]	3 [26.2]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Classic Group]					Support	Support amendment to "front boundary" definition to exclude access lot boundaries	Amend definition as proposed by submitter
39	39.3	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōm		Support in part	The amendment provides for swimming pools to be included in the area calculation for exclusions as swimming pools provide storage volume. The inclusion of soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay will be impossible to assess/monitor and are therefore uncertain.	<p>Amend the definition as follows:</p> <p>"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōmōkoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means an area with a surface which prevents the infiltration of rainfall into the ground and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Roofs (whether fixed or retractable); b. Paved areas including paths, driveways, and sealed/compa

									<p>cted metal parking areas;</p> <p>c. Patios;</p> <p>d. Swimming pools; and</p> <p>e. Soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay</p>
FS 78 [39]	4 [39.3]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support amendment to remove swimming pools and compacted soils areas from Impervious Surface definition	Amend definition as proposed by submitter
40	40.3	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōm		Support in part	The amendment provides for swimming pools to be included in the area calculation for exclusions as swimming pools provide storage volume. The inclusion of soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay will be impossible to assess/monitor and are therefore uncertain.	<p>Amend the definition as follows:</p> <p>"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means an area with a surface which prevents the infiltration of rain fall into the ground and includes:</p> <p>a. Roofs (whether fixed or retractable);</p> <p>b. Paved areas including paths, driveways, and sealed/compacted metal parking areas;</p> <p>c. Patios;</p> <p>d. Swimming pools; and</p> <p>e. Soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay.</p>
26	26.3	Classic Group	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōm		Support in part	The amendment provides for swimming pools to be included in the area calculation for exclusions as swimming pools provide storage volume. The inclusion of soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay will be impossible to assess/monitor and are therefore uncertain. We also seek for Council to recognise advances in technology available through permeable paving.	<p>Amend the definition as follows:</p> <p>"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means an area with a surface which prevents the infiltration of rainfall into the ground and includes:</p> <p>a. Roofs (whether fixed or retractable);</p> <p>b. Paved areas including paths, driveways, and sealed/compacted metal parking areas; <u>unless these are specifically designed to allow the penetration of stormwater</u></p> <p>c. Patios;</p> <p>d. Swimming pools; and</p> <p>e. Soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay.</p>
FS 78 [26]	5 [26.3]	The North Twelve Limited					Support	Support amendment to paving description inclusion as proposed to impermeable surface definition	Amend definition as proposed by submitter

		Partnership [Classic Group]							
19	19.16	Pete Linde	Section 3 - Definitions	Definition s	"Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōm		Support in part	It is considered the definition of "impervious surface" is so broad, the simplistic diagram for impervious surface is a bit misleading, in particular when clause "e" of the definition for impervious surface is applied. Aim for consistency of definitions used by neighbouring Council who has recently been through hearings with Commissioners. A diagram (attached to this submitter's full submission) is considered useful to complement the worded definitions for "impervious surface", "building coverage" and "outdoor living space", although in this instance, suggest including a note beside diagram advising reader to check corresponding definitions as just using italics for defined terms might not be a sufficiently effective method.	Amend definition drawing and it is also of note that the recent decision on Tauranga City Council's Plan Change 27 definition for impervious surface included the following additional wording to clause g as follows: <i>"g. stormwater management devices <u>not located beneath sealed or compacted surfaces</u>".</i> WBOPDC may considered it appropriate to amend the definition to reflect this change. "Impervious Surfaces" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means an area with a surface which prevents the infiltration of rainfall into the ground and includes: a. Roofs (whether fixed or retractable); b. Paved areas including paths, driveways, and sealed/compacted metal parking areas; c. Patios; d. Swimming pools; and e. Soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay. For the purposes of this definition impervious surfaces excludes: a. Any natural surface; b. Grass and bush areas; c. Gardens and other vegetated areas; d. Porous or permeable paving and living roofs; e. Permeable artificial surfaces, fields or lawns; f. Slatted decks; and g. Stormwater management devices <u>not located beneath sealed or compacted surfaces</u> . Request include of additional text to align with Tauranga City Council.
FS 78 [19]	6 [19.16]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Pete Linde]					Support	Support amendment to stormwater management device description inclusion as proposed to impermeable surface definition	Amend definition as proposed by submitter
24	24.4	Ara Poutama	Section 3 -	Definition	"Residential		Support	Ara Poutama requests that the definition of "residential unit"	Retain the definition of "residential unit" as

		Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Definitions	s	Unit" when used in Section 14A (Ōmoko			is retained. The definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. This definition applies to supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e., people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. Providing reintegration and rehabilitation support is an important component of the reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. It enables people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	proposed in Section 3 Definitions.
FS 76 [24]	1 [24.4]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections]					Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission seeking that Retirement Units be removed from the definition.	Disallow the submission to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS 77 [24]	1 [24.4]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections]					Oppose in part	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission seeking that Retirement Units be removed from the definition.	Disallow the submission to the extent it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
34	34.2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 3 - Definitions	Definition s	"Residential Unit" when used in Section 14A (Ōmoko		Support in part	Consequential amendment to addition of 'retirement unit' definition sought below.	<u>The RVA seeks an amendment to the definition of 'Residential Unit' so that it does not incorporate 'Retirement Unit'.</u>
25	25.31	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 3 - Definitions	Definition s	"Net Site Area" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa		Support in part	For infill areas, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area on a site, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network and can compromise existing levels of service if not mitigated.	Remove the exclusions (items a, b and c) from the definition for 'net site area' in relation to its use as an activity standard to determine the impervious surface percentage limit within the net site area (14A.4.2 (d)(i)).
FS 78 [25]	7	The North					Oppose	Oppose amendment to remove clauses a, b & c from net site	Decline changes as proposed

	[25.31]	Twelve Limited Partnership [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]						area definition	
26	26.4	Classic Group	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	"Net Site Area" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa		Support in part	Aim for consistency of definitions used by neighbouring Council. A diagram is considered useful to complement the worded definition, although in this instance, suggest including a note beside diagram advising reader to check corresponding definitions as just using italics for defined terms might not be a sufficiently effective method.	Amend the rule as follows: "Net Site Area" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) and within the definition of "building coverage" when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means the total area of the site, but excludes: a. any part of the site that provides legal access to another site; b. any part of a rear site that provides legal access to that site; c. any part of the site subject to a designation that may be taken or acquired under the Public Works Act 1981. <u>means the area of a site less any area of that site that is solely for the purpose of providing access to the site, and for clarity also excludes:</u> <u>a. An entrance strip owned in common with the owners of other sites;</u> <u>b. Any area in a cross-lease, company lease or unit title subdivision that is not covered by an independent dwelling unit, the accessory buildings of that independent dwelling unit, or other area set aside for the exclusive use of the occupants of that independent dwelling unit.</u>
FS 67 [26]	1 [26.4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in our submission point 25.31, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area on a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service (e.g. for stormwater and wastewater infrastructure).	Remove the exclusions (items a, b and c) from the definition of 'net site area' in relation to its use as an activity standard to determine the impervious surface percentage limit within the net site area (14A.4.2 (d)(i)).
FS 78 [26]	8 [26.4]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Classic					Support	Support amendment to net site area definition as proposed	Amend definition as proposed by submitter

		Group]							
19	19.15	Pete Linde	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	“Net Site Area” when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa		Oppose	Aim for consistency of definitions used by neighbouring Council. A diagram is considered useful to complement the worded definition, although in this instance, suggest including a note beside diagram advising reader to check corresponding definitions as just using italics for defined terms might not be a sufficiently effective method.	<p>It is requested the proposed definition for Net Site Area below is deleted and instead more closely adopt the definition being used in the Tauranga City Plan (including the illustrative diagram) (attached to this submitter’s full submission).</p> <p>WBOPDC –</p> <p>“Net Site Area” when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) and within the definition of “building coverage” when used in Section 14A (Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) means the total area of the site, but excludes:</p> <p>a. any part of the site that provides legal access to another site;</p> <p>b. any part of a rear site that provides legal access to that site;</p> <p>c. any part of the site subject to a designation that may be taken or acquired under the Public Works Act 1981.</p> <p>Tauranga City Plan –</p> <p><u>Nett site area – The area of a site less any area of that site that is solely for the purpose of providing access to the site, and for clarity also excludes:</u></p> <p>a. <u>An entrance strip owned in common with the owners of other sites;</u></p> <p>b. <u>Any area in a cross-lease, company lease or unit title subdivision that is not covered by an independent dwelling unit, the accessory buildings of that independent dwelling unit, or other area set aside for the exclusive use of the occupants of that independent dwelling unit.</u></p>
24	24.3	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	“Residential Activity” within the definition of “r		Support	<p>Ara Poutama requests that the definition of “residential activity” is retained.</p> <p>The definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards.</p>	<p>Retain the definition of “residential activity” as proposed in Section 3 Definitions.</p>

								This definition applies to supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. Providing reintegration and rehabilitation support is an important component of the reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. It enables people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	
34	34.3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	The existing definition of retirement village ceas	Retirement Villages	Oppose	The definition does not align with the National Planning Standards.	The RVA seeks the definition be amended to comply with the National Planning Standards: <u>Retirement village means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</u>
FS 74 [34]	16 [34.3]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support RVA's suggested relief that the definition of 'Retirement Village' is amended. This would ensure that the definition aligns with relevant standards and policies.	Amend the definition of "retirement village" as per the National Planning Standards: Retirement village means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.
34	34.4	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 3 - Definitions	Definitions	The existing definition of retirement village dwel	Retirement Villages	Oppose	While the RVA supports the distinction from general residential dwellings provided by the 'retirement village dwelling' definition, the RVA considers that a 'retirement unit' definition is required in the District Plan as a result of its submission on PC92 to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	The RVA seeks to replace the definition of 'Retirement Village Dwelling' with the following 'retirement unit' definition to the District Plan: <u>Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>

FS 74 [34]	17 [34.4]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support RVA's suggestion to delete 'Retirement Village Dwelling' and replace it with 'Retirement Unit'. OCC believes it is important that the distinct nature of retirement activities is acknowledged.	If OCC's relief is not accepted, adopt RVA relief. Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.
56	56.2	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	The existing definition of retirement village inde	Retirement Village Definition	Support	The definitions around the use of retirement related terms are unclear. It appears that Plan Change 92 proposes to remove the definitions of "retirement village", "retirement village dwelling" and "retirement village independent apartment", however Chapter 14A still uses the term "retirement village" (e.g., rule 14A.3.3). Retirement villages, although residential activities, are significantly different in the way they are developed and operated. Therefore, there is merit in keeping these separate definitions. This enables them to be treated differently and appropriately through the District Plan provisions.	Retain definitions of "retirement village", "retirement village dwelling" and "retirement village independent apartment".
34	34.5	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions	The existing definition of retirement village inde	Retirement Villages	Oppose	The RVA considers that the proposed definition for Retirement Unit (refer row above) encapsulates the Retirement Village Independent apartment activity, and accordingly, this definition can be deleted.	Delete 'retirement village independent apartment' definition.
FS 74 [34]	18 [34.5]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support RVA's suggestion to delete the definition 'Retirement Village Independent Apartment'.	If OCC's relief is not accepted, adopt RVA relief.
24	24.1	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 3 – Definitions	General	General	New Definition for Community Corrections Activity	Oppose	Ara Poutama requests the addition of a definition of "community corrections activity", consistent with the National Planning Standard definition. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will	Add the following definition to Section 3 Definitions: <u>"Community Corrections Activity" means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</u>

								correspondingly increase. It is therefore important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	
24	24.2	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 3 - Definitions	General	General	New Definition for Household	Oppose	The National Planning Standards includes definitions for "residential activity" and "residential unit" that must be used when a local authority includes a definition for such in its plan. PC92 includes both of these definitions, which is supported. However, the definition of "residential unit" (as well as the definition of "dwelling" in the Operative District Plan) refers to a "household" which is not defined in the Operative District Plan, nor PC92. Ara Poutama seeks that a new definition be added, to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (which are more commonly perceived household situations).	Add the following definition to Section 3 Definitions: <u>"Household" means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:</u> <u>a. any or all of them are members of the same family; or</u> <u>b. one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</u>
30	30.6	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 3 - Definitions	General	General	New Definition for Noise Sensitive Activity	Support in part	Kiwi seeks a new definition be inserted for "noise sensitive activity".	KiwiRail seeks a related new definition for "noise sensitive activity" <u>Noise sensitive activity means any lawfully established:</u> <u>a) residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation, including boarding houses, residential visitor accommodation and papakāinga;</u> <u>b) educational activity;</u> <u>c) health care activity, including hospitals;</u> <u>d) congregation within any place of worship; and</u> <u>e) activity at a marae.</u>
FS 73 [30]	6 [30.6]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	The amendment sought is not accepted.
FS 76 [30]	2 [30.6]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [KiwiRail Holdings]					Oppose	The RVA opposes this submission because it goes beyond the scope of the plan change and/or is not necessary or appropriate.	Disallow the submission.

		Limited]							
FS 77 [30]	2 [30.6]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Ryman opposes this submission because it goes beyond the scope of the plan change and/or is not necessary or appropriate.	Disallow the submission.
15	15.1	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 3 – Definitions	Definitions		New Definition for Qualifying Matter	Support in part	<p>An addendum document to the Section 32 Report provides an assessment and evaluation of existing and proposed qualifying matters in accordance with sections 77K and 77J of the RMA respectively. Existing qualifying matters such as significant ecological, landscape and heritage features and natural hazards will continue to be operative in the District Plan and make the MDRS less enabling of development. Proposed qualifying matters such as updated and new natural hazards would also make the MDRS less enabling of development. These won't have legal effect at notification but if confirmed when decisions are made will become operative.</p> <p>A definition of qualifying matter is required so that when the Plan Change is operative plan users will know in which circumstances the MDRS are less enabling of development due to a qualifying matter. This is as provided for in Policy 2 (Schedule 3A of the RMA and within Section 14A of Proposed Plan Change 92). This policy reads "Apply the MDRS except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga)".</p>	<p>Add a new definition as follows:</p> <p>"Qualifying matter" means one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ecological features listed in Appendix 1 (Schedule of Identified Significant Ecological Features) and identified on the District Plan Maps. · Natural features and landscapes listed in Appendix 2 (Schedule of Identified Significant Ecological Features) and identified on the District Plan Maps. · Cultural and built heritage features listed in Appendix 3 (Schedule of Identified Significant Historic Heritage Features) and identified on the District Plan Maps. · Proposed Esplanade Reserves, Esplanade Strips and Access Strips identified in Appendix 4 (Schedule of Proposed Esplanade Reserves and Strips) and identified on the District Plan Maps. · Designations listed in Appendix 5 – Schedule of Designations and identified on the District Plan Maps. · Reserves identified on the District Plan Maps. · Stability Areas – Landslip and General identified on the District Plan Maps. · Floodable Areas identified on the District Plan Maps. · Coastal Inundation Areas identified on the District Plan Maps. · Coastal Erosion Areas – Primary Risk and

									<p>Secondary Risk identified on the District Plan Maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Land within 10m of a railway corridor or designation for railway purposes (for sites created by way of an application for subdivision consent approved after 1 January 2010). · Lot 601 DP 560118 and Lot 603 DP 560118 (Harbour Ridge) for new sites created from these which adjoin the esplanade reserve (directly south of the railway line in Ōmokoroa).
FS 67 [15]	45 [15.1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support relief sought by submitter. Outstanding Natural Features/Landscapes (ONFLs) are also identified as a qualifying matter (see s(77)(l)(b)).	Include ONFLs in a new definition of qualifying matter.
FS 71 [15]	1 [15.1]	KiwiRail [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support in part	<p>KiwiRail supports the inclusion of a new definition of a qualifying matter so that it is clear for readers of the District Plan what constitutes a qualifying matter in the relevant provisions and to ensure consistency.</p> <p>In particular, KiwiRail supports express recognition in the definition of provisions that are necessary to support the ongoing efficient operation of the rail corridor as nationally significant infrastructure (as recognised in sections 77I and 77O of the RMA), such as setbacks from the rail corridor and related noise and vibration controls.</p>	Accept submission to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's submission.
FS 73 [15]	7 [15.1]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Oppose in part	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment in relation to the railway corridor as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	That any definition for a qualifying matter is amended to exclude "Land within 10m of a railway corridor or designation for railway purposes (for sites created by way of an application for subdivision consent approved after 1 January 2010)."
FS 75 [15]	1 [15.1]	Powerco [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Oppose in part	This submission point seeks a new definition of "qualifying matter" be inserted. Powerco agrees this would aid in administration of the District Plan, however the list of qualifying matters does not include the overhead electricity distribution network, which Powerco sought in its submission.	<p>Amend the definition to include the following:</p> <p>"Qualifying matter" means one or more of the following: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The overhead electricity distribution networks identified on the [non-statutory] planning maps.</u> <p>...</p>
FS 78 [15]	9 [15.1]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership					Support	Support inclusion of qualifying matter definition	Include new definition of qualifying matter definition, subject to any consequential changes to confirmed qualify matters

		[Western Bay of Plenty District Council]							
FS 79 [15]	4 [15.1]	Waka Kotahi [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	<p>A new definition of 'qualifying matter' is proposed. The new definition includes 'Designations listed in Appendix 5'. This includes Waka Kotahi designation D181.</p> <p>Designated future state highway infrastructure is required to support development within the Omokoroa peninsula. Waka Kotahi considers that inclusion of these designations as a qualifying matter is appropriate in this instance.</p>	That the proposed definition of 'qualifying matter' be adopted.

Section 4B – Transportation Access and Parking & Section 4C – Amenity

Submitter Ref. No	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
58	58.13	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 4B – Transportation Access and Parking	General	General		Oppose	<p>Suggest also that rule 4B.3.4</p> <p><i>Note: The submitter has clarified that their relief sought is to amend Rule 4B.3.4 (b) (ii) so that new vehicle crossings onto Omokoroa Road become a restricted discretionary activity (rather than a non-complying activity). This is to align with Rule 12.3.4.1 which provides restricted discretionary activity status when not meeting the performance standards including 12.4.4.4 (c) (i) which states “The number or potential number of dwellings or other activities gaining direct access to these roads shall not be increased”. See related submission points 58.11 and 58.12.</i></p>	<p>Suggest also that rule 4B.3.4</p> <p><i>Note: The submitter has clarified that their relief sought is to amend Rule 4B.3.4 (b) (ii) so that new vehicle crossings onto Omokoroa Road become a restricted discretionary activity (rather than a non-complying activity). This is to align with Rule 12.3.4.1 which provides restricted discretionary activity status when not meeting the performance standards including 12.4.4.4 (c) (i) which states “The number or potential number of dwellings or other activities gaining direct access to these roads shall not be increased”. See related submission points 58.11 and 58.12.</i></p>
18	18.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 4B – Transportation Access and Parking	4B.4.4 Access to Urban Roads (Residential, Medium Density Residential, Rural-Residential, Natural Open Space, Commercial, and Industrial Zones) other than Strategic Roads			Support	<p>Fire and Emergency recognise that access to urban roads is largely regulated through Council’s 2009 Development Code and Rule 4B.4.4 has been amended to include the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Fire and Emergency request that Council’s Development Code be updated to reflect the changes sought in this submission and the changing urban environment of which PPC92 enables.</p>	<p>No amendment sought.</p>
18	18.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 4B – Transportation Access and Parking	4B.4.6 On-site Manoeuvring	General	Matters of Discretion	Oppose	<p>Where compliance is not achieved with the on-site manoeuvring requirement of Rule 4B.4.6, resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity. Fire and Emergency request a new matter of discretion be added to 4B.6.2.</p>	<p>Add new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>h. the ability for emergency service vehicles to manoeuvre on-site effectively and safely.</u></p>
FS 78 [18]	10 [18.3]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Fire and					Oppose	<p>Oppose inclusion of new matter of discretion as requested. It is impractical to provide onsite manoeuvring for emergency service vehicles on residential properties given their size. Access to and emergency services considerations including distances to fire hydrants a part of a development is a more</p>	<p>Decline inclusion of new matter of discretion requested</p>

		Emergency New Zealand]						appropriate consideration														
18	18.2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 4B - Transportation Access and Parking	4B.4.6 On-site Manoeuvring	All activities shall provide manoeuvring space ons		Support in part	Fire and Emergency support 4B.4.6 insofar that the exception for onsite manoeuvring in the MDRZ applies only where there is direct access off a road only. Where direct access cannot be achieved, it will be important that sufficient onsite manoeuvring is provided for residents as well as emergency service vehicles. Any accessway with a dead end needs a turnaround area so that Fire and Emergency vehicles can move their vehicles quickly in an emergency to protect them.	No amendment sought.													
30	30.4	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 4C - Amenity	General	General	New Rule	Support in part	<p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of Plan Change 92, KiwiRail is concerned that the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations, is significantly elevated.</p> <p>Kiwirail seeks to manage this interface through controls in District Plans, including - Noise and vibration controls - requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Within 60m of the railway corridor, controls are sought that buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration.</p> <p>The Operative District Plan includes acoustic insulation and ventilation standards, however these are not specific to rail noise. There are also no specific vibration controls to ensure that buildings containing new (or altered) noise sensitive activities are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. The acoustic and ventilation standards (in the relief sought) do not affect the density of development near the rail corridor, but rather seek to ensure that where urban development co-locates near the rail corridor, the health and amenity of residents is not adversely affected, and the rail corridor is protected from reverse sensitivity effects. KiwiRail considers it is appropriate that these controls apply on a district-wide basis (particularly in the context of the additional intensification proposed through Plan Change 92).</p>	<p>KiwiRail seek that noise controls requiring acoustic insulation apply to new and altered sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor, as follows.</p> <p>Indoor railway noise</p> <p><u>(1) Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building or structure for a noise sensitive activity within 100m of the legal boundary of any railway network</u></p> <p><u>Activity-specific standards:</u></p> <p><u>1. Any new building or alteration to an existing building that contains a noise sensitive activity where the building or alteration:</u></p> <p><u>(a) is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels resulting from the railway not exceeding the maximum values in the following table; or</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Building type</th> <th>Occupancy/activity</th> <th>Maximum railway noise level $L_{Aeq}(1h)$</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><u>Residential</u></td> <td><u>Sleeping spaces</u></td> <td><u>35 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>All other habitable rooms</u></td> <td><u>40 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><u>Education</u></td> <td><u>Lecture rooms/theatres, music studios</u></td> <td><u>35 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Teaching areas, conference rooms, drama studios, sleeping</u></td> <td><u>40dB</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Building type	Occupancy/activity	Maximum railway noise level $L_{Aeq}(1h)$	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Sleeping spaces</u>	<u>35 dB</u>	<u>All other habitable rooms</u>	<u>40 dB</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Lecture rooms/theatres, music studios</u>	<u>35 dB</u>	<u>Teaching areas, conference rooms, drama studios, sleeping</u>	<u>40dB</u>
Building type	Occupancy/activity	Maximum railway noise level $L_{Aeq}(1h)$																				
<u>Residential</u>	<u>Sleeping spaces</u>	<u>35 dB</u>																				
	<u>All other habitable rooms</u>	<u>40 dB</u>																				
<u>Education</u>	<u>Lecture rooms/theatres, music studios</u>	<u>35 dB</u>																				
	<u>Teaching areas, conference rooms, drama studios, sleeping</u>	<u>40dB</u>																				

										<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>areas</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>Library</u></td> <td><u>45dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><u>Health</u></td> <td><u>Overnight medical care, wards</u></td> <td><u>40dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses stations</u></td> <td><u>45dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Cultural</u></td> <td><u>Places of worship, marae</u></td> <td><u>35dB</u></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>(b) is at least 50 metres from any railway network, and is designed so that a noise barrier completely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows, to all points 3.8 metres above railway tracks..</u></p> <p>Kiwirail seek that the activity status where compliance is not achieved.</p> <p><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) location of the building;</u></p> <p><u>(b) the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards;</u></p> <p><u>(c) special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate noise impacts;</u></p> <p><u>(d) the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p>		<u>areas</u>			<u>Library</u>	<u>45dB</u>	<u>Health</u>	<u>Overnight medical care, wards</u>	<u>40dB</u>	<u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses stations</u>	<u>45dB</u>	<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Places of worship, marae</u>	<u>35dB</u>
	<u>areas</u>																							
	<u>Library</u>	<u>45dB</u>																						
<u>Health</u>	<u>Overnight medical care, wards</u>	<u>40dB</u>																						
	<u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses stations</u>	<u>45dB</u>																						
<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Places of worship, marae</u>	<u>35dB</u>																						
FS 68 [30]	2 [30.4]	Classic Group [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Oppose the addition of Indoor Railway Noise provisions as proposed by Kiwirail as it will affect affordability due to potentially increase insulation and a requirement for beefed up building foundation design	Decline inclusion the Indoor Railway Noise provisions as requested															
FS 70 [30]	15 [30.4]	Kāinga Ora [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora does not consider the acoustic and vibration controls sought from Kiwirail to be a qualifying matter.	Disallow															
FS 73 [30]	4 [30.4]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	The amendment sought is not accepted.															
FS 76 [30]	3 [30.4]	Retirement Villages Association					Oppose in part	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity	Disallow the submission.															

		of New Zealand Incorporated [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]						to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	
FS 77 [30]	3 [30.4]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow the submission.
30	30.5	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 4C – Amenity	General	General	New Rule	Support in part	<p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of Plan Change 92, KiwiRail is concerned that the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations, is significantly elevated.</p> <p>Kiwirail seeks to manage this interface through controls in District Plans, including – Noise and vibration controls – requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Within 60m of the railway corridor, controls are sought that buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration.</p> <p>The Operative District Plan includes acoustic insulation and ventilation standards, however these are not specific to rail noise. There are also no specific vibration controls to ensure that buildings containing new (or altered) noise sensitive activities are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. The acoustic and ventilation standards (in the relief sought) do not affect the density of development near the rail corridor, but rather seek to ensure that where urban development co-locates near the rail corridor, the health and amenity of residents is not adversely affected, and the rail corridor is protected from reverse sensitivity effects. KiwiRail considers it is appropriate that these controls apply</p>	<p>KiwiRail seek that vibration controls be included to apply to sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. KiwiRail seek that non-compliance with the permitted standards be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.</p> <p><u>Indoor railway vibration</u></p> <p><u>1. Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity, within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor.</u></p> <p><u>2. Compliance with standard 1 above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw,95 or</u></p> <p><u>(b) the new building or alteration to an existing building is a singlestorey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p><u>i. a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier’s instructions and recommendations; and ii. vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and</u></p> <p><u>iii. no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p>

								on a district-wide basis (particularly in the context of the additional intensification proposed through Plan Change 92).	<p>Matters of discretion</p> <p><u>(a) location of the building;</u></p> <p><u>(b) the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards;</u></p> <p><u>(c) special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts;</u></p> <p><u>(d) the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p>
FS 70 [30]	16 [30.5]	Kāinga Ora [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora does not consider the acoustic and vibration controls sought from Kiwirail to be a qualifying matter.	Disallow
FS 73 [30]	5 [30.5]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	The amendment sought is not accepted.
FS 76 [30]	4 [30.5]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [30]	4 [30.5]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Disallow the submission.
34	34.6	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 4C - Amenity	4C.1.3 Activity Performance Standards	i. For potentially noise-sensitive activities such		Support in part	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements should not apply to residential zones, and in zones where they do apply, need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Amend 4C.1.3.2(c) to exclude its application to residential zones and for all other zones integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances, and the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.
FS 70 [34]	20 [34.6]	Kāinga Ora [Retirement Villages					Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 34.6 which seeks that the noise management provisions within the plan change are appropriate to the specific site and noise	Allow

		Association of New Zealand Incorporated]						characteristics of any proposed development or activity.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Section 8 – Natural Hazards

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
25	25.40	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	General	General	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	Section 8: Natural Hazards Matters for Discretion Floodable Areas and Coastal Inundation Areas: Section 8.5.1.3; In response to new flooding information for Te Puke and Ōmokoroa and to manage significant risk from flooding as a qualifying matter, it is proposed that a new matter of discretion (d) for floodable areas and coastal inundation areas to manage the potential risk to life be added. Evacuation can become difficult for children and elderly when flood depths are greater than 500mm . Therefore, in these situations, development should provide a safe evacuation route to ensure a low level of risk to life can be achieved during the design event. BOPRC considers development should be avoided if safe evacuation cannot be provided in this situation.	<p>The following specific relief is sought:</p> <p><u>d) The development shall provide a safe evacuation route to ensure a low level of risk to life in the design event. The threshold for risk to life for the purpose of providing safe evacuation is a flood depth >500mm; and</u></p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.</p>
29	29.8	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	General	General	Liquefaction	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes, in part, Council’s approach to liquefaction and seeks the provisions be deleted in full. While Kāinga Ora supports a framework to manage the risks of liquefaction on people’s safety, well-being and property, the proposed approach, as drafted, places the onus of identifying areas subject to liquefaction risk onto the applicants – increasing both the costs and time for residential development within both Te Puke and Ōmokoroa urban limits. Kāinga Ora understands that PC92 incorporates the liquefaction investigations prepared by Tonkin + Taylor (T+T) into Section 8 – Natural Hazards rule framework and District Plan Maps. The T+T investigations adopted are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan Area (as part of the natural hazards risk assessment accompanying the structure plan) [Level B liquefaction assessment] • The remainder of Ōmokoroa (undertaken as part of a region-wide study) [Level A liquefaction assessment]; and • Te Puke (undertaken as part of a region-wide study) [Level A liquefaction assessment] <p>The amendments to the District Plan Maps include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a ‘Liquefaction Damage is Possible’ overlay • a ‘Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely’ overlay; and • a ‘Liquefaction Category is Undetermined’ overlay. 	<p>1. Delete the proposed liquefaction framework and finalise the susceptibility mapping and risk assessment for liquefaction across the whole of the district – as with the other natural hazards – and provide a framework to appropriately manage the risk to people’s safety, well-being, and property. Such a process should be undertaken as part of a separate plan change process that would seek additional amendments to existing frameworks across the District Plan in response to the results of the mapping and assessments of all relevant natural hazards (noting the scope of this plan change is for residential areas only).</p> <p>2. Should Council wish to retain a liquefaction framework for residential areas as part of PC92, prioritise a Level B liquefaction assessment for both Te Puke urban limit and the balance of Ōmokoroa (that is, the same level of assessment undertaken for the Structure Plan Area) to remove the proposed ‘Liquefaction Category is Undetermined’ overlay.</p> <p>3. Remove the liquefaction overlay from within the WBOPDP into a “nonDistrict Plan overlay,” in line with other natural hazard overlays, that is available publicly on a GIS viewer.</p>

							<p>The subsequent amendments to Section 8 – Natural Hazards to introduce a framework to manages the risks of liquefaction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Permitted Activity rule (8.3.1.e) for buildings / structures within the ‘Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely’ – Ōmokoroa (applies only to Ōmokoroa) • a Restricted Discretionary Activity rule (8.3.3.e) for buildings, subdivision and infrastructure within both the ‘Liquefaction Damage is Possible’ and ‘Liquefaction Category is Undetermined’ (applies to both Ōmokoroa and Te Puke) • Matters of Discretion (8.5.1.5.a-j) relating to rule 8.3.1.e • Information Requirements (8.6) relating to liquefaction in both Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. <p>Under the proposed PC92 rule framework, any building, subdivision and / or infrastructure (any) within either the ‘Liquefaction Damage is Possible’ or ‘Liquefaction Category is Undetermined’ overlay triggers a RDA consent requirement. The RDA trigger requires the landowner/s to provide a liquefaction assessment prepared by a Category 1 Geo-professional (or Category 2 if endorsed by a Category 1) as part of the application. Given the spatial extent of the ‘Possible’ and ‘Undetermined’ liquefaction overlays, the resulting scenario is any building, subdivision and / or infrastructure within the entire urban limit or Te Puke or the balance of the existing Ōmokoroa urban limit not within the Structure Plan area requires resource consent (and, therefore, an accompanying liquefaction assessment) – placing the onus (including the associated costs) of determining the ‘undetermined’ liquefaction overlays on the landowner/s.</p> <p>Parallel to PC92, Kāinga Ora notes that Council is in the process of completing the susceptibility mapping and risk assessment for all natural hazards across the whole of the district to meet Council’s obligations pursuant to the Regional Policy Statement. It is considered that these assessments would clarify the ‘undetermined’ overlay for both Te Puke and the balance of Ōmokoroa urban area outside the Structure Plan area. Therefore, Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed liquefaction framework, as drafted, acts as a “stop gap” until such a time these assessments are completed by Council – with landowners bearing the costs in the interim.</p> <p>In addition, Kāinga Ora questions whether the proposed</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>approach to liquefaction in PC92 is consistent with the existing policy framework of the District Plan – insofar as not enabling development in existing urban areas where those areas are not known to be at risk (noting the “undetermined” category rating for liquefaction in both Te Puke and Ōmokoroa . Specifically, whether the proposed liquefaction framework is consistent with Policy 8.2.2.3:</p> <p>“Enable the development or redevelopment of land already subdivided or otherwise developed for urban purposes in areas now known to be at risk from natural hazards only where any likely adverse effects can be avoided or appropriately mitigated”</p> <p>Finally, Kāinga Ora considers such an overlay should be located as a “non-district plan overlay” consistent with other natural hazard overlays (noted on WBOPDC’s GIS maps).</p>	
15	15.2	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	Introduction	General	Oppose	<p>The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land shown as “Liquefaction Category is Undetermined” in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA and the Building Act to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.</p>	<p>Amend the explanatory statement as follows:</p> <p>This section imposes controls on subdivision and land use to manage natural hazard risk in accordance with Council’s statutory responsibilities. In many cases, proposed activities can proceed in locations which are susceptible to natural hazards subject to appropriate mitigation measures. For example, relocatable buildings in coastal erosion areas, minimum floor levels in coastal inundation and floodable areas and specific foundation design in land instability and liquefaction areas.</p> <p>It is important to note that the District Plan Maps do not identify all of the natural hazards that may affect land in the District. The District Plan Maps currently only identify coastal erosion, coastal inundation, flooding; <u>and</u> land instability and liquefaction because these are the natural hazards managed through this section’s rules.</p> <p>Council is in the process of completing susceptibility mapping and risk assessment for all natural hazards across the whole of the District to meet the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement. This work is taking into account at least a 100-year timeframe including the effects of climate change such as sea level rise and more extreme rainfall and will be used to update the District Plan in due course. In the meantime, all completed maps (<u>including coastal erosion, coastal inundation, flooding, liquefaction and tsunami maps not shown in the District Plan</u>) are publicly available on the Non District Plan Layers of this ePlan. This information should be used to fully understand what natural hazards are identified within</p>

									<p>an area.</p> <p>Liquefaction</p> <p>Liquefaction can occur when some saturated soils (typically silts and sands) lose strength and stiffness (temporarily behaving as a liquid rather than a solid) in response to earthquake shaking. <u>The District Plan Maps do not currently show liquefaction. However, using the maps that are available to Council, liquefaction risk will be addressed using s106 of the RMA (for subdivision) and the Building Act 2004.</u></p> <p>The District Plan Maps currently only identify liquefaction within Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. These maps generally show that “Liquefaction Damage is Possible” in lower lying areas, that “Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely” in Ōmokoroa’s elevated areas and that the “Liquefaction Category is Undetermined” in Te Puke’s elevated areas. “Liquefaction Damage is Possible” means a probability of more than 15 percent that liquefaction-induced ground damage will be minor to moderate in a 0.2% AEP (1-in-500 year) earthquake shaking event. “Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely” means a probability of more than 85 percent that liquefaction-induced ground damage will be none to minor in a 0.2% AEP (1-in-500-year) earthquake shaking event. The study took into account the effects of sea level rise in the lower-lying areas. “Liquefaction Category is Undetermined” means there is not enough information to determine the appropriate category with the required level of confidence.</p>
FS 67 [15]	39 [15.2]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.
FS 70 [15]	1 [15.2]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 15.2 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
32	32.5	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 8 - Natural Hazards	Introduction	This section also recognises		Support	The explanatory text is supported.	No relief sought. Submitter supports explanatory text.

					that in situations wh				
26	26.5	Classic Group	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	Introduction	Council is in the process of completing susceptibi		Support in part	The current wording is unclear and uncertain. The amendment confirms that these provisions are “non-statutory” and do not form part of the District Plan.	Amend the explanatory statement as follows: “In the meantime, all completed maps are publicly available on the non-district plan layers of this ePlan but do not form part of the District Plan.”
39	39.4	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	Introduction	Council is in the process of completing susceptibi		Support in part	The current wording is unclear and uncertain. The amendment confirms that these provisions are “non-statutory” and do not form part of the District Plan.	Amend the explanatory statement as follows: “In the meantime, all completed maps are publicly available on the non-district plan layers of this ePlan but do not form part of the District Plan.”
15	15.3	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.1 Permitted Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely – Ōmokoroa		Oppose	The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land shown as “Liquefaction Category is Undetermined” in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA and the Building Act 2004 to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.	Delete Rule 8.3.1 (e) (permitted activity listing for liquefaction) as follows: Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely – Ōmokoroa (i) Buildings/Structures
FS 67 [15]	40 [15.3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.
FS 70 [15]	2 [15.3]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 15.3 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
25	25.36	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.1 Permitted Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely – Ōmokoroa		Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of liquefaction maps and related provisions because the information base is mostly at Level A (regional) scale. Based on the available liquefaction mapping, BOPRC do not consider liquefaction to be a significant risk for Ōmokoroa or Te Puke and therefore not a Qualifying Matter in the context of PC92. Due to recent changes in the Building Act and outcomes of the regional liquefaction study and the liquefaction assessment for Ōmokoroa undertaken by Western	Remove liquefaction maps, explanation and associated liquefaction provisions from PC92. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.

								Bay of Plenty District Council, BOPRC consider liquefaction risk can be appropriately managed at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke by methods outside of the district plan, including assessment at subdivision through s106 of the RMA.	
FS 70 [25]	9 [25.36]	Kāinga Ora [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 23.36 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
14	14.2	Peter Musk	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.1 Permitted Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely – Ōmokoroa		Oppose	Buildings and structures should not be permitted where liquefaction damage is unlikely.	Do not permit buildings and structures where liquefaction damage is unlikely, require resource consent.
47	47.1	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.1 Permitted Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely – Ōmokoroa		Oppose	To render any activity within a liquefaction area that is undetermined a Restricted Discretionary Activity is unnecessary, and a geotechnical assessment report or geotechnical completion report addresses liquefaction and is submitted with a building consent or resource consent application. To create an RDA activity for this which subsequently becomes a qualifying matter where a sites liquefaction risk is undetermined is unnecessary and can adequately be addressed through the provision of a geotechnical assessment.	Amend 8.3.1(e) as notified to provide for dwellings s a permitted activity within an undetermined liquefaction area subject to the provision of a geotechnical assessment report of geotechnical completion report addressing liquefaction at the time of building consent or subdivision
25	25.37	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefaction		Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of liquefaction maps and related provisions because the information base is mostly at Level A (regional) scale. Based on the available liquefaction mapping, BOPRC do not consider liquefaction to be a significant risk for Ōmokoroa or Te Puke and therefore not a Qualifying Matter in the context of PC92. Due to recent changes in the Building Act and outcomes of the regional liquefaction study and the liquefaction assessment for Ōmokoroa undertaken by Western Bay of Plenty District Council, BOPRC consider liquefaction risk can be appropriately managed at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke by methods outside of the district plan, including assessment at subdivision through s106 of the RMA.	Remove liquefaction maps, explanation and associated liquefaction provisions from PC92. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
FS 70 [25]	10 [25.37]	Kāinga Ora [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 23.37 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
15	15.4	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefaction		Oppose	The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land	(i) Buildings (not within an Approved Building Site – Natural Hazards) for the following purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential units Garages

								shown as "Liquefaction Category is Undetermined" in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA and the Building Act 2004 to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheds which require building consent • Retirement villages • Rest homes • Accommodation facilities • Education facilities • Home enterprises • Places of assembly • Hospitals • Activities listed in Section 19.3 – Commercial • Activities listed in Section 21.3 – Industrial <p>(ii) — Subdivision</p> <p>(iii) — Infrastructure which provides essential services to households or the wider community specifically water supply, wastewater, stormwater, roads, telecommunication, electricity generation, gas and liquid fuels.</p>
FS 67 [15]	41 [15.4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.
FS 70 [15]	3 [15.4]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 15.4 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
58	58.18	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	e. Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefaction		Oppose	The main liquefaction risk has already been considered by Council. Further additional engineering of any identified hazards would be dealt with at time of subdivision and or building consent.	Delete this provide or make this an information requirement for subdivision.
15	15.5	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.5.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities	8.5.1.5 Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefa		Oppose	The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land shown as "Liquefaction Category is Undetermined" in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA	Delete Rule 8.5.1.5 (matters of discretion for liquefaction) as follows: 8.5.1.5 Liquefaction Damage is Possible – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke (a) — The extent to which the assessment has been carried out in accordance with the information requirements within 8.6.2. (b) — Whether the proposal achieves a low level of natural hazard risk for buildings, lifeline utilities and health

								and the Building Act 2004 to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.	<p>and safety as required by the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>(c) — The identification of suitable building foundations, suitable building sites and appropriate development setbacks from waterways/waterbodies, sloping ground or free faces.</p> <p>(d) — The use of ground improvement techniques such as perimeter treatment and area wide densification (compaction).</p> <p>(e) — The extent to which lifeline infrastructure providing essential services to households or the wider community is avoided within areas known to be susceptible to possible liquefaction or lateral spread.</p> <p>(f) — The design of infrastructure to ensure it is readily repairable should liquefaction damage occur, including placing below ground infrastructure at relatively shallow depths.</p> <p>(g) — For pipe networks, the use of ductile materials (such as flexible couplings and polyethylene pipe) and pressurized systems (as opposed to gravity systems) to mitigate the effects of global and differential settlement.</p> <p>(h) — Detailing of utility connections with buildings to reduce damage and to facilitate the ease and speed of repair in the case of differential settlement of buildings relative to the surrounding ground.</p> <p>(i) — The timing, location, scale and nature of earthworks and how these may affect liquefaction risk.</p> <p>(j) — Any verifiable information which confirms that the property should be categorised as “Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely”.</p>
FS 67 [15]	42 [15.5]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.
FS 70 [15]	4 [15.5]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 15.5 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow

		District Council]							
47	47.2	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.5.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities	8.5.1.5 Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefa		Oppose	The assessment criteria are not required if a geotechnical report is provided that addresses liquefaction.	Delete 8.5.1.5 as notified.
25	25.38	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.5.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities	8.5.1.5 Liquefaction Damage is Possible or Liquefa		Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of liquefaction maps and related provisions because the information base is mostly at Level A (regional) scale. Based on the available liquefaction mapping, BOPRC do not consider liquefaction to be a significant risk for Ōmokoroa or Te Puke and therefore not a Qualifying Matter in the context of PC92. Due to recent changes in the Building Act and outcomes of the regional liquefaction study and the liquefaction assessment for Ōmokoroa undertaken by Western Bay of Plenty District Council, BOPRC consider liquefaction risk can be appropriately managed at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke by methods outside of the district plan, including assessment at subdivision through s106 of the RMA.	Remove liquefaction maps, explanation and associated liquefaction provisions from PC92. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
FS 70 [25]	11 [25.38]	Kāinga Ora [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 23.38 as the relief sought is generally consistent with submission point 29.8 of Kāinga Ora.	Allow
18	18.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.5.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities	e. The extent to which lifeline infrastructure pro		Support	Risk reduction is central for Fire and Emergency as a national organisation as set out in the Risk Reduction Strategy 2019–2029. Fire and Emergency’s role in relation to natural hazards is embedded in Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. Fire and Emergency support the addition of rule 8.3.3(e) to the extent that the rule seeks to manage the effects of liquefaction. This will support in guiding new development to appropriate locations and safeguard well-functioning and resilient communities.	No amendment sought.
15	15.7	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.6.1 Stability – The Minden Lifestyle Structure Plan Area			Support in part	The removal of liquefaction maps and associated provisions would require consequential changes to the headings of 8.6 and 8.6.1.	Amend the headings of 8.6 and 8.6.1 as follows: 8.6 Information Requirements <u>Stability Requirements – The Minden Lifestyle Structure Plan Area</u> 8.6.1 Stability – The Minden Lifestyle Zone Area
FS 67 [15]	44 [15.7]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.
25	25.39	Bay of Plenty	Section 8	8.6.2	General		Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of liquefaction maps and related	Remove liquefaction maps, explanation and associated

		Regional Council	- Natural Hazards	Liquefaction – Omokoroa and Te Puke				provisions because the information base is mostly at Level A (regional) scale. Based on the available liquefaction mapping, BOPRC do not consider liquefaction to be a significant risk for Ōmokoroa or Te Puke and therefore not a Qualifying Matter in the context of PC92. Due to recent changes in the Building Act and outcomes of the regional liquefaction study and the liquefaction assessment for Ōmokoroa undertaken by Western Bay of Plenty District Council, BOPRC consider liquefaction risk can be appropriately managed at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke by methods outside of the district plan, including assessment at subdivision through s106 of the RMA.	liquefaction provisions from PC92. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
47	47.3	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.6.2 Liquefaction – Omokoroa and Te Puke	General		Support	The information requirements are suitable to address liquefaction risk and should be linked to permitted activity provisions.	Approve information requirements as notified and link to permitted activity provision.
15	15.6	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 8 – Natural Hazards	8.6.2 Liquefaction – Omokoroa and Te Puke			Oppose	The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land shown as “Liquefaction Category is Undetermined” in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA and the Building Act 2004 to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.	Delete Rule 8.6.2 (information requirements for liquefaction) as follows: 8.6.2 Liquefaction – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke (a) Liquefaction Assessment – Liquefaction Damage is Possible A liquefaction assessment must be prepared by a Category 1 Geo-professional or by a Category 2 Geo-professional provided that the assessment is endorsed by a Category 1 Geo-professional. This assessment: • Must be carried out in accordance with the MfE and MBIE “Planning and Engineering Guidance for Potentially Liquefaction Prone Land” (2017). • Is likely to require deep geotechnical investigations such as cone penetration testing (CPT) or boreholes and could involve the identification of Rotoehu Ash horizon in the soil profile in relation to groundwater levels. However, the investigation requirements are ultimately to be determined by the Geo-professional. • Must assess land stability and earthworks design for construction of buildings, roads and other infrastructure in accordance with best practice. Section 4.10 (DS10 Natural Hazards and Earthworks) of the Development Code is one means of compliance.

									<p>•—— Must identify suitable building foundations, suitable building sites and appropriate development setbacks from waterways/waterbodies, sloping ground or free faces.</p> <p>The Category 1 Geo-Professional is to complete certificate 10b (geotechnical suitability of land for development) and 10c (geotechnical suitability of land for building).</p>
FS 67 [15]	43 [15.6]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the removal of liquefaction related provisions and panning maps as reasoned in BOPRC submission points 25.36, 25.38, 25.39.	Accept the relief sought in the WBOPDC submission points stated in 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, which is aligned with the BOPRC submission on this point.

Section 10 Infrastructure Network Utilities and Designations & Section 11 – Financial Contributions

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
19	19.10	Pete Linde	Section 10 – Infrastructure, Network Utilities and Designations			10.4 (r) – Public Trails	Support in part	<p>A “Public Trail” is defined in the District Plan as per below, and is provided for as a permitted activity when located in a Natural Open Space Zone. We support inclusion of this activity however there are standards applicable to when this activity is undertaken under 10.4(r).</p> <p>There appears however to be a gap in the rule framework for when the land a public trail is formed on is still in private ownership instead of being in Council/public ownership. A variety of walkway / cycleways are shown on the Omokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure – Roading and Walkway / Cycleway Infrastructure Plans in close proximity to property boundaries. As they are shown on this plan, it may well be interpreted as being a “plan” prepared under the RMA 1991; if not, development of sites are required to be in compliance with the Omokoroa Structure Plans (Rule 12.4.11.5.(c)) or resource consent as a non-complying activity is required that starts to create an ultra vires consenting situation. The requested additional words as suggested are considered to be a tidy way of closing this apparent gap and allowing this public trail to be formed prior to land being vested with Council.</p> <p>Definition: “Public Trail” means a path either on or off road for the purpose of public recreational or commuter cycle or pedestrian transport or can be a bridle trail or similar. Public trail includes activities associated with creating the path, which includes pathways, bridging, boardwalks, walkways and steps, and includes related signage and maintenance activities, but excludes public trail support infrastructure such as public toilets and carparks.</p>	<p>It is requested that the following amendment in underline be made to Rule 10.4(r):</p> <p>10.4(r) Public trails</p> <p>i. Any part of a <i>public trail</i> shall be a minimum of 30m from any title boundary.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <p>ii. Clause i. shall not apply if the public trail location is closer than 30m from a title boundary and the <i>public trail</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Has been identified in a plan prepared under the Reserves Act 1977, the Local Government Act 2002, or the Resource Management Act 1991; or · Is on land that is an esplanade reserve, esplanade strip, formed or unformed road, or an access strip. · <u>Located on land zoned Natural Open Space.</u> <p>Provided that:</p> <p>iii. A <i>public trail</i> may be located closer than 30m to a title boundary where the written approval of the owner/s of the title/s has been obtained.</p>
18	18.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.4.2 Council’s infrastructure network to which financial contributions apply			Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support the amendment to Chapter 11 insofar that it enables council to impose a financial contribution as a condition of a resource consent or through the building consent process in the case of one or two additional residential units in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones.</p> <p>Where there is additional demand on infrastructure, in particular on the transportation and water supply network, it is important that council ensure that new development does not compromise the existing networks that are currently</p>	No amendments sought.

