

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
2	Lin, D	1	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Support	Support the direction of Housing for Everyone - Plan Change 9. Very keen to have Residential 1 zone to be updated to Medium Density Residential Standard. It allows a better usage of the land, and provide more housing for the families.	The relief I seek is to adopt the plan change. I fully support the proposed plan.	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
3	Taiatini, J	2	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	I support the development of housing, but to seek land on the market for development. The more houses we have the more kids we will have. We need the reserves as safe areas to play. Housing deemed for medium and high density need to have reserves and safe play areas in plan.	The Council purchase land on the open market for housing development and not use reserve land for housing development.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
4	Taiatini, J (FS)	2	1	5	1	