								<p>serving the communities and that additional infrastructure is provided for in order to adequately service future developments. Fire and Emergency specifically support financial contributions for transportation and water supply for the purpose of ensuring that the impacts of growth and intensification are adequately managed.</p>	
29	29.9	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.3 One or two additional residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora consider that the way in which financial contributions are to be calculated are overly complicated and require amendments for simplification and clarity. Kāinga Ora also seeks consequential amendments to incorporate reference to the High Density Residential Zones. Amendments sought.</p>	<p>1. Amend Rule 11.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>One or two additional <u>All additional</u> residential units <u>or lots</u> on a site in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium <u>and High</u> Density Residential Zones</p> <p>a. For clarity, these rules do not apply to:</p> <p>i. The first residential unit on a site (these shall be exempt from financial contributions);</p> <p>ii. One or two additional residential units on a site where a subdivision consent has been granted subject to a condition of consent imposing financial contributions for that site under Rule 11.5.5 (except for any balance lots under 11.5.5 (e)).</p> <p>b. The following rules shall apply where an application for building consent is lodged for one or two additional residential units on a site:</p> <p>i. Each additional residential unit shall be charged a financial contribution for ecological protection, recreation and leisure, transportation, water supply and wastewater based on the gross floor area of each residential unit (excluding garage);</p> <p>ii. Each additional unit shall be charged a financial contribution for stormwater based on the building footprint of each residential unit (including garage);</p> <p>iii. For this rule, building footprint means the total area of the buildings (residential unit and garage) at ground floor level together with the area of any section of any of those buildings that extends out beyond the ground floor level limits of those buildings and overhangs the ground.</p> <p>iv. One household equivalent for a residential unit is equal to a gross floor area of 150m² (excluding any garage) or building footprint of 150m² (including any garage) in the case of stormwater;</p> <p>v. An additional residential unit with a gross floor area or building footprint exceeding 150m shall not pay</p>

									<p>more than one household equivalent;</p> <p>vi. Each additional residential unit with a gross floor area or building footprint less than 150m² shall pay a reduced financial contribution that is proportional to 150m²;</p> <p>vii. The minimum contribution to be paid for an additional residential unit shall be 0.5 of a household equivalent;</p> <p>viii. Financial contributions shall be assessed and imposed through the building consent application process;</p> <p>ix. The financial contribution required through the building consent application process is payable immediately prior to the issue of that consent.</p> <p>2. Seeks consequential amendments to incorporate reference to the High Density Residential Zones.</p>
FS 74 [29]	10 [29.9]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Support amendment to Rule 11.5.3 to apply to all additional residential units or lots on a site. This would aid in clarifying financial contributions.	Amend Rule 11.5.3 to apply to all additional residential units or lots.
41	41.8	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.5.3 One or two additional residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Support	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed provision for financial contributions to be collected for permitted activities at building consent stage.	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed provision for financial contributions to be collected for permitted activities at building consent stage.
15	15.8	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.5.4 One or two additional lots not for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units from sites of less than 1,400m ² in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones			Support in part	For small infill subdivisions of 1-2 additional vacant lots, charging financial contributions based on one household equivalent per lot would mean that all lots pay the same financial contribution regardless of whether they were larger or smaller lots. It may also lead to these lots paying more financial contributions than lots in larger subdivisions where financial contributions are paid on a per hectare basis. It would therefore be fairer to charge these small infill subdivisions financial contributions on a per hectare basis. This requires rule 11.5.4 to be deleted.	<p>Delete 11.5.4 as follows (and make consequential amendments to 11.5.5 as shown in next submission point):</p> <p>One or two additional lots not for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units for sites of less than 1,400m² in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones</p> <p>(a) — Each additional lot shall be charged a financial contribution for ecological protection, recreation and leisure, transportation, water supply, wastewater and stormwater equal to one household equivalent.</p>

FS 70 [15]	5 [15.8]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 15.8, which generally seeks to achieve a more balanced and equitable approach to the charging of financial contributions for smaller household / land lot sizes.	Allow
FS 78 [15]	11 [15.8]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Generally, support flexibility for Financial Contributions for small residential subdivisions on a per ha basis, however provision for special assessment for each subdivision should be included so that lot size can effectively be considered	Support removal of current 11.5.4 provisions and include provision for special assessment for infill subdivision financial contributions
29	29.10	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.4 One or two additional lots not for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units from sites of less than 1,400m ² in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Support in part	Kāinga Ora consider that the way in which financial contributions have been calculated are overly complicated and require amendments for clarity. Kāinga Ora also seeks consequential amendments to incorporate reference to the High Density Residential Zones. Amendments sought.	Amend Rule 11.5.4 as follows: One or two additional lots <u>for non-residential activities not for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units</u> from sites of less than 1,400m ² in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium <u>and High</u> Density Residential Zones 2 a. Each additional lot shall be charged a financial contribution for ecological protection, recreation and leisure, transportation, water supply, wastewater and stormwater equal to one household equivalent.
15	15.9	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones			Support in part	To allow small infill subdivisions of 1-2 additional vacant lots to be charged financial contributions on a per hectare basis, Rule 11.5.5 would need to apply to all subdivision. It would also need to be renumbered to 11.5.4.	Renumber Rule 11.5.5 to 11.5.4 and amend as follows: All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones.
FS 70 [15]	6 [15.9]	Kāinga Ora [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 15.9, which generally seeks to achieve a more balanced and equitable approach to the charging of financial contributions for smaller household / land lot sizes.	Allow
15	15.10	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and			Support in part	Rule 11.5.5 requires only additional lots and additional residential units to pay financial contributions. This acknowledges that landowners would have already paid financial contributions to create the existing lot and therefore the first residential unit shall not need to pay financial contributions. However, by charging the financial	Amend Rule 11.5.5 to clarify that a household equivalent will not be payable for the existing lot or the first residential unit. For example, in Te Puke, where financial contributions are charged based on 20 household equivalents per hectare, a development of one hectare should only be charged 19 household equivalents and

				Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones				contributions on a per hectare basis, this will require financial contributions to be paid for the whole of the site including where financial contributions had already been paid for an existing lot / first residential unit. This was not the intention.	a development of two hectares should only be charged 39 household equivalents etc.
FS 74 [15]	1 [15.10]	Omokoroa Country Club [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the clarification of Rule 11.5.5, but seek that financial contributions are not calculated on a per hectare basis.	Amend Rule 11.5.5 so that financial contribution no longer applies to mean that when less density is delivered, the financial contribution increases.
47	47.4	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Oppose	The proposed provisions do not provide for special assessment of Financial Contributions on a site-by-site basis and are inequitable between infill and greenfield development based on a 20 unit per hectare basis. Developable area for greenfield development should also exclude all internal public roading to be vested and any reserve land to be vested in addition to land that is unsuitable for development due to geotechnical constraints or other natural hazard risks.	Delete entirety of 11.5.5 as notified and retain or improve existing District Plan provisions to allow for special assessment of Financial Contributions
FS 74 [47]	36 [47.4]	Omokoroa Country Club [The North Twelve Limited Partnership]					Oppose	Oppose the deletion of the entirety of Rule 11.5.5, however OCC supports amendments to Rule 11.5.5 to reflect retirement villages lower occupancy rate and lower demand on infrastructure.	Amend Rule 11.5.5 in accordance with OCC's original submission.
58	58.19	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Support	Supportive of per hectare financial contributions for development. This creates an incentive for intensification. This also creates a disincentive if yield targets are not achieved. Should relate to developable land area.	Retain
34	34.7	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 11 – Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Oppose	The RVA opposes 11.5.5 as it requires financial contributions to be paid on the basis of the hectares of developable area. It does not allow for any amendments if the number of units developed is less than those assumed based on that calculation. It therefore does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or works carried out as part of development.	The RVA seeks amendments to: - Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and - Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke

				Residential Zones					Medium Density Residential zone and in other zones that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
FS 74 [34]	19 [34.7]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support RVA's submission opposing the financial contributions being paid on the basis of hectares of developable area for Rule 11.5.5. The current wording of Rule 11.5.5 disadvantages Retirement Villages and does not reflect their lower occupancy and lower demand on infrastructure.	Amend Rule 11.5.5 so that the financial contributions regime recognises the lower demand profile of retirement development compared to standard residential.
29	29.11	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.5 All other subdivision and four or more residential units on a site in the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that the way in which financial contributions have been calculated are overly complicated and require amendments for clarity and seek that Rule 11.5.5 is deleted and replaced with Rule 11.5.3 as amended by this submission.	Delete Rule 11.5.5 in its entirety.
FS 74 [29]	11 [29.11]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Support the deletion of Rule 11.5.5 in its entirety and replace it with Rule 11.5.3.	Deletion of Rule 11.5.5 and replacing it with Rule 11.5.3 means that financial contribution would no longer apply to mean that when less density is delivered, the financial contribution increases (what Rule 11.5.5 currently imposes).
56	56.3	Omokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.7 Retirement villages	General		Oppose	<p>Plan Change 92 proposes to amend the way that financial contributions are levied on retirement village developments. Financial contributions are determined on a "household equivalent" (a defined term, not proposed to be amended by Plan Change 92, which is typically based on 2.7 persons per occupied dwelling). The operative District Plan appropriately reflects that retirement village dwellings and retirement village independent apartments shall be charged a financial contribution for recreation and leisure, transportation, water supply, wastewater, stormwater and ecological protection equal to 0.5 of a household equivalent for 1 and 2 bedroomed dwellings/apartments (11.5.4). However, Plan Change 92 proposes to remove this for the Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones.</p> <p>OCC opposes the proposed financial contributions regime as it applies to retirement development. The proposal is inappropriate for a number of reasons:</p> <p>1. The objectives and policies of the operative District Plan with respect to financial contributions have not been changed and there is no assessment of whether Plan</p>	<p>Amend the District Plan to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the amendments to 11.5.4 (now 11.5.7) which remove the 0.5 household equivalent multiplier for retirement village dwellings and retirement village independent apartments. 2. Amend the financial contributions provisions so that they reflect the lower occupancy and demand on infrastructure created by retirement villages, e.g., through provisions providing for lower financial contributions for retirement villages and rest home activities. 3. Make all consequential amendments required to the District Plan and financial contributions regime.

							<p>Change 92 continues to achieve the objectives of the District Plan.</p> <p>2. The section 32 report is silent on this change regarding the levying of financial contributions against retirement villages.</p> <p>3. Plan Change 92 uses financial contributions for an ulterior purpose, being the encouragement of density, as 11.5.5 makes it clear that in Ōmokoroa Stage B (where a yield of 20 dwellings per hectare is sought), the delivery of 40 lots/units will pay only a 0.5 household equivalent per lot/unit notwithstanding that if this were a standard house the household equivalent would still have a typical occupancy of 2.7. Conversely, if less density is delivered, then the multiplier will increase, notwithstanding that demand on infrastructure has not increased. This goes beyond any stated purpose of financial contributions in the District Plan and is therefore unlawful in terms of s 108(10)(a) RMA.</p> <p>4. The focus on encouraging development density will not enable a variety of homes as sought by Policy 1 of the NPS for Urban Development.</p> <p>5. It is appropriate for financial contributions levied on retirement villages and rest homes to reflect their lower occupancy and lower demand on infrastructure. This is already reflected in the operative District Plan.</p> <p>6. In the absence of the financial contribution's regime reflecting the lower occupancy and lower demand on infrastructure than residential development, retirement village operators will have to fall back on the reduction and waiver provisions for the payment of reduced financial contributions. This creates uncertainty and will deter retirement village operators from delivering retirement developments. This in turn means that Plan Change 92 will not deliver a variety of homes as sought by Policy 1 of the NPS for Urban Development which clearly looks to include homes that meet the needs (in terms of price, type and location) of different households - which includes the retirement sector.</p>	
FS 76 [56]	5 [56.3]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Ōmokoroa Country Club				Support in part	<p>The RVA supports points 2 and 3 of the relief sought to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission seeking a bespoke financial contributions regime for retirement villages. However on point 1, the RVA seeks lower HUE charges for retirement villages than the proposed 0.5 multiplier, which does not fully account for the lower impacts on council services of retirement villages.</p>	Allow the submission to the extent it is consistent with the RVA submission and otherwise disallow it.

		Ltd]							
FS 77 [56]	5 [56.3]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]					Support in part	Ryman supports points 2 and 3 of the relief sought to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission seeking a bespoke financial contributions regime for retirement villages. However on point 1, Ryman seeks lower HUE charges for retirement villages than the proposed 0.5 multiplier, which does not fully account for the lower impacts on council services of retirement villages.	Allow the submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission and otherwise disallow it.
34	34.8	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 11 - Financial Contributions	11.5.7 Retirement villages	General		Oppose	The RVA opposes 11.5.5 as it requires financial contributions to be paid on the basis of the hectares of developable area. It does not allow for any amendments if the number of units developed is less than those assumed based on that calculation. It therefore does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or works carried out as part of development. The RVA also opposes the related retirement village specific provision (11.5.7 - 0.5 household equivalent rate), which does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages.	The RVA seeks amendments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and - Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential zone and in other zones that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.

Section 12 – Subdivision and Development

Submitter Ref No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
25	25.15	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	General	General		Support in part	<p>12.3.8 (Information Requirements)</p> <p>A further method is sought to ensure subdivision demonstrates consistency with the specific methods and outcomes anticipated by the catchment management plan for Ōmokoroa Stage 3 only. To give effect to the higher order documents, including the integrated management directives of the NPS-FM which seeks to ensure that freshwater, and land use and development in catchments is managed in an integrated manner, and the relevant provisions of the RPS.</p>	<p>Further provision(s) are sought to require that subdivision within Stage 3 of the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan demonstrates consistency with the stormwater management approach in the relevant catchment management documents and the 'Stormwater Management Concept: Ōmokoroa Stage 3', in Appendix 7 (Structure Plans) with regards to water quantity, volume reduction and water quality.</p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.</p>
19	19.21	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	General	General	Policies	Support in part	<p>Sections 12 Policies and Matters of Discretion generally. It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion. In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The "NPS on Urban Development" and "Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act" are trying to give Council's the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have flourished in our planning and consenting worlds. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.</p>	<p>It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Policies.</p>
19	19.22	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	General	General	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	<p>Sections 12 Matters of Discretion generally. It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion. In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The "NPS on Urban Development" and "Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act" are trying to give Council's the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have flourished in our planning and consenting worlds. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our</p>	<p>It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Matters of Discretion.</p>

								efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	
19	19.2	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development			Objectives	Support in part	Sections 12 Policies and Matters of Discretion generally. It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion. In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The "NPS on Urban Development" and "Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act" are trying to give Council's the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have flourished in our planning and consenting worlds. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives.
FS 69 [19]	25 [19.2]	Jace Investments [Pete Linde]					Support	Support - Revised explanatory statement for the Natural Open Space zone to recognise that it has a function for stormwater, drainage and is generally geotechnically constrained.	Accept Submission point and amend explanatory statement as suggested.
26	26.6	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	General	General		Support in part	In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The "NPS on Urban Development" and "Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act" are trying to give Council's the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion.
25	25.17	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.3.7 Information Requirements - Subdivision Plan	General		Support in part	Ensure that subdivision plans identify and consider the location of stormwater infrastructure within the plan change area.	The following specific relief (new clause (r)) is sought: <u>r. The indicative or approved locations of all stormwater infrastructure (at source and subdivision-wide) within the subdivision area in Te Puke Structure Plan and Ōmokoroa Structure Plan for Stage 3.</u> Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.

26	26.9	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.3.10 Engineering Design, Physical Works and Supervision	For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Res		Oppose	The further rule is unnecessary as earthworks requirements are already addressed in the Plan by Rule 12.4.1.i - Site Suitability Requirements (engineering design required for earthworks).	Delete the reference in b. Engineering documents are to include: " For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zones, the proposal must include a detailed contour plan. This must show the existing ground level and proposed new contours to demonstrate compliance with the earthworks performance standards in Section 14A. "
39	39.5	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.3.10 Engineering Design, Physical Works and Supervision	For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Res		Oppose	The further rule is unnecessary as earthworks requirements are already addressed in the Plan by Rule 12.4.1.i - Site Suitability Requirements (engineering design required for earthworks).	Delete the reference in b. Engineering documents are to include: " For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zones, the proposal must include a detailed contour plan. This must show the existing ground level and proposed new contours to demonstrate compliance with the earthworks performance standards in Section 14A. "
40	40.4	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.3.10 Engineering Design, Physical Works and Supervision	For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Res		Oppose	Earthworks requirements are already addressed in the Plan by Rule 12.4.1.i - Site Suitability Requirements (engineering design required for earthworks). The provision is unnecessary.	Delete the reference in b. Engineering documents are to include: " For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zones, the proposal must include a detailed contour plan. This must show the existing ground level and proposed new contours to demonstrate compliance with the earthworks performance standards in Section 14A. "
42	42.3	Brian Goldstone	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.3.10 Engineering Design, Physical Works and Supervision	For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Res		Oppose	Earthworks requirements are already addressed in the Plan by Rule 12.4.1.i - Site Suitability Requirements (engineering design required for earthworks). The provision is unnecessary.	Delete the reference in b. Engineering documents are to include: " For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zones, the proposal must include a detailed contour plan. This must show the existing ground level and proposed new contours to demonstrate compliance with the earthworks performance standards in Section 14A. "
18	18.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.1 Site Suitability	g. Each lot in a Residential, Medium Density Resid		Support in part	Fire and Emergency strongly support the amendment to Rule 12.4.1 to include the Medium Density Residential Zone to require each lot to be capable of being connected to reticulated water supply infrastructure of adequate capacity and formed and sealed roading in accordance with Council's Development Code. Development Code DS7 Water Supply (section 7.1) sets out the minimum requirements for all developments which require all allotments to be provided with a water supply connection which shall be 20mm internal diameter. All water supply connections require application to and approval by Council. Further, developments without access to a public supply must be "served by a privately owned water supply which satisfies all legislation and guidelines, including but not limited to, drinking water standards, Building Act and the New Zealand Fire Service Code of Practice; SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and subsequent amendments, to the satisfaction of the New Zealand Fire Service". Section 7.2 (Level of Service) requires "All water supply reticulation shall be to a Water Supply Classification W3, or such higher classification as appropriate in terms of the New Zealand Fire	No relief sought.

								Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice, SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and subsequent amendments". The Section 32 Report notes that through Council's Water Conservation Strategy and Asset Management Plan, initiatives exist to measure and manage the water supply giving Council the ability to monitor and report on water usage and pro-actively plan for growth, future source, storage and reticulation infrastructure. For Te Puke, Fire and Emergency understand that based on the modelling exercise undertaken and the planned identified upgrades, Council's infrastructure staff are comfortable that with the planned upgrades, the water network has sufficient capacity to cater for intensification expected as a result of the plan change. However, in order for Council to ensure that level of service is maintained, Fire and Emergency strongly suggest that additional mechanisms are put in place to adequately monitor and manage the cumulative effects of the future growth and intensification on the water supply infrastructure in both Ōmokoroa and Te Puke through the district plan. Fire and Emergency require a rule in the district plan that requires developers to demonstrate and provide evidence that their development can be adequately serviced in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This is sought elsewhere in this submission.	
26	26.10	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.1 Site Suitability	j. Controlled Earthworks Ōmokoroa Stage 2 and Stag		Oppose	The proposed provisions for earthworks greater than 300m2 conflicts with the Regional Plan and will result in unnecessary process requirements, delays, and cost which has not been properly evaluated. The provisions are unnecessary and inefficient.	Delete the controlled activity earthworks requirement for Stage 2 and Stage 3 structure plan areas for Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential
FS 76 [26]	6 [26.10]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Classic Group]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [26]	6 [26.10]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Classic Group]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
39	39.6	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.1 Site Suitability	j. Controlled Earthworks Ōmokoroa Stage 2 and Stag		Oppose	The proposed provisions for earthworks greater than 300m2 conflicts with the Regional Plan and will result in unnecessary process requirements, delays, and cost which has not been properly evaluated. The provisions are unnecessary and inefficient.	Delete the controlled activity earthworks requirement for Stage 2 and Stage 3 structure plan areas for Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential
FS 76 [39]	7 [39.6]	Retirement Villages					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the	Allow the submission.

	6]	Associatio n of New Zealand Incorporat ed [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]						benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	
FS 77 [39]	7 [39. 6]	Ryman Healthcar e Limited [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
40	40.5	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.1 Site Suitability	j. Controlled Earthworks Ōm okoroa Stage 2 and Stag		Oppose	The proposed provisions for earthworks greater than 300m2 conflicts with the Regional Plan and will result in unnecessary process requirements, delays, and cost which has not been properly evaluated. The provisions are unnecessary and inefficient and the appendix referred to specifically relates to Omokoroa only	Delete the controlled activity earthworks requirement for Te Puke medium density residential
FS 76 [40]	8 [40. 5]	Retiremen t Villages Associatio n of New Zealand Incorporat ed [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [40]	8 [40. 5]	Ryman Healthcar e Limited [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
18	18.7	Fire and Emergenc y New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.3 Extension of Services	12.4.3.2 Residential, Medium Density Residential,		Support	Fire and Emergency support Rule 12.4.3 to the extent that it requires all existing utility services (i.e. the water supply network) to be extended into all developments in accordance with all other relevant parts of the District Plan and the Development Code, allowing for the connection of each new site within the development, capacity for future land use in the catchment being serviced, and assessing the adequacy of the existing utility services available, including upgrading such services where inadequacy exists. In order to ensure that the cumulative effects	No relief sought.

								on the water supply network are adequately managed, Fire and Emergency request that Council require developers to demonstrate and provide evidence that their development can be adequately serviced in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. This is sought elsewhere in this submission.																					
18	18.8	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.3 Extension of Services	12.4.3.3 Rural, Lifestyle, Rural-Residential and N		Support	Fire and Emergency support this rule insofar that Natural Open Space Zones are subject to the water supply requirements set out in Council's Development Code.	No relief sought.																				
18	18.10	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access			Oppose	Fire and Emergency oppose rule 12.4.4.4(e)(v) to the extent that the reserve and pavement widths required in the Development Code tables can be reduced at the point where the number of lots dependent on access defaults to the next (lower) standard in the tables. Fire and Emergency has requested above that the minimum access width be 4m. Fire and Emergency request that this rule be removed.	Delete 12.4.4.4(e)(v).																				
FS 76 [18]	9 [18.10]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is appropriate that the consent process enable a case by case assessment of design and the provisions should not duplicate or alter requirements of the Building Code.	Disallow the submission																				
FS 77 [18]	9 [18.10]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is appropriate that the consent process enable a case by case assessment of design and the provisions should not duplicate or alter requirements of the Building Code	Disallow the submission																				
18	18.9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access	Table 1: Urban Roads (Residential, Medium Density		Oppose	<p>The MDRZ has been added to Table 1 which set out the road reserve and pavement widths and maximum grades based on road function for urban roads. By way of background, for fire appliances to access an emergency, adequate accessway width, height and gradient is necessary. A 95th percentile pumping appliance has a width of 2.5m, a height of 3.55m and a length of 8.72m. Vehicular roading and access widths, surface and gradients should support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. These requirements are set out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliance to access hoses and pumps. • A clear vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided 	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Classification</td> <td colspan="2">width – Min</td> <td>Max grade – %</td> <td>Road function</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Road reserve</td> <td>Carriageway (includes parking bays)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Privateway serving up to 2 units</td> <td>2.7 5.0</td> <td>2.5-4.0</td> <td>20 16</td> <td>Private access: max length 35m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Classification	width – Min		Max grade – %	Road function		Road reserve	Carriageway (includes parking bays)			Privateway serving up to 2 units	2.7 5.0	2.5-4.0	20 16	Private access: max length 35m
Classification	width – Min		Max grade – %	Road function																									
	Road reserve	Carriageway (includes parking bays)																											
Privateway serving up to 2 units	2.7 5.0	2.5-4.0	20 16	Private access: max length 35m																									

							<p>as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. <p>Carriageways should be wide enough to allow fire and emergency vehicles to get through them easily and to allow Fire and Emergency to carry out emergency operations. This means that when the fire appliance vehicle is parked, Fire and Emergency personnel can easily open and exit the doors, access equipment from its compartments and safely connect the hose to the pump. Fire and Emergency request that Table 1 be amended to reflect Fire and Emergency's minimum access requirements for all urban roads and that the Development Code be updated to align with the requirements set out in this submission.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Privateway serving 3-6 units</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>3.5 4.0</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>Private access: max length 100m with provision for mid point passing <u>and</u> <u>hardstand in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008</u> if greater than 70m <u>from the road frontage</u></td> </tr> </table>	Privateway serving 3-6 units	5.0	3.5 4.0	12.5	Private access: max length 100m with provision for mid point passing <u>and</u> <u>hardstand in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008</u> if greater than 70m <u>from the road frontage</u>
Privateway serving 3-6 units	5.0	3.5 4.0	12.5	Private access: max length 100m with provision for mid point passing <u>and</u> <u>hardstand in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008</u> if greater than 70m <u>from the road frontage</u>									
FS 69 [18]	1 [18.9]	Jace Investments [Fire and Emergency NZ]				Oppose	The private ways grades sought by NZFS grade are too restrictive.	Reject submission and allow private ways to be steeper in accordance with the development Code. This will assist marginal land retaining its landform to a greater extent.					
FS 76 [18]	10 [18.9]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]				Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as the Building Act provides the framework for considering access to sites for fire-fighting purposes. The plan provisions should not duplicate or alter requirements of the Building Code.	Disallow the submission					
FS 77 [18]	10 [18.9]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]				Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as the Building Act provides the framework for considering access to sites for fire-fighting purposes. The plan provisions should not duplicate or alter requirements of the Building Code.	Disallow the submission					
FS 78 [18]	12 [18.9]	The North Twelve Limited Partnership [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]				Oppose	Oppose inclusion of new accessway provisions. While it is accepted that adequate provision for emergency service access is necessary, this is better addressed through subdivision design to ensure there is adequate water supply and fire hydrants within proximity to a development along with sufficient clear area to access rear properties. Widening accessways utilises residential land and will not achieve the purpose of the residential intensification provisions.	Decline inclusion of new accessway provisions					

58	58.11	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access	c. Access on to Ōmokoroa Road, Prole Road, Athenre		Oppose	The rule does not reflect the approved Omokoroa Town Centre masterplan that has three connections to Omokoroa Road. This is locked down in terms of the existing live resource consent and could be retained if a variation to that consent were applied for. However, for any new resource consent for the town centre masterplan this rule would remain relevant. Noncompliance with this rule triggers an RDA (restricted discretionary activity) classification pursuant to Rule 12.3.4.1.	Amend rule 12.4.4.4(c) and be consistent with the town centre plan.
29	29.12	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access	c. Access on to Ōmokoroa Road, Prole Road, Athenre		Oppose	Kāinga Ora notes the rule requiring Prole Road accesses to be closed and relocated means that some sites/developments will be reliant on others to complete the (Structure Plan) road network before their sites can be connected (or otherwise seek a noncomplying resource consent). In respect to Ōmokoroa Road, Kāinga Ora notes sub clause i. does not provide for an increase in direct access by dwellings or activities. Kāinga Ora is concerned that this may restrict the ability to unlock development and realise the development capacity resulting in delays to achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora seeks clarification from WBOPDC in relation to this matter. It is the view of Kāinga Ora that a subdivision and/or development that proposes access to Prole or Ōmokoroa Road should be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity if no alternative access (as per the Structure Plan) is available. This would enable landowners to unlock the land's development potential without relying on a third party landowner.	<p>1. Seeks clarification in respect to provisions which appear to enable or unlock the development of Ōmokoroa Stage 3 and how this impacts on realising the development capacity of the area.</p> <p>2. That a subdivision and/or development that proposes access to Prole or Ōmokoroa Road should be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity if no alternative access (as per the Structure Plan) is available. This would enable landowners to unlock the land's development potential without relying on a third party landowner.</p>
FS 68 [29]	1 [29.1 2]	Classic Group [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	We oppose the submission point as we support the proposed plan change.	Support rule 12.4.4.c as proposed in the plan change document.
FS 74 [29]	12 [29.1 2]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Oppose clarification of Rule 12.4.4.4.c as sought by Kāinga Ora.	This relief could lead to multiple uncoordinated accesses which is not in the interests of the structure plan.
11	11.2	Elles Pearse-Danker	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access	i. The number or potential number of dwellings or		Support in part	Existing accesses cannot be closed until alternative access has been provided.	i. The number or potential number of dwellings or other activities gaining direct access to these roads shall not be increased. On subdivision or development, Council may apply a segregation strip to the certificate of title to ensure that access is gained from elsewhere in the Zone. For Prole Road any existing accesses shall be closed and relocated <u>once alternative access has been provided</u> .
26	26.11	Classic Group	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	12.4.5.1 Stormwater systems shall be provided or e		Support	The proposed provisions will provide for sustainable alternatives to stormwater reticulation such as water reuse systems.	We consider that alternatives to connecting to the reticulated stormwater system as set out in 12.4.5.1 should be accepted as notified.
39	39.7	Urban Taskforce for	Section 12 – Subdivision	12.4.5 Stormwater	12.4.5.1 Stormwater systems shall		Support	The proposed provisions will provide for sustainable alternatives to stormwater reticulation such as water reuse systems.	We consider that alternatives to connecting to the reticulated stormwater system as set out in 12.4.5.1 should be accepted as notified.

		Tauranga	on and Development		be provided or e				
26	26.12	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	12.4.5.3 Each new or existing site shall be indivi		Support	The proposed provisions will provide for sustainable alternatives to stormwater reticulation such as water reuse systems.	We consider that alternatives to connecting to the reticulated stormwater system as set out in 12.4.5.3 should be accepted as notified.
39	39.8	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	12.4.5.3 Each new or existing site shall be indivi		Oppose	The proposed provisions will provide for sustainable alternatives to stormwater reticulation such as water reuse systems.	We consider that alternatives to connecting to the reticulated stormwater system as set out in 12.4.5.3 should be accepted as notified.
FS 67 [39]	2 [39.8]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support in part	Support in part relief sought by the submitter. Bay of Plenty Regional Council ("Regional Council") supports any plan provision that encourages/requires water sensitive design such as stormwater reuse within a site. However even with onsite water retention measures in place, sites in medium density residential areas are still likely to need to connect to the reticulated stormwater system because it may not be possible to retain all stormwater on site during larger storms to meet Western Bay of Plenty District Council's level of service for management of stormwater. Any site that did not connect to reticulated stormwater would fall outside of the comprehensive stormwater consent for that area. The comprehensive stormwater consent aims to manage stormwater in the whole catchment, including cumulative effects of the stormwater discharge. A site that did not connect to the reticulated stormwater system may need a resource consent from the Regional Council because the stormwater discharge may not meet the relevant permitted rule of the relevant regional plan.	Retain provision 12.4.5.3 as notified.
29	29.13	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	12.4.5.17 In Ōmokoroa and Te Puke in the Medium De		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes rule 12.4.5.17 specifically because: (a) Kāinga Ora is unclear if the rule relates to both development and subdivision as sub clause (a) only refers to 'subdivisions. (b) It is not clear what Stormwater Management Plans are being referred to in sub clause (b) without full references. The additional detail in sub clause (b) is not necessary if the detail is incorporated into the Stormwater Management Plan itself. (c) Sub-clause (c) should be rewritten for improved readability. (d) Kāinga Ora does not support reference to the stormwater discharge consent for Ōmokoroa, noting this is to expire in May 2023 and will	Amend 12.4.5.17 as follows: In Ōmokoroa and Te Puke in the Medium Density Residential, Commercial and Industrial Zones, the following requirements shall be met. a. All new subdivisions <u>and development</u> shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to pre-development levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment. b. All works shall be in accordance with the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan (<u>insert full</u>

							<p>therefore be out of date shortly (sub clauses (d)-(e)), with WBOPDC due to lodge a new consent for its replacement. Additionally, it is not necessary to include a rule to comply with a resource consent if one is in place. Kāinga Ora seek that sub clause (d) and (e) be deleted.</p> <p>(e) Kāinga Ora also does not consider it appropriate to include requirements for third party approvals from Bay of Plenty Regional Council (which are also linked to the aforementioned consent) in sub clause (e) as part of a District Plan.</p> <p>(f) Sub clause (f) is not a rule and Kāinga Ora seek that it be deleted or changed to an advice note.</p> <p>Amendments sought.</p>	<p><u>reference</u>) and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan (<u>insert full reference</u>)and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands and pervious pavement) as far as practicable to maintain and/or enhance pre-development hydrology and quality.</p> <p>c. Inert Exterior building materials only shall be <u>inert used</u> (e.g., no unpainted zinc or copper products that would result in soluble metals becoming entrained in stormwater) unless additional treatment is provided to ensure no offsite adverse effects.</p> <p>d. The construction plans...</p> <p>e. An erosion and...</p> <p>f. <u>Advice note:</u> The stormwater reserve areas at Ōmokoroa are shown on the Planning Maps and described in more detail in the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan.</p>
FS 67 [29]	3 [29.1 3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities]				Support in part	<p>Support addition of 'and development' to the rule.</p> <p>Oppose deletion of the additional detail in 12.4.5.17(b) (requirement for water sensitive urban design to maintain/enhance pre-development hydrology and quality). The additional detail in (b) ensures that this detail will be included in the SMP – without this direction, these measures may not be included. The plan should detail the requirements of the SMP, including requirements to manage attenuation and water quality to give effect to the NPS-FM, the relevant provision/s of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and to ensure consistency with the relevant regional plans.</p> <p>Oppose deletion of 12.4.5.17 (d) (construction plans) and (e) (erosion and sediment control plans). These plans support comprehensive and integrated planning to manage water quality effects, and therefore meet SMP and comprehensive consent requirements and give effect to regional and national policy requirements.</p> <p>Regional Council supports using clear and consistent terminology for the catchment management documents, including the SMP (per submission point 25.12). We understand that the proposed Ōmokoroa SMP is still in draft form and so the final version cannot be referenced. Regional Council considers the SMP should be an adaptive management document, able to be updated and respond to the circumstances for the best outcome for stormwater quality and flood management. References to the SMPs should be consistent throughout the plan and should refer to the most recent certified version.</p>	<p>Retain the additional detail required under 12.4.5.17(b), (d) and (e) as notified. Ensure a clear and consistent terminology is used to reference the SMPs throughout the plan.</p>
FS 69 [29]	2 [29.1]	Jace Investmen				Support	<p>If stormwater management plans are to be referred to in the District Plan, they should be properly referenced to enable appropriate RMA</p>	<p>Accept submission point provided there is an available referenced document that has been approved through due</p>

	3]	ts [Kāinga Ora]						scrutiny to amendments that may occur to the plans in the future.	process.
47	47.5	The North Twelve Limited Partnershi p	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.5 Stormwat er	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for atte		Oppose	Matters in 12.4.5.17 are unclear and further clarity is sought on design figures used in 12.4.5.17(a)	Delete changes to 12.4.5 as notified subject to further clarification on matters 12.4.5.17 being clarified
FS 67 [47]	4 [47.3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [The North Twelve Limited Partnershi p]					Support	Support relief sought by the submitter because there is uncertainty around the design figures in 12.4.5.17(a): the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) (submission point 25.9) to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.
25	25.8	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.5 Stormwat er	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for atte		Oppose	The flooding management standard in Clause (a) is at odds with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.	Delete 12.4.5.17 Clause (a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.
26	26.13	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.5 Stormwat er	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for atte		Support in part	The rule is unclear as it refers to 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events. The rule is also unnecessary as both Te Puke and Omokoroa are subject to existing comprehensive discharge consents which set out the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved. The second part of the rule should be retained to refer to the comprehensive catchment consents which are in place for each catchment.	Delete Rule 12.4.5.17.a All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to predevelopment levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment. All work shall be in accordance with the Omokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan comprehensive catchments consent and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands, and pervious pavements) as far a practicable to maintain or enhance predevelopment hydrology and quality.
FS 67 [26]	5 [26.1 3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Classic Group]					Support	Support relief sought by the submitter because there is uncertainty around the design figures in 12.4.5.17(a): the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) (submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12) to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.
58	58.14	Jace	Section 12	12.4.5	a. All new		Support	This rule requires attenuation to 50% of predevelopment flow and 1% AEP	Amend Rule 12.4.5.17 as the Kaimai View Stormwater pond and

		Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	- Subdivision and Development	Stormwater	subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation		in part	levels. The stormwater pond for the subcatchment which includes the town centre has been built and includes a large dam structure designed and built under the Omokoroa Comprehensive Stormwater Consent. A new resource consent for the Omokoroa Comprehensive Stormwater Consent has been lodged with the BOPRC and is being processed. It is important that the new CSC consent and this rule recognises the established infrastructure that provides for the subcatchment already.	large dam has been constructed at great cost and provides for the whole commercial town centre, mixed use precinct and other land within the sub catchment. Need to add to 12.4.5.17(a) Where stormwater infrastructure has already been constructed for a sub catchment that new upgrades are not required.
FS 67 [58]	6 [58.14]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. Existing stormwater infrastructure may need to be upgraded to meet consent conditions and the SMP requirements.	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) (submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12) to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
39	39.9	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation		Support in part	The rule is unclear as it refers to 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events. The rule is also unnecessary as both Te Puke and Omokoroa are subject to existing comprehensive discharge consents which set out the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved. The second part of the rule (12.4.5.17.b) should be retained to refer to the comprehensive catchment consents which are in place for each catchment.	Delete Rule 12.4.5.17.a All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to predevelopment levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment. Amend Rule 12.4.5.17.b <u>All work shall be in accordance with the Omokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan comprehensive catchments consent and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands, and pervious pavements) as far as practicable to maintain or enhance predevelopment hydrology and quality.</u>
FS 67 [39]	7 [39.9]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support in part	Support relief sought by the submitter to delete Rule 12.4.5.17(a) because there is uncertainty around the design figures in 12.4.5.17(a): the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. Oppose relief sought by the submitter to delete references to the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan from Rule 12.4.5.17(b) – it is appropriate for the district plan and associated SMPs to provide direction on the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved, rather than to rely on resource consents alone to set this direction. Resource consents take direction from policies in a plan and SMP rather	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) in submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12, to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.

								than being standalone documents.	
40	40.6	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation		Support in part	<p>The rule is unclear as it refers to 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events. The rule is unnecessary as the Te Puke structure plan area is subject to existing comprehensive discharge consents which set out the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved. Modelling is therefore completed as part of the subdivision process. The second part of the rule (submitter is referring to rule 12.4.5.17(b)) should be retained to refer to the comprehensive catchment consents which are in place for the Te Puke Structure Plan Catchment.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 12.4.5.17.a</p> <p>All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to predevelopment levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment.</p> <p>Amend Rule 12.4.5.17.b</p> <p><u>All work shall be in accordance with the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan comprehensive catchments consent and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands, and pervious pavements) as far as practicable to maintain or enhance predevelopment hydrology and quality.</u></p>
FS 67 [40]	8 [40.6]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support in part	<p>Support relief sought by the submitter to delete 12.4.5.17(a) because the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.</p> <p>Oppose relief sought by the submitter to delete references to the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan from Rule 12.4.5.17(b) – it is appropriate for the district plan and associated SMPs to provide direction on the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved, rather than to rely on resource consents alone to set this direction. Resource consents take direction from policies in a plan and SMP rather than being standalone documents.</p>	<p>Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) in submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12, to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.</p>
42	42.4	Brian Goldstone	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	a. All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation		Support in part	<p>The rule is unclear as it refers to 50% and 1% AEP flood events. The rule is unnecessary as the structure plan area is subject to existing comprehensive discharge consents which set out the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved. The second part of the rule (submitter is referring to rule 12.4.5.17(b)) should be retained to refer to the comprehensive catchment consents.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 12.4.5.17.a</p> <p>All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to predevelopment levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment.</p> <p>Amend Rule 12.4.5.17.b</p> <p><u>All work shall be in accordance with the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan comprehensive catchments consent and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such</u></p>

										as swales, wetlands, and pervious pavements) as far as practicable to maintain or enhance predevelopment hydrology and quality.
FS 67 [42]	9 [42.4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Brian Goldstone]					Support in part	Support relief sought by the submitter to delete 12.4.5.17(a) because the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. Oppose relief sought by the submitter to delete references to the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan from Rule 12.4.5.17(b) – it is appropriate for the district plan and associated SMPs to provide direction on the requirements for attenuation and discharge standards to be achieved, rather than to rely on resource consents alone to set this direction. Resource consents take direction from policies in a plan and SMP rather than being standalone documents.	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17 (b) in submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12, to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.	
25	25.9	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	b. All works shall be in accordance with the Ōmoko		Support in part	Recognise the intent to rely on the existing and future catchment management documents and manage attenuation and water quality to give effect to the NPS-FM, the relevant provision in the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and, ensure consistency with the Bay of Plenty Coastal Environment Plan (2019) (RCEP) and BOP Regional Natural Resources Plan (2008) (RNRP). Further clarification is sought as to the method by which subdivision is managed by existing and, in particular, future catchment management documents to recognise that this is an interim period, and that more comprehensive planning is being developed that will better manage these effects and give effect to national and regional policy and planning requirements.	Clarify and strengthen the 'linking' method in 12.4.5.17 (b) to ensure: (i) that future subdivision must comply with existing and future comprehensive stormwater consent(s) and associated management documents; (ii) that the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans will give effect to the NPS-FM, and the RPS and not be inconsistent with the RCEP and RNRP; (iii) And in the interim: ensure that the plan does not foreclose on or predetermine options or outcomes in the interim period before full effect is given to the NPS-FM and the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES-F).	
25	25.11	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	b. All works shall be in accordance with the Ōmoko		Support in part	Amend wording to better align with the wider stormwater management objectives of the relevant catchment management documents and plans.	In addition to relief sought elsewhere to 12.4.5.17(b), the following or similar relief is sought: (i) All works shall be in accordance with the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and the Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan and shall incorporate <u>best practicable options</u> for water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands and pervious pavement) as far as practicable to <u>manage</u> hydrology and <u>water</u> quality. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.	
25	25.12	Bay of Plenty Regional	Section 12 - Subdivision	12.4.5 Stormwater	b. All works shall be in accordance		Support in part	Various terms are referred to in the s.32 report and provisions regarding the various catchment and stormwater management documents that may lead to confusion.	Ensure a clear and consistent terminology is used for the catchment management documents i.e. catchment management plans, stormwater management plans and	

		Council	on and Development		with the Ōmoko				comprehensive stormwater consents
47	47.6	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	b. All works shall be in accordance with the Ōmoko		Oppose	Matters in 12.4.5.17 are unclear and further clarity is sought on reference to the Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan in 12.4.5.17(b).	Delete changes to 12.4.5 as notified subject to further clarification on matters 12.4.5.17 being clarified
FS 67 [47]	10 [47.6]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [The North Twelve Limited Partnership]					Support	Support relief sought by the submitter because there is uncertainty around the design figures in 12.4.5.17(a): the flooding management standard in 12.4.5.17(a) does not align with the various attenuation requirements anticipated or approved in the existing catchment management plans for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.	Delete 12.4.5.17(a) in favour of relief sought for 12.4.5.17(b) (submission points 25.9, 25.11 and 25.12) to ensure that attenuation is managed at the subdivision stage by the relevant catchment management documents and associated management plans.
25	25.16	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	c. Inert exterior building materials only shall be		Support	At source controls contribute to water quality outcomes.	Retain as notified.
47	47.7	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	d. The construction plans for any instream works i		Oppose	Matters in 12.4.5.17 are unclear and further clarity is sought on reference to the Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan in 12.4.5.17(d).	Delete changes to 12.4.5 as notified subject to further clarification on matters 12.4.5.17 being clarified
47	47.8	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	e. An erosion and sedimentation control plan for a		Oppose	Matters in 12.4.5.17 are unclear and further clarity is sought on reference to the Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan in 12.4.5.17(e).	
25	25.6	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	f. The stormwater reserve areas at Ōmokoroa are sh		Oppose	Stormwater management plans are not considered the most appropriate method for confirming details for stormwater reserves.	Subject to the resolution of the above, refer to the relevant map(s) and/or method(s) to clarify the details of stormwater reserves in the District Plan. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
26	26.14	Classic Group	Section 12 -	12.4.5 Stormwater	f. The stormwater		Oppose	Rule 12.4.5.17.f does not act as a rule and should be included as an advice note.	Amend f. to an advice note as follows: Note: The stormwater reserve areas at Omokoroa are shown

			Subdivision and Development	er	reserve areas at Ōmokoroa are sh				on the planning maps and described in more detail in the Omokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan.
39	39.10	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.5 Stormwater	f. The stormwater reserve areas at Ōmokoroa are sh		Oppose	Rule 12.4.5.17.f does not act as a rule and should be included as an advice note.	Amend f. to an advice note as follows: <u>Note: The stormwater reserve areas at Omokoroa are shown on the planning maps and described in more detail in the Omokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan.</u>
FS 69 [39]	3 [39.10]	Jace Investments [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support amendment to the rule to include an advice note.	Accept the submission seeking advice note. The standard proposed did not read as a performance standard.
29	29.14	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.6 Wastewater Drainage	12.4.6.3 For all development within the Ōmokoroa S		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks clarification on the intent and outcome sought for rule 12.4.6.3, notably: • Whether the 'completely sealed wastewater system' needs to be in place before any Stage 3 development can occur; • Whether this rule can be applied 'per development'; • The impact this rule may have on realising the development capacity available within the Stage 3 Structure Plan Area, if the intent is that development is unable to take place until such time as a 'completely sealed wastewater system' has been established for the area. Kāinga Ora seeks that this rule be deleted in full, and the intent be reviewed to clarify the above matters.	Delete in full and review intent of this rule.
11	11.3	Elles Pearce-Danker	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.6 Wastewater Drainage	c. The upstream catchment is provided for and the		Support	Good to consider upstream properties.	Keep as is.
18	18.11	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.7 Water Supply			Support	Fire and Emergency support Rule 12.4.7.1 insofar that new or existing sites are required to be connected to the reticulated water supply system in accordance with Council's Development Code. It will be important that Council enforce the requirements of the Development Code which includes compliance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	No relief sought.
18	18.12	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and	12.4.7 Water Supply	12.4.7.2 Within Residential, Medium Density Reside		Support in part	Fire and Emergency supports the amendment made to 12.4.7.2 to include Residential and Medium Density Zones. Fire and Emergency specifically support 12.4.7.2(b) that requires "A reticulation system which is compliant for fire-fighting purposes and for estimated domestic,	Add new advice note as follows: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>1. To demonstrate compliance, applicants must provide evidence to Council (i.e. hydrant testing data) to confirm that</u>

			Develop ment					commercial and industrial consumption shall be provided taking into account the peak demands and the latest version of the New Zealand Fire Service Code of Practice". It will be important that Council ensure that each new connection is able to achieve sufficient capacity and pressure in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Fire and Emergency request that, where the reticulated network already exists, that developers are required to demonstrate by way of evidence that the reticulated water supply system will be able to adequately service their sites prior to resource consent being granted. This will be particularly important for intensification developments which will likely be connecting to the existing network. Where compliance cannot be achieved with 12.4.7.2(b), it is requested that these applications require resource consent as a discretionary activity.	<u>the water supply network is able to service their site/s in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>
25	25.13	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	General		Support in part	To ensure stormwater management, landform and subdivision are considered in an integrated manner at subdivision stage. This method recognises the sensitivity of the receiving freshwater and coastal environment and the wider approach undertaken as part of the catchment management plan for Stage 3 Ōmokoroa.	<p>The following relief or similar is sought:</p> <p>(i) Provide provisions and information requirements for recognising the necessity for considering subdivision applications in parallel with discharge and earthworks consents for Ōmokoroa Stage 3; and</p> <p>(ii) Recognise and give effect to the integrated management direction in the NPS-FM 3.5 and, Method 3 and Method 18 and IR 5B of the RPS, including by providing stormwater management plans as a method for Stage 3 only of the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan to ensure stormwater management, landform and subdivision are considered in an integrated manner at subdivision stage.</p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised. Further relief to 12.3.8 or 12.4.11 is sought below, or otherwise as appropriate.</p>
25	25.18	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	General		Support in part	Inappropriate development in sub-catchment NI in the Stage 3 of the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan could result in effects on nationally significant infrastructure i.e. KiwiRail owned land/assets) from increased or prolonged elevated water levels behind the railway embankment affecting the engineering performance of the embankment or increased flows and velocities at the inlet and outlet of the culvert leading to potential scour.	<p>The following relief or similar is sought:</p> <p>(i) Any subdivision contributing to sub-catchment NI in Ōmokoroa Stage 3 shall undertake a detailed hydraulic assessment as part of the design to identify potential effects on the railway infrastructure.</p> <p>In addition to any specific requirements sought by KiwiRail, the assessment should consider the culvert's capacity to pass increased peak flows and volume of the stormwater resulting from land use changes within the site and whether any upgrade of the culvert and inlet/outlet protection is required.</p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief</p>

									sought or address the matter raised.
25	25.14	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	General		Support in part	The Catchment Management Plan for Ōmokoroa Stage 3 (which sits outside of the district plan) provides a specific framework for the integrated management of stormwater.	Further provision(s) are sought to require that subdivision within Stage 3 of the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan demonstrates consistency with the stormwater management approach in the relevant catchment management documents and the 'Stormwater Management Concept: Ōmokoroa Stage 3', in Appendix 7 (Structure Plans) with regards to water quantity, volume reduction and water quality. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
29	29.15	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	12.4.11.2 Streetscape		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks amendment to the rule to: • Clarify that sub-clause (a) relates to new residential roadways only; • Delete sub clause (c) as it is not clear how this rule would be enforced and is too onerous in its specificity.	Amend 12.4.11.2 as follows: a. <u>New Residential roadways</u> (local and collector roads)... ...c. Council shall require that Ōmokoroa Road be planted in Maple-Acer palmatum 'Osakazuki' with a tree spacing of approximately 40m (centres).
FS 76 [29]	11 [29.15]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	11 [29.15]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission
25	25.19	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	c. Council shall require that Ōmokoroa Road be pla		Support in part	Deciduous trees, such as maple trees, can increase the cost burden on Council and ratepayers due to increased blockages caused by autumn leaf falls. Additionally, they increase the difficulty and cost of maintaining stormwater infrastructure such as catchpits, swales and rain gardens encouraged in 12.4.5.17(c).	Consider using alternative trees, such a native or evergreen trees, to support the provision of requiring street trees along Ōmokoroa Road in 12.4.11.2(c).
58	58.15	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New	Section 12 - Subdivision and Develop	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	c. Council shall require that Ōmokoroa Road be pla		Support in part	Accept that the Maple trees can be placed in the Omokoroa Road corridor, but request clarification that this rule does not apply to the adjacent Omokoroa town centre, as Pirirakau had indicated a preference towards native tree species.	Add the words Within the Omokoroa Road corridor to the start of Rule 12.4.11.2 c

		Zealand Limited	ment						
FS 67 [58]	11 [58.15]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited]					Support	<p>Support relief sought by the submitter to prefer native trees instead of maples because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deciduous trees such as maples can increase the cost burden on Council and ratepayers due to increased blockages to the stormwater network caused by autumn leaf falls. 2. Deciduous trees can increase the difficulty and cost of maintaining stormwater infrastructure such as catchpits, swales and rain gardens encouraged in 12.4.5.17(c). 3. Pirirakau hapū indicated a preference for native trees (as outlined in submission point 58.15). 4. Native trees provide greater ecological benefits than introduced species by providing habitat and food sources for native birds, bats and invertebrates. 	Provision 12.4.11.2(c): consider requiring native evergreen trees along Ōmokoroa Road instead of maple trees.
18	18.13	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Ōmokoroa Structure Plan	All subdivision, use and development in the identi		Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support the use of structure plans as a mechanism to ensure comprehensive and integrated development of a growth area. In particular, it enables discussions with service providers (including Fire and Emergency) to occur for a growth cell in a holistic manner. As the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan is in place, development is required to occur in a more planned and coherent manner. Where compliance with the structure plan does not occur, resource consent is required as a non-complying activity. This is important to Fire and Emergency as this ensures that adequate water supply and roading infrastructure will be in place before enabling the development of these large growth areas, particularly those that are intended to be serviced. This includes reticulated water supply, roading and property access in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and Council's Development Code.</p>	No relief sought.
41	41.3	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Section 12 – Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Ōmokoroa Structure Plan	b. Roading		Support	<p>At a high-level, Waka Kotahi is supportive of the proposed re-zoning of the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan area. This land is well-suited to future development and the structure plan is consistent with SmartGrowth principles. However, PC92 in its current form does not make provision for the management of the adverse traffic safety and efficiency effects that future development within the peninsula will have on the intersection of Ōmokoroa Road and State Highway 2 (SH2) and the wider state highway network. Additional rules, supported by a comprehensive Integrated Transport Assessment, and imposition of controls on subdivision unless and until infrastructure upgrades are completed, are required. Waka Kotahi considers that inclusion of the intersection improvements (roundabout and interchange) as a</p>	<p>Waka Kotahi considers that an Integrated Transport Assessment should be prepared, identifying the capacity of the interim roundabout using SIDRA modelling. Based on this, a rule(s) or performance standard(s) should be adopted in PC92 that:</p> <p>Affords non-complying activity status to subdivision/development within the Stage 3 structure plan area prior to the interim roundabout becoming operational; and</p> <p>Affords non-complying activity status to subdivision/development within the Stage 3 structure plan</p>

							<p>qualifying matter would be appropriate in this instance.</p> <p>PC92 is not supported by an Integrated Transport Assessment that identifies the projected performance of the interim roundabout, specifically traffic modelling to demonstrate its capacity. While Waka Kotahi is confident that the roundabout will deliver a very significant safety improvement over the current intersection, it is not known how many additional housing unit equivalents and other development can occur within the peninsula before the roundabout will reach an unacceptable level of service or safety, necessitating construction of a grade-separated interchange at this intersection. Following on from this, PC92 does not include any rules or performance standards that limit development within the peninsula until the interim roundabout is operational, nor any provision to limit development once its capacity is reached and a grade separated interchange is required. A grade-separated interchange (discussed further below) will be required to support full development capacity facilitated by PC92.</p> <p>Takitimu North Link Stage One, from Tauranga to Te Puna, is under construction. Stage Two, from Te Puna to Ōmokoroa, does not have construction funding but is funded for the requisite notice of requirement (anticipated to be an alteration of the existing D181 designation) and regional consents. Construction is not currently anticipated within the next 10 years. Importantly, Stage Two includes a grade-separated interchange at the intersection of SH2 and Ōmokoroa Road. This is required to safely and efficiently accommodate the full build-out of Ōmokoroa. An Integrated Transport Assessment should be undertaken to inform a rule or performance standard that affords non-complying activity status to subdivision/development within the Stage 3 Structure Plan area post the capacity of the interim roundabout being reached and prior to the grade-separated interchange becoming operational.</p>	<p>area post the capacity of the interim roundabout being reached (development trigger to be determined by SIDRA modelling) and prior to a future grade-separated interchange becoming operational.</p> <p>Objectives and policies supporting the rules should also be included in PC92. Waka Kotahi is happy to work with WBOPDC to develop an appropriate development trigger(s).</p> <p>Waka Kotahi considers that inclusion of the intersection improvements (roundabout and interchange) as a qualifying matter would be appropriate in this instance.</p>
FS 69 [41]	5 [41.3]	Jace Investments [Waka Kotahi]				Oppose	<p>Object to a NC activity classification for subdivision and development. Government funding for the intersection improvements and temporary management of traffic during construction will enable traffic management and safety on the State Highway and Omokoroa Rd intersection.</p>	<p>Reject the submission as these regional roading projects should be confirmed to provide certainty to significant urban growth projects such as Omokoroa Urban Growth area.</p>
FS 70 [41]	25 [41.3]	Kāinga Ora [Waka Kotahi]				Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora acknowledges the intent of the submission point in seeking to plan subdivision and development in conjunction with infrastructure upgrades. However, Kāinga Ora is concerned around a 'blanket' approach to resource consent triggers as suggested given not all subdivision and development may result in adverse effects on the capacity and demand of the transport network to the extent that large scale infrastructure is required. Furthermore, Kāinga Ora has concerns around the ability to monitor such a rule and the timing of the rule in respect to the roundabout or interchange being 'operational'. Kāinga Ora therefore opposes the relief sought and requests that they be involved in any discussions should new objectives/policies/rules be drafted.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>

FS 74 [41]	33 [41.3]	Omokoroa Country Club [Waka Kotahi]				Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of a rule or performance standard that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • affords non-complying activity status to subdivision/development within the Stage 3 structure plan area prior to the interim roundabout becoming operational; and • affords non-complying activity status to subdivision/development within the Stage 3 structure plan area post the capacity of the roundabout being reached (development trigger to be determined by SIDRA modelling) and prior to a future grade-separated interchange becoming operational. 	Reject submission.
29	29.16	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	b. Rooding	Oppose	Kāinga Ora notes the intent of the rule (in respect to Prole Road and Ōmokoroa Road) appears to double up with rule 12.4.4.4(c). Amendments sought.	...iii. No subdivision or development shall utilise Prole Road for direct vehicular property access. iv. There shall be no additional access to Ōmokoroa Road except as identified on the Structure Plan.
11	11.4	Elles Pearse-Danker	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	ii. All roads, including indicative roads labelled	Support	Support, important to ensure connectivity.	Keep as is and ensure rule is followed when assessing applications.
59	59.3	Jace Orchards Limited and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	iii. No subdivision or development shall utilise P	Oppose	If the structure plan road is not established over the structure plan road alignment it defaults to a non-complying activity. Need flexibility in the plan to enable temporary access	Amend 12.4.11.5(iii) by adding: Council may consider temporary access to Prole Road in a location not consistent with the structure plan provided the subdivision is designed to connect to the structure plan road network and the temporary access will be closed as soon as the structure plan roads are developed and vested in Council.
19	19.7	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	iii. No subdivision or development shall utilise P	Support in part	It is understood temporary and formal direct vehicular property access is to be provided for as part of the planned Prole Road upgrading works (along with installation of other infrastructure related services). These temporary and formal direct vehicular property accesses should be shown on the structure plan to avoid the need to first obtain land use resource consents as per Rule 12.4.11.5.(c). Similarly with temporary construction traffic haul roads – instead of causing undesirable traffic related effects on a newly formed vested road, a more appropriately located temporary roadway and / or vehicular access point could be used. To assist, direct vehicular access points that are already planned to be provided for with the Prole Road urbanisation works can be shown on the structure plan document “APP7 - OSP - Rooding, Walkway & Cycleway Infrastructure”.	Delete proposed new Rule “(iii). No subdivision or development shall utilise Prole Road for direct vehicular property access.” Replace / include new / additional rule or clause that allows for “ <u>Temporary (up to 6 months continuous use) direct vehicle property access can be provided from a site to Prole Road where written approval from the WBOPDC is obtained. Such a vehicular access may require compliance with rooding relating provisions or conditional implementation of traffic management measures during the course of planned use</u> ”. Include new / additional policy to support this new rule /

									clause in section 12, however it is believed existing Policies 12.2.2.5 and 12.2.2.9 can be used to adequately justify such a rule / clause being used.
FS 69 [19]	6 [19.7]	Jace Investments [Pete Linde]					Support	Support temporary access to Prole Road during construction to minimise impact on other new roads under construction or recently completed.	Accept the submission to provide for temporary access to Prole Road and Omokoroa Road where appropriate.
25	25.20	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	c. Non-compliance		Support	Non-compliance with 12.4.5.17 should be appropriately considered as a non-complying activity, particularly with regards to deviations from the relevant comprehensive stormwater consent or associated catchment management plan.	Retain as notified.
FS 69 [25]	7 [25.20]	Jace Investments [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Oppose	Disagree with NC default activity classification. The Natural Open Spaces zone has not been accurately determined by ground truthing or survey. Consequently, the default activity classification should not be so stringent.	Reject submission seeking NC activity classification for non-compliance with Rule 12.4.5.17. Apply a more lenient activity classification with restricted discretion i.e. RDA.
29	29.17	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	c. Non-compliance		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks clarification on the use of 'vicinity' in the context of the rule (in that non-compliance with the provision for new road access to Ōmokoroa Road in the vicinity of the approved town centre is a discretionary activity.) 'Vicinity' is too subjective for use in a rule as it can be interpreted in different ways. Kāinga Ora also oppose use of the non-complying & discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the structure plan and instead consider this should be amended to be a restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters for discretion (relating to specific outcomes sought by the structure plan). Kāinga Ora seeks that this rule be reviewed in full and amended to clarify and respond to the above matters.	1. Kāinga Ora seeks that this rule be reviewed in full and amended to clarify and respond to the reasons outlined. 2. Kāinga Ora also oppose use of the non-complying & discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the structure plan and instead consider this should be amended to be a restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters for discretion (relating to specific outcomes sought by the structure plan).
FS 67 [29]	12 [29.17]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter to change provision 12.4.11.5(c) because development should be led by the plan rather than carried out on a consent-by-consent basis, with unintended incremental changes to how the structure plan is implemented. The issues that initiated the structure plan have been explored, and the structure plan provides the approach to manage those issues. The structure plan has been consulted on and incorporates the community's input. As such, non-complying is the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with the plan or associated stormwater consent/stormwater management plan.	Retain 12.4.11.5(c) as notified.
26	26.15	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	Non compliance with the Ōmokoroa		Oppose	Structure planning is a high-level combination of guidance documents that more specific design is to generally accord to when further investigation / assessment of a matter is undertaken. The proposed rule is drafted so vague, it is anticipated it will be problematic for both	Amend the rule as follows: 12.4.11.5(c) Non-compliance — Non-compliance with the Omokoroa Structure Plans will require a resource consent for a

			Develop ment		Structure Plans w			Council as administrator of the District Plan, and person/s undertaking an act as to when compliance is adequately achieved. It is considered there are plenty of other resource consent triggers in the zone and other District Plan sections that would capture when an act or activity would require a resource consent, and when it is, should more readily be assigned a restricted discretionary activity status.	non-complying activity, except that non-compliance with the provision for new road access to Omokoroa Road in the vicinity of the approved town centre shall be a Discretionary Activity. 12.4.11.5(c) Non-compliance – Non compliance with the Omokoroa Structure Plans will require a resource consent for a non-complying restricted discretionary activity, except that non compliance with the provision for new road access to Omokoroa Road in the vicinity of the approved town centre shall be a restricted Discretionary Activity.
FS 67 [26]	13 [26.1 5]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because development should be led by the structure plan rather than carried out on a consent-by-consent basis, with unintended incremental changes to how the structure plan is implemented. The issues that initiated the structure plan have been explored, and the structure plan provides the approach to manage those issues. The structure plan has been consulted on and incorporates the community's input. As such, non-complying is the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with the plan or associated stormwater consent/stormwater management plan.	Retain 12.4.11.5(c) as notified.
FS 69 [26]	8 [26.1 5]	Jace Investmen ts [Classic Group]					Support	Support non-compliance with Structure Plan being an RDA.	Accept submission to include activity classification as an RDA.
58	58.16	Jace Investmen ts and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 12 - Subdivisi on and Develop ment	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	Non compliance with the Ōmokoroa Structure Plans w		Oppose	Compliance with Omokoroa Structure Plan. As the Omokoroa Town centre Masterplan has been incorporated into the Omokoroa Structure Plan we need to create rules that avoids a circular classification of activities that end in a non-complying activity status. For example, as the town centre plan forms part of the Omokoroa Structure Plan any deviation from it would be a noncomplying activity.	Amend activity classification to discretionary within rule 12.4.11.5 c
FS 67 [58]	14 [58.1 6]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Jace Investmen ts and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because development should be led by the structure plan rather than carried out on a consent-by-consent basis, with unintended incremental changes to how the structure plan is implemented. The issues that initiated the structure plan have been explored, and the structure plan provides the approach to manage those issues. The structure plan has been consulted on and incorporates the community's input. As such, non-complying is the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with the plan or associated stormwater consent/stormwater management plan.	Retain 12.4.11.5(c) as notified.
19	19.14	Pete Linde	Section 12 -	12.4.11 Omokoroa	Non compliance		Oppose	Structure planning is quite a high-level combination of guidance documents that more specific design is to generally accord to when	In the first instance delete the proposed rule as notified due to it being so vague as to when the non-compliance would

			Subdivision and Development	Structure Plan	with the Ōmokoroa Structure Plans w			further investigation / assessment of a matter is undertaken. The proposed rule is drafted so vague, it is anticipated it will be problematic for both Council as administrator of the District Plan, and person/s undertaking an act as to when compliance is adequately achieved. It is considered there are plenty of other resource consent triggers in the zone and other District Plan sections that would capture when an act or activity would require a resource consent, and when it is, should more readily be assigned a restricted discretionary activity status.	occur. If such a rule is considered necessary, request the activity status be downgraded to restricted discretionary from non-complying. 12.4.11.5(c) Non-compliance – Non compliance with the Omokoroa Structure Plans will require a resource consent for a non-complying-restricted discretionary activity, except that non compliance with the provision for new road access to Omokoroa Road in the vicinity of the approved town centre shall be a <u>restricted</u> Discretionary Activity.
FS 67 [19]	15 [19.14]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Pete Linde]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because development should be led by the structure plan rather than carried out on a consent-by-consent basis, with unintended incremental changes to how the structure plan is implemented. The issues that initiated the structure plan have been explored, and the structure plan provides the approach to manage those issues. The structure plan has been consulted on and incorporates the community's input. As such, non-complying is the appropriate activity status for non-compliance with the plan or associated stormwater consent/stormwater management plan.	Retain 12.4.11(c) as notified.
FS 69 [19]	9 [19.14]	Jace Investments [Pete Linde]					Support	Support non-compliance with Structure Plan being an RDA.	Accept submission to include activity classification as an RDA.
26	26.16	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	12.4.11.6 Reimbursement for Provision of Infrastru		Support in part	Reimbursement or compensation requested for significant tracts of privately owned land zoned Natural Open Space where it will be used for infrastructural purposes such as conveyance (and in some instances storage and treatment) of water, stormwater, wastewater, and transportation purposes until it is vested with Council.	Amend a as follows: 12.4.11.6 Reimbursement for Provision of Infrastructure a. Council shall reimburse developers for the costs of providing completed infrastructure (<u>and Natural Open Space Zoned land to be vested with Council</u>) as identified in the Omokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure Schedule. For the purpose of this rule "completed" shall mean infrastructure that is constructed, approved by Council and vested in Council
58	58.17	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	12.4.11.6 Reimbursement for Provision of Infrastru		Support	It is important that where a developer goes bankrupt on the construction of infrastructure that they have a mechanism to be refunded proportionate costs.	Retain as drafted
FS 74 [58]	36 [58.17]	Omokoroa Country Club					Oppose	The submitter supports the per hectare financial contributions for development which is opposed by OCC.	Reject the submission; amend financial contributions regime as sought by OCC and the RVA.

		[Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited]							
26	26.17	Classic Group	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	a. Council shall reimburse developers for the cost		Support	As part of the infrastructure network to be used and vested with Council, it is appropriate to reasonably reimburse developers for the costs to supply it.	Retention of the reimbursement of cost to developers providing this infrastructure as complete.
19	19.13	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	a. Council shall reimburse developers for the cost		Support in part	For land shown to be zoned Natural Open Space that is still in private ownership, reimbursement or compensation requested for significant tracts of privately owned land zoned Natural Open Space where it will be used for infrastructural purposes such as conveyance (and in some instances storage and treatment) of water, stormwater, wastewater, and transportation purposes until it is vested with Council.	Insert following underline: 12.4.11.6 Reimbursement for Provision of Infrastructure a. Council shall reimburse developers for the costs of providing completed infrastructure <u>(and Natural Open Space Zoned land to be vested with Council)</u> as identified in the Omokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure Schedule. For the purpose of this rule “completed” shall mean infrastructure that is constructed, approved by Council and vested in Council.
19	19.8	Pete Linde	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.11 Omokoroa Structure Plan	a. Council shall reimburse developers for the cost		Support	Support retention of proposed Rule for reimbursement of cost to developers providing this infrastructure as complete. As part of the infrastructure network to be used and vested with Council, it is appropriate to reasonably reimburse developers for the costs to supply it.	Support retention of the reimbursement of cost to developers providing this infrastructure as complete.
47	47.9	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.14 Te Puke Structure Plan	General		Support in part	The matter are generally appropriate subject N12LP’s concerns on stormwater and structure plan submissions being adequately addressed.	Approve changes to 12.4.14 as notified subject N12LP’s concerns on stormwater and structure plan submissions being adequately addressed
25	25.27	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.14 Te Puke Structure Plan	12.4.14.1 Stormwater		Support in part	The Structure Plan area sits outside of the Comprehensive Stormwater Consent for the Eastern Catchments Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent for Te Puke (ref: 67481). It is understood that earthworks and discharge consent applications are being prepared for Seddon Street. Until such time that these are approved in accordance with the BOPRC Stormwater Management Guidelines (2012, updated 2015 (see link to these Guidelines provided in submitter’s full submission)), the following relief is sought to ensure the attenuation requirements for this location are achieved to ensure cumulative effects on the flood scheme can be managed in the Te Puke area.	The following specific relief is sought: (i) <u>All subdivision shall be designed to ensure that displacement effects on the storage capacity can be appropriately managed within the development site to ensure that the post development peak discharge for the 100-year return period storm for a new development be limited to 80% of the predevelopment peak discharge; and</u> (ii) <u>Advice note: All subdivision shall be undertaken in</u>

									<p><u>accordance with relevant water quality guidelines of the BOPRC Stormwater Management Guidelines (2012, updated 2015).</u></p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.</p>
29	29.18	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.14 Te Puke Structure Plan	12.4.14.2 Streetscape		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks the same relief sought as per rule 12.4.11.2(a) to reference that the rule only refers to new residential roadways. Amendments sought.	<p>Amend 12.4.14.2 as follows:</p> <p>a. <u>New</u> Residential roadways (local and collector roads)...</p>
29	29.19	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.14 Te Puke Structure Plan	12.4.14.3 Compliance with the Te Puke Structure PI		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks clarification of the broad reference to “subdivision, use and development” within this rule. Kāinga Ora do not consider it is appropriate for land use consents relating to ‘activities’ (e.g., for a change of use within a building) or small-scale development to be required to provide “stormwater management reserves and access thereto, roading and road widening, public reserves, walkways/cycleways, green buffer areas, ecological areas and water and sewage areas,” but rather consider that any such requirement should be targeted towards more comprehensive, multi-unit/lot proposals. Kāinga Ora seeks that this rule be reviewed in full and amended to clarify and respond to the above matters.	<p>1. Kāinga Ora seeks that this rule be reviewed in full and amended to clarify and respond to the above matters.</p> <p>2. Kāinga Ora seeks clarification of the broad reference to “subdivision, use and development” within this rule.</p>
18	18.14	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 12 - Subdivision and Development	12.4.14 Te Puke Structure Plan	12.4.14.3 Compliance with the Te Puke Structure PI		Support	Fire and Emergency support the use of structure plans as a mechanism to ensure comprehensive and integrated development of a growth area. In particular, it enables discussions with service providers (including Fire and Emergency) to occur for a growth cell in a holistic manner. As the Te Puke Structure Plan is in place, development is required to occur in a more planned and coherent manner. This is important to Fire and Emergency as this ensures that adequate water supply and roading infrastructure will be in place before enabling the development of these large growth areas, particularly those that are intended to be serviced. This includes reticulated water supply, roading and property access in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and Council’s Development Code.	No relief sought.

Section 13 – Residential & Section 14 – Medium Density Residential

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
34	34.9	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 13 – Residential	General	General		Support in part	The RVA notes that the MDRS provisions of the Enabling Housing Act have not been applied to the Residential Zone. As set out in the submission above, the RVA considers the MDRS must be applied to Residential Zoned areas at Katikati and Waihi Beach. The RVA therefore seeks that those areas be zoned Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone (with the amendments to that zone as sought below).	The RVA seeks to rezone the Residential Zoned areas at Katikati and Waihi Beach to the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone, with the same amendments as sought for the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone as set out in this submission.
FS 79 [34]	6 [34.9]	Waka Kotahi [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	The RVA considers that the MDRS must be applied to Residential Zoned areas at Katikati and Waihi Beach. Waka Kotahi considers that due to factors including location, population base, existing development typologies and community infrastructure, higher density development within the residential areas of Katikati and Waihi Beach would be conducive to a sustainable transport system supported by the ability of residents to live, learn, play and work locally.	Waka Kotahi does not support extending MDRS zoning to the residentially zoned areas of Katikati and Waihi Beach.
34	34.10	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14 – Medium Density Residential	General	General		Oppose	The RVA notes that the MDRS provisions of the Enabling Housing Act have not been applied to the Medium Density Residential Zone. As set out in the submission above, the RVA considers the MDRS must be applied to the Medium Density Residential Zoned areas of Katikati and Waihi Beach. The RVA therefore seeks that those areas be zoned Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone (with the amendments to that zone as sought below).	The RVA seeks to rezone the Medium Density Residential Zoned areas of Katikati and Waihi Beach to the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone.
4	4.3	Robert Hicks	Section 14 – Medium Density Residential	14.4.1 General			Oppose	Section 32 Report, page 160, paragraph 1 says "The preferred option enables the opportunity for one to three level buildings in the new Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential zone and provides more enabling provisions for additional height of up to 20 and 23m in areas (Ōmokoroa Stage 3 and Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct) where it can be accommodated and that are likely to be able to support higher density." Council consultation with residents has only ever suggested a maximum build height of 11m (3 levels). The maximum 23m height is probably just intended for the 'mixed use residential precinct' directly adjacent to the proposed commercial area at 404 Omokoroa Rd. However, the quoted paragraph makes specific reference to all Omokoroa stage 3. This is probably an error and needs correction. If not an error, a 23m building height should not be allowed in Omokoroa Stage 3. I strongly oppose building height above 11m (3 level). Buildings of 23m height would be totally out of character in Omokoroa, which will be essentially a satellite rural town. This would create excessive shade diminishing natural sunlight and lower the general quality of life for residents. Lack of privacy would also diminish the quality of life for residents.	A maximum building height of 20-23 in Omokoroa Stage 3 has not been consulted with the community, is totally out of character and should be removed from the Plan Change. Remove any reference to 20-23m building height from plan change 92

Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential

Submitter Ref. No	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
19	19.24	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The “NPS on Urban Development” and “Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act” are trying to give Council’s the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of District Plan Matters of Discretion.
56	56.5	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General		Oppose	Chapter 14A states (e.g., Objective 3) that it provides for a variety of housing developments including infill development, comprehensive residential developments, retirement villages, papakāinga and pocket neighbourhood typologies with a variety of different tenures. However, the provisions of Chapter 14A (particularly when combined with Chapter 11) do not do this. The provisions force developers towards higher intensity by incentivising reduced financial contributions per lot/unit where density exceeds the target yields of Plan Change 92. The approach is not nuanced enough to deliver a variety of housing, and certainly not retirement development with less density, higher amenity, and shared facilities. Chapter 14A should have greater focus on delivering amenity outcomes including the appeal of buildings, visual amenity, façade articulation. Otherwise, there is a risk of high density developments under delivering on amenity such as Kaimai Views where street trees are planted in the active road corridor.	Amend Chapter 14A to include provisions (objectives, policies and rules) specific to retirement development with less density, higher amenity, and shared facilities. Make further provision within Chapter 14A to incentivise developers to deliver high quality-built form. For example, provide more permissive activity status where developments have been through a robust urban design peer review process, or require this to have occurred for developments to be processed on a non-notified basis.
FS 76 [56]	12 [56.5]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated					Support in part	The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission point as it does provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs. However, with regard to the submission where robust urban design processes are recommended to be included, the RVA opposes this point.	Allow the portion of the submission that seeks for objectives and policies and rules relating to retirement villages to be included with a more permissive activity status, and otherwise disallow the remainder of the submission.

		[Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]							
FS 77 [56]	12 [56.5]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]					Support in part	Ryman supports part of the relief sought in this submission point as it does provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs. However, with regard to the submission where robust urban design processes are recommended to be included, Ryman opposes this point.	Allow the portion of the submission that seeks for objectives and policies and rules relating to retirement villages to be included with a more permissive activity status, and otherwise disallow the remainder of the submission.
56	56.8	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General	Activity Performance Standards	Oppose	14A.4 (Activity Performance Standards) apply to all activities, however any Permitted or Controlled Activity that fails to comply with any of these standards shall be a Restricted Discretionary Activity and Council's discretion shall be restricted to any particular noncompliances. Any other activity that fails to comply with any of these standards shall retain the same activity status. This is nonsensical. It is not clear why the standards should apply to restricted discretionary activities where the Council already retains discretion e.g., retirement villages. Further, it will encourage larger developments to deliver higher density developments complying with the medium density residential standards, which will not deliver quality built outcomes. It also leads to a repetitive set of restricted discretionary rules in 14A.7 which appear to be conjunctive.	Amend 14A.4 (Activity Performance Standards) so that it only applies to permitted and controlled activities. Develop more nuanced rules for restricted discretionary activities, where the matters over which discretion is reserved are clearly directed toward quality built outcomes.
8	8.2	Armada Properties Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential				Support in part	Armada Properties Limited support the inclusion of the MDRS as notified (with the exception of the earthworks rules).	Armada Properties Limited seek Council to retain the MDRS as notified (with the exception of the earthworks rules).
29	29.36	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the use of "structure" within the proposed rule framework. The definition of "structure" in section 3 cross references to the existing "building/structure" definition, albeit a proposed amendment to include a "building" definition specific for section 14A. This creates unnecessary ambiguity for plan users and can have unintended consequences in a rule framework pertaining to the control of "buildings" on a residential site. Note the relief sought by Kāinga Ora to the definitions (section 3) above. Amendments sought.	Delete reference to "structures" within Chapter 14A and retain reference to "buildings" (noting the relief sought to Section 3 of this submission).
FS 71 [29]	8 [29.36]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	While KiwiRail supports a planning framework that is clear and unambiguous for plan readers, KiwiRail is concerned to ensure that any amendments to the definition does not erode or impact the provisions sought in its primary submission, including as the terms buildings and structures	Reject the submission to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submissions

								are used in the building setbacks relating to the rail corridor.	
FS 76 [29]	14 [29.3 6]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	14 [29.3 6]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Ryman supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
26	26.8	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General		Support in part	In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The “NPS on Urban Development” and “Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act” are trying to give Council’s the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of Matters of Discretion.
29	29.21	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	General	General		Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain, as notified, where they are consistent with the prescribed MDRS.
29	29.4	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	General	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the duplication of zone names with respect to MDRZ zones. There is the (existing) MDRZ (i.e., applying to areas of Waihi Beach, Katikati and Ōmokoroa) in Section 14 and now a new Ōmokoroa Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone (“OTP MDR”) in proposed Section 14A. This duplication is unnecessary, confusing and not aligned with	Kāinga Ora opposes the duplication of zone names with respect to MDRZ zones and seeks amendments as outlined in reasons for submission

			Density Residential					National Planning Standards (regarding naming of zones). Kāinga Ora seeks that WBOPDC addresses this duplication.	
FS 71 [29]	4 [29.4]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	KiwiRail supports the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora, to the extent that removal of duplicated zone names removes any ambiguity, confusion and inconsistencies from the District Plan. However, KiwiRail is concerned to ensure that any removal of any zones does not erode, impact or complicate the application of the provisions sought by KiwiRail in its primary submission.	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.
34	34.11	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	General		Support	The RVA supports the Explanatory Statement of the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone, and the specific inclusion of retirement villages in the list of varying housing development types. However, it considers the reference to four or more developments being designed comprehensively to achieve consistency with 'good urban design outcomes' seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act for the MRZ.	Retain paragraph 4 of the Explanatory Statement as notified. Delete the following text from paragraph 3: Four or more residential units on a site can be applied for through resource consent. These larger medium density developments must be designed comprehensively to achieve high quality and wellfunctioning urban environments. including consistency with activity performance standards, and structure plans and good urban design outcomes.
FS 71 [34]	13 [34.11]	KiwiRail [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	KiwiRail supports intensified residential development in the appropriate Medium Density Residential zoning, which occurs in a way that is compatible with the surrounding environment and does not compromise existing lawfully established infrastructure. KiwiRail considers that in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments, especially where these developments are proposed in proximity to the railway corridor, it is critical that these developments are designed consistently with specified activity performance standards, including the railway corridor setbacks and noise and vibration controls sought in KiwiRail's submission.	Reject amendment sought and retain the explanatory statement for Section 14A as notified.
29	29.22	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the explanatory text where it is inconsistent with the relief sought through this submission. In addition, Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to the applicability of the objectives and policies of the Medium Density Residential (Section 14) of the District Plan as the objectives and policy framework of Section 14 will be inconsistent with the outcomes sought through the Section 14A framework.	1. Re-write the explanatory text to be consistent with the relief sought in this submission including: 2. Deleting reference to the applicability of the objectives and policies of the Medium Density Residential (Section 14) section, as follows: In support of the provisions of this Section, the Medium Density Residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies still remain applicable. In addition, this Section (14A) also contains more specific objectives for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any inconsistencies in objectives and policies, those specific to Ōmokoroa and Te Puke in this Section (14A) take precedence.
26	26.19	Classic Group	Section 14A -	Explanatory Statement	To cater for the varying		Support in	It is unclear what is meant by pocket neighborhood typologies, this is not an industry accepted definition and the	Amend the explanatory statement as follows:

			Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		needs of the community a		part	deletion of this reference removes uncertainty.	These can be provided with varying housing development types which could include infill development, comprehensive residential developments, retirement villages, PapaKāinga , and pocket neighbourhood typologies with a variety of different tenures.
39	39.11	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	To cater for the varying needs of the community a		Support in part	It is unclear what is meant by pocket neighborhood typologies and the deletion of this reference removes uncertainty. Tenure options is not a matter controlled by District Plans.	Amend the explanatory statement as follows: These can be provided with varying housing development types which could include infill development, comprehensive residential developments, retirement villages, PapaKāinga , and pocket neighbourhood typologies with a variety of different tenures.
58	58.20	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	There are a number of area specific overlays that		Support	Support inclusion of the paragraph with respect to the medium density precinct.	Retain.
26	26.20	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	Structure plans exist for 'greenfield' medium dens		Support in part	The amendment clarifies the reference to the Omokoroa Structure Plan (incorrectly referred to as McLoughlin Drive South and Seddon Street East) and provides for infrastructure (regardless of scale).	Amend the explanatory statement as follows: Structure plans exist for greenfield medium density development areas in Omokoroa (Stage 3 and <u>the Te Puke Structure Plan</u>), McLoughlin Drive South and Seddon Street East to provide further guidance for subdivision and development in these areas. These structure plans ensure appropriate scale infrastructure is provided including roads, walkways, cycleways, Three Waters infrastructure and reserves.
39	39.12	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	Structure plans exist for 'greenfield' medium dens		Support in part	The amendment clarifies the reference to the Te Puke Structure Plan (incorrectly referred to as McLoughlin Drive South and Sedden Street East) and provides for infrastructure regardless of scale.	Amend the explanatory statement as follows: Structure plans exist for greenfield medium density development areas in Omokoroa (Stage 3 and the <u>Te Puke Structure Plan</u>), McLoughlin Drive South and Sedden Street East to provide further guidance for subdivision and development in these areas. These structure plans ensure appropriate scale infrastructure is provided including roads, walkways, cycleways, Three Waters infrastructure and reserves.
40	40.7	Vercoe	Section	Explanatory	Structure		Support	The amendment clarifies the reference to the Te Puke	Amend the explanatory statement as follows:

		Holdings Limited	14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Statement	plans exist for 'greenfield' medium dens		t in part	Structure Plan (incorrectly referred to as McLoughlin Drive South and Sedden Street East) and provides for infrastructure (regardless of scale).	Structure plans exist for greenfield medium density development areas in Omokoroa (Stage 3 and the <u>Te Puke Structure Plan</u>), McLoughlin Drive South and Sedden Street East to provide further guidance for subdivision and development in these areas. These structure plans ensure appropriate scale infrastructure is provided including roads, walkways, cycleways, Three Waters infrastructure and reserves.
26	26.21	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	In support of the provisions of this Section, the		Oppose	The existing medium density provisions under Section 14 differ from those provided for under the NPS-UD and the Medium Density Residential Standards and other provisions which have been adopted in Chapter 14A. The chapter should retain its own explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies with specific reference to the Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD.	Delete the explanatory statement as follows: In support of the provisions of this section, the medium density residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies, will remain applicable. In addition, this Section 14A also contains more specific objectives for Omokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any inconsistencies in objectives and policies those specific to Omokoroa and Te Puke in this Section 14A take precedence. And add specific Objectives and policies for the chapter as required by Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
39	39.13	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	In support of the provisions of this Section, the		Oppose	The existing medium density provisions under Section 14 differ from those provided for under the NPS-UD and the Medium Density Residential Standards and other provisions which have been adopted in Chapter 14A. The chapter should retain its own explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies with specific reference to the Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD.	Delete the explanatory statement as follows: In support of the provisions of this section, the medium density residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies, will remain applicable. In addition, this Section 14A also contains more specific objectives for Omokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any inconsistencies in objectives and policies those specific to Omokoroa and Te Puke in this Section 14A take precedence. And add specific Objectives and policies for the chapter as required by Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
40	40.8	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	In support of the provisions of this Section, the		Oppose	The existing medium density provisions under Section 14 differ from those provided for under the NPS-UD and the Medium Density Residential Standards and other provisions which have been adopted in Chapter 14A. The chapter should retain its own explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies with specific reference to the Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD.	Delete the explanatory statement as follows: In support of the provisions of this section, the medium density residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies, will remain applicable. In addition, this Section 14A also contains more specific objectives for Omokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any inconsistencies in objectives and policies those specific to Omokoroa and Te Puke in this Section 14A take precedence. And add specific Objectives and policies for the chapter as required by Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
42	42.5	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A -	Explanatory Statement	In support of the provisions		Oppose	The existing medium density provisions under Section 14 differ from those provided for under the NPS-UD and the	Delete the explanatory statement as follows:

			Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		of this Section, the			Medium Density Residential Standards and other provisions which have been adopted in Chapter 14A. The chapter should retain its own explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies with specific reference to the Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD.	In support of the provisions of this section, the medium density residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues, objectives and policies, will remain applicable. In addition, this Section 14A also contains more specific objectives for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any inconsistencies in objectives and policies these specific to Ōmokoroa and Te Puke in this Section 14A take precedence. And add specific Objectives and policies for the chapter as required by Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 And add specific Objectives and policies for the chapter as required by Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
47	47.13	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	The area specific overlays that provide direction		Support	Map encompasses existing residential zoned land that is capable of proving for medium density housing.	Approve Map as notified
19	19.26	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	The area specific overlays that provide direction	Stages 3A, 3B and 3C	Support in part	It is requested that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road. The points set out in this submission point have been raised with WBOPDC to varying degrees prior to notification of the Plan Change 92 documentation. These changes are requested to reflect the intent and evolution of these discussions through future development.	Suggest including measurement of 40m to define offset of Area 3B with Area 3C boundary from the adjoining property to the north to assist design, setout and administration of associated District Plan provisions.
61	61.5	Paul and Maria van Veen	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	The area specific overlays that provide direction		Oppose	Regarding 42A Francis Road. We are writing this in an addition to the submission that we have already made. We now understand that the area on our boundary is definitely proposed 3C. This potential for 20 metre buildings or even 11 metre buildings directly on our boundary or very nearby has come as a real shock. We feel our lives would be significantly negatively affected. Here are the main benefits of our proposal (see the relief sought): • The steepness of our land does not lend itself to future 3C type development in any case. The land gets progressively steeper as it drops into the gully to the north of our home.	We recommend a minor change to the zoning proposal, so that part of the 3C area adjoining our boundary becomes 3A. The smaller northern part would become 3A while the larger southern part remains 3C. This would then be similar to the area next to the proposed school (see suggested boundary indicated in red in the map included in the submitter's full submission).

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southern portion of this block is considerably wider, flatter and closer to proposed public transport and community facilities. • This is a minor change to the proposal that still allows council to meet its medium density housing obligations, while protecting the only people who already live here. <p>We think our proposal would be really positive as it would still allow for a similar amount of future development, without dramatically negatively impacting upon us. We really are concerned about this and feel that council making a minor change would result in a very positive outcome. It alleviates our worries about such high buildings so close to our boundary, which would completely dominate our home. It is really important to realise that this is our family home, it's a modern home and it is where we have put our heart and soul raising our three young children and where we also run our business.</p>	
19	19.4	Pete Linde	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Explanatory Statement	The area specific overlays that provide direction	Mixed Use Residential Precinct	Support in part	Inclusion of “Mixed Use Residential Precinct” overlays with associated District Plan Provisions. Additional areas should also have the overlay placed over appropriate them to support and promote the Smartgrowth vision “ <i>Live, Learn, Work and Play</i> ”. To help promote this vision more efficiently it is requested that two areas (approx. 950m2 and 600m2) as shown below that are located towards the north-west corner of the property located at 60 Prole Road have “Omokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct” overlay included over them as indicated (attached to this submitter’s full submission).	It is requested that two areas (approx. 950m2 and 600m2) as shown below (attached to this submitter’s full submission) that are located towards the north-west corner of the property located at 60 Prole Road have “Omokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct” overlay included over them as indicated. Preliminary planning and discussion held with Council staff that these areas can support opportunity for appropriate mixed use development due to their proximity to planned higher density residential living; good connection and access to planned public travel routes; these sites will have appropriate buffering setbacks from nearby adjacent land by roading.
29	29.20	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.1 Significant Issues	See the Significant Issues in Section 14.1 – Medium		Oppose	Section 14A does not have specific “significant issues” but cross references back to those in Section 14. Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to 14.1.6 and 14.1.7 in respect to Section 14A, noting: In respect to issue 14.1.6 it is not appropriate to reference established amenity values noting the character of the OTP MDRZ areas will change over time (acknowledged in Objective 4 and Policy 6(b)(i) of the NPS-UD). In respect to issue 14.1.7 the references to Community Plans are considered out of date noting the (more recent) directions of the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act and noting the Community Plans have not been reviewed or updated in light of this national direction.	Remove reference to 14.1.6 and 14.1.7 in Chapter 14A as follows: 14A.1 Significant Issues – See the Significant Issues in Section 14.1- Medium Density Residential <u>except that 14.1.6 and 14.1.7 do not apply.</u>
FS 76 [29]	15 [29.20]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga					Support	The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.

		Ora]							
FS 77 [29]	15 [29.20]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
19	19.3	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	General		Support in part	It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion. In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The “NPS on Urban Development” and “Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act” are trying to give Council’s the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have flourished in our planning and consenting worlds. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives.
32	32.6	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	General		Support	The applicable objectives, policies and rules of the Plan Change, as they relate to the Submitter’s site and interests will generally (except as identified in Attachment 1): i) promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; ii) are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Act; iii) will not give rise to adverse effects on the environment that are not avoided, remedied or mitigated; iv) are appropriate and justified in terms of Section 32 of the Act. The specific reasons for the submitters’ support are as follows; the submitter supports the objectives under 14A Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Zone.	Text is retained Objectives 14A.2.1.1- 8
18	18.15	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives			Support	Fire and Emergency support this objective insofar that it requires Council to provide for a well-functioning urban environment and enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future. This would include provision of an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	No relief sought.

FS 71 [18]	2 [18.15]	KiwiRail [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Support	KiwiRail considers it is appropriate that the objectives of the District Plan give effect to the objectives of the NPS-UD, insofar that well-functioning urban environments are provided for, which includes adequately managing the interface between significant infrastructure and urban development.	Accept submission. 1
47	47.14	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	1. A well-functioning urban environment that enabl		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1.1 as notified.
34	34.12	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	1. A well-functioning urban environment that enabl		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.1 Objective 1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.1 Objective 1 as notified.
FS 71 [34]	14 [34.12]	KiwiRail [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	KiwiRail considers that it is important that the objectives of the District Plan align with those of the NPS-UD, in that well-functioning urban environments are provided for, including the need integrate development in a manner that is consistent with the ongoing operation of significant infrastructure necessary to service these developments.	Accept submission.
47	47.15	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	2. Provide for a variety of housing types and size		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1. 2 as notified.
34	34.13	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.2.1 Objectives	2. Provide for a variety of housing types and size		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.1 Objective 2 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.1 Objective 2 as notified.

			Residential						
47	47.16	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	3. Provide for a variety of housing developments		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1. 3 as notified.
34	34.14	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	3. Provide for a variety of housing developments		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.1 Objective 3 as it provides for a variety of housing developments, including retirement villages.	Retain 14A.2.1 Objective 3 as notified.
29	29.23	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	3. Provide for a variety of housing developments		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Objective 3 because it is similar to Objective 2. Whilst Kāinga Ora acknowledges that Objective 3 describes in further detail the 'variety of housing types' referenced in Objective 2, noting this specificity is repeated in Policy 6, Objective 3 is considered unnecessary. Amendments sought.	1. Delete Objective 3 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the remaining objectives.
47	47.17	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	4. An urban form providing positive private and pu		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1. 4 as notified.
26	26.22	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.2.1 Objectives	4. An urban form providing positive private and pu		Support in part	The wording is unnecessary. The objective should promote amenity outcomes regardless of whether these are private or public. It is anticipated that some urban form may not provide positive amenity outcomes as anticipated by Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. Also, a shift towards medium density recognises that trade-offs are acceptable.	Amend objective 4 as follows: An urban form providing positive private and public amenity outcomes.

			Residential						
FS 74 [26]	5 [26.22]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose amendment to Objective 4 to delete “private and public” with respect to amenity outcomes. Both private and public amenity is important and should be stated to ensure a comprehensive approach and avoid watering down the intent of the plan.	Reject the following amendment to Rule 14A.2.1, Objective 4: An urban form providing positive private and public amenity outcomes.
FS 76 [26]	16 [26.22]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Classic Group]					Oppose	The RVA supports the reasoning but opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [26]	16 [26.22]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Classic Group]					Oppose	Ryman supports the reasoning but opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
34	34.15	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	4. An urban form providing positive private and pu		Oppose	The RVA opposes 14A.2.1 Objective 4 as it seeks to provide an urban form that comprises positive private and public amenity outcomes, which seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the MDRS. The RVA considers Policy 5 provides the appropriate direction.	Delete Objective 4.
39	39.14	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	4. An urban form providing positive private and pu		Support in part	The wording is unnecessary. The objective should promote amenity outcomes regardless of whether these are private or public. It is anticipated that some urban form may not provide positive amenity outcomes as anticipated by Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	Amend objective 4 as follows: An urban form providing positive private and public amenity outcomes
29	29.24	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	5. Increased density of development to provide a m		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to amenity values within Objective 5. It is not appropriate to reference established amenity values noting the character of the OTP MDRZ areas will change over time (acknowledged in Objective 4 and Policy 6(b)(i) of the NPS-UD). Kāinga Ora also consider that this is an objective which primarily relates to earthworks and associated activities, rather than residential use and development, and should therefore be relocated out of Chapter 14A and into the general ‘district-wide’ earthworks	Amend Objective 5 and shift to ‘district wide’ section of WBOPDP as follows: Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural landform and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.

								provisions of the District Plan. Amendments sought.	
FS 76 [29]	17 [29.24]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	17 [29.24]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports part of the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined by the submitter and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission
47	47.18	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	6. Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthwor		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1. 6 as notified.
26	26.23	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	6. Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthwor		Support in part	The proposal is contrary to the policy outcomes of the NPS-UD and will result in significant reductions in usable flat sites, and a loss of yield and density, and significant construction cost increases which have not been assessed or considered through modelling and analysis. In particular, the proposal will not assist with meeting Policy 2, Policy 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The provisions are more restrictive than existing District Plan provisions.	Delete the objective as follows: Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural land form and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.
FS 76 [26]	18 [26.23]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Classic Group]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [26]	18 [26.23]	Ryman Healthcare					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of	Allow the submission.

]	Limited [Classic Group]						retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	
39	39.15	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	6. Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthwor		Oppose	The proposal is contrary to the policy outcomes of the NPS-UD and will result in significant reductions in usable flat sites, and a loss of yield and density which have not been assessed or considered through modelling and analysis. In particular, the proposal will not assist with meeting Policy 2, Policy 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The provisions are more restrictive than existing District Plan provisions.	Delete the objective as follows: Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural land form and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.
FS 76 [39]	19 [39.15]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [39]	19 [39.15]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
42	42.6	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	6. Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthwor		Oppose	The proposal is contrary to the policy outcomes of the NPS-UD and will result in significant reductions in usable flat sites, and a loss of yield and density which have not been assessed or considered through modelling and analysis. In particular, the proposal will not assist with meeting Policy 2, Policy 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The provisions are more restrictive than existing District Plan provisions for the urban area.	Delete the objective as follows: Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural land form and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.
FS 76 [42]	20 [42.6]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Brian Goldstone]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.

FS 77 [42]	20 [42.6]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Brian Goldstone]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
40	40.9	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	6. Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthwor		Oppose	The proposal is contrary to the policy outcomes of the NPS-UD and will result in significant reductions in usable flat sites, and a loss of yield and density which have not been assessed or considered through modelling and analysis. In particular, the proposal will not assist with meeting Policy 2, Policy 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The provisions are more restrictive than existing District Plan provisions for Te Puke.	Delete the objective as follows: Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural land form and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.
FS 76 [40]	21 [40.9]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [40]	21 [40.9]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to delete objective 14A.2.1.6 as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
47	47.19	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	7. Maintenance and enhancement of the stormwater m		Support	The objectives directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Objectives 14A.2.1. 7 as notified.
34	34.16	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.2.1 Objectives	7. Maintenance and enhancement of the stormwater m		Support in part	The RVA opposes a requirement for development to “enhance” the natural and built stormwater network. New development should only be required to manage its own effects, not the effects of historic development.	Delete “and enhancement”.

		d	Density Residential						
58	58.21	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	8. A well-functioning high quality residential-led		Support	This clearly describes the hierarchy associated between the town centre and the mixed use precinct and distinguishes between other residential areas.	Retain
29	29.25	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.1 Objectives	8. A well-functioning high quality residential-led		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part the inclusion of Objective 8 to describe the intended land use outcomes for the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct (OMURP). However, the Objective is considered overly descriptive with several unnecessary adjectives and/or verbs. The final part of the sentence appears to describe the purpose of the neighbouring Commercial Zone which is not considered necessary for an objective focused on OMURP. Amendments sought.	Amend Objective 8 as follows: A well-functioning high quality residential-led mixed use area within the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct that actively and positively integrates and engages with the surrounding environment and is complementary to the function, viability and vitality of the neighbouring Commercial Zone, comprising daytime and nighttime activities compatible with residential uses.
FS 71 [29]	6 [29.25]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	KiwiRail supports in part the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora, to the extent that Objective 8 continues to promote well-functioning residential-led mixed use areas within the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct and that development integrates with the surrounding environment and is complementary to its function, which includes integrating development with transport corridors and ensuring development does not affect their ongoing operation through the inclusion of appropriate planning provisions (such as noise and vibration controls).	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.
41	41.7	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Support in part	Include additional Objectives and Policies to 14A Omokoroa & Te Puke Medium Density Residential, that: - 14A.2.2 Policies - Ensure that vehicle kilometres travelled are reduced by enabling public transport and active travel choice and integrated land use patterns.	Include additional Objectives and Policies to 14A Omokoroa & Te Puke Medium Density Residential, that: - 14A.2.2 Policies - Ensure that vehicle kilometres travelled are reduced by enabling public transport and active travel choice and integrated land use patterns.
34	34.30	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporate	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.2.2 Policies	General	Policies	Support in part	In addition to the current policies for the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone, the RVA considers that to facilitate the intensification purpose of the Enabling Housing Act, the following additional policies should be integrated in this chapter of the District Plan:	The RVA seeks to integrate the following policies into the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone: <u>14A.2.2 Policy X</u>

		d	Density Residential					<p>- A policy that recognises that the existing character and amenity of the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities;</p> <p>- A policy that recognises and provides for the intensification opportunities of larger sites; and</p> <p>- A policy that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of effects.</p>	<p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p>14A.2.2 Policy X</p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p>14A.2.2 Policy X</p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>
19	19.23	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Support in part	<p>It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of District Plan Objectives, Policies and Matters of Discretion. In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well-functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The “NPS on Urban Development” and “Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act” are trying to give Council’s the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have flourished in our planning and consenting worlds. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.</p>	<p>It would be good to take a more positive stance for by using the terms “support”, “encourage” and “promote” more in the drafting of District Plan Policies.</p>
56	56.6	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Oppose	<p>Chapter 14A Policies 9 10 and 11 are loose and ill defined. They are not directive enough to ensure quality and well-designed developments.</p>	<p>Amend Chapter 14A Policies 9 10 and 11 so that they are directive enough to ensure quality built outcomes.</p>
56	56.7	Ōmokoroa Country	Section 14A -	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Support in	<p>Chapter 14A should include a policy providing specifically for retirement villages, to reflect the work that has been done in</p>	<p>Include a policy within Chapter 14A specific to retirement village developments.</p>

		Club Ltd	Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential				part	this sector in providing a proven quality of amenity for residents.	
32	32.7	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Support	The applicable objectives, policies and rules of the Plan Change, as they relate to the Submitter's site and interests will generally (except as identified in Attachment 1): i) promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; ii) are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Act; iii) will not give rise to adverse effects on the environment that are not avoided, remedied or mitigated; iv) are appropriate and justified in terms of Section 32 of the Act. The specific reasons for the submitters' support are as follows; the submitter supports the policies under 14A Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Zone.	Text is retained Policies 14A.2.2.1-18.
26	26.7	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	General		Support in part	In recent times there is recognition by Government and Councils that we need to be doing better to ensure towns and cities in New Zealand are well functioning urban environments, that will meet the changing needs of our diverse communities. The "NPS on Urban Development" and "Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act" are trying to give Council's the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers. The Purpose and principles of the RMA are considered to be very well set out in section 5 of the RMA. In our efforts to promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is considered there are more opportunities to draft important District Plan provisions in a more positive manner that support, encourage and promote better environmental outcomes.	It would be good to take a more positive stance by using the terms "support", "encourage" and "promote" more in the drafting of District Plan Policies.
18	18.19	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies		Policies	Oppose	Fire and Emergency request that a new policy be included within the policy framework to ensure the impacts on the roading network are adequately addressed given that there is no longer a requirement to provide onsite carparking or therefore on-site vehicle access. This would require developers to assess the impacts of their proposal and give Council the ability to assess the impacts on the roading network and impose conditions of consent to manage such effects i.e. to require onsite parking or parking management plans. The proposed policy has been adopted from the Tauranga City Proposed Plan Change 33.	Insert new Policy 14A.2.2(19) as follows: <u>Policy 14A.2.2(19) - Access Requirements</u> <u>Ensuring that all right of ways, private accessways, or legal access lots are designed and constructed to ensure:</u> <u>a. The activity can be accommodated without compromising the functionality of the access and the effects of traffic generation on the surrounding transport network.</u> <u>b. The safe and efficient movement of pedestrians and vehicles within the site and the adjacent road network.</u> <u>c. The functional and operational requirements of activities and development, providing adequate space and location for waste management areas.</u> <u>d. Access and provision for emergency and waste collection services.</u>
FS 76 [18]	13 [18.19]	Retirement Villages					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief seeking a new policy 14A.2.2(19) as it is considered unnecessary and there is a rule already	Disallow the submission.

		Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]						providing for consideration of access requirements.	
FS 77 [18]	13 [18.19]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief seeking a new policy 14A.2.2(19) as it is considered unnecessary and there is a rule already providing for consideration of access requirements.	Disallow the submission.
47	47.20	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	1. Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 1 as notified.
24	24.5	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	1. Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of		Support in part	Ara Poutama requests that the policies applying to residential units in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone are retained. Ara Poutama requests Policy 14A.2.2.1 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community's diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in the zone, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support. This includes residential activities provided by Ara Poutama that provide housing, and associated care and support for people following their release, to assist with their transition and integration back into the community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences. Providing for a range of residential activities with support in the zone is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.	Retain the policies within section 14A.2.2 applying to "residential units" in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone, but with an amendment to Policy 14A.2.2.1: Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone <u>to provide for a range of households</u> , including three-storey attached and detached residential units, and low-rise apartments.
34	34.17	Retirement Villages	Section 14A -	14A.2.2 Policies	1. Enable a variety of		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.1 Policy 1 as notified.

		Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		housing types with a mix of				
47	47.21	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	2. Apply the MDRS except in circumstances where a		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 2 as notified.
34	34.18	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	2. Apply the MDRS except in circumstances where a		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 2 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, Policy 2 of the MDRS refers to "all relevant residential zones". The exclusion of that text from the policy creates confusion as to what density standards apply in the MRZ.	Amend 14A.2.2 Policy 2 to clarify where qualifying matters have been identified and which density standards apply instead of the MDRS in each qualifying matter area.
FS 71 [34]	12 [34.18]	KiwiRail [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support in part	KiwiRail supports a clarification to Policy 2, specifying where qualifying matters have been identified and which density standards apply in each qualifying matter area, particularly where those areas subject to the railway corridor qualifying matters.	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.
47	47.22	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	3. Encourage development to achieve attractive and		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 3 as notified
34	34.19	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.2.2 Policies	3. Encourage development to achieve attractive and		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 3 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.2 Policy 3 as notified.

		d	Density Residential						
47	47.23	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	4. Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-t		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 4 as notified.
34	34.20	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	4. Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-t		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 4 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.2 Policy 4 as notified.
18	18.16	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	4. Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-t		Support	Fire and Emergency support this policy insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This would include provision of an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	No relief sought.
47	47.24	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	5. Provide for developments not meeting permitted		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 5 as notified
34	34.21	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.2.2 Policies	5. Provide for developments not meeting permitted		Support	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 5 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.2.2 Policy 5 as notified.

		d	Density Residential						
47	47.25	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	6. Enable a variety of housing developments such a		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 6 as notified.
34	34.22	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	6. Enable a variety of housing developments such a		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.2.2 Policy 6 as it provides for a variety of housing developments, including retirement villages, in a manner which responds to the specific needs of the community the developments are designed for, but considers the policy is not sufficiently enabling of retirement villages. A new policy is required to recognise the provision of housing for an ageing population as set out in the submission above.	Retain 14A.2.2 Policy 6 as notified and insert new policy as follows: <u>14A.2.2 Px Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>
FS 74 [34]	20 [34.22]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support the inclusion of a new policy to recognise the provision of housing for an ageing population.	Adopt RVA Policy 14A.2.2 Px: 14A.2.2 Px Provision of housing for an ageing population 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.
29	29.26	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.2.2 Policies	6. Enable a variety of housing developments such a		Support in part	Kāinga Ora partly supports Policy 6 but seeks to delete or alternatively replace the reference to 'pocket neighbourhood' with a more common description. Kāinga Ora notes 'pocket neighbourhood' is not defined, is not referenced in the rules of the District Plan and is not included in the WBOPDC's Residential Design Outcomes. Furthermore, as noted earlier, Kāinga Ora recognises that Policy 6 and Objective 3 overlap	Amend Policy 6 as follows: Enable a variety of housing developments such as infill development, comprehensive residential development, retirement villages, and papakāinga and pocket neighbourhoods in a manner which responds to the specific

			Residential					in explanation and both are not needed. Objective 2 provides a cascading link to Policy 6. Amendments sought.	needs of the community which they are designed for.
18	18.17	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	6. Enable a variety of housing developments such a		Support	As per the explanatory statement for this chapter, these larger medium density developments must be designed comprehensively to achieve high quality and well-functioning urban environments including consistency with activity performance standards, structure plans and good urban design outcomes. Fire and Emergency support this policy insofar that it directs developers to respond to the specific need of the community of which they are designing for. This would include provision of an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	No relief sought.
47	47.26	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 7 as notified
25	25.43	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	Explicit reference is made for provision of the water sensitive design in performance standard 14A.7.1(xi) and consideration of water sensitive design as a matter of discretion in 14A.7.10 and to support the general approach of integrated assessment of infrastructure and high quality urban design.	Consider an amendment to make explicit reference to water sensitive urban design. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
FS 76 [25]	22 [25.43]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [25]	22 [25.43]	Ryman Healthcare Limited					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	Disallow the submission.

		[Bay of Plenty Regional Council]							
24	24.6	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	Ara Poutama requests that the policies applying to residential units in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone are retained.	Retain the policies within section 14A.2.2 applying to “residential units” in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone.
FS 67 [24]	16 [24.6]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections]					Support in part	Support relief sought by the submitter to retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).
26	26.24	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	The amendment clarifies and simplifies the intent of the policy.	Amend the policy as follows: Require proposals of four or more residential units on a site to provide integrated assessments which fully assess how the land is to be used effectively and efficiently, how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met including provision of infrastructure and how high quality <u>good</u> urban design outcomes are being achieved
FS 67 [26]	17 [26.24]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter to delete ‘how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met’ from Policy 14A.2.2.7 because the policy is appropriately specific in referring to the structure plan. Associated rule 14A.7.1 provides detail on how to assess how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met (Rule 14A.7.1 matters of discretion c-g).	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).
FS 74 [26]	6 [26.24]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose deletion of “high quality” for urban design outcomes.	Retain “high quality” in Rule 14A.2.2.7.
29	29.27	Kāinga Ora - Homes and	Section 14A - Omokoro	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 7 as it is considered unnecessary as a policy and is provided for as an assessment matter (i.e.,	1. Delete Policy 7 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the

		Communities	a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		residential u			14A.7.1) already. Amendments sought.	remaining policies.
FS 67 [29]	18 [29.27]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. It is appropriate to retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 because the policy provides direction on the matters to consider, and Rule 14A.7.1 provides more detail on how to assess these matters. The policy and rule are complementary rather than the policy repeating the matters of discretion in the rule.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).
34	34.23	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	<p>The RVA opposes 14A.2.2 Policy 7. The RVA considers the need for such developments to provide integrated assessments is contrary to the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and will slow, not speed up, intensification. The RVA considers that as a result of structure plans not being applicable to all areas of the zone, the requirement for proposals of four or more residential units on a site to assess 'how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met' should not be applicable to all areas. The RVA supports the seeking of efficient and effective use of land, however consider further recognition is required of the intensification opportunities that can be provided by larger sites (and the need to provide for the efficient use of those sites). This matter is addressed further by the new policies sought below.</p> <p>The RVA opposes the requirement for proposals of four or more residential units to provide integrated assessments which fully assess how high-quality urban design outcomes are being achieved. The RVA considers this is a vague requirement that is not defined in the Plan, which will lead to interpretation issues when the Plan is applied, and that it seeks to manage development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS. The RVA submits that retirement villages have unique functional and operational needs (including layout and amenity) that result in urban design considerations that differ from typical residential developments.</p>	The RVA seeks to delete 14A2.2 Policy 7.
FS 67 [34]	19 [34.23]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Retirement Villages Association]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. The requirement to assess how high-quality urban design outcomes are being achieved is not considered vague because the matters of discretion in Rule 14A.7.1 provide the detail of how to assess these matters. Rule 14A.7.1 states: "Council shall consider the following to assess the overall contribution of the development to deliver a high quality and well-functioning	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).

		of New Zealand Incorporated]						<i>urban environment</i> ", and the rule then provides detail on the matters to consider.	
39	39.16	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	The amendment clarifies and simplifies the intent of the policy.	Amend the policy as follows: Require proposals of four or more residential units on a site to provide integrated assessments which fully assess how the land is to be used effectively and efficiently, how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met including provision of infrastructure and how high quality <u>good</u> urban design outcomes are being achieved
FS 67 [39]	20 [39.16]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter to delete 'how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met' from Policy 14A.2.2.7 because the policy is appropriately specific in referring to the structure plan. Associated rule 14A.7.1 provides detail on how to assess how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met (Rule 14A.7.1 matters of discretion c-g).	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).
18	18.18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	7. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support	As per the explanatory statement for this chapter, these larger medium density developments must be designed comprehensively to achieve high quality and well-functioning urban environments including consistency with activity performance standards, structure plans and good urban design outcomes. Fire and Emergency support this policy insofar that it requires proposals of four or more residential units on a site to provide integrated assessments which fully assess how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met including provision of infrastructure and how high quality urban design outcomes are being achieved.	No relief sought.
FS 67 [18]	21 [18.18]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Support	Support the submission point and the submitter's reasons for supporting Policy 14A.2.2.7.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.7 as notified with an amendment to refer to water sensitive urban design (per submission point 25.43).
47	47.27	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.2.2 Policies	8. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 8 as notified

			Residential						
24	24.7	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	8. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Support in part	Ara Poutama requests that the policies applying to residential units in the Ōmokoroa, and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone are retained.	Retain the policies within section 14A.2.2 applying to “residential units” in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone.
34	34.25	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	9. Ensure that residential development achieves go		Oppose	The RVA opposes Policy 9. Providing for solar access and on-site privacy are not matters the MDRS seeks to control. In addition, the RVA submits ‘surveillance to and from public spaces’ overlaps with matters covered under Policy 3 MDRS/Policy 3 of the Plan. The RVA also submits a requirement to ensure development achieves “good private amenity outcomes” is not a requirement of the MDRS. For the reasons outlined in the submission above, the RVA opposes a policy requirement relating to on-site amenity. The RVA’s members have significant experience of building villages and know intimately the amenity needs of its residents. The RVA’s members frequently come across issues during consenting processes where council officers attempt to influence retirement villages’ internal layouts based on their understanding of design principles which only apply to traditional housing types.	The RVA seeks that 14A.2.2 Policy 9 is deleted.
FS 74 [34]	22 [34.25]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	Oppose RVA’s submission to delete Policy 9 as it would mean that there would be no policy to ensure quality built outcomes.	Retain and amend Policy 9 so that it is directive enough to ensure quality built outcomes for residential development.
34	34.24	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	8. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Oppose	The RVA considers that the imposition of a ‘minimum number of residential units per hectare of developable area’ requirement in Policy 8 is inconsistent with the MDRS. The expectations for the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone should only reflect those set out in the Enabling Housing Act.	The RVA seeks to delete 14A.2.2 Policy 8.

FS 74 [34]	21 [34.24]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support RVA opposition to Policy 8 – that the expectations for the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone should only reflect those set out in the Enabling Housing Act.	Delete 14A.2.2 Policy 8.
29	29.28	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	8. Require proposals of four or more residential u		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 8 as it is considered unnecessary as a policy and is provided for as a rule (i.e., 14A.4.2.a) and an assessment matter (i.e., 14A.7.1(b) and 14A.7.10). Amendments sought.	1. Delete Policy 8 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the remaining policies.
47	47.28	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	9. Ensure that residential development achieves go		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 9 as notified.
47	47.29	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	10. Ensure that the interface between residential		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 10 as notified.
24	24.8	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	10. Ensure that the interface between residential		Support in part	Ara Poutama requests that the policies applying to residential units in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone are retained.	Retain the policies within section 14A.2.2 applying to “residential units” in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone.
29	29.29	Kāinga Ora – Homes	Section 14A –	14A.2.2 Policies	10. Ensure that the interface		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 10 as it is overly complex, and it is not clear why there is a reference to ‘visual dominance of	Amend Policy 10 as follows:

		and Communities	Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		between residential			buildings other than residential units' when the start of the policy refers to residential development. Amendments sought.	Encourage a positive Ensure that the interface between residential development and public boundaries is positive by avoiding or mitigating the visual dominance of buildings other than residential units , minimising repetition of building form, limiting the heights of solid fences and by providing appropriate landscaping.
FS 74 [29]	13 [29.29]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Although OCC suggested amending 14A.2.2 (Policy 10), OCC wants any amendments that ensure quality built outcomes. These amendments do not achieve that.	Reject the amendments to Policy 10 suggested by Kāinga Ora.
34	34.26	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	10. Ensure that the interface between residential		Oppose	The RVA considers that 14A.2.2 Policy 10 seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the expectations for the MRZ, and overlaps with Policy 3 of the MDRS/Policy 3 of the Zone.	The RVA seeks that 14A.2.2 Policy 10 is deleted.
FS 74 [34]	23 [34.26]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	Oppose RVA's submission to delete Policy 10 as it would mean that there would be no policy to ensure quality built outcomes.	Retain and amend Policy 10 so that it is directive enough to ensure quality built outcomes.
47	47.30	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	11. Provide connections from subdivisions and deve		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 11 as notified.
34	34.27	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke	14A.2.2 Policies	11. Provide connections from subdivisions and deve		Oppose	The RVA considers that 14A.2.2 Policy 11 seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the expectations for the MRZ, and overlaps with Policy 3 of the MDRS/Policy 3 of the Zone. It also fails to recognise that	The RVA seeks that 14A.2.2 Policy 11 is deleted.

		Incorporated	Medium Density Residential					retirement villages provide communal open spaces on site.	
FS 74 [34]	24 [34.27]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	Oppose RVA's submission to delete Policy 11 as it would mean that there would be no policy to ensure quality built outcomes.	Retain and amend Policy 11 so that it is directive enough to ensure quality built outcomes.
39	39.17	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	11. Provide connections from subdivisions and deve		Support in part	Reference to the functioning of the residential environment is an unclear statement. The policy should relate to residential amenity values.	Amend the policy as follows: Limit non-residential activities, accommodation facilities and home enterprises to being undertaken only where any potential adverse effects on residential amenity values and the functioning of the residential environment are able to be avoided or mitigated.
47	47.31	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	12. Limit non-residential activities, accommodation		Support	The referenced policies directly provide for Medium Density Housing as per the MDRS standards.	Approve Policy 12 as notified.
47	47.32	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Oppose	Most greenfield residential developments require substantial modifications to landform to enable residential development and create suitable building platforms, road, and stormwater corridors and flowpaths. It is acknowledged that with development some landform needs to be retained generally in accordance with existing characteristics to manage overland stormwater flows however land modification including cut/fill earthworks balances is important economically to limit the requirements to import suitable engineered fill material.	Amend Policy 13 as notified as utilising existing landform to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls is not always possible.
FS 69 [47]	10 [47.32]	Jace Investments [The North Twelve Ltd Partnership]					Support	Support recognition that Greenfield growth requires a certain quantity and area of earthworks to facilitate development yields and complying road design and grades.	Accept Submission and amend Policy 13 to recognise earthworks are necessary for urban development.

]							
29	29.30	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Support in part	Kāinga Ora partly supports Policy 13 but seeks to replace the word ‘ensure’ which is too definitive for this policy, noting it is not always practicable to limit earthworks and retaining walls to achieve the residential outcomes sought for PC92 and by the Housing Supply Act and NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora also consider that this is a policy which primarily relates to earthworks and associated activities, rather than residential use and development, and should therefore be relocated out of Chapter 14A and into the general ‘district-wide’ earthworks provisions of the District Plan. Amendments sought.	Amend Policy 13 and shift to ‘district wide’ section of WBOPDP as follows: Ensure <u>Encourage</u> subdivision and development is to be designed to utilise the existing natural landform <u>where practicable</u> to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls.
39	39.18	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Oppose	The policy is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and is therefore inappropriate. The utilisation of existing natural landforms will result in a loss of yield and density. This is contrary to the NPS-UD and is not supported by Section 32 analysis which has not assessed the impact of the policy on infrastructure provision, housing choice yield and density.	Delete the policy as follows: Ensure subdivision and development is designed to utilise the existing natural landform to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls.
26	26.25	Classic Group	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Oppose	The policy is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and is therefore inappropriate. The utilisation of existing natural landforms will result in a loss of yield and density. This is contrary to the NPS-UD and is not supported by Section 32 analysis which has not assessed the impact of the policy on infrastructure provision, housing choice yield and density.	Delete the policy as follows: Ensure subdivision and development is designed to utilise the existing natural landform to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls.
40	40.10	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Oppose	The policy is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and is therefore inappropriate. The utilisation of existing natural landforms will result in a loss of yield and density. This is contrary to the NPS-UD and is not supported by Section 32 analysis which has not assessed the impact of the policy on infrastructure provision, housing choice yield and density.	Delete the policy as follows: Ensure subdivision and development is designed to utilise the existing natural landform to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls.
42	42.7	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.2.2 Policies	13. Ensure subdivision and development is designed		Oppose	The policy is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and is therefore inappropriate. The utilisation of existing natural landforms will result in a loss of yield and density. This is contrary to the NPS-UD and is not supported by Section 32 analysis which has not assessed the impact of the policy on infrastructure provision, housing choice yield and density.	Delete the policy as follows: Ensure subdivision and development is designed to utilise the existing natural landform to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls.

			Residential						
47	47.33	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	14. The maximum limit for impervious surfaces shou		Oppose	The policy as proposed is inflexible and implies that there is limited provision for impervious areas to be exceeded unless onsite mitigation is provided. The policy does not allow for other engineering solutions or for minor exceedances.	Amend Policy 14 as notified and utilise alternative wording.
FS 67 [47]	22 [47.33]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [The North Twelve Limited Partnership]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because it is appropriate to limit impervious surface area exceedances unless onsite mitigation is provided. The policy is considered sufficiently flexible by not specifying the type of onsite mitigation required.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.14 as notified with an amendment to include the receiving environment (as well as the stormwater network), per submission point 25.42.
25	25.42	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	14. The maximum limit for impervious surfaces shou		Support in part	The impacts of increased stormwater run-off should be considered on the receiving environment as well as the stormwater network.	The following specific relief is sought: The maximum limit for impervious surfaces should not be exceeded unless any additional stormwater runoff can be mitigated on-site and prevented or delayed (as required) from entering Council's stormwater network <u>or the receiving environment.</u> "
29	29.31	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	14. The maximum limit for impervious surfaces shou		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 14 as it is considered unnecessary as a policy and is provided for as an assessment matter (i.e., 14A.7.13) already. Amendments sought.	1. Delete Policy 14 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the remaining policies.
FS 67 [29]	23 [29.31]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. Policy 14A.2.2.14 is considered necessary because it provides guidance to the rule. The policy directs to manage stormwater on site, while Rule 14A.7.13 requires consent applicants to provide information on how this will be achieved. The policy and rule are complementary.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.14 as notified with an amendment to include the receiving environment (as well as the stormwater network), per submission point 25.42.
29	29.32	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te	14A.2.2 Policies	15. Retain existing overland flowpaths are		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 15 as this matter is more appropriately considered in Section 12 with respect to stormwater management. Amendments sought.	1. Delete Policy 15 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the

		es	Puke Medium Density Residential		to be r			remaining policies.	
FS 67 [29]	24 [29.32]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because: 1. Regional Council considers protecting overland flow paths is an appropriate policy response to achieve a low level of risk and not increasing risk offsite in the context of applying the MDRS to Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. 2. The policy is required in this chapter to support consequential provisions to protect overland flow paths from inappropriate development, i.e. the policy is complementary to and provides direction to the relevant rule.	Retain Policy 14A.2.2.15 as notified.
34	34.28	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	15. Retain existing overland flowpaths are to be r		Support in part	The RVA considers there should be no requirement to “enhance” the function of existing overland flowpaths.	The RVA seeks the deletion of “or enhance” from the policy.
58	58.22	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	16. The permitted gross floor area of non-resident		Support	This clearly describes the hierarchy associated between the town centre and the mixed use precinct and distinguishes between other residential areas.	Retain
29	29.33	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	16. The permitted gross floor area of non-resident		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 16 with reference to an ‘economic impact assessment’. There is no rule that requires the provision of such assessment and depending on the specific proposal has the potential to be overly onerous. Amendments sought.	Amend Policy 16 as follows: Enable the permitted gross floor area of non-residential uses within the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct should not to be exceeded unless where it can be demonstrated through economic impact assessment that the <u>economic</u> viability and associated vitality of use of the neighbouring Commercial Zone would not be significantly affected.
39	39.19	Urban Taskforce for	Section 14A - Omokoroa	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the		Support in part	The current wording of the policy fails to include Te Puke. The policy should refer to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol to provide appropriate guidance on urban design outcomes.	Amend the policy as follows: Ensure developments in the Omokoroa and <u>Te Puke medium</u>

		Tauranga	a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		Ōmokoroa Mixed Use				density residential zone residential precinct are designed holistically with respect to surrounding land uses, buildings, and colour changes, positively connect with and contribute to the quality of public spaces and provided density of use of land to deliver the planned character of a vibrant complimentary mixed use destination adjacent to the town centre <u>complies with the requirements of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.</u>
FS 70 [39]	22 [39.19]	Kāinga Ora [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 39.19 as it is not appropriate for District Plan policies to require compliance with guidance documents which have been prepared outside Schedule 1 RMA processes.	Disallow
FS 76 [39]	23 [39.19]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [39]	23 [39.19]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
29	29.34	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of Policy 17 however seeks amendments to refine the policy to be more specific to the outcome sought in the precinct. Amendments sought.	Amend Policy 17 as follows: Encourage Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct are to be designed holistically with respect to integrate with surrounding land uses, public spaces and natural features, buildings and contour changes, positively connect with and contribute to the quality of public spaces and provide developed at a density to of use of land to that deliver the planned character of promote a vibrant, complementary mixed-use destination that complements and supports adjacent to the town centre.
FS 71 [29]	7 [29.34]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	KiwiRail supports in part the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora, to the extent that Policy 17 will continue to provide direction that developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.

								Residential Precinct will be designed in such a way that integrates with surrounding land uses. KiwiRail considers that it is important that adequate steps are taken to ensure development is integrated in a way that requires compliance with the railway corridor setbacks and noise and vibration controls as sought by KiwiRail, where necessary.	
58	58.23	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Support	This clearly describes the hierarchy associated between the town centre and the mixed use precinct and distinguishes between other residential areas.	Retain
34	34.29	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Oppose	The RVA considers that 14A.2.2 Policy 17 seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the expectations for the MRZ.	The RVA seeks that 14A.2.2 Policy 17 is deleted
26	26.26	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Support in part	The current wording of the policy fails to include Te Puke. The policy should refer to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol to provide appropriate guidance on urban design outcomes.	Amend the policy as follows: Ensure developments in the Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zone residential precinct are designed holistically with respect to surrounding land uses, buildings, and colour changes, positively connect with and contribute to the quality of public spaces and provided density of use of land to deliver the planned character of a vibrant complimentary mixed use destination adjacent to the town centre complies with the requirements of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.
FS 74 [26]	7 [26.26]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Oppose	Oppose the deletion of existing text (the inclusion of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol can be supported).	Reject the following amendment to Rule 14A.2.2.17 as per Classic Group's suggested relief (except that reference to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol is acceptable and should be included). Ensure developments in the Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zone residential precinct are designed holistically with respect to surrounding land uses, buildings, and colour changes, positively connect with and contribute to the quality of public spaces and provided density of use of land to deliver the planned character of a vibrant complimentary

									mixed use destination adjacent to the town centre complies with the requirements of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.
FS 76 [26]	24 [26.26]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Classic Group]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [26]	24 [26.26]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Classic Group]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
42	42.8	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Support in part	The policy should refer to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol to provide appropriate guidance on urban design outcomes.	Amend the policy as follows: Ensure developments in the Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zone residential precinct are designed holistically with respect to surrounding land uses, buildings, and colour changes, positively connect with and contribute to the quality of public spaces and provided density of use of land to deliver the planned character of a vibrant complimentary mixed use destination adjacent to the town centre complies with the requirements of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.
FS 76 [42]	25 [42.8]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [42]	25 [42.8]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
40	40.11	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.2.2 Policies	17. Ensure developments in the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use		Support in part	The current wording of the policy fails to include Te Puke. The policy should refer to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol to provide appropriate guidance on urban design outcomes.	Amend the policy as follows: Ensure developments in the Omokoroa and Te Puke medium density residential zone residential precinct are designed holistically with respect to surrounding land uses, buildings, and colour changes, positively connect with and

			Density Residential						contribute to the quality of public spaces and provided density of use of land to deliver the planned character of a vibrant complimentary mixed use destination adjacent to the town centre <u>complies with the requirements of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.</u>
FS 76 [40]	26 [40.11]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [40]	26 [40.11]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow the submission.
58	58.24	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	18. Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on r		Support	This clearly describes the hierarchy associated between the town centre and the mixed use precinct and distinguishes between other residential areas.	Retain
29	29.35	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.2.2 Policies	18. Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on r		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Policy 18 because it runs counter to the purpose of the precinct in that it provides for some non-residential uses as a permitted activity. Policy 12 also has a similar intent and therefore Policy 18 is not considered necessary. Amendments sought.	1. Delete Policy 18 in full. 2. Consequential amendments needed to renumber the remaining policies.
47	47.34	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities	General		Support	The permitted activity list includes activities that are appropriate to a medium density residential zone.	Approve 14A.3.1 as notified

			Density Residential						
24	24.9	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities	a. Construction or use of buildings and structure		Support in part	Ara Poutama requests that the permitted activity rules applying to residential units in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone are retained. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities.	Retain the Activity List rules permitting “residential units” in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone. These include Rule 14A.3.1.a.
29	29.37	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities	a. Construction or use of buildings and structure		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports up to three residential units on a site as a permitted activity. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that the activity standard is amended to provide clarity for how this applies to papakāinga – recognising it is enabled through Policy 14A.2.2.6. Kāinga Ora requests that provision is made for a permitted level of papakāinga development, similar to that of general residential developments, i.e., up to three dwellings permitted. Kāinga Ora considers papakāinga housing to be inherently residential in nature and provisions should be drafted to reflect this. Moreover, the provision of a permissive framework for papakāinga housing is in accordance with policy 1(a)(ii) of the NPS-UD. Inclusion of such activity would support the objectives and policies of Section 14A which seek to enable papakāinga. Furthermore, Kāinga Ora requests that provisions for marae and cultural activities in association with papakāinga housing be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity to reflect the ability for such uses to co-exist with residential activities. To support the provisions requested above, a definition for Papakāinga Development is sought to be included within the definitions of the District Plan. Amendments sought.	Amend standard 14A.3.1.a, as follows: Up to three residential units on a site. <u>Note: This standard applies to papakāinga</u> Consequential amendment to add new definition for <u>Papakāinga development, as follows:</u> “Papakāinga development”: <u>A development by tangata whenua established to be occupied by tangata whenua for residential activities and ancillary social, cultural, economic, conservation and/or recreation activities to support the cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua.</u> <u>Include a new rule for marae (in association with papakāinga housing) in the OTP MDRZ as a restricted discretionary activity.</u>
24	24.10	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities	b. Up to three residential units on a site.		Support in part	The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities.	Retain the Activity List rules permitting “residential units” in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone. These include Rule 14A.3.1.b.
29	29.38	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities	g. In the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, a maximum threshold for nonresidential activities within the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct to ensure that there is no economic impact to the neighbouring Commercial Zone insofar as affecting its viability and associated vitality. However, it is not abundantly clear whether the ‘less than 150m2 maximum gross floor area’ applies per development, to the total per	Amend standard 14A.3.1.g to ensure the application of the rule is clear to plan users, as follows: In the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct only, the following activities where they occupy less than 150m2 in gross floor area <u>per activity</u> :

			Residential					precinct, or is the total gross floor area per activity. Amendments sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Offices ii. Retailing (ground floor only) iii. Restaurants and other eating places and taverns (ground floor only) iv. Commercial services (ground floor only) v. Places of assembly (excluding places of worship, marae, halls, theatres and taverns) vi. Medical or scientific facilities.
29	29.39	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.2 Controlled Activities	General		Oppose	14A.3.2a-c and 14A.3.4.i Kāinga Ora opposes locating subdivision specific standards within the residential standards. In accordance with the National Planning Standards, these subdivision specific standards should be located to the ‘district-wide’ provisions in Section 12 (subdivision and development) of the WBOPDP.	Move rules into Section 12 of the WBOPDP.
47	47.35	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.2 Controlled Activities	General		Support	The controlled activity list includes activities that are appropriate to a medium density residential zone and provides for complying subdivision.	Approve 14A.3.2 as notified
34	34.31	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	General		Support in part	<p>The RVA supports 14A.3.1 Rule (a) and the permitting of the construction or use of buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of restricted discretionary activity status under 14A.3.3 Rule (a) based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards.</p> <p>Noting that retirement villages will likely infringe the number of residential units per site standards (14A.4.1a), the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. The RVA considers that a specific rule should be integrated to provide specifically for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to amend 14A.3.3 Rule (a) as follows, to exclude the construction of retirement villages from the rule, and to integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (provided in the response to Matters of Discretion 14A.7.1 below).</p> <p>14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>a. Permitted and Controlled land use activities (<u>excluding the construction of retirement villages</u>) that do not comply with the density standards or other standards in Rules 14A.4.1 and 14A.4.2.</p> <p>...</p>

								<p>discretion. These matters of discretion will acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	<p><u>d. The construction of retirement villages (except for residential units which are permitted by complying with the density standards), including those that do not comply with the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1.</u></p>
FS 74 [34]	25 [34.31]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	<p>Support RVA's submission providing for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion. These matters of discretion will acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p>	<p>Adopt RVA relief to include a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion.</p>
47	47.36	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	General		Support	<p>The restricted discretionary activity list includes activities that are appropriate to a medium density residential zone and provides for an adequate activity status for noncompliance with permitted MDRS standards.</p>	<p>Approve 14A.3.3 as notified</p>
39	39.20	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	d. Retirement villages (except for residential un		Oppose	<p>Retirement villages are currently a controlled activity under the Operative District Plan. The change in activity status of retirement villages is less enabling than the current District Plan and does not give effect to the policy outcomes sought under the NPSUD. Retirement villages should continue to be provided for as a controlled activity (i.e. permitted but subject to conditions) to better enable housing supply.</p>	<p>Delete reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and provide for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2.</p>
FS 74 [39]	30 [39.20]	Omokoroa Country Club [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	<p>Support the deletion of the reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and instead providing for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2. This is in line with what is under the Operative District Plan – that Retirement Village activities are controlled activities.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 14A.3.3.d to remove d and include as controlled activity.</p>
34	34.32	Retirement Villages Association of New	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	d. Retirement villages (except for residential		Oppose	<p>The RVA opposes Rule 14A.3.3 Rule (d) as it does not recognise that retirement villages are residential activities that are encouraged and anticipated in residential zones. The RVA considers retirement villages as a land use activity must</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to delete 14A.3.3 Rule (d), and seeks the integration of a new rule as follows, to provide for retirement villages (as a land use activity) as a permitted activity:</p>

		Zealand Incorporated	Puke Medium Density Residential		un			be provided for as a permitted activity (and the construction of retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity, as detailed in response to 14A.3.1 Rule (a)), recognising that retirement villages as a permitted activity provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	14A.3.1 Permitted Activities ... <u>m. Retirement villages.</u>
FS 74 [34]	26 [34.32]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support	Support the RVA request to provide for retirement villages as a land use permitted activity.	Provide for retirement villages as a land use as a permitted activity. 14A.3.1 Permitted Activities ... m. Retirement villages.
FS 70 [34]	21 [34.32]	Kāinga Ora [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers it appropriate that retirement villages should remain as a restricted discretionary activity in line with other larger scale residential development (which is proposed as a restricted discretionary activity).	Disallow
26	26.27	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	d. Retirement villages (except for residential un		Oppose	Retirement villages are currently a controlled activity under the Operative District Plan. The change in activity status of retirement villages is less enabling than the current District Plan and does not give effect to the policy outcomes sought under the NPS-UD. Retirement villages should continue to be provided for as a controlled activity (i.e. permitted but subject to conditions) to better enable housing supply.	Delete reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and provide for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2.
FS 74 [26]	8 [26.27]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Support	Supporting the deletion of reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and provide for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2.	Amend Rule 14A.3.3.d to remove d and include as controlled activity.
40	40.12	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te	14A.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	d. Retirement villages (except for residential		Oppose	Retirement villages are currently a controlled activity under the Operative District Plan. The change in activity status of retirement villages is less enabling than the current District Plan and does not give effect to the policy outcomes sought	Delete reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and provide for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2.

			Puke Medium Density Residential		un			under the NPS-UD. Retirement villages should continue to be provided for as a controlled activity (i.e. permitted but subject to conditions) to better enable housing supply.	
FS 74 [40]	32 [40.12]	Omokoroa Country Club [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Support	Supporting the deletion of reference to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and provide for them as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2. This is in line with what is under the Operative District Plan – that Retirement Village activities are controlled activities.	Amend Rule 14A.3.3.d to remove d and include as controlled activity.
47	47.37	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.4 Discretionary Activities	General		Support	The discretionary activity list includes activities that are generally appropriate to be considered as Discretionary Activities however it is unclear what the intention 14A.3.4(i) relating to subdivision seeks to achieve.	Approve 14A.3.4 as notified subject to appropriate clarification on 14A.3.4(i) (Note: submission point 47.38 addresses 14A.3.4(i))
18	18.20	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.4 Discretionary Activities			Oppose	Fire and Emergency note that emergency service facilities and activities are not provided for in the MDRZ. Given the statement at 4A.1 'Activities Not Specifically Provided For', this means that all emergency service facilities are a non-complying activity. Fire and Emergency therefore seeks that emergency services activities be included in this activity list as fire stations are an integral component of the urban environment and these facilities (i.e. fire stations) provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of people in the community. As noted previously, the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community. Fire stations therefore need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies. Fire and Emergency therefore seeks that emergency service activities be added to 14A.3.4 Discretionary Activities.	Add new activity: Discretionary Activities <u>j. Emergency Service Activities</u> Add new definition: <u>EMERGENCY SERVICE ACTIVITIES</u> <u>those activities and associated facilities that respond to emergency call-outs, including police, fire, civil defence and ambulance services, but excluding health care facilities and hospitals.</u>
47	47.38	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.4 Discretionary Activities	i. Subdivision which is not for the purpose of the		Support in part	It is unclear what 14A.3.4(i) relating to subdivision seeks to achieve.	Appropriate clarification on 14A.3.4(i).

			al						
47	47.39	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.3.5 Non-Complying Activities	General		Oppose	A discretionary activity status is adequate to cater for subdivision not meeting the required yield standards and will give Council the full discretion to approve or decline a consent application.	Remove 14A.3.4 as notified
17	17.1	John Wade	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	General		Oppose	I oppose increasing the housing density with multiple three storey residential buildings in existing neighbourhoods without neighbours written consent. The social costs of this higher density will increase significantly. To have this radical change imposed on us by Wellington is not acceptable as it will change neighbourhoods significantly. The existing Te Puke road/parking/ sport and recreation/welfare infrastructures are not adequate to support the higher density and it takes many years to upgrade these. The Police station is only open limited hours Monday to Friday with delays in responding in the evenings, night and weekends. The road network in the town since the main street changes has become more congested at peak times. Adding greater density housing should only occur once the road network has been upgraded in advance to cope with the extra traffic. The road width is sufficient to allow a slip lane for traffic entering the town from Papamoa to merge with traffic from the two side roads (No 3 Road/Quarry Road). Te Puke really needs extra roads to provide an alternative route around the town to reduce main road congestion and cater for accident situations. Perhaps a direct link from the Te Puke township to the Expressway needs to be re-assessed.	The decision for Council to make is to say NO to three storey multi unit developments within the existing neighbourhoods of Te Puke. The people already living in these neighbourhoods that will be immediately affected by these developments must still be able to have a say and give written consent. Tell Wellington thanks but no thanks and make them listen. These sorts of developments can be included in new subdivisions where the whole needs of such high density living can be well considered and planned for.
53	53.1	Liz Gore	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	General		Oppose	Extra housing in Te Puke. Water: what worries me is that we already have many problems with water shortage, restrictions right up to winter if not longer now where's the needed water coming from? Sewage: Biggest problem to me I know you have upgraded but that only will cater for the home already built here in the last few years and now we need further work on this. Roading: Another big problem yesterday a friend nearly got bowled out of the town - that's out of the town. Congestion now bad. Te Puke centre getting worse. Things were bad long ago "rates, rates, rates" - worrying to me. Town has problem with our business side as well. Closing - not reopening "rate". Everyone is struggling "now" and have done for many years. Don't rely on kiwifruit for jobs. Remember crime is bad to me everywhere. People	No specific relief sought on the proposed plan change.

								won't take buses as unsure of "people" at buses. Police are needed here, extra police wardens especially who we had years ago.	
2	2.1	Lesley Blincoe	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	General		Oppose	Has council considered the impact that Plan change 92 will have on neighbours in the older residential areas of Omokoroa. Would any one of council like an 11 metre high set of 3 buildings a metre off their boundary, roads full of parked cars (I understand the idea is to have less or no cars, but by the time our public transport is good enough the buses won't be able to travel down most roads as they are too narrow and will be lined with parked cars). Also, how will our rubbish be collected. There will be a lot more of it and no way to collect it other than running between parked cars to get the bins. This means more collectors, different trucks, more rates. We assume our existing power lines are big enough to take the increase in power.	<p>We would like Council to encourage the proposed Plan Change 92 in newer, more suitable subdivisions - rather than the existing, older, established residential areas of Omokoroa.</p> <p>We would like Council to consider less development in these older established residential areas so that cars can be parked on the property & not on the street.</p> <p>We would like Council to allow development in the older established areas of Omokoroa on a discretionary basis only.</p>
34	34.33	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	a. Number of residential units per site		Support	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (a) as it aligns with the number of residential units per site standard of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.4.1 Density Standard (a) as notified.
47	47.40	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	a. Number of residential units per site		Support	Allowing for three dwellings per site as a permitted activity enables greater opportunity for multiple dwellings per site.	Approve provision for Three Dwellings as a permitted activity as notified.
34	34.34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. Building and structure height		Support	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (b) as it aligns with the building height standard of the MDRS, with some exclusions (which enable greater heights in specific areas of the District).	Retain 14A.4.1 Density Standard (b) as notified.
2	2.2	Lesley Blincoe	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. Building and structure height		Oppose	We are at 96A Harbour View Road, it seems that a developer could build 3 tall buildings (up to 12 metres roof height at the highest point, despite the day lighting envelope), on 98 Harbour View Road close to both us and 100 Harbour View boundaries with no real contouring of the land (as per the	That all applications to build on existing steep & sloping residential streets & sites in the older part of Omokoroa be subject to a lower height restriction.

			Medium Density Residential					Residential Design Outcome information) which slopes significantly uphill and downhill. This would effectively cut out our western sun and 100 Harbour View Road's eastern sun as they are significantly downhill from 98. These buildings would completely tower over 100 Harbour View Road. If a developer wanted to build those 3 tall buildings, what avenue of objection would we have as existing neighbours? Would this be a notified build to existing neighbours? If I sold to a developer, our neighbours on one side would see no morning sun and on the other side no afternoon sun.	
47	47.41	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. Building and structure height		Support	Increased height limit will readily provide for three level dwellings and allow for increased housing density on sites.	Approve 14A.4.1(b) as notified
16	16.6	Penny Hicks	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct where t		Oppose	There has been minimal consultation with regard to the 20-metre maximum building height in the Omokoroa 3C Medium Density Residential zone. This is out of character for a rural satellite town and is likely to cause issues of shading and privacy.	Reduce 20 metre building height in Omokoroa 3C Medium Density Residential zone.
FS 69 [16]	11 [16.6]	Jace Investments [Penny Hicks]					Oppose	The submission seeks to lower the height limit for buildings in the medium density areas. Additional height is required to meet the development densities sought by PC92 and provide housing typologies that respond to market needs including affordability.	Reject Submission
61	61.2	Paul and Maria van Veen	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct where t		Oppose	<i>'The preferred option enables the opportunity for one to three level buildings in the new Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential zone and provides more enabling provisions for additional height of up to 20 and 23m in areas (Ōmokoroa Stage 3 and Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct) where it can be accommodated and that are likely to be able to support higher density.'</i> (Plan Change 92 Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Enabling Housing Supply and Other Supporting Matters Section 32 Evaluation Report Submission, page 160) We strongly disagree with building such high structures in the future Omokoroa stage 3. These would be completely out of	In conclusion we oppose the very high building heights in Plan Change 92.

								character with this area. It seems that this was initially proposed only for the new shopping/commercial precinct. This is somewhat ambiguous and it appears that these proposals will apply to the Stage 3C development.	
FS 69 [61]	12 [61.2]	Jace Investments [Paul and Maria van Veen]					Oppose	The submission seeks to lower the height limit for buildings in the medium density areas – mixed use precinct area. Additional density is required in this area to enhance the legibility and vitality of the Omokoroa Town Centre.	Reject Submission
61	61.3	Paul and Maria van Veen	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	c. Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct where b		Oppose	<p><i>'The preferred option enables the opportunity for one to three level buildings in the new Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential zone and provides more enabling provisions for additional height of up to 20 and 23m in areas (Ōmokoroa Stage 3 and Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct) where it can be accommodated and that are likely to be able to support higher density.'</i> (Plan Change 92 Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Enabling Housing Supply and Other Supporting Matters Section 32 Evaluation Report Submission, page 160)</p> <p>We strongly disagree with building such high structures in the future Omokoroa stage 3. These would be completely out of character with this area. It seems that this was initially proposed only for the new shopping/commercial precinct. This is somewhat ambiguous and it appears that these proposals will apply to the Stage 3C development.</p>	In conclusion we oppose the very high building heights in Plan Change 92.
FS 69 [61]	13 [61.3]	Jace Investments [Paul and Maria van Veen]					Oppose	The submission seeks to lower the height limit for buildings in the medium density areas – mixed use precinct area. Additional density is required in this area to enhance the legibility and vitality of the Omokoroa Town Centre.	Reject Submission
34	34.35	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	c. Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct where b		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (c) and the height in relation to boundary provisions in principle, which reflect the height in relation to boundary standard of the MDRS, with some additional exclusions. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be included to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	<p>The RVA seeks to amend 14.A.4.1 Density Standard (c) as follows to include additional exclusions from the standard:</p> <p>14A.4.1(c) Height in relation to boundary</p> <p>...</p> <p>ii. This standard does not apply to a.</p> <p>a boundary with a road:</p> <p>b. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site:</p> <p>c. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sties or where a common</p>

									<p>wall is proposed:</p> <p>d. <u>boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones:</u></p> <p>e. d.where a subdivision is proposed between residential units that share a common wall (in this case it will not apply along the length of the common wall).</p> <p>f. e.subdivision (by unit plan) to the extent that the recession plane above shall only apply to buildings on the base land in their relationship to the base land external site boundaries and shall not apply between the internal boundaries of the principal units within the unit plan, nor between the principal units and their internal boundary with any common property.</p> <p>g-f.where the written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property to the specific encroachment is obtained.</p>
FS 69 [34]	14 [34.35]	Jace Investments [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Oppose	The submission seeks to include additional interfaces that the Residential HIRB rule would not apply to. Mixed use areas and town centres are also seeking good design outcomes and access to natural light and open space.	Reject submission to include mixed use and town centre zoned as excluded from Residential HIRB 14A.4.1(c)
34	34.36	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	d. Lot 601 DP 560118 and Lot 603 DP 560118 (Harbour)		Support	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (d) as it aligns with the setback standard of the MDRS, with some additional exclusions.	Retain Density 14A.4.1 Standard (d) as notified.
14	14.3	Peter Musk	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	c. Height in relation to boundary		Oppose	Oppose rule 14A.4.1(c) height in relation to boundary. Will create negative impacts on current property owners sunlight admission and views to features such as Te Awanui and the Kamai Ranges.	Retain the current height in relation to boundary rules.

47	47.42	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	c. Height in relation to boundary		Support	Increased HIRB limit will readily provide for three level dwellings and allow for increased housing density on sites.	Approve 14A.4.1(c) as notified.
32	32.8	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	ii. This standard does not apply to:		Support in part	There are no effects on adjacent land uses given no persons are able to access them. The maximum height, yard and retaining wall standards will suitably manage effects.	Amend the following rule to allow for an exclusion along boundary with a stormwater pond, refer to point g. 14A.4.1(c) Height to Boundary (ii) This standard does not apply to: a. a boundary with a road: b. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site: c. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed: d. where a subdivision is proposed between residential units that share a common wall (in this case it will not apply along the length of the common wall). e. subdivision (by unit plan) to the extent that the recession plane above shall only apply to buildings on the base land in their relationship to the base land external site boundaries and shall not apply between the internal boundaries of the principal units within the unit plan, nor between the principal units and their internal boundary with any common property. f. where the written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property to the specific encroachment is obtained. <u>g. a boundary with a stormwater pond with no physical public access.</u>
29	29.40	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	e. subdivision (by unit plan) to the extent that t		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes clause 14A.4.1 d.ii.e as this is a duplication of s87BA of the RMA.	Delete standard 14A.4.1.d.ii.e in its entirety and any references to the standard.
47	47.43	The North Twelve	Section 14A -	14A.4.1 Density	d. Setbacks		Support	More permissive setbacks will allow for increased housing density on sites.	Approve 14A.4.1(d) as notified.

		Limited Partnership	Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Standards					
18	18.21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	Yard Minimum depth Front 1.5 metres Si		Support in part	Fire and Emergency acknowledge that Rule 14A.4.1 incorporates the density standards required by Part 2 of Schedule 3A of the RMA. As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission, Fire and Emergency have concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area. Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 14A.4.1(d) directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage.</u>
FS 74 [18]	3 [18.21]	Omokoroa Country Club [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Support	Support inclusion of an advice note referring to the Building Code.	Amend Rule 14A.4.1 to include an advice note that directs plan users to the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code.
FS 76 [18]	27 [18.21]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as advice notes referring to other legislation are unnecessary and redundant.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [18]	27 [18.21]	Ryman Healthcare					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as advice notes referring to other legislation are unnecessary and	Disallow the submission.

		Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					redundant.	
30	30.1	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residenti al	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. site boundaries with a railway corridor or desi		Support Council has recognised the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in Plan Change 92 to protect nationally significant infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects and provide a greater level of amenity for residential occupants living close to the working rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter is applied in Plan Change 92 to: (a) require a 10m yard setback from the railway corridor for all buildings and structures in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential; and (b) require a 5m side yard setback for buildings and setbacks within Lot 601 DP 560118 and Lot 603 DP 560118 (Harbour Ridge) where sites adjoin the esplanade reserve (south of railway line). KiwiRail strongly supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and the related setback provisions from the rail corridor. KiwiRail considers the operative setback provisions to be appropriate, given the increased building height and reduced height to boundary controls enabled by Plan Change 92 which increases the risk of potential interference with the rail corridor from maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the rail corridor.	KiwiRail seeks: (a) retention of identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter; (b) retention of 14A.4.1(d)(ii)(b)
FS 70 [30]	12 [30.1]	Kāinga Ora [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppos e Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora does not consider the acoustic and vibration controls sought from Kiwirail to be a qualifying matter.	Disallow
32	32.9	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residenti al	14A.4.1 Density Standards	b. site boundaries with a railway corridor or desi		Oppos e The railway yard sought in Standard 14A.4.1.d. Setbacks ii.b. is opposed and is not considered to be evidential based, and it is greater than Kiwirail have identified elsewhere, nor are there other provisions in terms of objectives, policies, matters for discretion or assessment criteria that pertain to effects on the railway corridor. The extent of the existing Notice of Requirement should be sufficient for the purposes of maintenance issues. There is no evidence to demonstrate that a 10m yard is required for maintenance or use of the railway corridor. The other plan provisions in proposed Chapter 14A (objectives, policies, matters for discretion or assessment criteria) pertain to effects on the railway corridor.	Deletion of the standard. 14A.4.1.d. Setbacks ii.b. This standard does not apply to: b. site boundaries with a railway corridor or designation for railway purposes (for sites created by way of an application for subdivision consent approved after 1 January 2010) in which case all yards shall be 10m.
FS 70 [32]	18 [32.9]	Kāinga Ora [New Zealand]					Support Kāinga Ora supports submission point 32.9 in that it is consistent with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow

		Housing Foundation]							
FS 71 [32]	11 [32.9]	KiwiRail [New Zealand Housing Foundation]					Oppose	<p>Health, safety and amenity are key concerns for KiwiRail. KiwiRail considers that setbacks from the railway corridor is one of several essential planning tools (the others being noise and vibration controls) available for managing the interface between urban development and nationally significant infrastructure. Without appropriate setbacks for development in proximity to the railway corridor, residents' health, safety and amenity will be significantly compromised (due to increased exposure to adverse effects of railway operations), as well as increasing the risk of reverse sensitivity effects on KiwiRail and its operations.</p> <p>Setbacks are integral for managing those effects, as well as protecting the public from interfering with railway operations, which could lead to serious injury or death (if that risk is not appropriately managed / mitigated). The amendment sought by the New Zealand Housing Foundation will not promote safe, healthy or well-functioning urban environments and is therefore inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD and the District Plan.</p>	Reject amendment sought and retain the setback standard for site boundaries that adjoin the rail corridor.
30	30.2	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	d. Lot 601 DP 560118 and Lot 603 DP 560118 (Harbour Ridge)		Support	<p>Council has recognised the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in Plan Change 92 to protect nationally significant infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects and provide a greater level of amenity for residential occupants living close to the working rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter is applied in Plan Change 92 to:</p> <p>(a) require a 10m yard setback from the railway corridor for all buildings and structures in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential; and</p> <p>(b) require a 5m side yard setback for buildings and setbacks within Lot 601 DP 560118 and Lot 603 DP 560118 (Harbour Ridge) where sites adjoin the esplanade reserve (south of railway line).</p> <p>KiwiRail strongly supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and the related setback provisions from the rail corridor. KiwiRail considers the operative setback provisions to be appropriate, given the increased building height and reduced height to boundary controls enabled by Plan Change 92 which increases the risk of potential interference with the rail corridor from maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the rail</p>	<p>KiwiRail seeks:</p> <p>(a) retention of identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter;</p> <p>(b) retention of 14A.4.1(d)(ii)(d)</p>

								corridor.	
FS 70 [30]	13 [30.2]	Kāinga Ora [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Kāinga Ora does not consider the acoustic and vibration controls sought from Kiwirail to be a qualifying matter.	Disallow
FS 73 [30]	2 [30.2]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	The amendment sought is not accepted.
15	15.11	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	e. where the written approval of the owner(s) of		Support in part	The exemption from meeting yards where written approval of the owners of the immediately adjoining property should only apply with respect to side and rear yards. It should not apply to the front (road) boundary. This is a drafting error and needs correcting.	Amend Rule 14A.4.1 (d) (ii) (e) as follows: This standard does not apply to: <u>side and rear yards</u> where the written approval of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining property to a specified lesser distance is obtained.
FS 74 [15]	2 [15.11]	Omokoroa Country Club [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the correction of the drafting error to provide clarification regarding yarding issues.	Amend Rule 14A.4.1 to allow written approval from owners of immediately adjoining properties to only apply to those in respect of side and rear yards, not front (road) boundary.
29	29.41	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	e. Building coverage		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the maximum building coverage threshold of 50% of the net site area as prescribed by the Housing Supply Act. However, it is considered that the image is misleading insofar as it only demonstrates one residential unit per site - whereas the permitted number of residential units per site is three. Therefore, the illustration provided with the standard should be updated to demonstrate three residential units per site with a 50% maximum building coverage.	Delete the illustration provided with standard 14A.4.1.e and replace with an illustration demonstrating three residential units per site with a 50% maximum building coverage.
34	34.37	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	e. Building coverage		Support	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (e) as it aligns with the building coverage standard of the MDRS.	Retain 14A.4.1 Density Standard (e) as notified.

47	47.44	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	e. Building coverage		Support	50% site coverage is greater than currently permitted in Te Puke Residential area and will provide for increased density.	Approve 14A.4.1(e) as notified.
34	34.38	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	f. Outdoor living space (per unit)		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (f) and the outdoor living space provisions in principle, as it reflects the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to 14A.4.1 Density Standard (f) that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard.	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.4.1 Density Standard (f) as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard: 14A.4.1(f) Outdoor living space (per unit) ... iii. <u>For retirement units, clauses i and ii apply with the following modifications:</u> <u>a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> <u>b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>
47	47.45	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	f. Outdoor living space (per unit)		Support	The provisions ensure that each dwelling unit will have access to an outdoor living and amenity space.	Approve 14A.4.1(f) as notified.
18	18.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	f. Outdoor living space (per unit)		Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living space on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress. As above, Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is designed and consequential site	Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage.</u>

								layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent so that Council are able to assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 14A.4.1(f) directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	
FS 76 [18]	28 [18.22]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as advice notes referring to other legislation are unnecessary and redundant.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [18]	28 [18.22]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as advice notes referring to other legislation are unnecessary and redundant.	Disallow the submission.
34	34.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	g. Outlook space (per unit)		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (g) and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The RVA considers amendments should be made to 14A.4.1 Density Standard (g) to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.4.1 Density Standard (g) as follows to x. provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: 14A.4.1(g) Outlook space (per unit) ... <u>x. For retirement units, clauses i – ix apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u>
47	47.46	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	g. Outlook space (per unit)		Support	The provisions ensure that rooms in dwellings have adequate outlook and sunlight access.	Approve 14A.4.1(g) as notified.
34	34.40	Retirement Villages	Section 14A -	14A.4.1 Density	h. Windows to street		Support in	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (h) and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.4.1 Density Standard (h) as follows

		Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	Standards			part	windows to street standard of the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units and should be limited to units facing a public street (not internal to the village).	to provide for retirement units: 14A.4.1(h) Windows to street Any residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> facing the a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.
47	47.47	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	h. Windows to street		Support	The provisions ensure visibility and passive surveillance over street frontages and ensures a dwelling retains a front of house street façade.	Approve 14A.4.1(h) as notified
26	26.28	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	h. Windows to street		Support in part	Further definition and a diagram would provide clarification to the definition.	Add to the definition the detail in the FAQ section of PC92: <u>Any form of glazing is acceptable as the level of transparency is not specified in the standard. The National Planning Standards define both a residential unit and an accessory building i.e. a garage. As long as no part of the accessory building contains a residential unit, the glazing standard would not apply. This is regardless of whether the accessory building is attached to the residential unit or standalone.</u>
34	34.41	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	i. Landscaped area		Support in part	The RVA supports 14A.4.1 Density Standard (i) and the landscaped area provisions in principle, which reflect the landscaped area standard of the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.4.1 Density Standard (i) as follows to provide for retirement units: 14A.4.1(i) Landscaped area i. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. ii. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> .
47	47.48	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.1 Density Standards	i. Landscaped area		Support	The provisions ensure each property will have sufficient green space to assist with residential amenity for more intense residential development.	Approve 14A.4.1(i) as notified.

			al						
15	15.12	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards			Support in part	Section 14A cross references back to other sections of the District Plan to alert readers of other provisions which are also applicable. Section 12 – Subdivision and Development is cross referenced from the “subdivision standards” in 14A.4.3 but should also be cross referenced from the “other standards” in 14A.4.2 because Section 12 is also applicable to land use.	Add new Rule 14A.4.2 (z) as follows: <u>(z) Subdivision and Development – See Section 12</u>
34	34.42	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	General		Oppose	The RVA opposes 14A.4.2 Other Standards (a) – (x) and the triggering of a restricted discretionary activity status as a result of non-compliance with these standards, as the MDRS does not include these standards. A number of the standards are designed for standard residential typologies and are not directly applicable to retirement villages. For example, (e) assumes vehicle crossings are provided for a single residential unit rather than a multi-unit retirement village.	The RVA seeks the deletion of 14A.4.2 Other Standards (a) – (x).
33	33.1	Powerco	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	General		Support in part	<p>PC92 fails to give effect to the Enabling Housing Act by not adequately providing for Powerco’s electricity distribution network as a ‘qualifying matter’. Powerco wants to ensure that higher density housing activities are undertaken in a manner that is safe for developers and subcontractors. There are increasing instances where safety concerns are overlooked, and buildings (as well as scaffolding and mobile plant) do not meet the requirements of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances - NZECP 34:2001 (ECP34). ECP34 sets minimum safe electrical distance requirements from overhead electric line installations to protect people and property from harm or damage from electrical hazards. A breach of ECP34 could potentially lead to accidental contact with live conductors (lines) leading to injury or death, costs to either modify the overhead asset or the building, or a requirement for the affected asset to be taken out of service until the situation is remedied. The illustrations (in the submitter’s full submission) identify the potential implications associated with the provisions of the MDRS.</p> <p>Recognition of electricity distribution as a qualifying matter need not present a burdensome constraint. It would only result in activities that did not comply with the setback and notification requirements under ECP34 being identified at the planning stage. This would likely increase the efficiency and reduce the costs of higher density residential developments as it would avoid stop work orders, requirements to redesign, the demolition/deconstruction of non-compliant parts of works, and/or the undergrounding of the existing overhead</p>	Powerco submits that the distribution network should properly be recognised under PC92 as a new qualifying matter. It is considered that non statutory maps could be included in the District Plan for the areas covered by PC92 that identify existing overhead electricity networks in the area. In conjunction with the non-statutory maps, it is submitted that a new standard could be inserted into Section 14A.4.2 (Other Standards) of the District Plan worded along the lines of the following: Where a site contains or adjoins (e.g. on legal road) an overhead electricity line identified on the [nonstatutory] planning maps, an assessment of the building(s) against the provisions of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances - NZECP 34:2001 (ECP34) must be undertaken by a suitably qualified person with the report approved by the asset owner. If no report is provided, or a breach of ECP34 is identified, then resource consent is required for the development as a Restricted Discretionary Activity with the asset owner identified as an affected person.

							<p>network. Powerco submits that its distribution network falls into one or more of the following three section 77I (qualifying matter) categories. A matter required in order to give effect to a national policy statement (section 77I(b)); or A matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure (section 77I(e)); or Any other matter that makes higher density residential development, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3 of the NPSUD, inappropriate in an area (section 77I (J))</p> <p>With respect to national policy statements: The distribution network is integrally linked to electricity generation and transmission which are the subject of the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 (NPSREG) and the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 (NPSET). Giving effect to the NPSREG and NPSET relies on a functioning, safe and efficient distribution network. More specifically, the NPSREG recognises the national significance of renewable energy generation activities including distribution. With respect to nationally significant infrastructure: This is defined in the NPSUD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) to include both electricity generation and transmission. While the definition does not explicitly include distribution networks, Powerco submits that PC92 must provide for a well-functioning distribution system in order to achieve the efficient operation of both the electricity generation and transmission networks. With respect to any other matter: Powerco’s distribution infrastructure is a qualifying matter because residential development activities that result in safety and operational issues clearly make higher density development inappropriate in setback areas recognised by ECP34.</p> <p>Section 77L of the Enabling Housing Act requires section 32 analysis relating to any such qualifying matter to include a site-specific analysis. Powerco submits site-specific analysis could and should be incorporated by way of a further evaluation report under section 32AA or with sufficient information via the decision on PC92. Powerco is happy to work with Council on the evaluation reporting process. To accommodate a new qualifying matter, Council must address the requirements of s77J(3) and (4) of the Enabling Housing Act, which are briefly assessed below: Section 77J(3)(a): Residential development enabled by PC92 should be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with ECP34 to protect people and property from harm or damage from electrical hazards, and ensure continuity of electricity supply</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

								to surrounding communities. Development conducted in breach of ECP34 is clearly incompatible with the level of development permitted by the MDRS. Section 77J(3)(b): Such provisions are unlikely to limit development capacity, rather they will ensure that safety risks are taken into account during the design stages of a development. Section 77J(3)(c): If ECP34 is not considered during the design stage, significant costs can be incurred redesigning / physically modifying the development or modifying the electricity network. It can also avoid the situation of stopwork notices being issued on developers.	
FS 70 [33]	19 [33.1]	Kāinga Ora [PowerCo]					Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 33.1 as it not a qualifying matter and should not be identified as a qualifying matter in the Plan Change. Kāinga Ora opposes the relief and changes sought.	Disallow
61	61.1	Paul and Maria van Veen	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	a. Residential unit yield		Oppose	<p>Housing Density - Ōmokoroa Stage 3C, Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct - proposed minimum yield of 30 residential units per hectare of developable area. The Precinct area was initially proposed to have such high density due to it being a business and commercial area. Now this level of density is being proposed for residential areas outside of the precinct which are quite different in their purpose. Omokoroa stage 3A and 3B are at lower minimum yields of 15 and 20 residential units per hectare of developable area respectively. These area yields could be more evenly distributed across the whole stage 3. Because of these proposals there is pressure to have the option for even higher buildings. See concerns regarding height restrictions below (in next submission point).</p> <p>These levels of building density are out of character for this area. The densest housing for the whole of stage 3 now appear will be applied to area 3C. Development there also seems to have overlap with proposals for the business precinct area. These kind of densities in such small areas will invariably lead to the problems already experienced in other developments where not enough room is left for people to park their cars, for children to play outside and for a positive, healthy community to develop. City type densities should not apply to residential areas in a semi-rural area.</p>	We oppose the very high density. If lower density cannot be achieved within the last remaining areas of Omokoroa then housing yields per hectare could at least be more evenly distributed across the whole of stage 3 to provide lower average minimum residential unit yields than proposed for 3C, but over a larger area.
FS 69 [61]	15 [61.1]	Jace Investments [Paul and Maria van Veen]					Oppose	The submission seeks to lower the height limit for buildings in the medium density areas – mixed use precinct area. Additional density is required in this area to enhance the legibility and vitality of the Omokoroa Town Centre.	Reject Submission
47	47.49	The North Twelve Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa	14A.4.2 Other standards	a. Residential unit yield		Support in part	A minimum of 20 dwellings per hectare will ensure residential intensification, however not all land can achieve this density due to various factors such as, but not limited to ground	Approve 14A.4.2(a) as notified subject to further clarification

		Partnership	a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential					conditions and natural hazards. Accordingly, provision should be included for lower densities as a permitted activities where it can be determined that land is not suitable to achieve the minimum density.																	
32	32.10	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	a. Residential unit yield		Support	The specific reasons for the submitters' support are as follows: The submitter supports the minimum density standard under 14A, and the removal of the maximum density provision identified in the earlier draft structure plan work. Provision of a minimum density will ensure efficient use of land.	Retain the proposed standards																
29	29.42	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	a. Residential unit yield		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed residential unit yield requirements which at their current rate is not conducive to achieving medium or high density residential land use.	Amend standard 14A.4.2.a as follows: Four or more residential <u>Residential</u> units on a site are subject to the following requirements:																
									<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Yield Requirements</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3A</td> <td>Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3A</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3B</td> <td>Minimum yield of 20<u>35</u> residential units per hectare of developable area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Te Puke Medium Density Residential</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa <u>High Density Residential</u> Stage 3C</td> <td>Minimum yield of 50<u>30</u> residential units per hectare of developable area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Yield Requirements	Ōmokoroa Stage 3A	Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.	Ōmokoroa Stage 3A		Ōmokoroa Stage 3B	Minimum yield of 20 <u>35</u> residential units per hectare of developable area	Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)		Te Puke Medium Density Residential		Ōmokoroa <u>High Density Residential</u> Stage 3C	Minimum yield of 50 <u>30</u> residential units per hectare of developable area	Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential	
Area	Yield Requirements																								
Ōmokoroa Stage 3A	Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.																								
Ōmokoroa Stage 3A																									
Ōmokoroa Stage 3B	Minimum yield of 20 <u>35</u> residential units per hectare of developable area																								
Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)																									
Te Puke Medium Density Residential																									
Ōmokoroa <u>High Density Residential</u> Stage 3C	Minimum yield of 50 <u>30</u> residential units per hectare of developable area																								
Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential																									

									Precinct Te Puke High Density Residential
FS 69 [29]	16 [29.4 2]	Jace Investments [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	The submission seeks a minimum density yield much higher than notified by PC92. 50 units per ha is too high a minimum standard	Reject Submission
FS 73 [29]	1 [29.4 2]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Provision of an even greater minimum density is supported in terms of the efficient use of land.	Standard is revised as identified in the primary submission.
FS 74 [29]	14 [29.4 2]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Oppose increasing the proposed residential unit yield requirements.	Retain (or reduce) the residential yields within Plan Change 92; do not increase them.
39	39.21	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	The need for Council to overly restrict building typologies is unnecessary. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 of the NPSUD which requires Council's to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs in terms of type, needs, price and location of different households. The provision will limit choice and accessibility options for housing.	Delete the rule as follows: b. residential unit typologies i. six or more residential units on a site a maximum of 50% of the total number of residential units on the site may be physically detached from any other residential units.
FS 69 [39]	17 [39.21]	Jace Investments [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support submission that seeks to reduce the dwelling typology outcomes. Suggest Council use incentives should it wish a certain housing typology outcome.	Accept submission and delete the typology requirements or provide incentives within the District Plan to promote typology outcomes.
32	32.11	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Support	The specific reasons for the submitters' support are as follows; the submitter supports the maximum detached dwellings for a number of reasons including, amongst others, encourages more diversity and variety of building typologies in development. Provision will allow for variety and diversity of housing typologies allowing for efficient use of land, housing choice and affordability.	Retain the proposed standards.

			al						
47	47.50	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	Requiring specific unit typology for greater than six dwellings' does not allow a response to market demand to be provided and/or provide for the specific characteristics of a site or area.	Delete 14A.4.2(b) as notified.
FS 69 [47]	18 [47.50]	Jace Investments [The North Twelve Limited Partnership]					Support	Support submission that seeks to reduce the dwelling typology outcomes. Suggest Council use incentives should it wish a certain housing typology outcome.	Accept submission and delete the typology requirements or provide incentives within the District Plan to promote typology outcomes.
26	26.29	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	The need for Council to overly restrict building typologies is unnecessary. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 of the NPSUD which requires Council's to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs in terms of type, needs, price and location of different households. The provision will limit choice and accessibility options for housing.	Delete the rule as follows: b. residential unit typologies i. six or more residential units on a site a maximum of 50% of the total number of residential units on the site may be physically detached from any other residential units.
29	29.43	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes a control on residential unit typology when six or more residential units are located on a site as this is not consistent with Policy 1(a) of the NPS-UD nor Objective 2 and Policy 1 of Section 14A.	Delete standard 14A.4.2.b and any references to it.
42	42.9	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	The need for Council to overly restrict building typologies is unnecessary. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD which requires Council's to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs in terms of type, needs, price and location of different households. The provision will limit choice and accessibility options for housing.	Delete the rule as follows: b. residential unit typologies i. six or more residential units on a site a maximum of 50% of the total number of residential units on the site may be physically detached from any other residential units.

FS 74 [42]	34 [42.9]	Omokoroa Country Club [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	OCC opposes the deletion of the residential unit typologies as this is likely to lead to poor urban design outcomes.	Retail Rule 14A.4.2.b.
40	40.13	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	b. Residential unit typology		Oppose	The need for Council to overly restrict building typologies is unnecessary. The proposal is contrary to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD which requires Council's to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs in terms of type, needs, price and location of different households. The provision will limit choice and accessibility options for housing.	Delete the rule as follows: b. residential unit typologies i. six or more residential units on a site a maximum of 50% of the total number of residential units on the site may be physically detached from any other residential units
39	39.22	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	d. Impervious surfaces		Oppose	The MDRS provisions contain separate coverage requirements, and these are accepted. The need for separate impervious surface requirements is not supported by MDRS provisions (which only relate to landscaping and building coverage) and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Delete the rule relating to impervious surfaces
FS 67 [39]	25 [39.22]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service (e.g. for stormwater and wastewater infrastructure). Restricting surface runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets. The maximum impervious cover was used to quantify flooding extent, flood depth and velocity and associated effects on the receiving environment.	If the definition of 'net site area' is not amended (per submission point 25.31), in Rule 14A.4.2(d) change references to 'net site area' to 'total site' (or similar) so that all impervious surfaces (including accessways) within a site are considered. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
26	26.30	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	d. Impervious surfaces		Oppose	The MDRS provisions contain separate coverage requirements, and these are accepted. The need for separate impervious surface requirements is not supported by MDRS provisions (which only relate to landscaping and building coverage) and is inconsistent with the NPSUD.	Delete the rule relating to impervious surfaces
FS 67 [26]	26 [26.30]	Bay of Plenty Regional					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area	If the definition of 'net site area' is not amended (per submission point 25.31), in Rule 14A.4.2(d) change references to 'net site area' to 'total site' so that all impervious surfaces

		Council [Classic Group]						of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service. Restricting surface runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets.	(including accessways) within a site are considered. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
40	40.14	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	d. Impervious surfaces		Oppose	The MDRS provisions contain separate coverage requirements, and these are accepted. The need for separate impervious surface requirements is not supported by MDRS provisions (which only relate to landscaping and building coverage) and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Delete the rule relating to impervious surfaces.
FS 67 [40]	27 [40.14]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service. Restricting surface runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets.	If the definition of 'net site area' is not amended (per submission point 25.31), in Rule 14A.4.2(d) change references to 'net site area' to 'total site' so that all impervious surfaces (including accessways) within a site are considered. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
42	42.10	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	d. Impervious surfaces		Oppose	The MDRS provisions contain separate coverage requirements, and these are accepted. The need for separate impervious surface requirements is not supported by MDRS provisions (which only relate to landscaping and building coverage) and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Delete the rule relating to impervious surfaces.
FS 67 [42]	28 [42.10]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service. Restricting surface runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets.	If the definition of 'net site area' is not amended (per submission point 25.31), in Rule 14A.4.2(d) change references to 'net site area' to 'total site' so that all impervious surfaces (including accessways) within a site are considered. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
25	25.45	Bay of Plenty Regional	Section 14A - Omokoro	14A.4.2 Other standards	i. Impervious surfaces shall not exceed		Support in part	Restricting surface runoff from the intensification existing levels will have a minimal effect on downstream flood protection assets.	If the definition of 'net site area' is not amended, remove reference to 'net site area' so that all impervious surfaces (including accessways) within a site are considered. Any

		Council	a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential		70% of net				alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
47	47.51	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	i. Impervious surfaces shall not exceed 70% of net		Support in part	The MDRS standards has removed all impervious surface requirements from the approved version, however 50% impervious surface is overly restrictive and will not provide for intensified residential development. The 50% impervious area will not provide for any additional impermeable surface over and above the 50% site coverage permitted.	Approve 14A.4.2(d) as notified in relation to 70% provision and remove 50% provision in the Te Puke Stormwater Management Area.
FS 67 [47]	29 [47.51]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [The North Twelve Limited Partnership]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. The 50% impervious surface limit is to enable further development of Te Puke without having a negative impact on existing stormwater infrastructure or on downstream properties.	Retain standard 14A.4.2(d)(i)(a) as notified.
26	26.31	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	e. Vehicle crossing and access		Oppose	40% is too restrictive for narrow sites. This would mean the narrowest width lot for double garage is 14m. 10-14m generic sizing that maximises street spacing and increases our densities and yields which should be higher priority for Council. The definition drawing also appears to be inconsistent with the WBOPDC Development Code 2009 (W435) drawing (attached to this submitter's full submission). This would mean the narrowest width lot for double garage is 14m. 10-14m generic sizing that maximises street spacing and increases our densities and yields which should be higher priority for Council.	Amend the rule as follows: For a site with a front boundary the vehicle crossing shall not exceed 5.4m in width (as measured along the front boundary) or cover more than 40% <u>50%</u> of the length of the front boundary as shown in the diagram below.
29	29.44	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	e. Vehicle crossing and access		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the vehicle crossing and access controls, as drafted, as it would not provide for jointly owned access lots and / or two-way traffic for larger developments with one front boundary.	Delete standard 14A.4.2.e, as follows: Vehicle crossing and access i. For a site with a front boundary the vehicle crossing shall not exceed 5.4m in width (as measured along the front boundary) or cover more than 40% of the length of the front boundary as shown in the diagram below.
18	18.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te	14A.4.2 Other standards	e. Vehicle crossing and access		Oppose	This rule is opposed by Fire and Emergency as it does not prescribe the minimum vehicle crossing requirements that would ensure well-functioning and resilient communities. Fire and Emergency requires all sites to provide a minimum	Amend rule 14A.4.2 as follows: e. Vehicle crossing and access i. For a site with a front boundary the vehicle crossing shall <u>be</u>

			Puke Medium Density Residential					vehicle crossing width of no less than 3.5m and a height clearance of 4m at site entrances. This is prescribed in the Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD and NZBC. Fire and Emergency therefore request that this rule be amended to include a vehicle crossing minimum width and height clearance in the MDRZ in order to provide for emergency access. Should an application not comply with the minimum requirements, resource consent will be required as a restricted discretionary activity and will provide Council the ability to assess a development in accordance with the existing matters of discretion set out in 14A.7.14. This amendment gives effect to the objectives and policies set out in 14A.2.1 and 14A.2.2, providing for a well-functioning and resilient community. Fire and Emergency note that all other access provisions are set out in the subdivision and development section. Fire and Emergency suggest that this provision is relocated to 12.4.4 Transportation and Property Access where minimum carriageway widths are located in Table 1 for consistency and to start to align with the national planning standards.	<u>no less than 3.5m in width and not exceed 5.4m in width (as measured along the front boundary) or cover more than 40% of the length of the front boundary as shown in the diagram below. A clear passageway of no less than 4.0m in height at site entrances.</u>
FS 76 [18]	29 [18.23]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as the standards as notified are considered appropriate and the relief sought does not provide for the functional or operational needs of retirement villages.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [18]	29 [18.23]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as the standards as notified are considered appropriate and the relief sought does not provide for the functional or operational needs of retirement villages.	Disallow the submission.
26	26.32	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.4.2 Other standards	f. Streetscape		Support in part	The internal measurement of the garage has no bearing on the streetscape.	Amend the rule as follows: Garages <u>as measured at the façade of the dwelling</u> (whether attached to or detached from a residential unit), and other buildings (except residential units), shall not cumulatively occupy more than 50% of the total width of the building frontage facing the front boundary.

			Residential						
47	47.52	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	f. Streetscape		Support	Provision will limit garage door dominance on the streetscape.	Approve 14A.4.2(f) as notified.
29	29.45	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	f. Streetscape		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, a control on the percentage of the total width of the building frontage that can be occupied by a garage. However, there is an absence of a specific objective, policy and assessment criteria framework to support the rule – noting there are various references to streetscape landscaping in the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Structure Plans.	Retain standard 14A.4.2.f only if a suitable policy and associated assessment criteria is inserted into the District Plan.
39	39.23	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks
FS 68 [39]	3 [39.23]	Classic Group [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks, or provide more flexibility in the permitted earthworks standards, in particular, the vertical height cut and fill limitations and the permitted volume.
FS 69 [39]	19 [39.23]	Jace Investments [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Support	Support submission that is seeking greater flexibility in earthworks rule 14A.4.2	Accept submission and delete the rule. There are several other methods of control including stormwater catchment boundaries, identifying key landform features within the Peninsula, identifying significant ecological areas etc.
8	8.3	Armada Properties Limited	Section 14A - Omokoro	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	Council has included additional earthworks rules into PC92. The 1m vertical change in ground level is restrictive, especially when considering the topography of land all throughout	Remove the proposed earthworks provisions added under 14A.4.2 (and any other consequential provisions).

			a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential					WBOP. From review of Appendix 8: Residential Design Outcomes, it appears that biggest concern for Council is with respect to retaining walls on or close to the boundary, which in turn adversely affect the amenity of neighbours. However, we note that the definition of a Building/Structure under the DP includes "any retaining wall or breastwork exceeding 1.5m in wall height". Therefore, it is considered that there is already adequate provision in the District Plan for Council to assess excessive retaining walls on or near the boundary.	
58	58.25	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The permitted earthworks limits are too stringent for the development of large sites with varied contour.	Provide more flexibility in the permitted earthworks standards, in particular, the vertical height cut and fill limitations and the permitted volume.
FS 68 [58]	4 [58.25]	Classic Group [Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited]					Support	The permitted earthworks limits are too stringent for the development of large sites with varied contour.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks, or provide more flexibility in the permitted earthworks standards, in particular, the vertical height cut and fill limitations and the permitted volume.
29	29.46	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes locating earthwork specific standards within the residential standards. In accordance with the National Planning Standards, these earthworks specific standards should be located to the 'district-wide' provisions in Section 4A.5 (General - Earthworks) of the District Plan.	Delete standard 14A.4.2.g and insert this standard into Section 4A.5 of the District Plan.
47	47.53	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The provisions should only apply to infill or individual site development. Greenfield residential development should be excluded from the provision as bulk earthworks for Greenfield development are covered by BOPRC consenting requirements.	Amend 14A.4.2(f) as notified to make these provisions only applicable to infill or individual site development.
26	26.33	Classic	Section	14A.4.2 Other	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive	Delete the rule relating to earthworks

		Group	14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	standards			e	earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. Restricting bulk earthworks will inevitably increase the amount of earthworks that are undertaken site-by-site. As those earthworks are far less regulated, there is less control over sediment and erosion control. It is also important to recognise that a move to higher density housing usually comes with a reduced outdoor living area. It is important that the reduced size is offset by ensuring this is a high quality space ie easily accessible, well oriented for sun, flat for usability, and well landscaped. Such a restriction of landform modification may undermine the ability of developers and builders to provide such a space, and the enjoyment of that space by future residents. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	
42	42.11	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks
FS 68 [42]	5 [42.11]	Classic Group [Brian Goldstone]					Support	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks, or provide more flexibility in the permitted earthworks standards, in particular, the vertical height cut and fill limitations and the permitted volume.
40	40.15	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoro and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	g. Earthworks		Oppose	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	Delete the rule relating to earthworks
FS 68 [40]	6 [40.15]	Classic Group					Support	The rule proposed to introduce new and restrictive earthworks provisions which will limit yield because of	Delete the rule relating to earthworks, or provide more flexibility in the permitted earthworks standards, in particular, the vertical

]	[Vercoe Holdings Limited]						constraints on the ability to change existing ground levels/contours. This is inconsistent with Objective 6, and policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD. The rule will result in development capacity being unnecessarily constrained. The effects of the rule have not been properly assessed under Section 32 of the RMA in relation to the impact on infrastructure provision, housing choice, yield, and density.	height cut and fill limitations and the permitted volume.
47	47.54	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	h. Height of fences, wall and retaining walls		Support	The proposed fencing and retaining wall heights (including safety fences) are appropriate as permitted activities.	Approve 14A.4.2(h) as notified
29	29.47	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	j. Accommodation Facilities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes clause iii which states that accommodation facilities must not contain 'kitchen facilities or otherwise be selfcontained' as a permitted activity standard. It is highly likely that the majority of accommodation facilities would provide a kitchen and bathroom (e.g., hotels, camping grounds and motels) therefore falling within the definition of 'kitchen facility' and 'selfcontained.' As such the standard is not considered appropriate or reasonable to apply.	Delete standard 14A.4.2.j.iii, as follows: Accommodation Facilities i. Have maximum occupancy of five persons at any one time (excluding staff); ii. The total area available for exclusive use for the occupiers be no greater than 60m ² gross floor area; iii. Must not contain a kitchen facility or otherwise be self contained; iv. For Discretionary accommodation facilities, information is to be provided in accordance with 4A.6.2.
FS 69 [29]	20 [29.47]	Jace Investments [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Support the submission that seeks to have kitchens permitted within 'accommodation facilities'. Kitchens are a mandatory need for accommodation facilities to be economically viable and appeal to a broad market.	Accept submission and permit kitchens to be established in accommodation facilities.
29	29.48	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	k. Home Enterprises		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes standard 14A.4.2.k insofar as its application "per site." While that is appropriate for one residential unit per site, it is unclear why this would preclude home enterprises from occurring in more than one unit of a multi-units and / or residential apartment.	Delete the note associated with standard 14A.4.2.k to provide for multi-unit and apartments, as follows: Note: The above activity performance standards shall apply cumulatively to all home enterprises per site.

18	18.24	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	l. Transportation, Access, Parking and Loading – S		Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the addition of 14A.4.2(l) subject to the acceptance of the consequential amendments sought to Section 4B relating to access widths in the MDRZ.	No relief sought.
22	22.1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	v. Historic Heritage – See Section 7.		Support	HNZPT supports the inclusion, in the proposed new section of the Plan entitled; “Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential,” of a link to the Historic Heritage section, section 7 of the Plan. This reference is important as the areas chosen to accommodate Medium Density Residential housing, in Omokoroa and Te Puke, contain a number of scheduled, not listed, built heritage items (10), a cultural heritage item (1), and a considerable number of recorded archaeological sites recognised in the New Zealand Archaeological Association recording scheme. Given the presence of these recorded archaeological sites, there is an extremely high likelihood of additional unrecorded sites. The historic heritage section of the Plan provides guidance in the form of objectives, policies, and rules relating the need for resource consents if development, use, or subdivision is on the same site as scheduled built heritage or cultural heritage items. These consenting processes seek to retain the important historic heritage values of the items at the time of such works. These rules enable the Plan to provide for matters of National Importance, RMA s6(e) and s6(f). This section also provides advice and information related to the HNZPT processes around archaeology and the need or otherwise to obtain an archaeological authority at the time of earthworks. HNZPT looks forward to collaborating with parties that require archaeological authorities as early as possible in their development processes. This advice assists the applicants to fulfil their obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.	That the link to the Historic Heritage Section, contained at 14A.4 Activity Performance Standards, 14A.4.2-Other Standards, V. Historic Heritage-See Section 7, is retained.
18	18.25	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.2 Other standards	w. Natural Hazards – See Section 8.		Support	Fire and Emergency support the application of Section 8 to the MDRZ insofar that this will ensure that new developments in areas subject to natural hazard risk are avoided or adequately mitigated. This will ensure consistency with objective 1 that requires a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future as directed by the NPS-UD. Fire and Emergency support the cross-referencing of other methods such as emergency management plans as a means of providing for public education and preparedness in communities as set out in	No relief sought.

								the Chapter 8 introduction.	
29	29.49	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes locating subdivision specific standards within the residential standards. In accordance with the National Planning Standards, these subdivision specific standards should be located to the ‘district-wide’ provisions in Section 12 (subdivision and development) of the District Plan.	Delete standards relating to subdivision from Section 14A and insert these standards into Section 12 of the District Plan.
29	29.50	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	a. Controlled activity subdivision for the purpose		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks the provision of subdivision in accordance with an approved land use consent as a Controlled Activity.	<p>Insert a new Controlled Activity for subdivision in accordance with an approved land use consent, as follows:</p> <p><u>c. Subdivision in accordance with an approved land use consent.</u></p> <p><u>Any subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent must comply with that resource consent. Council’s control shall be reserved to any of the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Subdivision layout;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Compliance with the approved land use consent; and</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Provision of infrastructure.</u></p>
47	47.55	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	a. Controlled activity subdivision for the purpose		Support	The subdivision standards are appropriate as a controlled activity.	Approve 14A.3.3(a) as notified.
29	29.51	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	b. Controlled activity subdivision for sites of le		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the size of the shape factor within the rule. Rather, and for consistency with other relief sought in this submission, it is considered more appropriate to provide for a minimum shape factor standard of 8m x 15m. This would also be consistent with Tauranga City Council’s proposed shape factor as per Plan Change 33.	<p>Amend 14A.4.3.b as follows:</p> <p>Shape factor:</p> <p>All lots shall be capable of accommodating a rectangle of 8m X 15m exclusive of yard requirements.</p>
FS 69	21	Jace					Support	Support the submission that seeks to amend the minimum	Accept submission and amended shape factor standard

[29]	[29.51]	Investments [Kāinga Ora]				t	shape factor dimensions of Rule 14A.4.3																				
47	47.56	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	b. Controlled activity subdivision for sites of le		Support in part	Current requirement of 10 x 15m does not provide flexibility for smaller dwelling typologies and increased density.	Approve 14A.3.3(b) as notified with amendment to shape factor to 8m x 15m.																		
29	29.52	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	c. Discretionary activity subdivision not for the		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the Discretionary Activity status of this rule and considers a Restricted Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate. The potential adverse effects of the activity are discrete and well understood. Matters of discretion can be used to set out a clear framework for the assessment of those applications which cannot meet this standard. Kāinga Ora seeks to increase the yield requirements to better reflect medium and high-density yield volumes as per submission point 35. Kāinga Ora also opposes the shape factor size for the reasons outlined in the previous submission point.	<p>1. Delete the Discretionary Activity status of rule 14A.4.3.c and replace with a Restricted Discretionary Activity status with an appropriate suite of matters of discretion.</p> <p>2. Amend the yield requirements as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Yield Requirements</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3A</td> <td>Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3A</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Stage 3B</td> <td>Minimum yield of 2035 residential units per hectare of developable area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Te Puke Medium Density Residential</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa High Density Residential Stage 3C</td> <td>Minimum yield of 5030 residential units per hectare of developable area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Te Puke High</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Yield Requirements	Ōmokoroa Stage 3A	Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.	Ōmokoroa Stage 3A		Ōmokoroa Stage 3B	Minimum yield of 20 35 residential units per hectare of developable area	Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)		Te Puke Medium Density Residential		Ōmokoroa High Density Residential Stage 3C	Minimum yield of 50 30 residential units per hectare of developable area	Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct		Te Puke High	
Area	Yield Requirements																										
Ōmokoroa Stage 3A	Minimum yield of 15 residential units per hectare of developable area.																										
Ōmokoroa Stage 3A																											
Ōmokoroa Stage 3B	Minimum yield of 20 35 residential units per hectare of developable area																										
Ōmokoroa (Outside of Stage 3)																											
Te Puke Medium Density Residential																											
Ōmokoroa High Density Residential Stage 3C	Minimum yield of 50 30 residential units per hectare of developable area																										
Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct																											
Te Puke High																											

									Density Residential	
									All lots shall be capable of accommodating a rectangle of 108m X 15m exclusive of yard requirements.	
FS 68 [29]	7 [29.5 2]	Classic Group [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	We oppose this submission point because the density requirement is forcing the market into something it is ready for. Once it makes financial sense to do so, density will naturally increase.	Decline the proposed amendment as requested	
FS 69 [29]	22 [29.5 2]	Jace Investments [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Support RDA activity classification but reject 50lot/ha as minimum density. 14A.4.3(c) sub standards.	Reject submission with respect to minimum density. Support submission with respect to RDA activity classification.	
47	47.57	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.4.3 Subdivision Standards	c. Discretionary activity subdivision not for the		Oppose	We understand that this relates to large subdivision where dwelling typologies are not proposed. Provided the relevant shape factor and density is met this should remain as a controlled activity.	Delete 14A.3.3(c) as notified.	
56	56.9	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	General		Support in part	14A.5 Notification: This section should be amended to provide for non-notification, or limited notification, of retirement villages and rest home activities. This is appropriate given the zoning of the land and the minor effects created by these activities in residential areas.	Amend 14A.5 Notification to provide for non-notification or limited notification of retirement villages and rest home activities.	
34	34.43	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	General		Support in part	The rule does not directly address the notification of applications for retirement villages, but acknowledges that construction of four or more residential units that complies with the density standards cannot be publicly or limited notified. The RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should be precluded from public notification, and that retirement villages that comply with the relevant external amenity density standards (height, height in relation to boundary, setback and building coverage) should be precluded from limited notification.	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.5.1 Notification Requirements as follows to preclude public notification of retirement village proposals, and preclude limited notification of retirement villages that comply with the relevant external amenity density standards: 14A.5 Notification 14A.5.1 Requirements	

									<p>(a) ...</p> <p>(b) Council shall not require:</p> <p>i. ...</p> <p>ii. ...</p> <p>iii. ...</p> <p>iv. ...</p> <p>v. <u>Public notification if the application is for the construction of a retirement village.</u></p> <p>vi. <u>Limited notification if the application is for the construction of a retirement village that complies with density standards 14A.4.1(b) – (e).</u></p>
FS 74 [34]	27 [34.43]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]					Support in part	Support the amendment to exclude retirement villages from public notification. However, OCC believes the same should apply to limited notification regardless of whether the construction of the retirement village complies with density standards or not.	<p>Amend 14A.5.1 as per RVA's relief sought (with the deletion shown (and highlighted)).</p> <p>4A.5 Notification</p> <p>14A.5.1 Requirements</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p>(b) Council shall not require:</p> <p>i. ...</p> <p>ii. ...</p> <p>iii. ...</p> <p>iv. ...</p> <p>v. Public notification if the application is for the construction of a retirement village.</p> <p>vi. Limited notification if the application is for the construction of a retirement village that complies with density standards 14A.4.1(b) – (e).</p>
47	47.58	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	General		Support	The relevant notification provisions are supported to ensure certainty for developers.	Approve 14A.5 as notified.
39	39.24	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium	14A.5.1 Requirements	a. Council may require public or limited notification		Oppose	The provision is unnecessary and repeat those provisions set out in Section 95 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Delete Council may require public or limited notification of resource consent applications except as listed in b. below.

			Density Residential						
26	26.34	Classic Group	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	a. Council may require public or limited notification		Oppose	The provision is unnecessary and repeat those provisions set out in Section 95 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Delete Council may require public or limited notification of resource consent applications except as listed in b. below.
39	39.25	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	b. Council shall not require:		Oppose	14A.5.1 b iv. Notification for a controlled activity as specified in Section 4A - General in Rule 4A.4.7.1. The provision is unnecessary as it repeats the requirements of Section 95 of the RMA. Controlled activity resource consents must be processed by the Council on a non-notified basis.	Delete Notification for a controlled activity as specified in Section 14A - General in Rule 4A.4.7.1.
29	29.53	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	b. Council shall not require:		Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to include reference to section 14A.4.2 in the notification section as well as section 14A.4.1 and further non notification clause where an activity for four or more dwellings which does not comply with the development performance standards except for height and building coverage. Amendments sought.	Amend standard 14A.5.1, as follows: Requirements b. Council shall not require: i. Public notification if the application is for the construction and use of one, two or three residential units that do not comply with one or more of the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1 (except for the standard in 14A.4.1 (a)) <u>or the other standards in Rule 14A.4.2.</u> ii. Public or limited notification if the application is for the construction and use of four or more residential units that comply with the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1 (except for the standard in 14A.4.1 (a)) <u>or the other standards in Rule 14A.4.2.</u> <u>iii. Public or limited notification for the construction and use of four or more residential units that do not comply with one or more of the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1 (except for the standard in 14A.4.1 (a)) or the other standards in Rule 14A.4.2, but complies with Rule 14A.4.1.b - height and Rule 14A.4.1.e. - building coverage.</u>
FS 71 [29]	10 [29.53]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	KiwiRail opposes the inclusion of new rule 14A.5.1(b)(iii). KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for public or limited notification to be precluded for high density	Reject the amendment sought and retain the notification requirements under 14A.5.1. as notified.

								developments that do not comply with the prescribed density standards, particularly the railway corridor setbacks in Rule 14A.4.1(d). In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.	
FS 76 [29]	30 [29.53]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	The RVA supports the request for more permissive notification standards for four or more dwellings to the extent that it is consistent with RVA's original submission.	Allow the submission point to the extent that it seeks more permissive notification standards for four or more dwellings
FS 77 [29]	30 [29.53]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	Ryman supports the request for more permissive notification standards for four or more dwellings to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's original submission.	Allow the submission point to the extent that it seeks more permissive notification standards for four or more dwellings.
58	58.27	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	ii. Public or limited notification if the applicant		Support in part	Consider that a rule needs to be added to enable RC applications to be processed without notification if the permitted activity standards can be achieved for bulk, location and density.	Add a provision confirming comprehensive mixed use developments meeting the permitted activity standards would be processed non-notified.
32	32.12	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	ii. Public or limited notification if the applicant		Support in part	Non-notification should be provided for if all other standards are complied with.	Amend 14A.5.1 Requirements to include the text 'and other standards 14A.4.2 under 14A.5.1(ii). a. Council may require public or limited notification of resource consent applications except as listed in (b) below. b. Council shall not require: i. Public notification if the application is for the construction and use of one, two or three residential units that do not comply with one or more of the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1 (except for the standard in 14A.4.1 (a)). ii. Public or limited notification if the application is for the construction and use of four or more residential units that comply with the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1 (except for the

									standard in 14A.4.1 (a)) <u>and Other Standards 14A.4.2.</u> iii. Public or limited notification if the application is for a subdivision associated with an application for the construction and use of residential units described in subclause (i) and (ii) above. iv. Notification for a controlled activity as specified in Section 4A – General in Rule 4A.4.7.1.
26	26.35	Classic Group	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	iv. Notification for a controlled activity as spec		Oppose	The provision is unnecessary as it repeats the requirements of Section 95 of the RMA. Controlled activity resource consents must be processed by the Council on a non-notified basis.	Delete Notification for a controlled activity as specified in Section 14a – General in Rule 4A.4.7.1.
29	29.54	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.5.1 Requirements	iv. Notification for a controlled activity as spec		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks to clarify the references in 14A.5.1.b.iv. Sub clause (iv) references ‘Section 4A’ and ‘Rule 4A.4.7.1’. It is not clear what provisions these are referring to. Amendments requested.	Confirm correct references and amend provision.
47	47.59	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	General		Support in part	The relevant controlled activity criteria are generally appropriate however many provisions will not be relevant to infill development or development not within a structure plan area. North 12 LP’s support of Clause (i). is subject to satisfactory outcomes of its submission on Chapter 11 FINCOs.	Approve 14A.6.1 as notified subject to clarification of Financial Contributions per North 12 LP’s submission on Chapter 11 (Clause (i)).
18	18.26	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A – Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units			Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the matters of control insofar that they address the provision of roading (c) and infrastructure in accordance with the structure plan as well as compliance with the Development Code or an approved alternative design (d). Fire and Emergency further support (g) which controls the effects of access to and within the subdivision. Fire and Emergency request additional matters of control to address the actual and potential effects on the transport network when considering an application for the subdivision of land for the purpose of the construction and	Add matters of control as follows: <u>j. Whether vehicular traffic generated by any activity can be accommodated without compromising the functionality of the access and the road on to which the access links.</u> <u>k. The effects from the proposal on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network (including the function of roads as identified in the road hierarchy) and measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate those adverse effect.</u> <u>l. Whether the provision for collection points and facilities are readily accessible by emergency services, service vehicles and</u>

								use of residential units. This will provide Council the ability to impose conditions of consent (section 108 of the RMA) to address actual and potential effects on the roading network, should this be deemed necessary. These matters have been adopted from the Tauranga City Proposed Plan Change 33.	<u>workers and will not at any time detract visually or generate health risks in the area.</u>
39	39.26	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	f. Design of services which provides for the exten		Support in part	The provision extension of services to other property owners (and thus to benefit other parties) should only relate to those "connections" as identified on structure plans to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is equitably funded and provided.	Amend the rule as follows: f. design of services which provides for the extension of services to other properties as applicable <u>as identified on structure plans</u> to provide effective and efficient servicing of the whole urban area.
26	26.36	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	f. Design of services which provides for the exten		Support in part	The provision extension of services to other property owners (and thus to benefit other parties) should only relate to those "connections" as identified on structure plans to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is equitably funded and provided.	Amend the rule as follows: f. design of services which provides for the extension of services to other properties as applicable <u>as identified on structure plans</u> to provide effective and efficient servicing of the whole urban area.
40	40.16	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	f. Design of services which provides for the exten		Support in part	The provision extension of services to other property owners (and thus to benefit other parties) should only relate to those "connections" as identified on structure plans to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is equitably funded and provided.	Amend the rule as follows: f. design of services which provides for the extension of services to other properties as applicable <u>as identified on structure plans</u> to provide effective and efficient servicing of the whole urban area.
42	42.12	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	f. Design of services which provides for the exten		Support in part	The provision extension of services to other property owners (and thus to benefit other parties) should only relate to those "connections" as identified on structure plans to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is equitably funded and provided.	Amend the rule as follows: f. design of services which provides for the extension of services to other properties as applicable <u>as identified on structure plans</u> to provide effective and efficient servicing of the whole urban area.
39	39.27	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of	h. The effect of additional driveways on public sa		Support in part	The provision is uncertain as it is unclear what the reference to "and amenity along footpaths" would relate to.	Amend the rule as follows: h. the affect of additional driveways on public safety and amenity along footpaths.

			Residential	residential units					
26	26.37	Classic Group	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	h. The effect of additional driveways on public safety		Support in part	The provision is uncertain as it is unclear what the reference to “and amenity along footpaths” would relate to.	Amend the rule as follows: h. the effect of additional driveways on public safety and amenity along footpaths.
39	39.28	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	i. Lot designs that provide areas orientated towards		Oppose	It is unclear why this provision is incorporated as land orientated towards the sun may not be possible in many instances. This matter is largely already addressed in 14A.6.1e.	Delete as follows: i. lot designs that provide areas orientated towards the sun
26	26.38	Classic Group	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.6.1 Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units	i. Lot designs that provide areas orientated towards		Oppose	It is unclear why this provision is incorporated as land orientated towards the sun may not be possible in many instances. This matter is largely already addressed in 14A.6.1e.	Delete as follows: i. lot designs that provide areas orientated towards the sun
39	39.29	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	General		Oppose	The assessment criteria are uncertain and are more restrictive than those in the existing District Plan. They are contrary to the enabling purpose of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. There are 47 separate matters of restricted discretion which the Council will apply when considering four or more units through a resource consent process. This is contrary to the enabling provisions of the NPS –UD. Policy 6 sets out that significant changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by communities including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types. The provisions as drafted will not assist in improving housing affordability or in creating certainty in relation to resource consent pathways and outcomes and housing choice. A stepped and more certain approach is required. Many of the criteria are unclear, subjective in nature and or create considerable uncertainty (for example assessment	Delete and redraft in accordance with guidance from the objectives and policies as set out in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, and the NZ Urban Design Protocol

								criteria a). “whether the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan “. There are a significant number of urban design criteria which are subjective and uncertain in their nature. The urban design criteria specified should be deleted and replaced by reference to assessment against those matters set out in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.	
FS 74 [39]	31 [39.29]	Omokoroa Country Club [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose	OCC opposes the deletion or redraft of Rule 14A.7.1. Although OCC has made some suggestions regarding the improvement of Rule 14A.7.1, it is important that it be retained to ensure high quality built form. The amendments proposed by Urban Taskforce for Tauranga do not support good design outcomes.	Retain Rule 14A.7.1 and amend to address OCC’s original submission.
FS 76 [39]	31 [39.29]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose in part	The RVA supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
FS 77 [39]	31 [39.29]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Urban Taskforce for Tauranga]					Oppose in part	Ryman supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
26	26.39	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	General		Oppose	The assessment criteria are uncertain and are more restrictive than those in the existing District Plan. They are contrary to the enabling purpose of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. There are 47 separate matters of restricted discretion which the Council will apply when considering four or more units through a resource consent process. This is contrary to the enabling provisions of the NPS-UD. Policy 6 sets out that significant changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by communities including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types. The provisions as drafted will not assist in improving housing affordability or in creating certainty in relation to resource consent pathways and outcomes and housing choice. A stepped and more certain approach is required. Many of the criteria are unclear, subjective in nature and or create considerable uncertainty (for example	Delete and redraft in accordance with guidance from the objectives and policies as set out in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, and the NZ Urban Design Protocol.

								assessment criteria a). “whether the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan”. There are a significant number of urban design criteria which are subjective and uncertain in their nature. The urban design criteria specified should be deleted and replaced by reference to assessment against those matters set out in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.	
FS 69 [26]	23 [26.3 9]	Jace Investments [Classic Group]					Support	Support submission seeking to amend activity classification and establish more planning certainty. 14A.7.1	Accept submission point.
FS 74 [26]	9 [26.3 9]	Omokoroa Country Club [Classic Group]					Oppose	OCC opposes the deletion or redraft of Rule 14A.7.1. Although OCC has made some suggestions regarding the improvement of Rule 14A.7.1, it is important that it be retained to ensure high quality built form.	Retain Rule 14A.7.1 and amend to address OCC’s original submission e.g. by including specialist design assessments such as: a. Reflectivity and colour considerations; b. Material palette considerations; c. High level of building articulation and varied form; d. High level of visual interest; e. Having a positive relationship with neighbouring properties; and f. Avoidance of blank walls or facades.
FS 76 [26]	32 [26.3 9]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Classic Group]					Oppose in part	The RVA supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
FS 77 [26]	32 [26.3 9]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Classic Group]					Oppose in part	Ryman supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
56	56.10	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site,	General		Oppose	14A.7.1 which would apply to retirement villages should be replaced by a clearer design assessment approach that defers to specialist design assessment within a set of specific design outcomes. Council should seek specialist and experienced input in preparing what would function as a brief to urban design/ landscape architect specialists. The approach as proposed under the plan change is too vague and will present design preparation and assessment	Make it clear that retirement villages are only subject to rule 14A.7.1. Amend rule 14A.7.1 to remove reference to the activity performance standards which is unclear and unnecessary. Amend rule 14A.7.1 to include appropriate urban design outcomes for larger developments including those specified by

			al	Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes				difficulties.	specialist design assessment such as: a. Reflectivity and colour considerations; b. Material palette considerations; c. High level of building articulation and varied form; d. High level of visual interest; e. Having a positive relationship with neighbouring properties; and f. Avoidance of blank walls or facades. Additionally, or alternatively, provide for an urban design peer review process for comprehensive developments under Chapter 14A.
FS 76 [56]	33 [56.10]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]					Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part the specific relief regarding design assessments sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to design assessments.
FS 77 [56]	33 [56.10]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]					Oppose in part	Ryman opposes in part the specific relief regarding design assessments sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to design assessments.
34	34.44	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	General		Support in part	In accordance with the RVA's submission on 14A.3.3 Rule (a), the RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The RVA opposes the current matters of discretion, for the reasons outlined in its submission above, and consider them not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages which should be regulated in line with the MDRS. The RVA particularly opposes the reference to 'Residential Design Outcomes' which are not tailored to retirement villages. Overall, the matters of discretion are so extensive as to render the restricted discretionary activity status redundant. The RVA considers the matters of discretion	The RVA seeks to amend 14A.7.1 Matters of Discretion as follows, to remove retirement villages from the applicability of Matters of Discretion 14A.7.1: 14.7 Matters of Discretion 14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes In considering an application for four or more residential units on a site, comprehensive mixed use developments, retirement villages or rest homes, Council shall consider the following to assess the overall contribution of the development to deliver a high quality and well-functioning urban environment.

							applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	<p>...</p> <p>The RVA also seeks to include the following set of matters of discretion specific to the construction of retirement villages (in accordance with the new 14A.3.3 Rule (x) proposed above).</p> <p><u>14A.7.X Restricted Discretionary Activities – The construction of retirement villages, including those that do not comply with the density standards in Rule 14A.4.1.</u></p> <p><u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the standards: 14A.4.1(b) – (f);</u></p> <p><u>c. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>d. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>e. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>f. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider: i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>g. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p>
FS 74 [34]	28 [34.4 4]	Omokoroa Country Club [Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated]				Support	Support the amendment to Rule 14A.7.1 removing the retirement villages from the Matters of Discretion, and the creation of a new proposed rule for the construction of retirement villages. This allows for Retirement Villages to provide quality built outcomes.	<p>Amend the 14A.7.1 as per RVA’s relief sought.</p> <p>14.7 Matters of Discretion</p> <p>14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes</p>
47	47.60	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities –	General	Support in part	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate however are subject to satisfactory outcomes on N12LP’s submissions on Residential Unit Yield, Residential Unit Typology, impervious surfaces, and earthworks.	Approve 14A.7.1 as notified subject to satisfactory outcomes on N12LP’s submissions on Residential Unit Yield, Residential Unit Typology, impervious surfaces, and earthworks.

			Puke Medium Density Residential	Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes					
42	42.13	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	General		Oppose	The assessment criteria are uncertain and are more restrictive than those in the existing District Plan. They are contrary to the enabling purpose of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. There are 47 separate matters of restricted discretion which the Council will apply when considering four or more units through a resource consent process. This is contrary to the enabling provisions of the NPS-UD. Policy 6 sets out that significant changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by communities including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types. The provisions as drafted will not assist in improving housing affordability or in creating certainty in relation to resource consent pathways and outcomes and housing choice. A stepped and more certain approach is required. Many of the criteria are unclear, subjective in nature and or create considerable uncertainty (for example assessment criteria a). <i>“whether the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan”</i> . There are a significant number of urban design criteria which are subjective and uncertain in their nature. The urban design criteria specified should be deleted and replaced by reference to assessment against those matters set out in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.	Delete and redraft in accordance with guidance from the objectives and policies as set out in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, and the NZ Urban Design Protocol .
FS 74 [42]	35 [42.13]	Omokoroa Country Club [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	OCC opposes the deletion or redraft of Rule 14A.7.1. Although OCC has made some suggestions regarding the improvement of Rule 14A.7.1, it is important that it be retained to ensure high quality built form. The proposed amendment by Brian Goldston does not encourage a good design outcome.	Retain rule 14A.7.1 and amend to address OCC’s original submission.
FS 76 [42]	35 [42.13]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose in part	The RVA supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.

FS 77 [42]	35 [42.13]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose in part	Ryman supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
40	40.17	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	General		Oppose	The assessment criteria are uncertain and are more restrictive than those in the existing District Plan. They are contrary to the enabling purpose of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. There are 47 separate matters of restricted discretion which the Council will apply when considering four or more units through a resource consent process. This is contrary to the enabling provisions of the NPS-UD. Policy 6 sets out that significant changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by communities including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types. The provisions as drafted will not assist in improving housing affordability or in creating certainty in relation to resource consent pathways and outcomes and housing choice. A stepped and more certain approach is required. Many of the criteria are unclear, subjective in nature and or create considerable uncertainty (for example assessment criteria a). "whether the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan". There are a significant number of urban design criteria which are subjective and uncertain in their nature. The urban design criteria specified should be deleted and replaced by reference to assessment against those matters set out in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.	Delete and redraft in accordance with guidance from the objectives and policies as set out in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, and the NZ Urban Design Protocol.
FS 76 [40]	36 [40.17]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	The RVA supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.
FS 77 [40]	36 [40.17]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	Ryman supports the request for the assessment criteria for development (which includes retirement villages) to be redrafted in accordance with the MDRS and NPS-UD, but opposes including reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol is included.

18	18.27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes			Support	<p>Fire and Emergency broadly support the matters of discretion that apply to proposals that require resource consent for ‘Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes’. It is paramount to Fire and Emergency that these matters of discretion are comprehensive and provide Council the ability to decline a resource consent (or impose consent conditions) on the basis that a proposal will not deliver a high quality and well-functioning urban environment. Fire and Emergency specifically support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives and policies: 14A.7.1(a) • Relevant Structure Plan: 14A.7.1(c-g) on the basis that a proposal must be consistent with the structure plan of which it is subject to. • Urban Design: 14A.7.1(h-l) specifically (k)(vii) that requires consideration of the provision of efficient access for emergency vehicles. <p>Overall, Fire and Emergency support these matters of discretion and consider these robust enough to ensure that Council can require and subsequently ensure the delivery of high quality outcomes in the MDRZ.</p>	No relief sought.
29	29.55	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	Urban Design		Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of matters of discretion with respect to considering urban design matters for developments of four or more residential units. However, the provisions are overly complex and lengthy, and it is considered that the matters could be refined. Therefore, Kāinga Ora seek the adoption of the matters of discretion as they relate to the development of four or more residential units on a site.</p>	<p>Delete the matters of discretion for four or more residential units on a site, comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes and replace with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> • <u>The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u> • <u>The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development; and</u> • <u>The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u>
FS 69 [29]	24 [29.55]	Jace Investments [Kāinga Ora]					Support	<p>Support submission seeking to refine urban design assessment criteria in rule 14A.7.1.</p>	Accept Submission point.
FS 74 [29]	15 [29.55]	Omokoroa Country Club [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	<p>OCC opposes the deletion or redraft of Rule 14A.7.1. Although OCC has made some suggestions regarding the improvement of Rule 14A.7.1, it is important that it be retained to ensure high quality built form.</p>	<p>Retail rule 14A.7.1 and amend to address OCC’s original submission e.g. by including specialist design assessments such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reflectivity and colour considerations; Material palette considerations;

									c. High level of building articulation and varied form; d. High level of visual interest; e. Having a positive relationship with neighbouring properties; and f. Avoidance of blank walls or facades.
FS 76 [29]	34 [29.5 5]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part the specific relief regarding urban design assessments sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to specific urban design assessments for retirement villages.
FS 77 [29]	34 [29.5 5]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose in part	Ryman opposes in part the specific relief regarding urban design assessments sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to specific urban design assessments for retirement villages.
14	14.1	Peter Musk	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Four or More Residential Units on a Site, Comprehensive Mixed Use Developments, Retirement Villages and Rest Homes	Note: Council's adopted Residential Design Outcome		Support in part	Support making changes to enable more homes to be built faster, however the Residential Design Outcomes should be given greater weight for new developments.	Give greater weight to the Residential Design Outcomes.
FS 76 [14]	37 [14.1]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Peter Musk]					Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part the specific relief regarding Residential Design Outcomes sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to Residential Design Outcomes.
FS 77 [14]	37 [14.1]	Ryman Healthcare Limited					Oppose in part	Ryman opposes in part the specific relief regarding Residential Design Outcomes sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission where it refers to Residential Design Outcomes.

		[Peter Musk]							
29	29.56	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building and Structure Height	General		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of matters that WBOPDC have restricted their assessment to, however considers that the matters listed in 14A.7.2 and 14A.7.3 are of a similar nature inasmuch that these could be combined. Amendments sought.	Combine standard 14A.7.2 and 14.7.3 by deleting standard 14A.7.3 and amending standard 14.7.2, as follows: 14A.7.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building and Structure Height <u>and/or Height in Relation to Boundary</u> . In considering an application that does not comply with Activity Performance Standard 14A.4.1 (b) Buildings and Structure Height <u>and/or 14A.4.1(c) Height in Relation to Boundary</u> , Council shall consider the following: <u>...f) Overshadowing (loss of direct or indirect/ambient sunlight) on the adjoining properties and how this may adversely impact on the amenity values of these properties.</u>
FS 76 [29]	38 [29.56]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the request to combine the matters of discretion within 14A7.2 and 14A7.3 as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	38 [29.56]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the request to combine the matters of discretion within 14A7.2 and 14A7.3 as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
47	47.61	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building and Structure Height	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings exceeding height limits.	Approve 14A.7.2 as notified.
47	47.62	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A – Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.7.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Height in	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings exceeding HIRB.	Approve 14A.7.3 as notified.

			Residential	Relation to Boundary					
32	32.13	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Height in Relation to Boundary	General	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	To allow consideration about the visibility of the infringement from a public place.	<p>Provide additional matters for discretion as noted in e and f below.</p> <p>14A.7.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Height in Relation to Boundary</p> <p>In considering an application that does not comply with Activity Performance Standard 14A.4.1 (c) Height in Relation to Boundary, Council shall consider the following:</p> <p>a. The extent and scale of the non-compliance.</p> <p>b. How the non-compliance combines with the overall building bulk to create an increased visual dominance on other properties.</p> <p>c. Overshadowing (loss of direct or indirect/ambient sunlight) on the adjoining properties and how this may adversely impact on the amenity values of these properties.</p> <p>d. Any loss of privacy to neighbours.</p> <p><u>e. Any unusual site characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>f. Visibility of the non-compliance from a public place such as a reserve.</u></p>
FS 76 [32]	39 [32.13]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [New Zealand Housing Foundation]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [32]	39 [32.13]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [New Zealand Housing Foundation]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement	Disallow the submission

]							
30	30.3	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks	General	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	KiwiRail observes that the proposed matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the setbacks in 14A.7.4 only require consideration of the visual effects of building bulk and impacts on neighbouring property. There is no matter of discretion requiring the consideration of effects when the rail corridor setback standard is infringed. KiwiRail considers a matter of discretion requiring assessment of the impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is critical in situations where the 10m yard and 5m side yard setback standards are not complied with. KiwiRail seeks an amendment to 14A.7.4 to include a specific matter of discretion where setbacks from the rail corridor are not complied with and seeks that acoustic and vibration controls be inserted into Plan Change 92 to manage the impacts of rail noise and vibration on noise sensitive activities.	KiwiRail seeks inclusion of a new matter of discretion in 14A.7.4 for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor. Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks In considering an application that does not comply with Activity Performance Standard 14A.4.1 (d) Setbacks, Council shall consider the following: Side and rear yards <u>f. The location and design of the building or structure as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>
FS 70 [30]	14 [30.3]	Kāinga Ora [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought and considers the proposed additional assessment criteria is unnecessary as the set backs provided by the MDRS are considered appropriate to maintain safety.	Disallow
FS 73 [30]	3 [30.3]	New Zealand Housing Foundation [KiwiRail Holdings Limited]					Oppose	New Zealand Housing Foundation opposes the proposed amendment as it is inconsistent with its primary submission identified as 32.9.	The amendment sought is not accepted.
47	47.63	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings exceeding permitted setbacks.	Approve 14A.7.4 as notified.
19	19.18	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks	Front yard	Matters of Discretion	Support in part	The definition for front boundary is included below: "Front Boundary" when used in Section 14A (Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential) and within the definition of "Front Yard" means all of the following: · Road boundary (including the boundary of any structure plan road or designated road or paper road);	It is requested that a specific Matter of Discretion with linkage to supporting Policies is inserted: " <u>Support site design measures and methods that seek to more effectively utilise available environmental opportunities to provide enhanced character and amenity experiences where adverse environmental effects are still reasonably internalised with development site boundaries</u> ".

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Privateway boundary (for a privateway that serves three or more sites); · Access lot boundary (for an access lot that serves three or more sites). <p>Except that: Where a site has a road boundary, any other boundary of that site which is adjacent to any privateway or access lot shall be a side or rear boundary (see the figure below).(attached to this submitter's full submission)</p> <p>For residential units that only have access off a privateway / access Lot, often this vacant part of a development site can be activated / used for outlook and visibility out towards a formal public road. Upper level living areas and other habitable spaces can be designed to utilise this setback in an effective manner to optimise these view corridors (images attached to this submitter's full submission). Inclusion of a matter of discretion and supporting policy should be available to aide consideration of efficient use of these areas when infringement is proposed / resource consent sought.</p>		
FS 76 [19]	40 [19.18]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Pete Linde]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [19]	40 [19.18]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Pete Linde]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
29	29.57	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A – Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks	b. The residential unit design enabling a visual c		Oppose	Kāinga Ora queries the inclusion of sub clause (b) regarding the residential unit design enabling a visual connection between the residential unit and the road. It is not clear what WBOPDC would be assessing in the context of a front yard setback non-compliance. Amendments sought.	Delete standard 14A.7.4.b.
FS 76 [29]	41 [29.57]	Retirement Villages Association of New					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.

		Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]							
FS 77 [29]	41 [29.57]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
18	18.28	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Setbacks	Side and rear yards		Oppose	In considering an application that does not comply with 'Activity Performance Standard 14A.4.1 (d) Setbacks', Fire and Emergency request a new matter of discretion be included to enable Council the ability to consider the actual and potential effects of the non-compliance on the use of a development in regard to pedestrian access and egress. This will ensure consistency with objective 1 and 2 that requires a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future and that housing is designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This should also be an indication to Council that the NZBC requirements will need to be considered to ensure that Council are not granting resource consents under the RMA that are inconsistent with the NZBC. This matter of discretion should go some way in addressing the gaps in the NZBC (C5) of which setback controls do not apply to detached dwellings as discussed in Section 1.2.4 above.	Add new matter of discretion as follows: Front yard <u>d. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u> Side and rear yards <u>f. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u>
29	29.58	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building Coverage	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of (b) which cross references to whether the proposal complies with other performance standards and if not, if compliance could be used to mitigate adverse effects of the building bulk, and (c) whether the coverage can be reduced by providing an additional storey. Kāinga Ora consider these matters do not assess the proposal at hand. Amendments sought.	Delete standard 14A.7.5.b and 14A.7.5.c.
FS 76 [29]	42 [29.58]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it does provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77	42	Ryman					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as	Allow the submission.

[29]	[29.58]	Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					t	it does provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	
47	47.65	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building Coverage	General		Support in part	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings exceeding building coverage.	Approve 14A.7.5 as notified with removal of clause (c).
47	47.64	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Building Coverage	c. Whether the building coverage can be reduced by		Oppose	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings exceeding building coverage, however whether the building should be multi-level per clause (c) is not a decision for Council to make or exercise control over as that is the applicant's choice and consideration.	Approve 14A.7.5 as notified with removal of clause (c).
47	47.66	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Outdoor Living Space (Per Unit)	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with outdoor living space.	Approve 14A.7.6 as notified.
47	47.67	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Outlook Space (Per Unit)	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with outlook space.	Approve 14A.7.7 as notified.
47	47.68	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke	14A.7.8 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with windows to street.	Approve 14A.7.8 as notified.

			Medium Density Residential	Compliance with Windows to Street					
47	47.69	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Landscaped Area	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with landscaped areas.	Approve 14A.7.9 as notified
29	29.59	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Landscaped Area	e. The potential adverse effects on stormwater inf		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of matter (e) with respect to potential adverse effects on stormwater infrastructure and overland flowpaths. This is more appropriately covered by the stormwater rules in Section 12. Amendments sought.	Delete standard 14A.7.9(e).
FS 76 [29]	43 [29.59]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	43 [29.59]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
29	29.60	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.10 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Yield	General		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the matters of discretion listed in standard 14A.7.10, as notified. However, it is considered that these matters can be condensed to avoid repetition and to ensure that the matters are appropriate for the consideration of noncompliance with the residential unit yield (specifically whether the minimum yield target has been met or not). Moreover, the relief sought to standard 14A.7.10 is consequential to submission ID 35 – which sought to increase the minimum yield targets of standard 14A.4.2.a to deliver outcomes more aligned more appropriately with both MDRZ and HDRZ densities.	Amend standard 14A.7.10 as follows: - Delete clauses (e), (i), (j), (k), (l) and (m) - Retain clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h)

47	47.70	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.10 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Yield	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with relevant yield requirements.	Approve 14A.7.10 as notified.
39	39.30	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for noncompliance are not necessary given our submission on residential unit typologies.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with residential unit typology
26	26.40	Classic Group	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for noncompliance are not necessary given our submission on residential unit typologies.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with residential unit typology.
29	29.61	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that matters (b) and (c) are not relevant to the rule. Rule 14A.4.2(b) sets a maximum percentage of detached residential units when there are 6 or more units proposed. The rule does not require a variety of housing typologies as per (b) and no requirement to provide a variety of unit sizes, bedroom numbers and levels/storeys as per (c). Therefore, these matters are not appropriate to include. Amendments requested.	Delete standard 14A.7.11.b and 14A.7.11.c
47	47.71	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	N12LP opposes the introduction of Residential Unit Typology and seeks that this be deleted.	Delete 14A.7.11 as notified.

40	40.18	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on residential unit typologies.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with residential unit typology.
42	42.14	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Residential Unit Typology	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on residential unit typologies.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with residential unit typology.
29	29.62	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.12 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Minimum Storey Requirements in the Omokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct	b. The extent to which the proposal is consistent		Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose matter (b) which references the 'planned character of the Ōmokoroa Mixed Use Residential Precinct.' The 'planned character' is generally described in Objective 8 and Policy 17 and Kāinga Ora considers matters (a), (c) and (d) of 14A.7.12 adequately cover this without requiring (b). Amendments sought.	Delete standard 14A.7.12.b.
39	39.31	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on impervious surfaces.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with impervious surfaces.
26	26.41	Classic Group	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on impervious surfaces.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with impervious surfaces.

			Residential	Impervious Surfaces					
47	47.72	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	General		Support in part	N12LP generally supports the relevant RDA criteria 14A.7.13 as notified subject to impermeable surfaces being increased to 70% of areas within the Te Puke Stormwater Management Area.	Approve 14A.7.13 as notified subject to impermeable surfaces being increased to 70% of areas within the Te Puke Stormwater Management Area.
42	42.15	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on impervious surfaces.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with impervious surfaces.
FS 67 [42]	30 [42.15]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Brian Goldstone]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service. Restricting surface runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets.	Retain Rule 14A.7.13 as notified.
40	40.19	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on impervious surfaces.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with impervious surfaces.
FS 67 [40]	31 [40.19]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Vercoe Holdings Limited]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because, as outlined in Regional Council's submission points 25.31 and 25.45, driveways can form a significant part of the impervious area of a site for an infill area, especially when accessing rear sites. Impervious surface 'creep' from infill developments leads to cumulative effects on the stormwater network, which can compromise existing levels of service. Restricting surface	Retain Rule 14A.7.13 as notified.

								runoff from intensification to existing levels will appropriately mitigate effects on downstream flood protection assets.	
19	19.17	Pete Linde	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	b. Whether the amount of impervious surfaces can be		Oppose	While providing an additional storey to something may indeed reduce the amount of non-compliance of the 70% impervious surface standard, don't believe it would be reasonable for Council to require a development proposal to add another storey to assist compliance with the 70% impervious standard via a condition. Not sure how Council could request an additional storey, and such a change would likely result in a material change to a development proposal, so recommend not even mentioning it.	Delete - b. Whether the amount of impervious surfaces can be reduced by providing an additional storey.
25	25.44	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.13 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Impervious Surfaces	g. Compliance with the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Compre		Support in part	Support implementation of the catchment management documents in land use and, in addition to subdivision controls (as provided for in 12.4.5.17), to implement the overarching stormwater management outcomes for the respective catchments.	To support increased reference (12.4.5.17 and in relief sought for Ōmokoroa Stage 3) and consideration of catchment management documents, amend to ensure compliance with the relevant stormwater infiltration, treatment, detention and discharge requirements of the relevant catchment management plans and comprehensive stormwater consents. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
18	18.29	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.14 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Vehicle Crossing and Access		Matters of Discretion	Oppose	In considering an application that does not comply with the 'Activity Performance Standard 14A.4.2 (e) - Vehicle Crossing and Access' Fire and Emergency request a new matter of discretion that considers the impacts of non-compliance on the ability to provide efficient access for emergency vehicles and service vehicles. This is consistent with matter of discretion 14A.7.1(k)(vii).	Add new matter of discretion as follows: <u>d. Providing efficient and effective access for emergency vehicles and service vehicles.</u>
47	47.73	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.15 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Streetscape	General		Support	The relevant RDA criteria are generally appropriate for assessment of buildings not complying with streetscape requirements.	Approve 14A.7.15 as notified.
39	39.32	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for noncompliance are not necessary given our submission on earthworks.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to non-compliance with earthworks.

26	26.42	Classic Group	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for noncompliance are not necessary given our submission on earthworks	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to 14A.7.16 non-compliance with earthworks.
29	29.63	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes 14A.7.16 and in particular:</p> <p>(f) in regard to amenity values - it is not appropriate to reference established amenity values noting the character of the OTP MDRZ areas will change over time.</p> <p>(h) it is not clear how this matter would be addressed in a resource consent application. Adequate prior notice to hapū is more appropriately addressed in a condition of consent (e.g., as per existing provision 12.4.2(j)(i)).</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks that this provision be located within the 'district wide' section of the WBOPDP. Amendments sought.</p>	Delete standard 14A.7.16.f and 14A.7.16.h, and shift the remaining matters of discretion to 'district wide' section of WBOPDP
FS 76 [29]	44 [29.63]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Kāinga Ora]					Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission.
FS 77 [29]	44 [29.63]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Kāinga Ora]					Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point for the reasons outlined and as it better provides for the benefits of retirement villages or recognises their functional and operational needs.	Allow the submission
58	58.26	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 14A - Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Support	The default activity classification of RDA is supported.	The default activity classification of RDA is supported.

47	47.74	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Support in part	The proposed provisions are generally appropriate for infill and individual site development but are already covered by BOPRC earthworks consent requirements for greenfield development.	Approve 14A.7.16 as notified subject to the exclusion of greenfield development from these provisions.
40	40.20	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on earthworks.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to 14A.7.16 noncompliance with earthworks.
42	42.16	Brian Goldstone	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.16 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Earthworks	General		Oppose	These assessment criteria for non-compliance are not necessary given our submission on earthworks.	Delete the restricted discretionary activity criteria relating to 14A.7.16 noncompliance with earthworks.
47	47.75	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.17 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Non-Compliance with Height of Fences, Walls and Retaining Walls	General		Support	The proposed provisions are generally appropriate for discretionary and noncomplying activities.	Approve 14A.7.17 as notified.
39	39.33	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.19 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities - General	General		Oppose	Providing guidance for considering discretionary and non-complying activities is unnecessary. The relevant matters are as set out in Section 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Delete the provisions.
26	26.43	Classic	Section 14A - Omokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential	14A.7.19 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities - General	General		Oppose	Providing guidance for considering discretionary and non-complying activities is unnecessary. The relevant matters are as set out in Section 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Delete the provisions.

		Group	14A - Omokoro a and Te Puke Medium Density Residenti al	Discretionary and Non- Complying Activities – General			e	complying activities is unnecessary. The relevant matters are as set out in Section 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	
--	--	-------	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

Section 16 – Rural Residential, Section 19 Commercial, Section 20 – Commercial Transition & Section 21 – Industrial

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
4	4.9	Robert Hicks	Section 16 - Rural- Residential	16.4.1 General	Within Ōmokoroa, a maximum of 15% of the site area		Oppose	A 15% coverage of impermeable surfaces is too small and is unworkable. The minimum lot size for this zoning is 2000m ² . A 15% coverage would only allow a total of 300m ² . Houses in this zone are likely to be in the 250m ² - 300m ² range which means no (or very little) paved driveways, paths, sheds could be constructed. The nature of properties in this zoning (distance from Council roads) is that the driveway & turnaround area alone could potentially cover 15% of the site. This sort of development overlooking the estuary margins is best suited to single level development as it is more harmonious to the natural environment (blending in with the surroundings) so building two levels is not a likely outcome. My own existing house in this zone has more than 500m ² of driveway and paving around it before the house footprint is included. Our home is not excessively large at 250m ² and our driveway and paving in context is not excessively large.	Calculate a realistic actual site coverage based on existing homes in this zone or increase the maximum site coverage to (say) 30% which is more relevant to smaller blocks of 2000m ² (600m ² site coverage) or set a maximum area of (say) 800m ² site coverage (of impermeable surface) which would allow for a house, driveway, patio, paving shed/workshop etc. This would be more relevant for larger lots of say 3000-4000m ²
6	6.1	Tim Laing	Section 16 - Rural- Residential	16.4.2 Subdivision and Development (See also Section 12)	c. Ōmokoroa		Support in part	Mr Laing's land is at 467 D and F Omokoroa Road and adjoins a harbour reserve overlooking Mangawhai Bay. The land has rolling contour but approximately 7000m ² of flatter land that would be suitable for intensive development. To retaining the consistency of the character of the area a rural residential land zoning is considered appropriate but a slightly smaller minimum lot size of 1500m ² would make better use of the land, particularly for areas of flatter contour.	Amend Rule 16.4.2(c) to enable a minimum lot size of 1500m ² at Omokoroa.
4	4.10	Robert Hicks	Section 16 - Rural- Residential	16.4.2 Subdivision and Development (See also Section 12)	i. The land to be subdivided shall be served by a		Oppose	The larger lot sizes allow for an effective, safe onsite treatment system. A sewerage connection for these Rural Residential areas is likely very difficult and costly because of the	Allow Rural Residential lots to be served by modern, efficient onsite waste water treatment (septic tanks).

								topography and distance from future main sewer lines. The existing Rural Residential properties within stage 3 are not connected to Council reticulated sewerage. Rural Residential subdivision is not connected to Council reticulated sewerage system in any other part of the WBOPDC .	
50	50.1	Mike and Sandra Smith	Section 16 - Rural-Residential	16.4.2 Subdivision and Development (See also Section 12)	iii. Minimum lot size of 2000m ² within the Ōmokoro		Oppose	There needs to be a provision for smaller lots on flatter land. We suggest 1500m ² as a minimum lot size recognising that the average lot size is likely to be much higher where the contour of the land is steeper.	Amend the minimum lot size to 1500m ² to enable a more efficient use of the finite urban land resource.
34	34.48	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 19 - Commercial	General	General	Matters of Discretion	Oppose	<p>In accordance with the RVA's submission on Rule 19.3.3, the RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The RVA considers the current matters of discretion in 19.7 are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages that complies with the relevant density standards should be precluded from being limited notified.</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to integrate the following set of matters of discretion specific to the construction of retirement villages (in accordance with the new 19.3.3 Rule (c) proposed above).</p> <p><u>19.7.X Restricted Discretionary Activities - The construction of retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the relevant activity standards in 19.4;</u></p> <p><u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>d. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>e. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider:</u></p> <p><u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>f. The positive effects of the construction,</u></p>

									<p><u>development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule 19.3.3 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule 19.3.3 where compliance is achieved with 19.4.1(a) is precluded from being limited notified.</p>
34	34.45	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 19 - Commercial	19.2.2 Policies	General	Policies	Support	<p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).</p>	<p>The RVA seeks the following policies:</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <p>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p>Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</p> <p>Larger sites Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p> <p>Density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</p>
24	24.11	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the	Section 19 - Commercial	19.3.1 Permitted Activities	General	Permitted Activity - New	Oppose	<p>Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Commercial Zone to enable</p>	<p>Amend the Activity List in the Commercial Zone to enable "community corrections activities" to</p>

		Department of Corrections						<p>“community corrections activities” as a permitted activity. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.</p>	<p>be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <p>19.3.1 Permitted activities</p> <p><i>Except where specified as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary Activity, the following are Permitted Activities:</i></p> <p><u>o. Community corrections activities</u></p>
34	34.46	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 19 – Commercial	19.3.1 Permitted Activities	j. Accommodation facilities, provided that retirem		Support in part	<p>The RVA considers that the Commercial Zone fails to give effect to the NPSUD and needs to be amended as part of the Plan Change.</p> <p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones, the RVA opposes the exclusion of retirement villages from locating within the Commercial Zone at Ōmokoroa Structure Plan Area 3.</p> <p>Furthermore, noting that the ‘accommodation facilities’ definition specifically excludes retirement villages, it is not clear why they have been linked to this rule. As currently drafted it is assumed that despite the reference to retirement villages, due to them not being specifically listed in the Commercial Zone activities they are a non-complying activity under Rule 4A.1.4.</p> <p>The RVA considers that the Commercial Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to remove the exclusion of retirement villages from 19.3.1 Rule (j).</p> <p>The RVA also seeks to integrate the following rule in the 19.3.1 Permitted Activities:</p> <p>19.3.1 Permitted Activities</p> <p><i>Except where specified as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary Activity, the following are Permitted Activities:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>j. Accommodation facilities, provided that retirement villages are excluded from locating within the Commercial Zone at Ōmokoroa Structure Plan Area 3.</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>o. Retirement villages.</u></p>

								including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	
34	34.47	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 19 – Commercial	19.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	General		Support in part	<p>The RVA considers the Commercial Zone fails to give effect to the NPSUD and needs to be amended as part of the Plan Change.</p> <p>As an unlisted activity, retirement villages are currently a non-complying activity under Rule 4A.1.4. The RVA considers that the Commercial Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity, (as detailed in the response to 19.3.3 above).</p> <p>The RVA considers that the construction of a retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	<p>The RVA seeks that a bespoke rule for the construction of a retirement village is included in the Commercial Zone as follows with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities (see response to 19.7 below for the bespoke matters of discretion the RVA seeks for retirement villages):</p> <p>19.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p><u>c. The construction of retirement villages.</u></p>
58	58.4	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 19 – Commercial	19.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	b. Within the Commercial Zone shown on the Ōmokoro		Support	Support the classification of a town centre master plan being a RDA (a restricted discretionary activity) subject to Rule 19.5, but only as modified by our submission point in 58.2. Otherwise, if a town centre masterplan is inconsistent with 19.5 the default activity.	Retain 19.3.3b
58	58.6	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 19 – Commercial	19.4.1 General	iii. Ōmokoroa Commercial Zone Stage 3 Structure PI		Support in part	Some buildings will need service vehicle car parking at grade with the ground floor of the building rather than all underground, which wouldn't be practicable for all activities. Suggest 90% of car parking is provided underground to enable the height bonus. That way the commercial buildings can still function.	<p>Reword the rule to read as follows.</p> <p>The maximum building/structure height in the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan area shall be 20m, except where buildings locate at <u>at</u> <u>90%</u> of parking and servicing requirements enclosed below ground level, in which case the maximum height shall be 23m.</p>

58	58.2	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 19 - Commercial	19.5 Development of a Commercial Area Master Plan for the Commercial Zone - Omokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan Area	General		Support in part	<p>This is an existing rule that helps guide the UD outcomes of the Omokoroa Town centre. The design and subsequent resource consent process for the approved town centre master plan did not comply with several of the criteria in Rule 19.5 for good design reasons. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of only muted natural or recessive colours. • Maximum of one connection to Omokoroa Road [inconsistency between 19.5 (a)iv and 19.5 (b)iv] and associated policy 15. • No building exceeding 50m in length. • Mirrored GFA above ground floor building footprint. • Screen planting 4m wide along the length of Omokoroa Road. 	Remove the criteria in Rule 19.5 that are inconsistent with the approved town centre master plan proposed to be incorporated into the Omokoroa Structure Plan.
58	58.3	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 19 - Commercial	19.5 Development of a Commercial Area Master Plan for the Commercial Zone - Omokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan Area	General		Oppose	<p>This provision triggers a non-complying activity status if the site coverage of 80% is exceeded. While this is unlikely, we request the default activity classification be an RDA limited to stormwater matters as the NPS-UD is promoting intensification around town and neighbourhood centres. (Note: submitter is referring to the Explanatory Note below Rule 19.5.i)</p>	Amend explanatory note default activity classification for exceeding the 80% site coverage to RDA.
58	58.5	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 19 - Commercial	19.6.2 Subdivision (refer also to Section 12)	c. Where subdivision occurs in the Commercial Zone		Oppose	<p>Non-compliance with the structure plan, which now includes the approved town centre masterplan defaults to a noncomplying activity. So a change to the town centre master plan, if a new RC, it would default to a non-complying activity. This is too stringent an activity classification and I suggest an RDA or discretionary activity is appropriate and provides council with the sufficient decision making flexibility to decline a proposal if the departure was significant.</p>	Amend default activity classification from noncomplying to discretionary or RDA.
25	25.21	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 19 - Commercial	19.7.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Omokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan Area	iv. In the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan area re		Support in part	<p>To ensure explicit reference to 'treatment' is included in the identified methods to achieve stormwater management.</p>	<p>Seek the following amendment to 19.7.2 (a) (iv):</p> <p>"In the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan area retaining the integrity of the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan (June</p>

									2002) including the efficiency and effectiveness of stormwater infiltration, <u>treatment</u> , detention, discharge downstream and discharge to the Tauranga Harbour with particular regard to storm events.”; and
FS 76 [25]	45 [25.21]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [25]	45 [25.21]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it does not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs.	Disallow the submission.
34	34.49	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 20 - Commercial Transition	General	General	Policies	Support	Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Transition Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).	<p>The RVA seeks the following policies:</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <p>3. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>4. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>c. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>d. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p>Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</p> <p>Larger sites</p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p>

									Density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.
34	34.50	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 20 – Commercial Transition	General	General	Permitted Activity – New	Oppose	<p>The RVA considers that the Commercial Transition Zone fails to give effect to the NPSUD and should be amended as part of the Plan Change.</p> <p>The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones. The RVA considers that the Commercial Transition Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages as a permitted activity provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to integrate the following rule in the 20.3.1 Permitted Activities:</p> <p>20.3.1 Permitted Activities</p> <p>Except where specified as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary Activity, the following are Permitted Activities:</p> <p>...</p> <p>k. Retirement villages.</p>
34	34.51	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 20 – Commercial Transition	General	General	Restricted Discretionary Activity	Oppose	<p>The RVA considers the Commercial Transition Zone fails to give effect to the NPSUD and should be amended as part of the Plan Change.</p> <p>As an unlisted activity, retirement villages are currently a non-complying activity under Rule 4A.1.4. Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers that the Commercial Transition Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (as detailed above) with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity, recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of</p>	<p>The RVA seeks that a bespoke rule for the construction of a retirement village is included in the Commercial Transition Zone as follows with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>20.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p><u>b. The construction of retirement villages.</u></p>

								<p>dwelling located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>The RVA considers that the construction of a retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	
24	24.12	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 20 - Commercial Transition	General	General	Permitted Activity - New	Oppose	<p>Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Commercial Transition Zone to enable "community corrections activities" as a permitted activity. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.</p>	<p>Amend the Activity List in the Commercial Transition Zone to enable "community corrections activities" to be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <p>20.3.1 Permitted activities</p> <p>Except where specified as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary Activity, the following are Permitted Activities:</p> <p><u>k. Community corrections activities.</u></p>
34	34.52	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Section 20 - Commercial Transition	20.6.1 Restricted discretionary activities – non-compliance with activity performance standards	General		Support in part	<p>In accordance with the RVA's submission on Rule 20.3.3, the RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement</p>	<p>The RVA seeks to amend Rule 20.6.1 as follows, to integrate the retirement village specific matters of discretion:</p> <p>20.6 Matters of Discretion</p> <p><u>20.6.x Restricted discretionary activities – the construction of retirement villages</u></p> <p><u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the relevant activity standards in 20.4;</u></p>

								<p>villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages that complies with the relevant density standards should be precluded from being limited notified.</p>	<p><u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>d. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>e. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider:</u></p> <p><u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>f. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p>
24	24.13	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Section 21 – Industrial	General	General	Permitted Activity – New	Oppose	<p>Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Industrial Zone to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate</p>	<p>Amend the Activity List in the Industrial Zone to enable “community corrections activities” to be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <p>21.3.1 Permitted Activities (all areas except for the Comvita Campus Structure Plan Area (see 21.3.4) and where otherwise specified</p> <p><u>s. Community corrections activities.</u></p>

								areas.	
25	25.22	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 21 - Industrial	21.6.4 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Stormwater Management Reserves and Private Conservation areas in Omokoroa Stages 2 and 3	General		Support in part	To ensure explicit reference to 'treatment' is included in the identified methods to achieve stormwater management.	Ensure that references to the catchment management documents are consistent including references in 21.6.4 (b).

Section 24 – Natural Open Spaces

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
31	31.4	N and M Bruning	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	General	General		Oppose	The addition of a Natural Open Space zone (new Section 24 of the District Plan) should only relate to land that is Council reserve or has been designated under the RMA for reserve purposes. It is inappropriate to apply this zone to and over private land for a public purpose. In particular, it is inappropriate to apply this zone and its provisions to N & M Brunings land, because the land is currently zoned Future urban under the Operative District Plan and is farmland. It has no history of use or policy identification or designation as Natural or recreational open space/public reserve. A Natural Open Space zone conflicts with the existing NZTA designation (D181). Much of the land affected by this proposed zone has been identified as required for roading and State Highway purposes and not reserve or open space. Any land not needed to be taken for roading designation is expected to be offered back to the original landowner under the Public Works Act and developed for urban purposes.	Amend the provisions of Chapter 24 explanatory statement, objectives, policies and rules to ensure that the chapter excludes private land and only relate to land which has a history of use as recreational open space/public reserve.
FS 79 [31]	2 [31.4]	Waka Kotahi [N and M Bruning]					Support	<p>The submitter notes that much of the land affected by the proposed Natural Open Space zone has been identified as required for roading and state highway purposes and not reserve or open space. Any land not needed to be taken for roading designation is expected to be offered back to the original landowner under the Public Works Act.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi considers that the Natural Open Space zone is designed for land that is generally unsuitable for urban development and has significant open space, natural character, ecological and cultural values. This underlying zoning is incompatible with the urban infrastructure of a grade-separated interchange and may hinder Waka Kotahi in its ability to construct the intersection.</p>	Waka Kotahi seeks that the proposed Natural Open Space zoning within the footprint of designation D181 is removed. Retention of the existing Rural zoning is supported.
19	19.20	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	Explanatory Statement	General		Support in part	Requested changes to Explanatory Statement. Requested changes sought to more accurately reflect the understood the purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone without unduly setting barriers and limitations to what can be considered appropriate use	Request changes set out below with <u>underline</u> for insertions and strikeout for deletions. 24. Natural Open Space

							and activity on the land within it.	<p>Explanatory Statement</p> <p>The Natural Open Space Zone applies to land within Ōmokoroa Stage 3 that is <u>currently likely to be</u> unsuitable for urban <u>building development</u> due to <u>steep terrane contour</u> and /or natural hazards. The Zone has stormwater and/or coastal inundation management functions as it contains the generally natural drainage systems (including gullies) directing overland run-off towards Tauranga Harbour. The Zone <u>will ideally also</u> provides for open space, <i>maintenance</i> and restoration of natural character, green corridor links and visual separation between areas that are planned to be fully urbanised. <u>These areas can #</u> also contains <u>a variety and combination of</u> ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity values.</p> <p><u>Land within t</u>The Zone is currently largely in private ownership but due to <u>physical geotechnical natural</u> constraints, <u>is anticipated to have</u> has very limited <i>development</i> potential. This Section allows for activities that are compatible with the Zone's values and attributes including activities required for reserve purposes and the management of the stormwater network. As appropriate, areas may be obtained by <i>Council</i> for stormwater management, walkways and cycleways, other recreational purposes or to provide for the <i>maintenance</i> and enhancement of natural and cultural values. Subdivision will generally be required to facilitate this transfer of land from private ownership to <i>Council</i>.</p>
19	19.31	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.1 Significant Issues	General	Support in part	Requested changes to the Significant Issues. Requested changes sought to more appropriately align with the understood the purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone without unduly setting barriers and limitations to what can be considered appropriate use and activity on the land within it.	<p>24.1 Significant Issues</p> <p>1. The area is <u>unlikely to be</u> unsuitable for residential subdivision and urban <i>development</i> due to <u>geotechnical</u> constraints associated with topography and natural hazards.</p> <p>2. The area contains land that has stormwater and/or coastal inundation management functions, <u>and</u> in <i>inappropriate development</i> could compromise its ability to perform this role.</p> <p>3. <u>Inappropriate</u> development of the <u>land within this Zone area</u> for urban activities <u>would</u> result in a <u>loss of</u> in open space, natural character and ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity values.</p> <p>4. People living in more intensive living environments will <u>likely desire</u> require easy access to quality open space and nature areas to provide for their physical and mental wellbeing.</p>
19	19.32	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural	24.2.1 Objectives	General	Support in part	Requested changes to the Objectives and Policies. Requested changes sought to use more	<p>24.2.1 Objectives</p>

			Open Space					appropriate non-fictional prose in the wording used, in particular that these objectives and policies are to be given specific examination when considering an application for resource consent under section 104 of the RMA.	<p>1. Subdivision and land use <u>can occur when it that is</u> compatible with the underlying topographical and natural hazard constraints.</p> <p>2. Maintenance and enhancement of the stormwater and coastal inundation management functions of the area.</p> <p>3. Maintenance and enhancement of open space, natural character and the ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity values of the Tauranga Harbour coastal margins and inland gully systems within the area.</p>
19	19.33	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.2.2 Policies	General		Support in part	Requested changes to the Policies. Requested changes sought to use more appropriate non-fictional prose in the wording used, in particular that these policies are to be given specific examination when considering an application for resource consent under section 104 of the RMA.	<p>24.2.2 Policies</p> <p>1. Avoid <u>or control</u> subdivision and <i>development within this Zone that is not complimentary to its purpose. Which is for urban purposes.</i></p> <p>2. Provide for subdivision and <i>development</i> which is for public stormwater management purposes.</p> <p>3. Avoid <u>or control</u> the obstruction, modification or diversion of natural watercourses in a manner <u>that could which</u> adversely affects their stormwater management functions.</p> <p>4. Provide for subdivision and development which is for the creation and / or management of <i>public reserves</i>.</p> <p>5. Provide for recreational activities and the enjoyment of the natural environment in areas where the landform is suitable and safe for public use.</p> <p>6. Land use should be restricted to activities that are unlikely to adversely affect the natural character, ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity values of the area.</p>
FS 67 [19]	32 [19.33]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Pete Linde]					Oppose	<p>Oppose relief sought by the submitter to Policy 24.2.2 because:</p> <p>1. Policy 24.2.2.1: it is unclear what subdivision and development would be complementary to the Natural Open Space Zone or how this would be assessed. It is appropriate to avoid residential subdivision and development in the Natural Open Space Zone, which is considered unsuitable for urban development due to contour and natural hazards and has stormwater functions.</p> <p>2. Policy 24.2.2.3: The submitter's proposed addition of</p>	<p>Retain Policy 24.2.2.1 as notified.</p> <p>Consider redrafting Policy 24.2.2.3 to confine matters to obstruction, modification and diversion of overland flow paths and floodplains, which can be controlled through district plan rules (per submission point 25.46). Reject submission point 19.33 to include the word 'control' in the policy.</p>

								'control' implies it is appropriate to obstruct, modify or divert natural watercourses in a manner that could adversely affect their stormwater management function if it is controlled. Modification of natural watercourses is a regional planning matter and is not regulated under the district plan.	
FS 69 [19]	26 [19.33]	Jace Investments [Pete Linde]					Support	Support submission to amend policies 24.2.2	Accept Submission point and amend policies as suggested.
25	25.46	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.2.2 Policies	3. Avoid the obstruction, modification or diversio		Support in part	Support the intent. This needs to be framed in a way that is able to be linked back clearly to a district council's functions under the RMA, rather than reading like regional provisions.	Seek amendments and consider redrafting to confine matters to obstruction, modification and diversion of overland flow paths and flood plains which can be controlled through district planning rules. Suggest replacing 'natural watercourse' with overland flow path/flood plain or other changes to ensure the provisions are clearly within the scope of a district council's functions.
19	19.34	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	General		Support in part	Requested changes to notified prescribed activities. The notified thresholds / triggers for when an activity requires resource consent are considered to be set extremely low to be unreasonable. 24.3.3(a)(iii) in particular (The deposition of fill or any other material) seems very casual drafting given its importance as a trigger for when a resource consent in required. To still capture this type of activity to a reasonable extent, "deposition of more than 10m ³ of soil or material" is suggested to instead be added to 24.3.3(a)(i); The requested changes to the area and volume triggers are considered to be more appropriate considering the dual functions and objectives for the Natural Open Space Zone land.	<p>24.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>a. The following activities within a Floodable Area and/or Coastal Inundation Area as identified on the District Plan Maps (except where associated with activities which are permitted under 24.3.1 (b) – (e)):</p> <p>i. The disturbance <u>or deposition of more than greater than</u> 1m³-10m³ of soil <u>or material</u>;</p> <p>ii. The disturbance of greater than 1m <u>50m²</u> of vegetation (including natural ground cover);</p> <p>iii. The deposition of fill or any other material;</p> <p>iv. The diversion or modification of any natural watercourse.</p> <p>b. Native vegetation removal, destruction or clearance greater than 2m <u>50m²</u> except as identified in (a) above or where associated with activities which are permitted under 24.3.1 (b) – (e).</p>
4	4.11	Robert Hicks	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	a The following activities within a Floodable Area		Oppose	Quoted from 24.3.3 (a) "i. The disturbance of greater than 1m ³ of soil; ii. The disturbance of greater than 1m ² of vegetation (including natural ground cover); iii. The deposition of fill or any other material". Much of the Natural Open Space area will remain in private ownership for many years to come as development of the adjoining Medium Density development is many years away (e.g. Francis Road). These rules are overly restrictive and largely unworkable in what will continue to be farming land for many years to come.	Review and remove this section from Plan Change 92

FS 69 [4]	27 [4.11]	Jace Investments Limited [Robert Hicks]					Support	Support higher earthworks limit as 1m3 is far too stringent in Natural Open Space zone that will interface with the development earthworks for all development in Omokoroa Stage 3 – Rule 24.3.3	Accept submission to relax the earthworks limits. These could be relaxed further provided the outcomes of the gully reserve landscape plan are achieved.
25	25.47	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 24 – Natural Open Space	24.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	iv. The diversion or modification of any natural w		Support in part	Support the intent. This needs to be framed in a way that is able to be linked back clearly to a district council’s functions under the RMA, rather than reading like regional provisions.	Seek amendments and consider redrafting to confine matters to obstruction, modification and diversion of overland flow paths and flood plains which can be controlled through district planning rules. Suggest replacing ‘natural watercourse’ with overland flow path/flood plain or other changes to ensure the provisions are clearly within the scope of a district council’s functions.
58	58.8	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 24 – Natural Open Space	24.3.5 Non-Complying Activities	a. Subdivision or development that is not in gener		Oppose	A default activity classification for noncompliance with he structure plan is too stringent. Structure plans are high level guidance documents rather than detailed blueprints. There needs to be flexibility for engineering transition spaces leading into the green gully areas. This will require detailed engineering input. Suggest default activity classification should be discretionary.	Delete 24.3.5 and make non-compliance with the structure plan a discretionary activity under 23.3.4.
59	59.1	Jace Orchards Limited and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Section 24 – Natural Open Space	24.3.5 Non-Complying Activities	a. Subdivision or development that is not in gener		Oppose	A default activity classification for non-compliance with the structure plan is too stringent. Structure plans are high level guidance documents rather than detailed blueprints. There needs to be flexibility for engineering transition spaces leading into the green gully areas. This will require detailed engineering input. Suggest default activity classification should be discretionary.	Delete 24.3.5 and make non-compliance with a structure plan a discretionary activity under 23.3.4.
19	19.35	Pete Linde	Section 24 – Natural Open Space	24.3.5 Non-Complying Activities	a. Subdivision or development that is not in gener		Oppose	Requested change to delete Rule 24.3.5(a). Structure planning is quite a high-level combination of guidance documents that more specific design is to generally accord to when further investigation / assessment of a matter is undertaken. The proposed rule is drafted so vague, it is anticipated it will be problematic for both Council as administrator of the District Plan, and person/s undertaking an act as to when compliance is adequately achieved. It is considered there are plenty of other resource consent triggers in the zone and other District Plan sections that would capture when an act or activity would require a resource consent, and when it is, should more readily be assigned a restricted discretionary activity status.	24.3.5 Non-Complying Activities a. Subdivision or development that is not in general accordance with the respective structure plan.
19	19.36	Pete Linde	Section 24 – Natural Open Space	24.5.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – All	General		Support in part	Requested changes to Matters of Discretion. The requested changes are sought to help complete the sentence; or align wording and phrasing with that used in Natural Open Space Zone provisions to help	24.5.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – All In assessing a Restricted Discretionary Activity, <i>Council</i> shall consider the following:

							with assessments made during resource consent report writing.	<p>a. The potential adverse effects <u>balanced against the positive effects</u> on the natural character, ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity values of the area and how these may be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>b. The extent to which a natural watercourse will be obstructed, modified or diverted, <u>and for what purpose.</u></p> <p>c. Retaining the efficiency and effectiveness of stormwater infiltration, detention, discharge downstream and discharge to the Tauranga Harbour in accordance with the requirements of relevant stormwater management plans and <i>Regional Council</i> resource consents.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the a proposed activity to disturb soil or remove vegetation would exacerbate proposal would <u>cause</u> land to be susceptible to erosion or instability. including from the disturbance of soil or the removal of ground cover or vegetation.</p> <p>e. Whether the proposal will affect in a positive or negative way the function and/or public amenity values of reserves including <i>public trails</i>.</p>
25	25.48	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.5.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities – All	b. The extent to which a natural watercourse will	Support in part	Support the intent. This needs to be framed in a way that is able to be linked back clearly to a district council's functions under the RMA, rather than reading like regional provisions.	Seek amendments and consider redrafting to confine matters to obstruction, modification and diversion of overland flow paths and flood plains which can be controlled through district planning rules. Suggest replacing 'natural watercourse' with overland flow path/flood plain or other changes to ensure the provisions are clearly within the scope of a district council's functions.
19	19.37	Pete Linde	Section 24 - Natural Open Space	24.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Subdivision	General	Support in part	Requested changes to Matters of Discretion. The requested changes are sought to help complete the sentence; or align wording and phrasing with that used in Natural Open Space Zone provisions to help with assessments made during resource consent report writing.	<p>24.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Subdivision</p> <p>In assessing a Restricted Discretionary Activity for a subdivision, <i>Council</i> shall consider the following in addition to the matters above:</p> <p>a. Whether the subdivision will <u>be assisting to facilitate</u> a positive effect on the stormwater and coastal inundation management functions of the area <u>and purpose of the Natural Open Space Zone set out in the Explanatory Statement.</u></p> <p>b. Whether the subdivision will facilitate provision of land for the creation and/or management of <i>public reserves</i>.</p> <p>c. Whether the <i>lot/s</i> are usable for an intended purpose which is consistent with those described in a. and b. above.</p> <p>d. The ability for any <i>lot</i> to be amalgamated or otherwise incorporated into a residential zoned <i>lot</i> to enable a house</p>

										site to be created in the medium density residential zone.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 7 – Structure Plans

Submitter Ref. No.	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
25	25.1	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	General	General		Support	Support the inclusion of a structure plan for Ōmokoroa Stage 3 in Plan Change 92 (PC 92) to implement directives of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
4	4.8	Robert Hicks	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	General	General		Support in part	Francis Road is shown on District Plan Maps as providing access to both industrial and residential zoning. This is a very uncommon situation and not considered best practice from a town planning perspective. As a means of minimizing the effects a physical buffering of plantings has been allowed for as a screening of the industrial buildings from residential zone. However the road as shown will be shared by both residential and industrial traffic and potentially there could be multiple entries to industrial users on Francis Road which would make planted buffering only partially effective as the entry ways would create holes in the buffer zone.	Ensure that the planted buffer strip is completely sufficient to fully screen all buildings and infrastructure in the industrial zone from Francis Road residential zone. The buildings would this way be fully screened from Francis Road and there would be minimal sharing of Francis Rd with both residential and industrial users.
19	19.29	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	General	General		Support in part	Support in part retention of displaying on structure plan maps and diagrams for how infrastructure and services for stormwater, wastewater, water, roading, walkway and cycleways are envisaged to be generally provided for, including indicative routes for these services. It is requested however that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 to this submission are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road. For this particular point (the guidance note) without such guidance, proposed new Rule 12.4.11.5 as currently worded is likely to result in applications for resource consent un-necessarily stepping to be a non-complying activity when could more appropriately be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>It is requested that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road.</p> <p>Include appropriate guidance note on structure plan plans and in relevant sections of the District Plan to be used for engineering design and resource consent processing purposes that the size and shown routes for these services are high-level only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design. This guidance note should be supported by inclusion of policies within the zone chapters (Section 14A) & Natural Open Space (section 24), as well as other relevant section including the Subdivision and Development (Section 12), Natural Hazards (Section 8).</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p><u>"Guidance Note: Information and notations shown on structure plan documents are intended to be used for high level guidance only for the purpose of assisting with engineering design and resource consent processing purposes. This information, including size and shown routes</u></p>

									<u>for areas and infrastructural related notations are approximate and indicative only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design.”</u>
19	19.11	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	General	General	Other Maps	Support in part	12.4.11.5(c) sets out that non compliance with the Ōmokoroa Structure Plans will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity. Plan Change 92 was notified with an Appendix 10 called Omokoroa Gully Reserve Concept Plan (see Section 32 Report). Within this there is a “Pocket Park” is shown to be located on the north-eastern corner of Prole Road and the site at 60 Prole Road. There is support for such a park to be provided for generally in this area, however it is requested that there be notes included that clearly advise the location shown on this map (attached to this submitter’s full submission) is indicative only, and the final location be confirmed through it being pro-offered in an application for resource consent instead of it strictly needing to be in the illustrated shown size and location. Similarly with the “Pedestrian Connectors” shown in that they’re shown location and form are only indicative. For structure planning purposes it is helpful to show how an area might be developed in a coordinated and considered manner, however appropriate guidance notes advising that these sorts of developmental documents are high level only are considered warranted to avoid misleading confirmation of what will actually be established.	There is support for such a park to be provided for generally in this area, however it is requested that there be notes included that clearly advise the location shown on this map is indicative only, and the final location be confirmed through it being pro-offered in an application for resource consent instead of it strictly needing to be in the illustrated shown size and location. Similarly with the “Pedestrian Connectors” shown in that they’re shown location and form are only indicative. Include appropriate guidance note on structure plan plans and in relevant sections of the District Plan to be used for engineering design and resource consent processing purposes that the size and shown routes for these services are high-level only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design. This guidance note should be supported by inclusion of policies within the zone chapters (Section 14A) & Natural Open Space (section 24), as well as other relevant section including the Subdivision and Development (Section 12), Natural Hazards (Section 8). Suggested wording: <u>“Guidance Note: Information and notations shown on structure plan documents are intended to be used for high level guidance only for the purpose of assisting with engineering design and resource consent processing purposes. This information, including size and shown routes for areas and infrastructural related notations are approximate and indicative only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design.”</u>
19	19.12	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	General	General	Other Maps	Support in part	For structure planning purposes it is helpful to show how an area might be developed in a coordinated and considered manner, however appropriate guidance notes advising that these sorts of developmental documents are high level only are considered warranted to avoid misleading confirmation of what will actually be established. Rule 12.4.11.5(c) sets out that non compliance with the Ōmokoroa Structure Plans will require a resource consent	Include appropriate guidance note on structure plan plans and in relevant sections of the District Plan to be used for engineering design and resource consent processing purposes that the size and shown routes for these services are high-level only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design. This guidance note should be supported by inclusion of policies within the zone chapters (Section 14A) & Natural Open Space (section 24), as well as other relevant section including the Subdivision and Development (Section 12),

								for a non-complying activity. Plan Change 92 was notified with an Appendix 10 called Omokoroa Gully Reserve Concept Plan (see Section 32 Report). An "Ecological Linkage" is indicatively shown to be located in the lower gully area in the north-east corner of 60 Prole Road. The indicative location of such an area is supported in part, however request that the final location be confirmed through it being pro-offered in an application for resource consent instead of it strictly needing to be in the illustrated shown size and location.	Natural Hazards (Section 8). Suggested wording: <u>"Guidance Note: Information and notations shown on structure plan documents are intended to be used for high level guidance only for the purpose of assisting with engineering design and resource consent processing purposes. This information, including size and shown routes for areas and infrastructural related notations are approximate and indicative only, and are to be confirmed through applications for resource consent and engineering design."</u>
25	25.25	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.1 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Infrastructure Schedule	Note: This infrastructure schedule is a summary on		Support in part	Inclusion of key stormwater infrastructure in the relevant schedules ensures that bulk sitewide stormwater management solutions are secured by the Structure Plan and that financial contributions are required at the time of subdivision.	Include the indicative stormwater wetlands (N1a, N1, W2a, W1, W2b and E1) identified in the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure (4.3) in the Schedule, 'Ōmokoroa Stormwater'.
56	56.4	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.1 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Infrastructure Schedule	Note: This infrastructure schedule is a summary on		Oppose	The financial contributions schedule is difficult to follow and does not enable a developer to ascertain the financial contributions payable for a development. This means it does not accord with s 108(10)(b) RMA. The following (and final) entry in the schedule is unclear (and it is understood was included in Plan Change 92 in error): "FP-NLA - Francis/Prole Rd link to new wetland FP-NLA. This stormwater will traverse Sanderson's retirement village and will be developer funded - 2022".	Clarify or delete the following entry from the schedule: "FP-NLA - Francis/Prole Rd link to new wetland FP-NLA. This stormwater will traverse Sanderson's retirement village and will be developer funded - 2022".
58	58.12	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roading and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Oppose	There is an inconsistency between 12.4.4.4(c) and the Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roading and walkway/Cycleway which doesn't show additional connections to Omokoroa Rd that form part of the approved town centre master plan.	Amend the structure plan to be consistent with the town centre plan.
58	58.10	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roading and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support in part	There is no road connection proposed from Prole Road to the town centre. This would be a useful connection for all modes of transport including vehicles. While the MoE has indicated it needs all its land for education purposes even a reduced width road would be beneficial minimising congestion on Prole Road and the Prole Road/Omokoroa Rd intersection.	Add a road connection from Prole road to the town centre, but tag this item as one that requires agreement with landowners and should also be a community funded road project benefiting the whole of the peninsula.
41	41.4	Waka Kotahi	Appendix 7 -	4.2 Omokoroa Structure	General		Support	PC92 acknowledges the planned upgrade of	Waka Kotahi wishes to engage with Council further to

		The New Zealand Transport Agency	Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure			in part	the Ōmokoroa Road / SH2 intersection by showing the footprint of the future grade-separated interchange on the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan. However, there are no specific provisions within PC92 pertaining to the future intersection upgrade. Waka Kotahi wishes to understand the practical implications of PC92 in terms of notice of requirement and consenting requirements within the footprint. Waka Kotahi also seeks to understand what the intended consequences of including the footprint in the structure plan are. Waka Kotahi seeks that the plan change protects the interests of the interchange upgrade project to the maximum extent possible, given that the long-term development capacity provided for by PC92 is heavily reliant on this infrastructure being delivered.	better understand the practical implications of this inclusion both in terms of future consenting requirements for the Takitimu Northern Link Stage 2 project and Ōmokoroa/SH2 intersection upgrade and in terms of potential future development on land within, adjacent to and surrounding the footprint.
50	50.2	Mike and Sandra Smith	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support in part	There is a potential development yield from the site of between 25 and 40 lots depending on configuration and earthworks. The structure plan road adjacent to the site and servicing the adjacent industrial area should be extended to the property boundary to avoid ad hoc road construction and inappropriately located cul de sac heads. If reverse sensitivity noise is perceived as an issue, then the industrial area should have a loop road designed once it is developed.	Extend the structure plan road and cul de sac to the end of the structure plan road adjoining to 467E Omokoroa Road boundary. This will provide access to 467E Omokoroa Road and potentially to land not used by Bunning or NZTA for the interchange, which is located to the southwest of our property next to the SP stormwater pond.
50	50.5	Mike and Sandra Smith	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Supportive of the cycleway being located within the doc reserve land adjacent to our property (467B and E Omokoroa Road).	Amend location of cycleway to within the doc land.
50	50.6	Mike and Sandra Smith	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Rather than crossing our property (467B and E Omokoroa Road) this could be located east of the interchange alignment and included as part of the NZTA project, which would then provide a link to southern portion of the peninsula and employment centre.	Adjust the location of the cycleway to be south of the light industrial area to form part of the NZTA interchange project.
56	56.11	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Oppose	OCC has a development proposal for its land on Prole Road which has been discussed with the Council. As a retirement offering, the development would not provide through access to public roads. This has been discussed with the Council and was agreed.	Delete the road within the OCC land from the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan – Rooding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure, and indicative future road from the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Concept Plan.

								OCC has proceeded to design its development on this basis. The structure plan shows road connectivity through the OCC land. The consequence of this is that OCC's development appears as non-complying with the structure plan. If OCC were required to comply with the structure plan, that would require a full re-design and generate health & safety security risks to the residents. OCC therefore opposes the roading on its land as shown on the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan – Roding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure, and Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Concept Plan.	
FS 69 [56]	28 [56.11]	Jace Investments [Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd]					Support	Support submission to delete the SP road through Omokoroa Country Club Site but retain public access and pedestrian and cycle connectivity through the gully areas.	Accept submission and delete the SP through road through the retirement village.
4	4.7	Robert Hicks	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Oppose	Francis Road is shown on District Plan Maps as providing access to both industrial and residential zoning. This is a very uncommon situation and not considered best practice from a town planning perspective. As a means of minimizing the effects a physical buffering of plantings has been allowed for as a screening of the industrial buildings from residential zone. However the road as shown will be shared by both residential and industrial traffic and potentially there could be multiple entries to industrial users on Francis Road which would make planted buffering only partially effective as the entry ways would create holes in the buffer zone. Also the sharing of the road with higher volumes of larger industrial traffic (trucks) and residential users such as passenger vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, children etc. could create an unsafe environment for the future residents of the area.	Create one access road near the beginning of Francis Rd for access specifically into the industrial area so that it will run parallel with Francis Rd allowing all businesses to operate in a separate business precinct distinctly separate from the residential area. This would mean Francis Road would only have vehicle entries onto it from residential zoned properties. Having just one entry point into the industrial area would create a better transition between the industrial and residential zone, improve safety and create better outcomes for future residents as the industrial area would be largely unseen and the road no longer shared with residents.
19	19.9	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support	Support retention of the Walkway / Cycleway extent as shown on "OSP Infrastructure – Roding and Walkway / Cycleway Infrastructure" (attached to this submitters full submission). As part of the infrastructure network to be used and vested with Council, it is appropriate to reasonably reimburse developers for the costs to supply it.	Retention of the Walkway / Cycleway extent as shown on "OSP Infrastructure – Roding and Walkway / Cycleway Infrastructure" (attached to this submitter's full submission). However it is noted that the definition of "Public Trails" has been added as a definition and included as an activity that is provided for within Table 10.3(bc). Suggest changing references to "Walkway / Cycleway" to become "Public Trails" on Structure Planning documents and plans to use consistent with wording.

19	19.25	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.2 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Roading and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Support in part retention of displaying on structure plan maps and diagrams for how infrastructure and services for stormwater, wastewater, water, roading, walkway and cycleways are envisaged to be generally provided for, including indicative routes for these services. It is requested however that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road. The points set out in this submission point have been raised with WBOPDC to varying degrees prior to notification of the Plan Change 92 documentation. These changes are requested to reflect the intent and evolution of these discussions through future development.	<p>It is requested that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road.</p> <p>Adjust location and alignment of land area to be used for roundabout leading into 60 Prole Road to be consistent with understood agreed locations and alignments for where this will be positioned, include notations.</p> <p>Adjust location and alignment of land area to be used for roading leading into 60 Prole Road to be consistent with understood alignments for where this will be positioned, include notations.</p>
58	58.9	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Discussions were had in relation to the servicing of the town centre site with Council over the last few months. Conceptually a pump station on the Jace land connecting to the Sabre Site and WW9 would be a logical outcome, if practicable to construct. Therefore we suggest extending WW9 at least to the boundary of the sabre site so that a connecting to the wastewater pipe will be achievable in the future.	Amend the Three waters infrastructure plan in Appendix 7, section 4.0 Omokoroa Structure Plan, by extending WW9 to the boundary with the Omokoroa Town Centre site as a finco funded work. Also consider the inclusion of a financial contributions funded pump station and rising main on the town centre site as the whole Omokoroa community will benefit from the town centre.
50	50.4	Mike and Sandra Smith	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Oppose	Man made stormwater ponds located within ecological overlay or within Natural Open Space Zone area (467B and E Omokoroa Road). These are man made ponds and were establish over the last 30 years for farming purposes. They are now suitable to be enhanced for stormwater treatment when the land is developed.	Amend the structure plan to recognise and provide for the ponds to be improved to be used for stormwater wetlands treatment devices for the future rural residential development.
FS 67 [50]	33 [50.4]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Mike and Sandra Smith]					Oppose in part	The necessity of the submitter's proposed change is unclear.	Oppose in part as stormwater wetland locations are shown in the Omokoroa Catchment Plan (Appendix A - Concept Plan). See submission point 25.10.
25	25.3	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support	There appears to be conflicts with the indicative locations of stormwater wetlands E1 and N1a and areas that potentially contain water bodies that benefit from protection and management under the NPS-FM	<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>(i) Detailed mapping identifying wetlands, streams and freshwater ecosystems in close proximity to proposed stormwater wetlands, in particular, N1a and E1 be undertaken as part of the structure plan before confirming</p>

								<p>To resolve any conflict that may occur (at subdivision stage) between the sizing requirements of the proposed stormwater wetlands (as identified in the Table 14.1 of the draft Catchment Management Plan) and any protected water body and Natural Open Space zone, further mapping is sought.</p> <p>The Natural Open Space zone (Section 24) provides for subdivision and development for public stormwater. The use of this zone for this purpose is supported.</p> <p>There are concerns however, with the adequacy of the extent of the zone in these locations which will be confirmed through this plan change process, unless other methods are available to secure space for stormwater reserves and infrastructure i.e. subdivision or otherwise.</p>	<p>the extent of the Natural Open Space zone and/or the proposed locations of the indicative wetlands shown on 'Ōmokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure – Three Waters Infrastructure'; and</p> <p>(ii) Consider methods including as set out below with regards to stormwater reserves, subdivision and financial contributions.</p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.</p>
25	25.10	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Oppose	<p>The need to provide interim management via the 'Appendix Ōmokoroa Stage 3: Stormwater Management Concept' should also be addressed in the provisions. A planning response is required to ensure that the plan does not foreclose on or predetermine options or outcomes in the interim period before full effect is given to the NPS-FM and NES-F.</p>	<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>(i) To support implementation and, in the interim until a new Catchment Management Plan is approved for Ōmokoroa Stage 3, append 'Appendix A: Ōmokoroa Stage 3: Stormwater Management Concept' of the draft Catchment Management Plan in Appendix 7 (structure plans) and include cross references within provisions as appropriate; and</p> <p>(ii) Seek amendments for the 'Medium Density Residential' areas to include reference to rain tanks/paving/swales/bioretenion'.</p> <p>Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.</p>
25	25.7	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Oppose	<p>Stormwater ponds are not considered appropriate technology to achieve water quality outcomes sought by the 'treatment train' approach for Stage 3 of the Ōmokoroa Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Clarify or amend as appropriate, references to stormwater management methods that provide for stormwater ponds in Ōmokoroa Stage 3 including Restricted Discretionary Activity 21.3.8(d)(iii) in favour of stormwater wetlands.</p>
25	25.5	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support in part	<p>It is unclear how additional land for the purposes of stormwater management reserves can be secured if required at subdivision stage, in addition to the areas identified as Natural Open Space zone, as notified. For example, whether the intention is to take the land as a financial contribution under s108 RMA and if so,</p>	<p>Clarify the method in the District Plan, including by way of additional provisions if required, by which additional land can be required as part of subdivision, or as financial contribution or otherwise, for the purposes of providing stormwater wetlands beyond the extent of the Natural Open Space zone.</p>

								how the requirements of s108(10) are to be met about specifying the purpose of taking the land and the level of contribution being determined in the manner specified in the District Plan. If another method is contemplated for obtaining and securing stormwater reserves, then further clarification of this is sought to ensure that the plan change /existing provisions can give effect to the requirement for stormwater reserves.	
15	15.13	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Three Waters Infrastructure			Support in part	Indicative locations of planned stormwater ponds / wetlands are shown over houses and other planned infrastructure such as roads. These need to be redrawn to better represent where they are likely to be constructed.	<p>Amend the proposed map in Appendix 7 entitled “Ōmokoroa Structure Plan – Three Waters Infrastructure” to show the revised locations of the stormwater ponds / wetlands. See attached map (attached to this submitters full submission)</p> <p>Another map (aerial) entitled "Plan Change 92 – Revised Stormwater Pond Locations – September 2022" is (attached to this submitters full submission) only for the purpose of showing the difference between the proposed locations (at notification) and revised locations (through this submission).</p> <p>This will also require consequential changes to be made to the District Plan Maps.</p>
FS 67 [15]	34 [15.13]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support the need to accurately show locations of stormwater wetlands and ensure they are incorporated into the reserve areas for the reasons provided in submission point 15.13.	<p>Accept submission point 15.13. The following relief is also sought in regard to mapping (as detailed in submission point 25.3):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Undertake detailed mapping identifying existing wetlands, streams and freshwater ecosystems in proximity to proposed stormwater wetlands, (particularly N1a and E1) before confirming the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone and/or the proposed locations of indicative wetlands shown on ‘Ōmokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure – Three Waters Infrastructure’. 2. Consider methods, including as set out in submission point 25.4, for stormwater reserves, subdivision and financial contributions. 3. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.

FS 69 [15]	4 [15.13]	Jace Investments [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support concepts of SMP's in accordance with Council's CSC and recognising existing infrastructure that has been consented for sub catchment purposes such as the Kaimai Views pond.	Accept the submission seeking approved SMP's be included in the District Plan and appropriately referenced in accordance with best practice.
4	4.2	Robert Hicks	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Stormwater ponds are drawn inaccurately at 50a Francis Road and 51 Francis Road. The ponds are indicated as being across existing houses and proposed roads and not in the gully at the lowest point as logically intended.	The stormwater ponds at 50a and 51 Francis Road need to be redrawn accurately so they are at the lowest point in gully systems and not arbitrarily drawn across existing houses (within future residential zones) and new proposed roads.
FS 67 [4]	35 [4.2]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Robert Hicks]					Support in part	Regional Council supports the need to accurately map the locations of stormwater treatment wetlands, however Regional Council does not support treatment wetlands being positioned in the lowest point in the gully system if these were to be 'online'. However, 'online' stormwater treatment wetlands created within a stream/river are not supported and are contrary to the direction of the NPS-FM with regard to retaining stream values.	Regarding mapping (as detailed in submission point 25.3): 1. Undertake detailed mapping identifying existing wetlands, streams and freshwater ecosystems in proximity to proposed stormwater wetlands, (particularly NIa and EI) before confirming the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone and/or the proposed locations of indicative wetlands shown on 'Omokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure - Three Waters Infrastructure'. 2. Consider methods, including as set out in submission point 25.4, for stormwater reserves, subdivision and financial contributions. 3. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.
19	19.1	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure			Support in part	Support in part (subject to changes requested in submission points below), the use of structure plan to support planning maps for identifying locations of key areas referenced in District Plan provisions, and to show interrelationships of indicatively planned infrastructure routes.	Use of structure plan maps and associated documents to support changes to planning provisions in District Plan
19	19.30	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support	Support retention of proposed Rule and the extent of wastewater line WW9 as shown on "OSP Infrastructure - Three Waters Infrastructure" below (attached to this submitter's full submission).	Support retention of the extent of wastewater line WW9 as shown on "OSP Infrastructure - Three Waters Infrastructure" below (attached to this submitter's full submission).
26	26.18	Classic Group	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support	Retention of the extent of wastewater line WW9 as shown on "OSP Infrastructure - Three Waters Infrastructure".	Retention of the extent of wastewater line WW9 as shown on "OSP Infrastructure - Three Waters Infrastructure".
19	19.6	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Support in part	Support in part retention of displaying on structure plan maps and diagrams for how infrastructure and services for stormwater, wastewater, water, roading, walkway and	It is requested that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that

			Plan					cycleways are envisaged to be generally provided for, including indicative routes for these services. It is requested however that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road. The points set out in this submission point have been raised with WBOPDC to varying degrees prior to notification of the Plan Change 92 documentation. These changes are requested to reflect the intent and evolution of these discussions through future development.	<p>apply to the site at 60 Prole Road.</p> <p>Add indicative stormwater line connection from Prole Road to 60 Prole Road site</p> <p>Add indicative wastewater line connection from Prole Road to 60 Prole Road site.</p> <p>Show indicative route for a wastewater rising main to travel across gully area.</p>
32	32.2	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.3 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Oppose	There is a mapping error for the extent of Stormwater Pond and associated designation (DI91) identified on the Planning maps on 75 Kaylene Place, (Lot 2 DP 557551).	That the mapping layer for the Stormwater Pond Structure Plan feature as shown on 75 Kaylene Place (Lot 2 DP 557551) is updated to align with the boundary of Lot 1 DP 557551.
11	11.1	Elles Pearse-Danker	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.5 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Concept Plan	General		Support in part	<p>Omokoroa Stage 3 concept plan does not show road access to all properties. This does not ensure service of adjacent lots and may prevent those properties to be developed. This goes against the statement at the end of section 9.4.1 (of Section 32 Report):</p> <p>"Specific structure plan requirements are necessary to ensure that development is undertaken in a co-ordinated and integrated manner and to ensure that infrastructure can operate successfully to accommodate the planned growth. These include restrictions on access, requirements to link roads and related infrastructure to adjacent property boundaries, and provision of reserves. There are no practical alternative options for ensuring co-ordinated and integrated development."</p>	Show a road access (either proposed road or indicative future road) to all properties. In particular, to 118A and 118B Prole Road.
59	59.4	Jace Orchards Limited and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Appendix 7 – Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.5 Omokoroa Structure Plan – Concept Plan	General		Support in part	The planning maps show the designations and these are appropriate. Some of the structure plan maps show indicative buffer areas for the interchange a pink cross hatch. This overlay is not supported as it relates to 21 Francis Road.	Ensure there is no indicative works area for the interchange on 21 Francis Road as this is being discussed directly with Waka Kotahi and no designation is in place.
FS 79 [59]	5 [59.4]	Waka Kotahi [Jace Orchards Limited and Kiwi Green New Zealand					Oppose in part	The footprint of the future grade-separated interchange at the Ōmokoroa Road / SH2 intersection is shown on the Ōmokoroa Stage 3 Structure Plan. The submission by Jace Orchards and Kiwi Green seeks that the	<p>Waka Kotahi considers that before a decision is made in this regard there should be clarity in terms of the practical implications of this inclusion in terms of:</p> <p>1. future consenting requirements for the Takitimu Northern</p>

		Limited]						indicative footprint of the interchange be removed from 21 Francis Road.	Link Stage 2 project and Ōmokoroa/SH2 intersection upgrade; and 2. future development on land within, adjacent to and surrounding the footprint.
19	19.27	Pete Linde	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.5 Omokoroa Structure Plan - Concept Plan	General		Support in part	It is requested that the additional notations listed below and illustrated on Appendix 1 (attached to this submitter's full submission) are supplied on the structure plan that apply to the site at 60 Prole Road. The points set out in this submission point have been raised with WBOPDC to varying degrees prior to notification of the Plan Change 92 documentation. These changes are requested to reflect the intent and evolution of these discussions through future development.	Include appropriate note on Omokoroa Structure Plans "Proposed extent of Natural Open Space Zone (green shading), to be confirmed through subdivisional land transfer processes",
58	58.1	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Appendix 7 - Section 4: Omokoroa Structure Plan	4.6 Omokoroa Town Centre Concept Master Plan	General		Support	Support inclusion of the Omokoroa Town Centre Masterplan.	Retain Omokoroa Town Centre Master Plan as part of the Structure Plan
25	25.26	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 8: Te Puke Structure Plan	General	General		Support	Support the inclusion of the Seddon Street Structure Plan in PC 92 in principle.	Retain as notified with amendments shown below.
25	25.28	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Appendix 7 - Section 8: Te Puke Structure Plan	General	General		Support in part	A risk assessment was prepared for Seddon Street in accordance with Policy NH 9B of the RPS. Policy NH 4B of the RPS provides the risk outcomes required for new development, specifically natural hazard risk shall not be increased off-site once the development is complete. The risk assessment does not clearly state if this requirement of NH 4B will be achieved. It is also noted that new flood modelling has been released for Te Puke as part of PC92, which was not available at the time of the risk assessment for Seddon Street. Therefore, clarity is required that the development can achieve the risk management outcomes of Policy NH 4B of the RPS taking into account the new flood modelling for Te Puke. In particular, confirm the flood risk is not increased in the existing residential area located directly south of the site.	Further clarification is sought to confirm there is no increase in flood risk outside the Seddon Street development and it can achieve the risk management outcomes required under Policy NH 4B of the RPS. In particular, risk is not increased off-site after the completion of the development.
47	47.10	The North Twelve Limited	Appendix 7 - Section 8: Te	8.3 Infrastructure Schedule	General		Oppose	N12LP seeks clarity on the changes to the structure plan including the removal of specific	Delete changes to the Te Puke Structure Plan as notified subject to further clarification.

		Partnership	Puke Structure Plan					areas in the cost schedules for wastewater. Structure plan roading and wastewater has also been completed for the property at 83 Dunlop Road. Structure plan water supply is now included for 83 Dunlop Road which has already been completed and no reimbursement made.	
47	47.11	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Appendix 7 - Section 8: Te Puke Structure Plan	8.2 Te Puke Structure Plan - Roding and Walkway/Cycleway Infrastructure	General		Oppose	N12LP generally supports the inclusion of structure plan roading at 69 Whitehead Avenue subject to appropriate costs being allowed for in the relevant budgets.	Delete changes to the Te Puke Structure Plan as notified subject to further clarification.
47	47.12	The North Twelve Limited Partnership	Appendix 7 - Section 8: Te Puke Structure Plan	8.3 Te Puke Structure Plan - Three Waters Infrastructure	General		Oppose	N12LP generally supports the inclusion of wastewater and water supply at 69 Whitehead Avenue subject to appropriate costs being allowed for in the relevant budgets. N12LP supports the removal of structure plan stormwater pond 8 on its property located at 81 Dunlop Road but consider that its southern pond should be included in the Structure Plan.	Delete changes to the Te Puke Structure Plan as notified subject to further clarification.

District Plan – Planning Maps

Submitter Ref. No	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
50	50.3	Mike and Sandra Smith	Planning Maps	General	General	Ecological Features	Support in part	This area should align with the covenant on the title (see map in this submitter's full submission) for ecological features.	Amend the boundary of the ecological feature (467B and E Omokoroa Road) so it aligns with the covenanted area of approximately 1.3ha.
58	58.28	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Mixed Use Residential Precinct	Support	Support the location and extent of the Omokoroa Mixed Use Precinct as per the planning maps, recognising that the plan provides for small scale commercial activities within the medium density residential zone.	Support the location and extent of the Omokoroa Mixed Use Precinct as per the planning maps,
25	25.34	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Coastal Erosion	Support	Support the inclusion of the coastal erosion planning maps for Ōmokoroa based on the 1% AEP and climate change to 2130 at the RCP 8.5 scenario and the explanatory statement clarifying this matter under the natural hazards mapping section.	Retain the maps as notified.
14	14.4	Peter Musk	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Coastal Erosion	Support in part	Areas subject to hazards, such as liquefaction, coastal erosion, and land stability be excluded from the Medium Density Residential.	Exclude areas subject to hazards
25	25.33	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Coastal Inundation	Support	Support the inclusion of the coastal inundation planning maps for Ōmokoroa based on the 1% AEP and climate change to 2130 at the RCP 8.5 scenario and the explanatory statement clarifying this matter under the natural hazards mapping section.	Retain the maps as notified.
32	32.3	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Coastal Inundation	Oppose	The extent of the new coastal inundation layer appears not to have accounted for site characteristics.	That the mapping layer, coastal inundation, as shown on 75 Kayelene Place (Lot 2 DP 557551) and Pip Way (Lot 1000 DP 531604) be updated.
50	50.8	Mike and Sandra Smith	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Flooding	Oppose	Floodable Area overlay, some of the floodable area identified on the planning maps are halfway up a hill and may be a programming or mapping error (467B and E Omokoroa Road).	Delete these small areas (shown in submitters full submission) as the stormwater from the development of the rural residential areas will manage any temporary ponding and or overland flow paths.
15	15.14	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Planning Maps			Natural Hazards – Flooding	Support in part	The proposed flood maps for Te Puke require a further desktop review to ensure their accuracy (for example connecting flowpaths that may currently show as a series of puddles or to remove any other flooding which is shown in error). The maps also require site-specific reviews in response to queries from landowners about the accuracy of the maps for their particular properties.	That the proposed flood maps for Te Puke be amended as a result of the further desktop review and site-specific reviews.
FS 67 [15]	46 [15.14]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Western Bay of Plenty District Council]					Support	Support relief sought by the submitter. Regional Council accepts there was insufficient time to fully review mapping and considers this a reasonable approach.	Accept submission point 15.14 in favour of submission point 25.32.
48	48.1	Warren Dohnt	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards –	Oppose	The site at 198 Jellicoe St has two small proposed flood areas on the Western boundary. These two areas encroach into the	I wish for these two pockets to be removed from the plan change 92.

						Flooding		building platform. This building, when constructed, was raised by over a metre to the Reserve esplanade to the West. The entire esplanade slopes towards the Ohineangaanga Stream running adjacent, away from the two identified areas in the plan change. These two small pockets are equal to or higher than the rest of the esplanade and then slope down to the Stream, and the building is then higher again by over a metre. I believe these two pockets have been incorrectly identified as they are higher than the neighbouring area, and the building platform sits one metre higher again.	
48	48.2	Warren Dohnt	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	This site at 200–208 Jellicoe St has four small proposed flooding areas. Based on topographical measures the site sits at between 13–14m, with the adjacent Ohinerangaanga Stream sitting at sub 10m. We have extensive stormwater in place on this site with two separate discharges. The discharge pipe outfalls into the Ohineangaanga Stream are at approximately 11.0m. This is circa 2–3m of fall and as a result will create a significant head of pressure that requires an extremely large area to be underwater to prevent discharge from the site and specifically the proposed flood zones for this site. The areas adjacent to 200–208 Jellicoe St, Te Puke would need to be in flood before our site will flood and this would include a significantly larger area than has been proposed by the updated flood plan. It would be physically impossible for these areas on this lot to flood before very large areas of the surrounding Te Puke area. In addition, the areas identified as floodable in the proposed plan change, show areas within an existing building which sits higher than the yard. This floor level is also the same across the entire building shown on this site which have not been included in the floodable area.	I wish that these areas identified on 200–208 Jellicoe St be removed as they would not flood/could not flood due to a number of identified factors.
48	48.3	Warren Dohnt	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	The proposed flood area at the Eastern end of 576 Jellicoe St, Te Puke, when observed onsite, run along higher ground than the actual stormwater drain at the Eastern end of the site. The Stormwater drain which runs approximately 2 metres lower than the proposed plan change sits outside of the proposed flood zones, which must be a mistake. In addition to this, the two adjacent sites to 576 Jellicoe St (North and South), are both well over a metre lower than the entire site of 576 and the proposed flood area on our site, but only part of these sites are showing in the proposed flood zone.	I would suggest that the modelling done has incorrectly overlaid the proposed plan change to the rear of 576 Jellicoe St as this areas sits high than the neighbouring sites and the stormwater drain which isn't in the flood zone.
7	7.1	David Marshall	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	Plan Change 94 (Washer Road Business Park) has recently been approved. A hazards assessment (attached to this submitter's full submission) was completed with respect to all natural hazards pursuant to Appendix L RPS (Regional Policy Statement). Consultation with the Regional Council identified minor flooding of a depth of 0.1m on the north eastern corner of the plan change site (66 Washer Road). We believe there may be	Please amend the flooding maps so they align with the DHI flooding information recently assessed for PC94 – Washer Road Industrial Business Park.

								discrepancies in the mapping which is highlighting very minor ponding. This will be managed through ground treatment (contouring and preloading) and design of overland flow paths through the PC94 area.	
25	25.41	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Support in part	In response to new flooding information for Te Puke and Ōmokoroa and to manage significant risk from flooding as a qualifying matter, it is proposed that a new matter of discretion (d) for floodable areas and coastal inundation areas to manage the potential risk to life be added. Evacuation can become difficult for children and elderly when flood depths are greater than 500mm. Therefore, in these situations, development should provide a safe evacuation route to ensure a low level of risk to life can be achieved during the design event. BOPRC considers development should be avoided if safe evacuation cannot be provided in this situation.	The following specific relief is sought: <u>d) The development shall provide a safe evacuation route to ensure a low level of risk to life in the design event. The threshold for risk to life for the purpose of providing safe evacuation is a flood depth >500mm; and</u> Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
25	25.32	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Support	Support inclusion of flood planning maps for Te Puke and Ōmokoroa based on the 1% AEP and climate change to 2130 at the RCP 8.5 scenario and the explanatory statement clarifying this matter under the natural hazards mapping section.	Retain the maps and explanation as notified.
12	12.1	Vortac New Zealand Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	The long held belief by WBOPDC that there is a Flood-able Area on 29 Hookey Drive is incorrect. An easement exists on the neighboring property namely 37 Hookey Drive, for the conveyance of storm water. The easement provides the course & area for the discharge of storm water. Attached (to the submitter's full submission) is from the minutes of a Package of Plans meeting involving WBOPDC staff on 4/3/15 whereby WBOPDC staff stated storm water was being forced onto 29 Hookey Drive from out of the easement on 37 Hookey Drive. "Easement on neighboring property but drain has been forced onto #29". The minutes also stated that WBOPDC staff that "Council to action the easement." 29 Hookey Drive is being flooded by the forced storm water from easement on 37 Hookey Drive.	That WBOPDC action the easement. WBOPDC remove the Flood-able Area designation from 29 Hookey Drive.
FS 67 [12]	47 [12.1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Vortac New Zealand Limited]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. Overland flow and flooding occur in the lowest points of the land form, such as the gully system situated at 29 Hookey Drive. Modelling and observation of flooding events identified that the hazard spans across this gully floor. Whether or not an easement exists on the neighbouring property is irrelevant when considering flood risk to 29 Hookey Drive.	Reject submission point 12.1.
23	23.1	Frank and Sandra Hodgson	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	We own and live at 15 Lomay Place. There is a potential that future resale value of the property may be affected. We believe incorrect mapping has taken place, which has not taken into account the development of section with retaining walls, when the land development was done in 2018. When our section was developed, the developer was required to do ground works. A substantial retaining wall was constructed on the western boundary. Fill was taken from a knoll on the adjacent section at	We believe the "Other Natural Hazards, Te Puke Floodable Area" (proposed new flood map) should be corrected by our property, to be the same as the existing "District Plan Natural Hazard - Floodable Areas". We would appreciate the above be taken into consideration. In that the new district plan proposal should be changed, to indicate the new flood prone area be the same as the old Te Puke Flood plan. This to

								<p>17 Lomay Place and elsewhere to level the two sections to the same height. The retaining wall is 1.5 metres high approx, our section is elevated above the existing District Plan (flood map). We don't believe the "Other Natural Hazards, Te Puke Floodable Area" (proposed new flood map) would affect our property. There is an area on the new projection, invasive of our section, that probably depicts an old gully line that was on the land before the development. We question: has the new modelling picked up old contours lines data on the western edge of our property? The height of our retaining wall is almost at the same contour level of Cannell Farm Road opposite us over the floodable farm land, which is above the new proposed flood modelling. Stormwater drainage in the whole Lomay Place development, has overall improved the drainage of the catchment from No. 1 Road down the street. All the sections in Lomay Place have their own soak pits for stormwater catchment. The amount of stormwater freely draining down the landscape has therefore been considerably reduced. Lomay Place is a steep street and a second mitigating point is the stormwater collected on the sealed road in the street, redirected through drains to exit Lomay Place to the north into a large sump at the area designated as 14 Lomay on Council mapping. This low lying area, adjacent to the fields to the west, has no property on it. Please review (in the submitter's full submission) photos on page 3 showing the retaining wall in relation to the adjacent property at No. 17 Lomay which is unaffected by the proposed mapping and Jpeg picture on page 4 taken from the WBOP website of the new proposed plan. Refer to Stratum documents (also in the submitter's full submission) sections 9 & 10 which refer to ground works undertaken at time of development.</p>	<p>run parallel to our retaining wall on the western facing side of our property. Removing from our land, small area of flooding marked on the plan.</p>
52	52.1	Maxine Morris	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>We own Lot 1 and Lot 2 DP484064 or 12 and 14B Lenihan drive Te Puke. My husband and have resided on the property since 2006 and in this time it has never flooded.</p>	<p>We would like to strongly appeal the proposed changes shown on the map which show most of both lots as flooded. We would appreciate additional time to look into this further, possibly with a stormwater engineer.</p>
55	55.1	Zealandia Trust	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>I am an independent Architectural Designer with over 40 years' experience in the Te Puke and surrounding environs working predominantly with residential developments. I understand the need for Councils to be proactive in updating the District Plan for potential Flood Events, but question the rationale of the computer generated modelling these updates are based on. The LIM report obtained for this property in 2016 states: "Part of this site has been identified as possibly subject to flooding." This is marked on the previous maps as light blue lines. There is also a letter on file from Western BOP District Council dated 8 September 2015 regarding flood hazard for the property. There is an existing overland flow path from a 600mm diameter concrete</p>	<p>I request a review of this proposal as it impacts the already established area, potentially putting the existing dwelling at risk, negatively impacting future insurance cover for the existing dwelling, and negatively impacting future resale value of the property. Rather than being reliant on a computer-generated model, I require a qualified Council Representative visit the property to establish areas that have the potential for flooding. I request these areas be removed from the proposed flood hazard maps (59 Moehau Street).</p>

								<p>stormwater pipe, via an open drain through part of the property. The open drain is 2.0m to 3.0m wide and varies in depth from 600mm to 800mm, and is lined with rock filled 'Reno Mattress' and 'RipRap' offering scour protection. There is a consented 2.7 meter high retaining wall measured from the top of the drain, set back approximately 1.2m from the dwelling. Further, the floor level of the house is 'Finished Floor Level,' (FFL) RL 35.8 to Moturiki Datum. The modelled flood level in the letter of 8 September 2015 is RL 34.53. The letter of 8 September 2015 states; 'because your building floor level is identified as above the modelled flood level, your land (or part of) is subject to flood hazard, but your dwelling is not as risk for the modelled flood event.' You do not state a stipulated flood level for these new proposed events. The new proposal now includes an area the dwelling occupies, along with areas on the adjacent streets, Norrie Street and Moehau Street. The new areas appear to be randomly applied to already established sites. Your modelling does not appear to consider the development already undertaken on the site. In conclusion, I have marked on the attached map 'A' (attached to this submitter's full submission) the anomalies where the proposed flood zone includes part of a level floor within the existing dwelling house.</p>	
63	63.1	Dawn Mends	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>Flood mapping was done on the property due to an easter storm event in 2014 after a complaint due to roadway runoff entering the property via a drive way to the lower garage area. The easter storm event was two fold with high winds the previous day depositing debris and leaf litter on the roadway followed by torrential rain which showed up shortfalls in the stormwater system with the main one being the gratings over street catchpits blocking water flow to drain. A catchpit upgrade has been undertaken by council being a super pit installed directly under the Chaytor street road sign on oxford street this working well and there has been no storm water entering the property from the road since. An outside security gate has been modified to prevent damming/1 and allowing flow to drain on the lower level/3 so will prevent water reaching floorplan of property. Back opening on super pit allows drain to deal with leaf litter/2 also shown cause of stormwater flows from Chaytor street a catchpit blocked with debris with ponding at this point and over road storm water flow/4.</p>	<p>No relief sought. However, it is assumed that the submitter wants the flood maps reviewed based on the information provided in their submission.</p>
64	64.1	Ross List	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>I strongly object to the new floodable area designated (on 83 Jellicoe Street) and therefore wish to be heard at any hearings that may take place before any final decisions are made.</p>	<p>I strongly object to the new floodable area designated.</p>
57	57.1	Kirsty Mortensen	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>I would like to write my submission to reassess the flood zoning of my property located at 8 Beatty Ave, Te Puke. Previously I have drawn to your attention via a submission the concerns I had with the stormwater drainage outside my property. Upon inspection from the contractors, they identified that the stormwater culvert was installed upside down and informed me of this. This meant</p>	<p>Reassess the flood zoning of my property located at 8 Beatty Ave, Te Puke.</p>

								that it needed to get to full capacity before the floodwaters would disperse accordingly. They have since been in and corrected this issue by installing a new stormwater system in the correct position and changed the stormwater layout on the road. Since this has occurred my property no longer has any flooding issues and the correct layout to divert the water is working.	
60	60.1	David Crawford	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	<p>Submission for flooding map for 1 Hookey Drive, Te Puke. Note for context that the submitter appears to be referring to the existing District Plan flood maps and associated consultation (Council sent letters to landowners in September 2015 and met with the submitter on 4 July 2016). I am concerned that Waikato University has been paid to produce the result the WBOPDC were told by central government to produce in creating this fanciful flooding map. We had a meeting in our home with council staff and we expressed our deep dissatisfaction with their methodology of placing a blue smear (flood map) over the space occupied by our home. After that meeting I took photos of every drain on both sides of Hookey Drive, Boucher Avenue and Lenihan Drive. I submitted these to council in absolute disgust at the blocked cover grates and lack of council maintenance. I have since learned that most of the drains are not connected to a central system but rather are soak holes which need annual or biannual cleaning out. The second pumice layer at about 5 - 6 metres below the surface. This pumice layer can take as much water as can flow down the drain. These soak holes connect to that second pumice layer. Any build up of leaf matter on top of the pumice restricts water transfer. Surely council understand the need for annual or biennial maintenance of every soak drain in the district? After the meeting in our home we were supplied with details of a weather event that would cause such flooding and were shocked to see the prediction by the esteemed 'scientists' at Waikato University describing peak rainfall at 300mm/hour over a 30 minute period in 2130. This is an absurd assumption and a great example of flawed modelling. Recent downpours in both Australia and New Zealand show that nothing worse has happened recently than happened historically decades or centuries ago. Anyway, the result of my photographs of blocked drains was immediate council action to suck out the soak hole drains on all three roads. A week after, we had a downpour lasting several hours of very heavy rain and I expected to see the usual ponding at the Hookey/Boucher corner. No water accumulated because every soak hole was working as designed and every drain had been cleared of debris. This downpour was described as a one in fifty year event. No issue at all. There is no climate crisis. There is no appreciable rise in world temperature, there is no appreciable rise in sea levels.</p>	Remove any flood modelling from our property before it is forever lodged against our title on the district plan.

								Climate has always changed. You worked on a clear assumption/decision mandated by central government that man made climate change was fact. Wrong. Your computer modelling is seriously flawed. As a result the value of our property is affected massively for the most spurious of reasons.	
10	10.1	Blair Reeve	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Support in part	First of all, I want to say I'm grateful for the work council does for us. I refer to the new Floodable Area map and how it affects my dwelling at 139a Boucher Ave, Te Puke. I accept the flood report recommendation to widen the flood area, but I believe the detail around my dwelling to be incorrect. You will note the new flood area map has been extended from the original map to include a "peninsula" shape that now covers part of my dwelling. Considering the actual topography of the property and that of the surrounding land, I believe the new Floodable Area should not be covering my dwelling but should instead run according to the actual topography. Furthermore, my dwelling is approximately 2-3m higher than the "downstream" land to the north-west of me, specifically 56 Moehau St, where a severe flood would flow then fan out to Moehau St and the gully to the west of it. I have attached (see submitter's full submission) photos to show that the contour matches my suggested flood map, as well as giving an indication of height difference between my dwelling and the neighboring "downstream" property and beyond.	Amend the Floodable Area map to reflect the actual topography around my dwelling, as indicated on the attached drawing (attached to this submitter's full submission).
19	19.5	Pete Linde	Planning Maps			Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	Oppose the Floodable areas shown on the property at 60 Prole Road. Request the removal of isolated ponded and flood hazard areas shown on structure plan and planning maps on the elevated portion of the site at 60 Prole Road. They are not accurate or necessary, rainwater will drain to eastern gully that travels along east of the site at 60 Prole Road.	Remove isolated ponded and flood hazard areas shown on structure plan and planning maps on the elevated portion of the site at 60 Prole Road. Reasons: They are not accurate or necessary, rainwater will drain to eastern gully that travels along east of the site at 60 Prole Road.
49	49.1	Paul and Julie Prior	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	We own 10 Lenihan Drive (Lot 1 DP563983) and our new subdivision which is 8 Lenihan Drive (Lot 2 DP563983). As part of the subdivision process with Western Bay Council (which was approved in July last year) we obtained a report from a civil engineer hydrologist (attached to this submitter's full submission) which showed that only a minimal area of Lot 2 could be affected by flooding. The hydrologist who carried out the report is going to look at your proposed changes and may give us additional comments, and so we'd like additional time. In summary, we disagree with the proposed changes for our property based on the attached report.	We wish to appeal against the proposed changes shown on the map which show most of which is now Lot 2 as being flooded.
51	51.1	Torrey Hilton	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	I wish to make a submission on the updated flood plan maps, regarding my property at 17a George Street, Te Puke. My question is in regard to how the council arrived at what area is to be deemed as being in the new flood plain. Is it topo / survey related or aerial image or some other form? The issue for me is that the grassy area by the glass houses, as proposed as a flood plain by the dark blue lines, is at the same height as the area on	Can you please reconsider the classification of this area.

								my property not included as a flood plain. Also the area on the northern boundary under the trees is shown as a flood plain, this area is about three meters above the level of the stream and there is no potential to flood in the way that the map currently suggests. The council has in the past granted a building permit for a building on that ground adjacent to the drain on the northern boundary currently shown as above the flood plain. An engineer also made a solid argument that it was indeed well above the flood plain. On the eastern boundary the map indicates with dark blue lines that this is also a flood plain. But again, the topography doesn't allow the property to flood in the way indicated.	
66	66.1	Steve Chalmers	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	I have owned and resided at 10 Tui Street for 17 years. I am not in agreement with the proposed maps of my section being a flood zone. My house sits up higher than most houses in Te Puke. It is not a flood zone. There is a gully below me. It is no doubt a flood zone down there. It would be very wrong to mark my place with a red flag regarding flooding which as you know will unfairly hinder things such as the future sale of my home. I would want buyers to be given the correct information and this is that 10 Tui Street is not in any danger of flooding.	I am not in agreement with the proposed maps of my section being a flood zone. I would like someone to come and see me.
44	44.1	Ken and Raewyn Keyte	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	We have checked the flood zone shown for our property 8A Cannell Farm Drive, Te Puke. The updated map shows two floodable zones on our property. However, 8A Cannell Farm Drive is part of a subdevelopment that has been elevated approximately 1.5m above Cannell Farm Drive. All of our section is at the same elevation with a solid retaining wall around the property. In my opinion the flood zone map needs to be altered to follow the boundary line of our section and therefore follow the 1.5m retaining wall of our property. The other small flood zone shown on our property should also be removed as the right-of-way road on which all the 8 Cannell Farm Drive properties are located slopes to Cannell Farm road and is well drained with storm water drains. We do not understand how either sections of flood zone that are indicated on our property can be regarded as floodable.	That the flood zone affecting 8A Cannell Farm Drive be altered as per our submission.
43	43.1	Jacqueline Field	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards - Flooding	Oppose	We own a residential property, currently under construction at 12 Queen Palms Road, Te Puke. (Our property is Lot 13 in the 41 Queen Street development). According to the new flood maps, 12 Queen Palms Road appears to be at risk of inundation under the modelling to determine the extent of a 100-year flood event. It appears that there is little change to the flood model for the Queen Palms development between previous maps and the newly revised map. Prior to our purchase of the house and land package in December 2021, the developer of our subdivision provided Western Bay District Council with a geotechnical report	That the flooding situation for 12 Queen Palms Road, Te Puke, also potentially listed in WBDC documentation as Lot 13, 41 Queen St, Te Puke, be reconsidered in light of the flooding mitigations and stormwater re-direction that have occurred as part of the land development process.

								containing sufficient evidence of flood mitigation to obtain resource consent for a residential development. The geotechnical report was produced by CMW Geosciences, report number TGA2018-0244AD.Rev.3. The council has this report on file. During the course of our house build, we received notification that our property was potentially going to be subject to Section 73. This alarmed us as we were under the impression that all required flooding mitigations had taken place in order to obtain resource consent. Further investigation and discussion resulted in our receiving an email from Council's Building Services Manager citing the aforementioned geotechnical report, which outlined that the flooding risk had been mitigated, and the imposition of Section 73 was unnecessary. Based on this, it came as a surprise to discover that the flood mitigation and changed storm water arrangements of the 41 Queen Street development appear not to have been reflected in the new flooding maps. I am unable to attach the full geotechnical report but I have attached an excerpt (in the submitter's full submission) showing the file cover page, with its identifying details, and two pages of drawings showing land contours and stormwater arrangements.	
FS 72 [43]	1 [43.1]	Prem Gill [Jacqueline Field]					Support	<p>This submission notes that the flood modelling for 12 Queen Palms Road, Te Puke. Does not take into consideration the flooding mitigations and stormwater re-direction that have occurred as part of the land development process.</p> <p>Likewise, the flood modelling over the accessway associated with 50 Macloughlin Drive has increased, and does not reflect the proposed up stream stormwater mitigation, including stormwater pond (Te Puke_A3_3), which will ultimately manage and reduce the level of flooding across the accessway at 50 Macloughlin Drive.</p>	That the flood modelling be reconsidered in light of the upstream flood mitigations and stormwater re-direction that is proposed.
15	15.15	Western Bay of Plenty District Council	Planning Maps			Natural Hazards – Liquefaction	Oppose	<p>The proposed liquefaction maps are based on a Level B (calibrated desktop) level of assessment for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. However, for the remainder of Ōmokoroa and for Te Puke they are based on a Level A (basic desktop) level of assessment at a region-wide scale. As a result, there are significant areas of land shown as "Liquefaction Category is Undetermined" in the remainder of Ōmokoroa and in Te Puke. The proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) and associated provisions should be removed from the District Plan for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke to allow Council to investigate options for improving the level of accuracy of these maps for a possible future Plan Change. In the meantime, Council will continue to hold these maps outside of the District Plan and use Section 106 of the RMA and the Building Act 2004 to manage liquefaction risk through resource consents (for subdivision) and building consents respectively.</p>	Delete the proposed liquefaction maps (all classifications) from the District Plan Maps. This includes "Liquefaction Damage is Possible", "Liquefaction Category is Undermined" and "Liquefaction Damage is Unlikely".
FS 70 [15]	7 [15.15]	Kāinga Ora					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 15.15 as the relief sought is	Allow

		[Western Bay of Plenty District Council]						generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	
25	25.35	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Natural Hazards – Liquefaction	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of liquefaction maps and related provisions because the information base is mostly at Level A (regional) scale. Based on the available liquefaction mapping, BOPRC do not consider liquefaction to be a significant risk for Ōmokoroa or Te Puke and therefore not a Qualifying Matter in the context of PC92. Due to recent changes in the Building Act and outcomes of the regional liquefaction study and the liquefaction assessment for Ōmokoroa undertaken by Western Bay of Plenty District Council, BOPRC consider liquefaction risk can be appropriately managed at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke by methods outside of the district plan, including assessment at subdivision through s106 of the RMA.	Remove liquefaction maps, explanation and associated liquefaction provisions from PC92. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matter raised.
FS 70 [25]	8 [25.35]	Kāinga Ora [Bay of Plenty Regional Council]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 23.35 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.8.	Allow
29	29.3	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – All Natural Hazards	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the inclusion of new natural hazard overlays within the WBOPDP. Such overlays are often subject to change once additional investigations and new information come to light. Having the overlays located outside the WBOPDP enables greater flexibility to update and amend the overlays when new information arises without needing a formal 'Schedule 1' Plan change process to occur. Kāinga Ora also notes that there are existing natural hazards that are mapped as part of a series of 'non District Plan' overlays and therefore the relief sought is consistent with the existing approach.	1. Amend and shift the new District Plan natural hazards layers out of the District Plan so that they sit within the 'non District Plan layer', made available publicly on a GIS viewer. 2. Provisions in PC92 should be amended to reflect this relief sought.
37	37.1	Sylvia Oemcke	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	I'm writing to convey my concerns regarding the strip of land running down the length of the southern side of Francis Road planned for future industrial zoning. Firstly, the industrial area planned is unnecessarily sprawled out which will negatively impact future neighbouring residents. The industrial zone is directly opposite, and accessed through, a large intensive medium density future housing development and the heavy industrial traffic, noise pollution and safety concerns that this entails for residents, including children, are significant. It is not desirable or safe to have an Industrial area directly opposite intensive medium density residential. If it is to exist, its presence should be as minimal as possible. Secondly the negative impact of an Industrial Zone so close to a river regarding noise pollution, the diminishing and lack of green space for bird and wildlife, and the pollution and runoff directly into the river. The industrial zone on Omokoroa Road is marked Light Industrial whereas the Francis Road portion is marked Industrial suggesting that it is intended to be heavy Industrial.	I would urge the council to consider minimising the border where the residential meets Industrial where possible, and therefore keeping the Industrial zone more concentrated around Omokoroa Road rather than stretching out all the way down Francis Road. I propose that the council remove the planned Industrial Zoning for numbers 51 and 21 Francis Road and allow both pieces of land to retain their Rural Residential Zoning, due to future safety and ecological concerns. An alternative plan which I deem acceptable is to retain Rural Residential Zoning for numbers 21 and 51 Francis Road, and rezone 467, 467A and 425 Omokoroa Road for Industrial, thus containing the 'exposure' to the industrial area more so. Another suggestion is Re Zoning the Omokoroa Road Industrial area as Industrial and making the Francis Road Portion (if there absolutely has to be one) Light Industrial.

								Any type of Industrial zoning this close to the river will upset the habitat of the wildlife down there, let alone heavy industrial. It is absolutely impossible to monitor and divert contaminants 100% of the time. Having the Industrial zoning further away from the river will have a positive impact on the wildlife and the river.	
FS 67 [37]	36 [37.1]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Sylvia Oemcke]					Support	<p>Regional Council supports the provision of a minimum 10 metre setback (and a larger setback for larger streams/rivers) between new development and rivers/streams/wetlands. This is good practice given the ecological and flooding issues that arise when development is too close to a river/stream/wetland.</p> <p>Regional Council notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rivers/streams/wetlands are dynamic systems that need space to meander and interact naturally with their floodplains; larger rivers have larger floodplains and require larger setbacks. • When infrastructure is built too close to a river, there are few alternative solutions other than hard engineering, for which Council support is often requested. • Setbacks should be adequate to allow for natural meandering to occur without risk of compromising infrastructure and without the need for hard engineering solutions, which can cause loss of river extent and values. • Wetlands are a threatened ecosystem that provide habitat for threatened species. Setbacks should be adequate to protect ecosystem health and functioning of wetlands. • Setbacks/buffers to protect biodiversity and ecosystem health will often need to be wider than setbacks for water quality. <p>Provision of an appropriately sized, intact riparian/wetland margin, particularly adjacent to industrial areas, is consistent with Objective 1 and Policies 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 15 of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM). The healthiest streams/rivers are those with vegetated buffers. The benefits of appropriately sized and planted riparian/wetland margins are well documented, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in water quality by filtering sediment and contaminants from runoff before it enters the water. • Reduction in water temperature. • Mitigates streambank erosion. • Provides habitat and migration corridor for wildlife. • Connected corridors (hills to sea/ki uta ki tai). • Enhances landscape. • Allows access to remove fallen trees/debris. • Lessens disturbance of wetland wildlife including threatened species. • Increases social and cultural values, including health and wellbeing. 	Consider requiring all buildings/structures and impervious surfaces to have a setback of at least 10 m from the edge of a bank of a permanently flowing river or stream, or a wetland.

								Buildings constructed on the 10 m boundary of a river/wetland are likely to encroach into and fragment a riparian margin with additional structures such as decks, patios, fences and pools. Allowing minor structures and activities to encroach into the riparian margin will result in less space for the waterbody/wetland and its floodplain and permanent fragmentation of the riparian margin.	
27	27.1	David and Diana Bagley	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Proposed industrial zoning to west side of Francis Road up to the strip of “constrained land” at item 14 – we totally oppose this zoning as it will shatter the existing peaceful habitat for current residents, birdlife, and the rural environment. The volume of industrial traffic, including the pollution from heavy vehicles along this country lane style road, will be an absolute nightmare for parents of young children, dog walking owners, and those of us who came to live here to escape such large city activity. We believe that it would be highly desirable to preserve the quasi rural environment that attracted us to this locality and to provide balance against the more intensive housing in the other proposed residential zones. The proximity of industrial activity alongside residential, and sharing the same road access would be a series of disasters waiting to happen in our opinion. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.	Expand the area described as “industrial land not under review” all the way along the south side of Omokoroa Road to encompass the retail shop and yards, recently developed by ITM, the very large vehicle fleet of Omokoroa Carriers, a kitchen fabricator, and a concrete products distribution centre. This would provide far better access for the industrial traffic to SH2, and remove the perils of positioning industrial activities and vehicles adjacent to residential precincts. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.
28	28.1	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Support	The site this submission is associated with is owned by Foodstuffs North Island Limited (FSNI) and is shown (map attached in the submitter’s full submission). It is located at 492 Omokoroa Road, Omokoroa. Under the Operative District Plan, the site is zoned Rural. Under proposed PC 92, the site is intended to be rezoned ‘Industrial’. FSNI support the proposed rezoning.	FSNI seeks all such consequential relief required to give effect to the Industrial rezoning of the site. FSNI seeks for Council to approve the proposed plan change in so far as it relates their submissions.
31	31.1	N and M Bruning	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Support	The retention of an industrial zone over part of the submitters land is supported and consistent with the Operative District Plan. <i>(Note: Submission is in reference to submitters property land held in records of title 26D/746, 713/54, 65A272 and 10D/397)</i>	Retain the industrial zoning as shown.
45	45.1	Ian Yule	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	The proposal will lead to the destruction of a significant proportion of the highest quality land in the catchment area, as well as the destruction of a distinctive rural environment. At least one third of all class 2 and 3 land in the catchment area will be lost. This type of development also leads to further fragmentation of agricultural land. There are existing sustainable jobs and considerable income being generated by orchards that will be lost. Transport - I feel the council is being grossly irresponsible in its actions. Why would the council want to put the safety and well being of local inhabitants at risk by deliberately making traffic problems worse? Traffic is often	The proposal should be rejected and further development should be considered in consultation with other areas such as Katikati, Te Puna and Tauranga. The local council need to demonstrate some leadership in engaging with the government in terms of working with them to reduce the transportation problems of the region. The BOP Regional Council need to look to work with others to overcome the issues of rising demand for housing. They need to look to develop smaller, local to industry and employment, compact communities close to

								<p>subject to congestion. As the cost of transport is likely to increase then the desirability of a non-central location is diminished. I do not believe the local council can create enough employment to compete with large regional employment hotspots. Smart Growth Strategy philosophy being promoted but not followed. This is about stopping urban sprawl, creating efficient land use and transport patterns, creating attractive life work spaces with amenities, providing pedestrian access to amenities and promoting viable public transport options. It is likely there will still be a very high level of dependency on cars for transport. The proposal will have a significant negative impact on existing residents and facilities.</p> <p>Industrial zoning on Francis Road will bring heavy industrial traffic to residential streets. Traffic noise next to the road was put forward by the council as a justification for having the area as industrial rather than residential or leaving it with existing houses. Yet we are building houses next to other parts of State highway 2 near Papamoa. The site also has the potential for additional pollutants, dust, noise and additional heavy traffic, yet is being planned right next to a medium density residential area. The proposal will have a significant impact on a rural road and an obvious deterioration in this area of prime horticultural land. Due to the transport issues mentioned above, I do not believe this will be an attractive site for an industrial facility.</p>	<p>existing urban areas. Councils should look to use infill on smaller sites around the district including Te Puna and into Tauranga itself. If further larger scale developments were to be considered then the area to the East of Tauranga, off the toll road between the junction of Domain, to the east of the Old Pacific highway coast towards Te Puke would seem to offer a more regionally significant opportunity. Adding to the industrial area near Te Puke would provide scale and easier transport to main arterial routes. Adding further development in this area toward Papamoa could offer a much larger area of continuous development.</p>
65	65.2	Russell Prout	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	<p>Many of us have purchased properties for the rural lifestyle and quiet surroundings. The addition of an industrial area on this small street will add significant traffic (likely some heavy as well) that already cannot handle turning vehicles with trailers attached. It is likely that an industrial area may attract noise, evening or 24hr work/activity. As with some other industrial areas, there is likely to be vehicles left at night which will attract undesirable visitors.</p>	<p>I would like the opportunity to have a minuted discussion with those who represent the decision makers so that all concerns are factored into this and similar proposals. In short I strongly object to any industrial development in or on Francis road and request these be ceased.</p>
16	16.2	Penny Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	<p>Francis Road Industrial zone adjacent to Medium Density Residential zone: Poor planning practice. Concerns about amenity, traffic, noise, pollution, and safety.</p>	<p>Relocate industrial zone elsewhere or mitigate impacts per suggestions below.</p> <p>In Appendix 10 - Omokoroa Gully Reserves Concept Plan (of Section 32 Report), Boffa Miskell's concept plan design structure (page 11) included a green buffer on the residential side of Francis Road to mitigate industrial land interface with adjacent residential areas and suggested a "linear park" arrangement with recreation opportunities such as walking or cycling or a strong green belt. To further separate the zones and reduce heavy traffic on Francis Road adjacent to housing, improve safety, congestion and noise pollution, a single point of entry should be sited at the beginning of the industrial zone from the Omokoroa Rd end. The industrial zone would be a contained destination area avoiding multiple access points</p>

									along Francis Road. The industrial area should be screened by fencing and planting bordering its length of Francis Road.
54	54.1	Christine Prout	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	I understand the need to provide different areas (eg land for Industrial businesses) in our Stage 3 zoning. But I cannot understand why rural land between SH2 and Francis Road is not kept as rural land as a buffer zone. A lot of it is hilly and not conducive to industrial sites, without a lot of soil disruption etc. Omokoroa is a special peninsula with good healthy soil, more suited to growing food and trees rather than covered over with so many buildings. However, the main reason for not wanting industrial businesses to start up in this area is the danger and the probable increase in heavy traffic. Many new and existing, residents would be detrimentally affected. If the transport plan 5.3.2 (see Section 32 Report) goes ahead and Francis Road is closed off to SH2 (a necessary move to reduce the danger of that corner), the only option for all the new industrial traffic would be to drive past many residential houses, a school, a recreation centre and an aquatic centre. Is it necessary to rezone that particular land on Francis Road, when there is land already zoned Industrial on the south eastern side of Omokoroa Road?	This land on the south east side of Omokoroa is next to "rural land" – could some of that rural land there be rezoned Industrial? Or somewhere else more suitable and on the same side of Omokoroa Road. Could the Francis Road "industrial" zoning be changed to "future commercial" and recreational open space etc for local residents to use. With walkways and cycleways, this could reduce motorised traffic and help keep residents and traffic away from needing to use Omokoroa Road as often.
36	36.1	Susan Phinn	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Proposed industrial zoning to west side of Francis Road up to the strip of "constrained land" at item 14 – I am totally opposed to this zoning as it will destroy the existing peaceful environment for current residents, animals (both domestic, horses and cattle), birdlife, and the rural environment. The volume of industrial traffic, including the pollution from heavy vehicles along our country lane, will be a constant worry for parents of young children, residents taking walks, owners walking their dogs, and for those of us who bought land, built and came to live in this beautiful area to escape the activity associated with such large town/city activity. I believe that it would be highly desirable to preserve the tranquil rural environment that attracted me to this very special area and to provide balance against the more intensive housing in the other proposed residential zones. The proximity of industrial activity alongside residential, and sharing the same road access would be a series of disasters waiting to happen. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled "Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two" by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.	Expand the area described as "industrial land not under review" along the south side of Omokoroa Road to encompass the retail shop and yards, recently developed by ITM, the very large vehicle fleet of Omokoroa Carriers, a kitchen fabricator, and a concrete products distribution centre. This would provide far better and safer access for the industrial traffic to and from SH2, and remove the very real perils of positioning industrial activities and vehicles adjacent to residential precincts. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled "Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two" by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.
62	62.1	Angela Yule	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Industrial (Omokoroa)	Oppose	The proposed industrial zone in Francis Road has several key issues. Impact on the environment: This will have an impact on wildlife, including nesting birds and insects. Pollution and noise: a collection of industrial units will pose additional noise and	That council reconsider the need for this zoning and look for alternative solutions. I have suggested the area below (attached to this submitter's full submission) will allow less impact on housing

							<p>potential environmental pollution. Pollutants emitted from factories can enter the human body. The toxic gases that factories release into the air, combined with those added by trucks on the road, mean that we have an increased risk of developing illnesses, diseases, and conditions. The impact on local residents will be obvious and the deterioration in the peaceful setting will mean this small green space will be lost forever. Health and safety: I am seriously concerned on the impact of increase in heavy goods traffic such a trucks and trailers on a road used also by residential properties. It can pose a serious threat since the nearby streets are proposed to be used by cyclists, walkers and animals. This seems ill advised in view of the number of properties identified. Refer (EHINZ factsheet on road injuries in children aged 0-14 years linked to from this submitter's full submission). The philosophy of "Smartgrowth" sounds laudable, however destruction of green spaces and annihilation of the natural landscapes is in total opposition with its ideology. Smartgrowth encourages redevelopment of brown spaces and prevention of urban sprawl.</p>	development and be a much safer solution.
13	13.1	Matthew Hardy	Planning Maps			Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	<p>Support in part</p> <p>The proposed zoning (425 Omokoroa Road) is partially Medium Density, within the northwest part, and Rural Residential over the rest (shown in the submitter's full submission). It has been indicated by Council that the split zoning appears to be due to geotechnical constraints.</p> <p>There is a notable contour running through the area, and the zoning follows this. This runs through several properties but a close neighbour to the southwest (429A Omokoroa Rd) is included in the medium density (zone) in its entirety including higher and steeper areas. This contour would indicate that Medium Density would be problematic within this area. However, the submitter has a geotechnical report (attached to the full submission). The preliminary geotechnical investigations found no obvious indication of instability, and with appropriate geo-professional supervision, suitability for higher density residential development can be achieved. The appraisal is preliminary and further detailed geotechnical investigations would be required for development.</p> <p>The following provides a high-level civil servicing assessment of the (submitter's) proposed change in zoning.</p> <p>Earthworks and retaining walls will be required to form reasonably level building platforms. The costs associated aren't considered prohibitive to the development.</p> <p>Roading/access - Both a private right of way ("ROW") servicing up to six lots or a public road could feasibly be constructed at the site entrance.</p>	The rezoning of the entire site at 425 Omokoroa Road to Medium Density Residential.

								<p>Stormwater - There is existing stormwater infrastructure in Omokoroa Road immediately outside the site. Runoff from the predevelopment site drains to Omokoroa Road where it is collected in roadside sumps. It is feasible to manage stormwater onsite using detention storage such that offsite discharge is no greater than predevelopment rates. The Geotechnical Appraisal states that the site is not suitable for soakage due to the terrain of the site.</p> <p>Flooding - The site is outside of the 'Omokoroa Floodable Area' layer. Given the topography at the site, it is anticipated that overland flowpaths from the site can easily be designed and constructed such that no localised flooding will occur within the site.</p> <p>Wastewater - There is an existing manhole on Omokoroa Road approximately 75m northeast of the site. The invert level of the manhole is low enough that wastewater from the site could be reticulated to it by gravity, via a short extension.</p> <p>Potable Water Supply - The existing rider main will require an upgrade to a larger diameter. That upgrade work could be considered either as part of the structure plan infrastructure upgrade to Omokoroa Road, or as part of the development work of the various sites that could be developed to medium density</p> <p>Fire Fighting Water Supply - To meet the NZPAS:4509 FW2 requirement (residential dwellings with no sprinkler protection) and to service the potential lots to the south of the existing dwelling, a new fire hydrant would be required. The additional fire hydrant installation can be completed at the same time as the water supply upgrade work.</p> <p>Utilities - The site is currently serviced by power and telecom. There is an existing transformer and telecommunication cabinet immediately outside the site. It is therefore assumed that capacity could be provided to accommodate the structure plan changes, without required network upgrades being financially prohibitive.</p> <p>Planning - In general, Medium Density Development should only occur in locations that are suitable. The site would be within walking distance of "Potential Feature 6" (Park and Ride). The site would also be close to the town centre. There would also be areas of natural open space in the surrounding area. There is a housing shortage at a national level. Consideration should be given to the NPS-UD when forming an opinion on the merits of future development. Furthermore, to provide sufficient</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

								development capacity to meet the needs of people, communities, and future generations. The area is a highly sought-after area, and the development would be in keeping with the established and anticipated character of the area. It would be consistent with the type and density of development which would be anticipated upon other nearby Medium Density properties. Council should be making decisions that improve housing affordability. While the intention of the partial zoning of several properties may be to allow for a larger development that encompasses the entire area, development would be reliant on either a major land developer purchasing all properties, or a joint venture amongst several landowners. Rezoning the property, in its entirety, will enable a single entity to undertake residential development yielding approximately 10 or more dwellings.	
38	38.1	TDD Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support	We are the owners of 474 Omokoroa Road (being that land held in record of title 50A/596). Our land is affected by Plan Change 92 provisions. We support the rezoning of our land to residential under Plan Change 92. The reason for our submission is that the rezoning of our land to residential will assist in providing further land to create a well functioning urban environment at Omokoroa, and will assist with the intensification and housing requirements required under the National Policy Statement - Urban Development for Omokoroa.	We support the rezoning of our land to residential under Plan Change 92.
45	45.2	Ian Yule	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Oppose	<p>The proposal will lead to the destruction of a significant proportion of the highest quality land in the catchment area, as well as the destruction of a distinctive rural environment. At least one third of all class 2 and 3 land in the catchment area will be lost. This type of development also leads to further fragmentation of agricultural land. There are existing sustainable jobs and considerable income being generated by orchards that will be lost. Transport - I feel the council is being grossly irresponsible in its actions. Why would the council want to put the safety and well being of local inhabitants at risk by deliberately making traffic problems worse? Traffic is often subject to congestion. . Smart Growth Strategy philosophy being promoted but not followed. This is about stopping urban sprawl, creating efficient land use and transport patterns, creating attractive life work spaces with amenities, providing pedestrian access to amenities and promoting viable public transport options. It is likely there will still be a very high level of dependency on cars for transport. The proposal will have a significant negative impact on existing residents and facilities.</p> <p>The proposed medium density housing development will have a negative impact on existing residents through increase traffic and congestion, noise, as well as a major loss of habitat for the extensive bird life of the area. The orchards and extensive natural vegetation around the orchards are a natural habitat and hunting ground for many species of birds and it is</p>	The proposal should be rejected and further development should be considered in consultation with other areas such as Katikati, Te Puna and Tauranga. The local council need to demonstrate some leadership in engaging with the government in terms of working with them to reduce the transportation problems of the region. The BOP Regional Council need to look to work with others to overcome the issues of rising demand for housing. They need to look to develop smaller, local to industry and employment, compact communities close to existing urban areas. Councils should look to use infill on smaller sites around the district including Te Puna and into Tauranga itself. If further larger scale developments were to be considered then the area to the East of Tauranga, off the toll road between the junction of Domain, to the east of the Old Pacific highway coast towards Te Puke would seem to offer a more regionally significant opportunity.

								connected to the Waipapa river estuary. The proposal will mean the destruction of many mature trees with considerable amenity value. The proposed area is also crossed with small highly eroded streamlets, which act as natural wildlife corridors. These will also be put under more pressure, changes in drainage and hydrology leading to further loss of habitat and amenity as well as increasing the risk of further erosion.	
42	42.1	Brian Goldstone	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support	The addition of the land will provide for the efficient use of land for residential and stormwater purposes and will enable the delivery of further residential intensification in an area where there is high demand for residential housing. The site is able to be serviced and will contribute to a wellfunctioning urban environment.	That Lot 1 DPS 6707 (being 17.5758 hectares more or less at Prole road, Omokoroa) be zoned residential.
1	1.1	Richard Hewison	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support in part	<p>Lynley Park Omokoroa: There are still seven vacant allotments within Stage 2 (4), Stage 8B (2) and Stage 8C (1). Stage 7 will create 9 Allotments.</p> <p>Stormwater: Stage 2 has a stormwater pond. That pond has a fixed capacity and there is a limit to the volume of stormwater that can be held. There is a silt removal unit and there will be another silt removal unit installed within Stage 7. There is another storage pond at the end of Lynley Park Drive. There is a limit to the volume of stormwater that can be directed to the pond and the stormwater system will discharge excess water. There is a silt removal unit. Stormwater discharge increased due to an increase in site coverage with effects on the existing silt removal units and the associated stormwater ponds. If the new rules for intensified residential use are applied to those sections there will be an increase in the volume of rain that will be captured by the piped systems and thus the volume of water that will enter the ponds. The additional runoff will need to be handled and treated before reaching the Stormwater Pond.</p> <p>Wastewater is handled by pipes that are of a sufficient size to take a flow greater than what will actually exist. The pipes all lead to one or more waste water pumps. Whilst the pumps can be increased in size and thus handle additional wastewater the tanks are a different story. Once the design capacity is reached then any additional flow needs to be held somewhere. There is usually additional capacity available in the inlet pipes to the pump station and the nearby manholes along those lines but is provided to allow the pumps to be shut down for maintenance.</p> <p>Note: The submitter provides further details and locations of the stormwater and wastewater systems in their full submission.</p>	<p>Advise concerning what research was carried out and the decisions made.</p> <p>To me there does not appear to be any specific measures that need to be amended other than change the areas within Omokoroa that the new rules will apply to.</p> <p>Stormwater: Retention of the increased runoff from each Lot, to be retained temporarily within that Lot is an option that could become a part of the consent process. This could be an above ground water tank or tanks or one sited below the ground level with a pump to empty the tank once the piped system and in due course the pond or storage system is capable of taking the excess runoff.</p> <p>Wastewater: Retention of the increased discharge from each Lot, to be retained temporarily within that Lot, is an option that could become a part of the consent process. This would be an below ground level storage system or tank with a pump to empty the tank once the piped system and the associated pump units are in due course capable of taking the excess discharge.</p>
16	16.1	Penny Hicks	Planning	General	General	Zoning -	Support	Proposed zone on property at 4 Francis Road, Omokoroa which	Further discussion with council to clarify zoning and

			Maps			Medium Density (Omokoroa)	in part	includes two built heritage sites, listed as numbers 56 and 57 per appendix 3 of the District Plan and protected by the rules in section 7 (Historic heritage) is at odds with section 14A.2.2. Policies point 2 which states; "Apply the MDRS except in circumstances where the qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage etc.)" Per the current structure plan there is a *5 reference on the Francis Family homestead and noted in the key as reserve/historic house/remembrance garden. Appendix 10 – Omokoroa Gully Reserves concept plan (Boffa Miskell – July 2021) refers to a pocket park on the site of the Francis family homestead. The protection of the homestead and the top of the hill with 360-degree views has been discussed with council over a number of years.	the future use of this site.
4	4.4	Robert Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support in part	Re zoning of large tracts of the stage 3 area of Omokoroa is quite premature as development is likely to be 10-15 years or more away for much of the area (Francis Road in particular). The likely effect of the rezoning is that property values will rise significantly. As a result, landowners in these new zones may face large increases in rates yet their property use will not have changed. Plan Change 92 includes all of the Future Urban zoned areas of Stage 3 including the Francis Road area. Some of the zone changing may be overly restrictive for the orchards and farms operating in this area. The adoption of Plan Change 92 to include the Francis Road area may be premature.	Council should create a mechanism to maintain rates to current levels so long as properties are not developed for residential use. Review the decision to include Francis Road in Plan Change 92. Consider whether it should be included in another plan change in say 5 (or more) years time.
4	4.5	Robert Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support in part	The boundary lines of the Rural Residential / Medium density zones are to some degree arbitrary.	Council representatives to meet onsite with landowners (specifically of 50d and 42b Francis Rd) to agree on the most suitable lines.
62	62.2	Angela Yule	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Medium Density zone – Francis Road. The urbanization of one side of Francis Road has a number of matters which I would draw attention to: Impact on the environment. This will have an impact on wildlife, including nesting birds and insects. Diminution of areas of large trees and native shrubs found in rural residential properties. Loss of the distinctive character of the area. Once the properties transition to urban zones the green and peaceful environment is lost forever (Stats NZ article on impacts of demands on land in New Zealand linked to from this submitter's full submission).	That council consider a partial substitution of rural residential zoning for medium density sections. I have suggested these areas below (red hash) (map attached to this submitter's full submission). This would allow for better preservation of the integrity of the landscape.
32	32.1	New Zealand Housing Foundation	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning - Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Support	The applicable new Medium Density zoning and provision approach across the site (75 Kaylene Place, Lot 2 DP 557551) and Pip Way (Lot 1000 DP 531604) and wider Ōmokoroa is generally supported and will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The zoning and provisions are generally soundly based on evidence, or an appropriate cost benefit analysis as required by section 32 of the Act. The zoning aligns with the National Policy Statement: Urban Development and or the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and the NPS-UD.	The submitter supports the zoning approach to 75 Kayelene Place (Lot 2 DP 557551) and Pip Way (Lot 1000 DP 531604) and the wider Ōmokoroa area;

36	36.2	Susan Phinn	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Medium Density (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Residential zoning – We oppose this zoning proposal. Proposed residential lots to the areas shaded pink depicted to the north and east of the “constrained land” lying from reference numbers 5 through 10 through 14 through 9 through 14. I am opposed to the introduction of residential intensification with the destruction of the existing orchards and which include many beautiful large trees, including shelter belts – an oasis for birdlife, a contribution to carbon benefits, and a pleasing environment. I believe that it would be highly desirable to preserve the tranquil rural environment that attracted me to this very special area and to provide balance against the more intensive housing in the other proposed residential zones. The proximity of industrial activity alongside residential, and sharing the same road access would be a series of disasters waiting to happen. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.	Change this residential proposal to rural residential, and extend the same zoning to the east of Francis Road. For the latter we suggest constructing noise mitigating fencing along the east side of SH2, after allowing for the eventual development of SH2 to a 4 lane highway, providing a wide strip of mature tree planting to help with highway noise and to provide a pleasant backdrop to future rural residential sites. The proposed item 6, “Hilltop lookout” would then be far more appealing to both visitor and residents alike, viewing the peninsular over rural residential lots rather than the proposed sea of rooftops that would be the result of the more intensive residential zoning. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.
40	40.1	Vercoe Holdings Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Medium Density (Te Puke)	Support in part	The addition of the proposed commercial area as a commercial zone will provide for the efficient use of land for development purposes and will provide a mixed-use zone to enable the delivery of commercial activities and further residential intensification in an area where there is high demand for residential housing. The inclusion of this area as a commercial zone has been provide for in the transportation planning and infrastructure assessments undertaken by Vercoe Holdings as part of its subdivision. The site is well serviced, will create benefits including employment opportunities and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.	We support in part the proposed zoning layout as shown on the “Te Puke Plan Change 92 Zoning Map” and the “Te Puke Structure Plan” however we seek that with respect to 24 McLoughlin Drive, that the future area identified for commercial as part of our subdivision development, be rezoned commercial. This area is shown on the Zest Residential Development Masterplan (attached to this submitters full submission). The area of the proposed commercial zone is 12645m ² . The location and extent is shown on the Scheme Plan of Subdivision prepared as part of Vercoe Holdings resource consents (copies of the plans showing the commercial area are attached to this submitters full submission).
50	50.7	Mike and Sandra Smith	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Oppose	The rules associated with this zone are very stringent particularly to do with earthworks. The existing ponds (467B and E Omokoroa Road) that are outside of the covenanted area should not form part of the Natural Open Space Zone as they would then not be able to be developed easily for stormwater management.	Adjust the Natural Open Space Zone so not to impinge on the man-made farm ponds (467B and E Omokoroa Road).
25	25.2	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support	The Natural Open Space zone is supported as the most appropriate method to protect the extent of streams, wetlands and freshwater ecosystems for the purposes of this plan change and in the interim period until such time as full effect is given to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (2020) (NPS-FM).	Ensure that the Natural Open Space zone is applied to waterbodies and freshwater ecosystems that require management and protection under the NPSFM, including the consideration of including waterbodies at 51 Francis Road, 42 Francis Road and the gully system above and below the area for proposed stormwater wetland E1.
31	31.3	N and M Bruning	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open	Oppose	The addition of a Natural Open Space zone (new Section 24 of the District Plan) should only relate to land that is Council reserve	Delete the Open Space as shown on the Planning Maps and replace with the adjacent industrial zone; or

						Space (Omokoroa)		or has been designated under the RMA for reserve purposes. It is inappropriate to apply this zone to and over private land for a public purpose. In particular, it is inappropriate to apply this zone and its provisions to N & M Brunings land, because the land is currently zoned Future urban under the Operative District Plan and is farmland. It has no history of use or policy identification or designation as Natural or recreational open space/public reserve. A Natural Open Space zone conflicts with the existing NZTA designation (D181). Much of the land affected by this proposed zone has been identified as required for roading and State Highway purposes and not reserve or open space. Any land not needed to be taken for roading designation is expected to be offered back to the original landowner under the Public Works Act and developed for urban purposes. The adjacent industrial zone (or the residential zone sought to replace the rural-residential zone as set out in our submission above) is a more appropriate underlying zone for the land.	Delete the Open Space zone as shown on the Planning Maps and replace with the residential zone. (Note: Submission is in reference to submitter's land held in records of title 26D/746, 713/54, 65A272 and 10D/397)
FS 67 [31]	37 [31.3]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [N and M Bruning]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter because the Natural Open Space Zone is the most appropriate method to protect the extent of streams, wetlands and freshwater ecosystems for the purposes of this plan change and as required under the NPS-FM.	Ensure that the Natural Open Space Zone is applied to waterbodies including those within N&M Bruning's land. Waterbodies and freshwater ecosystems are required to be protected under the NPS-FM, per submission point 25.2.
FS 79 [31]	1 [31.3]	Waka Kotahi [N and M Bruning]					Support	The submitter notes that much of the land affected by the proposed Natural Open Space zone has been identified as required for roading and state highway purposes and not reserve or open space. Any land not needed to be taken for roading designation is expected to be offered back to the original landowner under the Public Works Act. Waka Kotahi considers that the Natural Open Space zone is designed for land that is generally unsuitable for urban development and has significant open space, natural character, ecological and cultural values. This underlying zoning is incompatible with the urban infrastructure of a grade-separated interchange and may hinder Waka Kotahi in its ability to construct the intersection.	Waka Kotahi seeks that the proposed Natural Open Space zoning within the footprint of designation D181 is removed. Retention of the existing Rural zoning is supported.
59	59.2	Jace Orchards Limited and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Oppose	The maps that apply to 69 Prole Road to not align with the existing landform or land cover. See attached map (attached to this submitter's full submission).	Revise maps as attached (attached to this submitter's full submission) or similar.
19	19.28	Pete Linde	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support in part	Amend extent of Natural Open Space Zone to that shown on Appendix 2 (attached to this submitter's full submission).	Amend extent of Natural Open Space Zone to that shown on Appendix 2 (attached to this submitter's full submission).
FS 67 [19]	38 [19.28]	Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Pete Linde]					Oppose	Oppose relief sought by the submitter. The submitter did not provide reasons for amending the Natural Open Space Zone in submission point 19.28. The Natural Open Space Zone is currently largely in private ownership but due to natural constrains has very limited development potential. Activities within the Zone	Reject submission point 19.28.

								should be compatible with the Zone’s values and attributes including the management of the stormwater network.	
58	58.29	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support in part	Support the location and extent of the Omokoroa Mixed Use Precinct as per the planning maps. Natural Open Space zone boundary may need slight amendment to align with planned contours and private/public realm.	Support with minor amendments to the Natural Open Space Zone boundary (see map attached to this submitter’s full submission).
61	61.4	Paul and Maria van Veen	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Landowner agreement on proposed land usage. Also regarding this plan (attached to this submitter’s full submission), we have identified areas where the green ‘natural open space’ areas appear to be drawn arbitrarily and will need agreement with current landowners to determine an agreed position.	Need agreement with current landowners to determine an agreed position.
16	16.5	Penny Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support in part	Per Appendix 6 – Omokoroa Structure Plan Urban Design Cultural Overlay (Section 32 Report), the preservation and protection of the gully systems and the Waipapa River corridor are important to Pirirakau being the remnants of culturally significant sites. Some of the gullies in stage 3 towards SH2 are not included in the natural open space zone. They had been included in prior structure plans. This may be due to uncertainty over the exact location of Waka Kotahi’s interchange for Takitimu North Link Stage 2 and the Francis Road extension to Omokoroa road, or they intended to be filled in to create more developable land.	Once the roading routes (Waka Kotahi interchange for Takitimu North Link Stage 2 and the Francis Road extension to Omokoroa Road) are finalised the remaining gullies in the area should get included in the natural open spaces zone and provide a link from Francis Road extension into the gully walkways.
58	58.7	Jace Investments and Kiwi Green New Zealand Limited	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support in part	The location of the Natural Open Space Zone for the gully areas adjacent to the town centre and mixed use precinct. However, the location of the zone doesn’t follow a consistent contour and includes part of the consented marketplace area, which was proposed to be a multifunctional space. Applying the Open Space zone creates limitations for future activities and also construction works (e.g earthworks). This will trigger consents and the baseline permitted effects for earthworks is 1m2 and 1m3, which is highly limiting.	Reposition the Natural Open Space zone boundary where the vegetation stops and or provide some more flexibility in the rules to allow earthworks. The earthworks model for the town centre development is being refined further but will present some plans at the hearing.
4	4.1	Robert Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Support in part	The ‘Natural open space’ boundaries as defined in ‘green’ on the district plan maps are drawn somewhat arbitrarily and are not always following logical lines such as contour. Council is seeking to balance maximum use of suitable contour land for residential use with natural outdoor spaces for recreational use. However in part the ‘Natural open space’ line is utilizing land that is flat or gently sloping and better suited to residential development. This is evident in part of the gully system at 42, 50a, 50d Francis Road but possibly elsewhere within the Stage 3 area also.	Council to meet directly with all current landowners who have ‘natural open space’ zones on their properties and agree on where the residential land should end and the natural open space should begin.
25	25.4	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)		There appears to be conflicts with the indicative locations of stormwater wetlands E1 and N1a and areas that potentially contain water bodies that benefit from protection and management under the NPS-FM. To resolve any conflict that may occur (at subdivision stage) between the sizing requirements of the proposed stormwater wetlands (as	The following relief is sought: Detailed mapping identifying wetlands, streams and freshwater ecosystems in close proximity to proposed stormwater wetlands, in particular, N1a and E1 be undertaken as part of the structure plan before

							identified in the Table 14.1 of the draft Catchment Management Plan) and any protected water body and Natural Open Space zone, further mapping is sought.	confirming the extent of the Natural Open Space zone and/or the proposed locations of the indicative wetlands shown on 'Ōmokoroa Structure Plan Infrastructure – Three Waters Infrastructure'; and Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.	
41	41.5	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Natural Open Space (Omokoroa)	Waka Kotahi designation D181, located in the southern part of the PC92 area, provides for an upgrade of the Ōmokoroa / SH2 intersection. PC92 introduces Natural Open Space zoning to much of this part of D181, replacing Rural zoning under the Operative District Plan. The Natural Open Space zone is designed for land that is generally unsuitable for urban development. This underlying zoning is incompatible with the urban infrastructure of a grade-separated interchange and may hinder Waka Kotahi in its ability to construct the intersection. Waka Kotahi considers, given the presence of D181 and the importance of the intersection upgrade for servicing the growth and development anticipated under PC92, it would be more appropriate to retain the Rural zone, which has a more 'neutral' policy setting.	Waka Kotahi seeks that the proposed Natural Open Space zoning within the footprint of designation D181 is removed. Retention of the existing Rural zoning is supported.	
8	8.1	Armadale Properties Limited	Planning Maps			Zoning – Rural (Te Puke)	Support in part	Landscape Road is approximately 3.64 hectares in area and is currently zoned rural. The site is surrounded by residential zoned properties to the south and adjoins small rural properties to the east and west. PC92 seeks to rezone selected greenfield areas in Te Puke to residential. While it is noted that the additional areas proposed to be rezoned are currently subject to the future urban overlay or were subject to a private plan change, it is considered that 22 Landscape Road should also be included. As shown in Figure 1 (attached to the submitter's full submission), the site is situated just outside the Te Puke Enabling Housing Supply Plan Change Area. Landscape Road was previously subject to a non-complying resource consent application for the creation of lifestyle allotments. Since then, with feedback received from Council's Policy Team for higher densities, a preliminary master-plan concept was prepared and is attached (to the submitter's full submission). Pre-application meetings have been held with Council where the concept plans were presented that showed typical low-density development around the perimeter of the site, and medium density duplex and terrace dwelling centred within the site. Following pre-application feedback and the recent government directive (per the MDRS), it is likely that this concept may change, and this greenfield site would be suited to well designed medium density development throughout. Providing housing supply at the site would utilise the existing transport networks in the Te Puke area and would not require any notable investment in transport infrastructure. In terms of transport infrastructure, the site is capable of being developed for residential use in the short term. Water and	The inclusion of 22 Landscape Road, Te Puke within the rezoning from rural to residential.

								wastewater mains are located within, or next to the site, and are readily accessible. Stormwater is able to be managed through soakage, or, through construction of stormwater infrastructure (such as on-site detention pond). Therefore, the development site is not constrained by three waters in the short term. Overall, it is considered the site is a logical extension to the existing Residential Zone and is well suited for the MDRS. Additionally, it will support the ongoing growth of Te Puke, thus meeting the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD.	
27	27.2	David and Diana Bagley	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Rural-Residential (Omokoroa)	Oppose	Residential zoning – We oppose this zoning proposal. Proposed residential lots to the areas shaded pink depicted to the north and east of the “constrained land” lying from reference numbers 5 through 10 through 14 through 9 through 14. We are opposed to the introduction of residential intensification of these orchards with their many large trees, including shelter belts – an oasis for birdlife, a contribution to carbon benefits, and a pleasing environment. We believe that it would be highly desirable to preserve the quasi rural environment that attracted us to this locality and to provide balance against the more intensive housing in the other proposed residential zones. The proximity of industrial activity alongside residential, and sharing the same road access would be a series of disasters waiting to happen in our opinion. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.	Change this residential proposal to rural residential, and extend the same zoning to the east of Francis Road. For the latter we suggest constructing noise mitigating fencing along the east side of SH2, after allowing for the eventual development of SH2 to a 4 – lane highway, then say a 15m strip with mature tree planting to help with highway noise and to provide a pleasant backdrop to future rural residential sites. The proposed item 6, “Hilltop lookout” would be far more attractive to view the peninsular over rural residential lots than a sea of rooftops resulting from the more intensive residential zoning. Note: The submitter is referring to a map entitled “Omokoroa Structure Plan Option Two” by RPS (Consultant) that was used for public consultation in 2018 and not proposed as part of Plan Change 92.
31	31.2	N and M Bruning	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Rural-Residential (Omokoroa)	Oppose	A rural residential zone within an urban area is an inappropriate zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The zone is not an urban zone. • The zone will not assist the Council with meeting expected demand for housing and development capacity in the short term, medium term or long term. • The zone does not achieve the benefits of urban development that are consistent with a well-functioning urban environment. • The zone will not contribute to meeting the requirements of the NPS-UD and will reduce development capacity, and housing yield that is anticipated to be provided in the urban area. • Significant funding has been provided for the development of infrastructure at Omokoroa by the Government and development capacity must obtain maximum benefits from this investment. 	Amend Planning Maps and Structure Plan to delete rural residential zone within the Structure Plan area and replace with residential zone. <i>(Note: Submission is in reference to submitters property land held in records of title 26D/746, 713/54, 65A272 and 10D/397)</i>
FS 79 [31]	3 [31.2]	Waka Kotahi [N and M Bruning]					Oppose in part	The submitter seeks removal of the Rural Residential zone within the Omokoroa Structure plan area, and that it be replacement by a Residential zone. This would result in the Residential zone extending to the boundary of Waka Kotahi designation D181, potentially leading to more significant reverse sensitivity noise	To ensure that noise reverse sensitivity effects are avoided, an area of influence may be necessary within which noise-sensitive activities require resource consent unless compliance with standard internal noise thresholds is demonstrated.

								effects than those associated with the Rural Residential zone.	
4	4.6	Robert Hicks	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Rural-Residential (Omokoroa)	Support in part	The boundary lines of the Rural Residential / Medium density zones are to some degree arbitrary.	Council representatives to meet onsite with landowners (specifically of 50d and 42b Francis Rd) to agree on the most suitable lines.
41	41.6	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Planning Maps	General	General	Zoning – Rural-Residential (Omokoroa)		PC92 creates a new Rural Residential zone adjacent to existing Waka Kotahi designation D181. Reverse sensitivity effects associated with traffic noise from the state highway is a well-known adverse effect that requires management. To protect human health and highway operation, Waka Kotahi implements best practice methods to minimise noise impacts in line with the requirements of relevant New Zealand Noise Standards (NZS6808) and any applicable designation conditions. However, noise impacts are best avoided by preventing new dwellings from being built in close proximity to an existing or designated state highway through the provision of areas of influence, unless appropriate internal noise standards are met.	To ensure that noise reverse sensitivity effects are avoided, an area of influence may be necessary, within which noise sensitive activities require resource consent unless compliance with standard internal noise thresholds is demonstrated. We would like to discuss this further with Council.
FS 71 [41]	15 [41.6]	KiwiRail [Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency]					Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of appropriate controls to manage reverse sensitivity effects on significant infrastructure, including provisions whereby noise-sensitive activities will require resource consent unless compliance with prescribed internal noise thresholds is demonstrated (such as, the noise and vibration controls as sought by KiwiRail for developments in proximity to the railway corridor). KiwiRail considers that the amendments sought by Waka Kotahi are necessary to manage the interface between urban development and significant infrastructure, mitigate and avoid reverse sensitivity effects, as well as provide for an adequate level of health and amenity for residents.	Accept submission.

Other – Not Specified

Submitter Ref. No	Sub Point No.	Submitter Ref. No	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Issue	Oppose/ Support	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary
16	16.4	Penny Hicks	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Consultation	Oppose	In the past residents of stage 3 Omokoroa have received flyers or letters from council with invitations to open days for presentations, discussions and seeking feedback around structure plan changes, smartgrowth and Omokoroa planning. Affected residents in stage 3 have been invited along to meet with council before the general public to get updates. We didn't receive any notifications of Plan change 92 from the council, hence a lot of residents have only found about the zoning changes recently by word of mouth. Council advise they notified plan change 92 by public notice which is their legal requirement and by media releases. In this day and age how many people look at public notices? Media releases focused on the medium density residential changes to the existing urban area of Omokoroa. Even the headlines on WBOPDC's your district update emailed on 18th August advising of the new MDRS rules state they apply to the existing residential areas across Omokoroa and Te Puke. There was no mention of zoning changes for stage 3.	The council extends the deadline for submissions or accepts new submissions in the October round.
4	4.12	Robert Hicks	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Consultation	Oppose	Plan Change 92 (in regard to the Stage 3 areas) has been poorly communicated (notified) to the public by Council. Nearly 20 years of consultation has occurred with regular mail outs and open days to affected parties over the years. At the final hurdle when the Plan is about to be enacted the communication has been a bare minimum and many residents have been left in the dark. Seeking information from Council's website has not been very straightforward and difficult to locate the actual changes to the plan.	Conduct a mail out to all affected residents in Stage 3 clearly stating that rezoning of their properties will occur once Plan Change 92 is adopted. Give a direct link to all residents of Stage 3 of all relevant parts of website so that they can be properly informed and make informed submissions. Extend deadline for submissions on Plan Change 92 to (say) Sept 30th 2022
65	65.1	Russell Prout	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Consultation	Oppose	I only found out about these proposed changes via fellow street resident who only became aware of them when a random stranger knocked on her door asking if he could purchase some land. As a resident I feel any proposals of this significance should be preceded by a personal contact process. This has not been the case.	I would like the opportunity to have a minuted discussion with those who represent the decision makers so that all concerns are factored into this and similar proposals. In short I strongly object to any industrial development in or on Francis road and request these be ceased.
29	29.6	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Other - Not Specified	General	General	High Density Section/Zone	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the extent of MDRZ in Te Puke given that WBOPDC intends to undertake a wider Te Puke District Plan review through a subsequent plan change / District Plan review. However, Kāinga Ora is concerned around the potential reduction in capacity as a result of the proposed natural hazard overlays (discussed elsewhere in this submission). Kāinga Ora is also aware of supporting a compact urban form model which supports higher density walkable catchments and reduces the need to encroach on	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rezone parts of Te Puke 'high density residential' typically within a 400m walking catchment of the town centre as per the proposed area set out in Appendix 3 (attached to this submitter's full submission) of this submission. 2. Accept and include a new High Density Residential

								the surrounding productive land to enable urban development. With the above in mind, Kāinga Ora seeks that appropriate parts of Te Puke be zoned 'high density residential.' The proposed area is included in Appendix 3 (attached to this submitter's full submission) and is based on a 400m walkable catchment around the town centre. Proposed HDR Zone provisions have been included in this submission in Appendix 2 (attached to this submitter's full submission). Locating higher density residential in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora in both Western Bay and Tauranga City and is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Zone in the WBOPDP for Te Puke. 3. Consequential amendments will be required to the rest of the WBOPDP in response to this submission point.
29	29.5	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Other - Not Specified	General	General	High Density Section/Zone	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the areas identified for rezoning in Ōmokoroa including additional intensification provisions for Ōmokoroa Stage 3. Kāinga Ora seeks to rezone the Ōmokoroa Stage 3C area to a new 'High Density Residential Zone' (HDRZ) instead of forming part of Section 14A. The rules of Section 14A relate to the provision of medium density residential living. However, Kāinga Ora notes the provision for high density residential is already acknowledged and provided for in Section 14A such as within the explanatory statement, proposed objective 14A.2.1.5, the increased height provisions in PC92 for Stage 3C (up to 20m as per proposed rule 14A.4.1.b.ii.a) and higher minimum yield rules (as per proposed rule 14A.4.2.a). Accordingly, Kāinga Ora seek a separate section (i.e., 14B) of the WBOPDP with specific set of provisions specifically for high density residential development. Proposed HDRZ provisions have been included in this submission in Appendix 2 (attached to this submitter's full submission). Kāinga Ora seeks to apply these to both Te Puke (see submission point 2) and Ōmokoroa Stage 3C for consistency in applying HDRZ rules throughout the District.	1. Accept and include a new High Density Residential Zone in the WBOPDP. 2. Adopt the proposed provisions of the new High Density Residential Zone into the WBOPDP and PC92 as set out in Appendix 2 (attached to this submitter's full submission) of this submission. 3. Rename Ōmokoroa Stage 3C area to a new 'High Density Residential Zone' (HDRZ) instead of forming part of Section 14A and retain spatial extent. 4. Consequential amendments will be required to the rest of the WBOPDP in response to this submission point.
FS 71 [29]	9 [29.5]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	<p>KiwiRail generally supports intensification and development of well-functioning urban environments, including around transport nodes. However, KiwiRail considers that to provide for high health and amenity values, as well as well-functioning urban environments, the interface between effects emitting significant infrastructure (such as the railway corridor) and urban development needs to be appropriately managed, including through the imposition of setbacks and noise and vibration controls as sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.</p> <p>To the extent that a new High Density Residential Zone is included in the District Plan in and around the railway corridor, it is necessary to ensure that appropriate controls are in place to manage adverse safety, health and amenity effects and reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Without the imposition of appropriate controls to manage adverse effects of infrastructure on residents and reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure providers, KiwiRail considers this will enable poor planning outcomes inconsistent with those sought in the NPS-UD or the District Plan and will result in long-term adverse health and amenity effects on future residents.</p>	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.

41	41.2	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Other - Not Specified	General	General	High Density Section/Zone	Oppose	<p>Waka Kotahi considers that high-density residential zones within walkable catchments surrounding the town centres of Ōmokoroa and Te Puke will be required to give effect to the intent of the NPS-UD. Such provision would need to be based on an accessibility study of these areas.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the NPS-UD sets out various requirements in respect of providing for increased densities and heights in the Central City, Metropolitan Centre Zones, and walkable catchments from existing and planned rapid transit stops, the edge of City Centre Zones and the edge of Metropolitan Centre Zones. It also directs councils to amend other residential zones to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in those zones.</p> <p>Council has not proposed high-density walkable catchments surrounding the town centres of Te Puke and Ōmokoroa. Waka Kotahi considers that the scale and typology of these centres, their projected population levels, and the existence of active mode infrastructure would support the application of higher density residential zones within walkable catchments surrounding these centres. The extent of the catchment and density therein would need to be determined with the support of an accessibility study. Contingent on the support of such a study, this would include an up-zoning within the walking catchment (likely 400m of the edge of the town centre zone). The catchment should be measured along pedestrian infrastructure rather than “as the crow flies”. This would enable the realisation of benefits associated with high densities, including access to services, employment, and recreation. A large, concentrated base population will also support existing and future public and active transport mode initiatives, which will also assist in reducing emissions and vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) and contribute to achieving Transport Target 1 of the NZ Emissions Reduction Plan.</p>	An accessibility study to assess/determine the extent of the walkable catchments surrounding the town centres of Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. If supported by the accessibility assessment, Waka Kotahi seeks that PC92 incorporates high-density residential zones within the walkable catchments surrounding these centres including, for example, within 400m of the edge of the town centre zones.
FS 70 [41]	24 [41.2]	Kāinga Ora [Waka Kotahi]					Support	Kāinga Ora supports submission point 41.2 as the relief sought is generally consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission point 29.5.	Allow
21	21.1	Joshua Marshall	Other - Not Specified	General	General	NPS-UD	Oppose	The s 32 report states: “Urban environments are defined as areas having a population greater than 5,000 at the 2018 Census or are planned to grow to greater than 10,000 people.” While this is an understandable mistake, this does not accord with the legal definition of urban environment in the NPS-UD. Urban Environment is defined as any area of land (regardless of size, and irrespective of local authority or statistical boundaries) that is, or is intended to be, predominantly urban in character; and is, or is intended to be, part of a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people. Note that (contrary to the ordinary meaning of the expression and the way the s 32 report writers have interpreted it) a settlement may be an	Investigate the compliance of the zoning in urban environments other than Ōmokoroa and Te Puke (as defined in the NPS-UD) for compliance with the policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Where the zoning is not in accordance with policy 3 in those settlements (that is, where building heights and densities of urban form are not commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in or adjacent to those settlements) amend the zoning accordingly.

								<p>urban environment even if the settlement is less than 10,000 people. If a settlement is “predominantly urban in character” and is or intended to be part of a housing and labour market of more than 10,000 (e.g. Tauranga) then even a small village will be an urban environment. In contrast, the definition of “relevant residential zone” is limited to settlements of at least 5,000 at the 2018 census (s 2). Only relevant residential zones are required to incorporate the MDRS (s 77G(1)). However, policy 3 is required to be implemented in every residential and urban non-residential zone in every urban environment whether it is a relevant residential zone or not (ss 77G(2) and 77N(2)). This must be done using an IPI and the ISPP (ss 77G(3) and 77N(1)). Since the Council may only ever use the IPI once, that must be done as part of this IPI. Although Ōmokoroa and Te Puke may be the only “relevant residential zones” in the District (and thus the only towns where the MDRS is required to be implemented), the IPI is still required to reconcile policy 3 of the NPS-UD across all other urban environments (such as those close to Tauranga). In particular, this means areas “within or adjacent” to neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones and town centre zones must be amended to have “building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services”. This exercise has not been done. This exercise is mandatory, not discretionary, and must be done for this IPI to be legally compliant. This exercise should have been done by the Council before notifying the IPI. I submit that the hearings panel is legally required to see that this exercise is undertaken before it makes its recommendations on the IPI.</p>	
29	29.2	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Other - Not Specified	General	General	NPS-UD	Oppose	<p>It is unclear to Kāinga Ora to whether WBOPDC have reassessed the housing capacity (previously undertaken in 2021)² as part of PC92. Kāinga Ora considers a reassessment should happen. The purpose of such a reassessment would be to consider the impact that the proposed qualifying matters and extent of MDRZ zoning identified by the Council has on housing capacity and whether the proposing rezoning as sought and notified by the Council still achieves the required short, medium and long term capacity in accordance with provision 3.2 of the NPS-UD. To that end, Kāinga Ora seek clarity from WBOPDC on this matter and if any reassessment has not happened, then Kāinga Ora seeks that this housing capacity assessment is undertaken with the proposed or preferred set of provisions the Council seeks to implement in the Western Bay of Plenty District.</p>	<p>Seek clarity from WBOPDC on this matter and if any reassessment has not happened, then Kāinga Ora seeks that this housing capacity assessment is undertaken with the proposed or preferred set of provisions the Council seeks to implement in the Western Bay of Plenty District.</p>
25	25.23	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape	Support in part	<p>ONFLs are identified as a qualifying matter (see s(77)(i)(b)). To ensure the plan change addresses the potential for effects on coastal ONFLs and is consistent with New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010) (NZCPS). In particular, the following NZCPS policies are particularly relevant Policy 4(c), Policy 6.1 (b), (c), (f), (h), (i), (j), Policy 7.1 (b), Policy 13 and Policy 15. The NZCPS policies have been cascaded to the RCEP Objective and Policies NH5, NH6. The outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes are identified on the RCEP maps and summary information on why</p>	<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>(i) A further landscape analysis be undertaken to understand the effects of the plan change on ONFL 3 (Te Awanui Tauranga Harbour, Waimapu Estuary & Welcome Bay) to determine whether a planning response may be required on land within the coastal environment (as identified in the RPS) that is subject to the Medium Density Residential</p>

								each area is identified is included in Schedule 3. The ONFL matter has also been raised as part of Tauranga City Council's (TCC) Plan Change 33. It is necessary to provide a consistent approach across the region, and for issues that apply across territorial authority boundaries. (s75(2)(f) RMA).	Standards; and (ii) Any additional relief to execute the outcomes of the landscape analysis by way of additional planning provisions to ensure integration of provisions crossboundary with TCC where appropriate. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.
16	16.3	Penny Hicks	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Rates	Oppose	It is unlikely the Francis Road area of stage 3, Omokoroa will develop until the Francis Road extension through to Omokoroa road is completed by Waka Kotahi. Feedback from Waka Kotahi is this will not happen within the next ten years. As the temporary roundabout at Omokoroa intersection has now been given the go ahead, it's likely the need for the interchange and re-routing of Francis Road may end up being delayed even further. I question the need to change our zoning from future urban to medium density, industrial etc. at this point. There are a number of highly productive kiwifruit (conventional and organic) and avocado orchards on very productive soils in the area, producing food, employment opportunities and contributing to GDP. What will be the impact on rates given the land use hasn't changed, but land values will significantly increase?	Delay zoning changes in the Francis Road of stage 3 or look at rate relief or specific rate.
25	25.29	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Related Document– Stormwater Management Guidelines	Support in part	The proposed Te Puke Stormwater Management Guidelines are brief and do not adequately cover the need to reduce runoff to 80% of the predevelopment runoff to account for the effects of volume increase on downstream flood protection assets or other relevant consideration in the comprehensive stormwater consent for Te Puke (ref: 67481). There is an error in one of the bullet points with regard to impermeable surfaces.	Update to ensure that the relevant provisions of the comprehensive stormwater consent for Te Puke (ref: 67481) are included in the guidelines with specific mention of ensuring attenuation achieves 80% of predevelopment run-off. Change "impermeable pavement will also be encouraged" to "permeable pavement will also be encouraged". Amend to encourage the use of stormwater wetlands over ponds.
25	25.30	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Related Document– Stormwater Management Guidelines	Support in part	It is not clear why there would be an increase in water levels i.e. climate change or, as a result of the plan change, or otherwise.	Seek clarification as to the reason why there would be an increase in water levels i.e. climate change or, as a result of the plan change, or otherwise. If the reason is as a result of the plan change then provide provisions or methods to address that adverse effect.
25	25.24	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Related Documents - Residential Design Outcomes	Support in part	Water sensitive design should be considered in an integrated manner. This reflects accepted good practices which has been increasingly incorporated in catchment management plans and district plan documents.	Update the Residential Design Outcomes document to refer to water sensitive design principles in the areas covered by the plan change.

18	18.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Other - Not Specified			Related Documents - Residential Design Outcomes	Support	Fire and Emergency generally support the proposed Residential Design Outcomes that recognise high quality urban design principles and provides direction on how to achieve these through good design. To aid delivery of high quality outcomes, Fire and Emergency request that Appendix 8 be updated to reflect best practice as sought throughout its submission, particularly as it relates to providing adequate emergency access to achieve quality residential developments.	Amend subject to amendments sought throughout Fire and Emergency's submission.
FS 76 [18]	46 [18.30]	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	The RVA opposes the specific relief regarding Residential Design Outcomes sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
FS 77 [18]	46 [18.30]	Ryman Healthcare Limited [Fire and Emergency New Zealand]					Oppose	Ryman opposes the specific relief regarding Residential Design Outcomes sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow the submission.
2	2.3	Lesley Blincoe	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Related Documents - Residential Design Outcomes	Oppose	The Residential Design Outcome information show designed homes, flat sites, flat paths, green areas, and beautiful landscaping with trees on roads and parking bays, which is all good in a new development. This is not the case in the road where we live - Harbour View Road. It is a steep road - we have old overhead power lines, cracked and sloping footpaths, old sewer lines, disused and infilled septic tanks in gardens. If council allows it (the Plan Change) to go ahead, are we then going to get all the lovely landscaping, underground power lines and beautiful new foot paths and parking bays as per your beautifully put together Residential Design Outcomes information?	That council undertakes to give us new footpaths, beautifully landscaped streets, underground power lines & parking bays as per the Residential Design Outcomes if they allow Plan Change 92 to go ahead in the older residential streets of Omokoroa.
46	46.1	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Support for Another Submission - Retirement Villages		Summerset is one of New Zealand's leading and fastest growing retirement village operators, with more than 6,600 residents living in our village communities. We offer a range of independent living options and care, meaning that as our residents' needs change, we have support and options within the village. Summerset welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the Council on its housing intensification plan change to respond to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Summerset wishes to express its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety.	That Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change.
35	35.1	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Support of Another Submission -	Support	Ryman adopts the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated's (RVA) submission on PC92. In addition, Ryman wishes to emphasise that PC92 will have a significant impact on the	Ryman seeks the relief sought by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated

						Retirement Villages		provision of housing and care for the Western Bay of Plenty's growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.	(RVA) in its submission on PC92.
39	39.1	Urban Taskforce for Tauranga	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Whole of Plan Change	Support in part	UTF advocates for connected thinking, connected planning, connected governments and strong leadership. UTF's submission is primarily focused on ensuring that Plan Change 92 is consistent with the Objectives, policies and requirements of the NPSUD and that Plan Change 92 will be effective in achieving the intended outcomes required by the NPS-UD. UTF consider that changes to the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan to provide for medium density residential development should be based on sound planning policy which will rectify the currently housing capacity shortage, whilst also avoiding unnecessary and inefficient process and uncertainty. UTF's view is that incorporating clear, certain and efficient Plan provisions is a fundamental part of the sustainable and efficient growth of the District, and in giving effect to the NPSUD. Plan Change 92 is required to be responsive and to enable development that adds significantly to capacity and contributes to a well-functioning urban environment. UTFs view is that further enabling and certain amendments are required to Plan Change 92 to achieve this. In particular more enabling provisions beyond those for permitted development under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) are required. Suggested amendments and changes to provisions are required to better provide for housing needs, to avoid uncertainty, unnecessary processes, costs, and delays. Provisions have been incorporated in PC 92 which are more restrictive than those in the current District Plan, and which may work to restrict housing yield and therefore capacity. These provisions should be removed.	The decision UTF seeks from the Council is that Plan Change 92 be approved with: (a) amendments to address UTFs submission. (b) such further other relief or other consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out in the attached table (in the submitter's full submission).
34	34.1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Whole of Plan Change	Support in part	New Zealand, including Western Bay of Plenty, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care at crisis point. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD). PC92 needs to adequately address the critical need for retirement accommodation and aged care in the District. It must also provide a clear and consistent regime for retirement villages. It is also important that potential effects from retirement villages are managed proportionately and efficiently with the least regulation and prescription necessary. The RVA is also seeking national consistency in the planning regimes for retirement villages through the intensification planning instruments required under the	The RVA seeks: Amendments to Plan Change 92 as set out in paragraphs 112-141 of their submission (this point (1) in this summary of submissions). Without limiting the generality of the above, the specific relief set out in Appendix 1 of their submission (points 2-52 in this summary of submissions). Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.

Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Enabling Housing Act).

The RVA is a voluntary industry organisation that represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of registered retirement villages. Today, the RVA has 407 member villages with approximately 38,520 units that are home to around 50,000 older New Zealanders. The demand for quality living options is significantly higher than the current supply. The supply is decreasing due to closures of older style small and poor quality aged care homes, which are usually conversions of old houses. A key barrier to meeting the increasing demand is the significant delay between the consenting and construction stages of developments. Even if the resource consent process goes smoothly, the development of a retirement village is around a 10 year project for most new villages.

Many of New Zealand's older residents are currently living in unsuitable accommodation which in this context can mean a couple or a single person living in a large house that is expensive and difficult to maintain and heat properly, has barriers to mobility such as stairs, or is built on a hill, or has a garden that they cannot maintain. In this context, it is important to note that retirement villages have a very different new-build pattern than the rest of the country's new-build housing stock. Retirement village industry is building units that match the needs of smaller households, with approximately 90% of retirement village units providing one or two bedrooms. Retirement units are also accessible for those with mobility restrictions, are modern, warm and comfortable, and responsibility for their upkeep and maintenance falls on the village operator rather than the resident. Mental wellbeing issues are also growing, including isolation, loneliness, and related depression due to many older people living alone and being separated from family and friends due to their mobility. Retirement villages are an important way to fight social isolation and loneliness.

In Western Bay of Plenty, there are currently 4 existing villages (one of which is expanding) that are home to around 646 residents. 6 villages are also in development. A number of additional villages will nevertheless be needed in the District. Retirement villages also cater to a wide range of residents offering a range of housing options and care to meet the specific needs of the residents. These distinguish retirement village operators from typical residential developers. Retirement villages also help to ease demand on the residential housing market and assist with the housing supply shortage in New Zealand.

WHAT PC92 MUST DELIVER FOR RETIREMENT VILLAGES

PC92 represents a major opportunity to better enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options. In fact, Council must take this step in order to give effect to the NPSUD

							<p>through PC92. The NPSUD specifically recognises that well-functioning urban environments enable all people and communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety (Objective 1). In order to meet the Enabling Housing Act, NPSUD, PC92 must ensure that the District Plan specifically and appropriately provides for and enables retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones. The RVA considers this outcome can only be achieved by providing for a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework.</p> <p>A key issue with many existing district plans is their failure to explicitly recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity. Retirement villages are clearly a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. A key consenting challenge faced by the RVA members is an expectation from council officers that the internal amenity controls used for traditional housing typologies (e.g. outlook, sunlight, privacy, outdoor living spaces, landscaping and the like) are appropriate for retirement villages. This approach fails to recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages (discussed above). For example, residents have access to a wide range of communal spaces so their amenity is provided by the village as a whole rather than an individual space.</p> <p>The RVA's members have faced significant cost and delay in consenting retirement villages in residential zones. Often, the process requirements are significantly out of proportion with the adverse effects of the activity, and do not recognise its substantial benefits. An example of this issue is excessive and extraneous information requests. Over time, the amount of information that is required to support an application for consent has substantially increased. It is therefore important that matters of discretion for decision-making are clear and focused on the aspects that matter. Provide appropriately focused notification rules</p> <p>Notification is a significant cause of the cost and delay of consenting processes. RMA processes currently provide multiple opportunities for opposition, which is the reason for significant delays in processing consents, and does not ensure good outcomes. Applications for residential activities that are anticipated in residential zones (i.e. through restricted discretionary activity status) should not be publicly notified. Limited notification should remain available as it provides for neighbours to participate when they are likely to be impacted by a next-door development.</p> <p>The Enabling Housing Act will result in a level of standardisation that will set expectations for the scale of development across the country. With some amendments to reflect the specific nature of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

								<p>retirement villages, the RVA considers the standards also set a relevant baseline for identifying standards relevant for the construction of retirement villages. Furthermore, it is important PC92 does not inadvertently make retirement village developments more difficult to consent, construct and use than standard residential development.</p> <p>The RVA's members generally seek to locate their villages in established, good quality residential areas, as these locations are most suited for residents to 'age in place'. However, due to the lack of suitable sites, the RVA's members also operate retirement villages in some commercial and mixed use zones where there is good access to services and amenities. It is important to note that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and also requires councils to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones.</p>	
29	29.1	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Whole of Plan Change	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the structure, alignment and integration of PC92 with the WBOPDP in particular to address:</p> <p>a. Structural issues / concerns with PC92 which lead to a continuing inconsistency of the WBOPDP framework with the National Planning Standards;</p> <p>b. The existence of two medium density residential zones ("MDRZ");</p> <p>c. The incorrect application of the issues, objectives and policies of the existing Section 14 Residential provisions of the WBOPDP to the newly proposed Section 14A provisions of PC92 in which Kāinga Ora considers to be inappropriate and not suitable for the proposed new zones; and</p> <p>d. Use of the non-complying and discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the structure plan, which should be amended to be a restricted discretionary activity with targeted matters for discretion (relating to specific outcomes sought by the structure plan).</p>	Seek amendments to the structure, alignment and integration of PC92 with the WBOPDP that will address the concerns and issues raised in the [reasons for submission] column.
FS 71 [29]	3 [29.1]	KiwiRail [Kāinga Ora]					Support in part	<p>KiwiRail supports the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora, to the extent that any amendments made clarify the application of the District Plan's objectives, policies, and rules, and ensures the provisions are consistent with the National Planning Standards. However, KiwiRail is concerned to ensure that any amendments made are compatible with the provisions sought in KiwiRail's primary submission, including ensuring that any building setbacks and noise and vibration controls continue to apply in relevant zones adjoining the rail corridor.</p>	Accept submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.
56	56.1	Ōmokoroa Country Club Ltd	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Whole of Plan Change	Support in part	<p>OCC is a provider of retirement villages / aged care accommodation. The aged sector of the population is growing, and there is lack of provision of retirement living options for the ageing population. The government has recognised that the ageing</p>	<p>1. Changes which will deliver amenity on sites which are to be comprehensively developed;</p> <p>2. The financial contributions being amended so</p>

								<p>population is one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (released in September 2021). OCC’s interest is to ensure that Plan Change 92 appropriately caters for retirement villages and to improve upon enabling quality environment amenity through the discretion in landscape and built form design. This includes a financial contributions regime which is clear and transparent, and proportionate to the demands which such developments place on Council infrastructure.</p> <p>OCC supports the plan change in principle, subject to the changes sought. OCC considers that these changes are required for a number of reasons, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To give effect to the NPS on Urban Development, including well-functioning urban environments enable all people and communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety (Objective 1), and to enable a variety of homes to meet the needs of different households (Policy 1). 2. That the delivery of quality outcomes for the aged sector is best achieved by making specific provision for retirement developments (rather than treating them in the same way as residential development). 	<p>that the financial contributions levied on retirement villages and rest homes reflect their lower occupancy and lower demand on infrastructure;</p> <p>3. Provision being made for retirement developments to deliver lower density.</p> <p>OCC seeks such changes to the Plan Change 92 as are required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission, including where necessary, consequential relief.</p>
41	41.1	Waka Kotahi The New Zealand Transport Agency	Other - Not Specified	General	General	Whole of Plan Change	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi is supportive of PC92 in principle. However, it considers that in its current form, PC92 has the potential to have adverse transport effects (safety and efficiency) on the existing and future state highway network. The traffic generated by future development within Ōmokoroa facilitated by PC92 is likely to be extensive and have noteworthy effects of the safety and efficiency of SH2 between Ōmokoroa and Te Puna. In many locations, SH2 in this area is already facing capacity and safety challenges. However, no assessment has been completed of the potential traffic effects of PC92 on the transport network. Waka Kotahi considers that a comprehensive Integrated Transport Assessment should be completed to support PC92.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the intent and content of the NPS-UD. The NPS-UD has a strong focus on ensuring that increased densities are provided in the most accessible parts of urban areas, where communities are able to access jobs, services and recreation by active and public transport modes. Waka Kotahi also supports the requirements of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. It seeks the full implementation of these requirements, including the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) and related provisions in</p>	<p>Waka Kotahi seeks amendments to PC92 and additional information as necessary to ensure the transportation effects (safety and efficiency) of PC92 on the existing and future planned state highway network have been properly considered and will be adequately managed. Specific amendments and information are listed below. We are keen to meet with Council to discuss the detail further.</p> <p>A comprehensive Integrated Transport Assessment, including: Details of the trip generation associated with the PC92 area, the mode share assumed, and the modelled distribution for the AM, IP and PM peak periods. Specifically, the distribution of these trips onto SH2 needs to be known to understand the impacts on Waka Kotahi.</p> <p>Evidence of the assessment of effects on SH2, including at the Ōmokoroa Road intersection with SH2. We also request evidence of consideration of the effects on other intersections on SH2 that may be impacted as a result of the additional trips</p>

							<p>eligible zones.</p> <p>The Waka Kotahi view on specific topics is set out below.</p> <p>SH2 between Ōmokoroa and Tauranga It is anticipated that a noteworthy proportion of future residents within Ōmokoroa will commute east of the peninsula via SH2 towards Tauranga. Additional traffic through SH2 at the Ōmokoroa Road intersection and along SH2 to the north or south has the potential to increase the safety risks on SH2. The Waka Kotahi Crash Analysis System (CAS) documents the history of police-reported crashes and shows a concerning safety record along this corridor.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi considers that traffic safety and efficiency effects of PC92 on the SH2 corridor should be assessed and addressed through an Integrated Transport Assessment. As noted, Takitimu North Link Stage One (Tauranga to Te Puna) is under construction and will deliver significant safety and efficiency improvements to this section of the network in the near-term. However, Takitimu North Link Stage Two (Te Puna to Ōmokoroa) is currently not funded for construction. Other relevant projects underway include SH2 Waihi to Ōmokoroa, SH2 Katikati to Tauranga and Mangatarata to Katikati.</p>	<p>enabled by PC92.</p> <p>Additional information in relation to the current public transport routes serving Ōmokoroa and Katikati and identify any potential for public transport priority changes on SH2 or at the Ōmokoroa intersection to serve PC92.</p> <p>Confirmation that all site access will be via the local roads in Ōmokoroa and not located in a way that will impact the SH2 / Ōmokoroa Road intersection.</p> <p>An assessment, based on SIDRA modelling, of how much development can be safely and efficiently accommodated by the interim roundabout at the intersection of SH2 and Ōmokoroa Road.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---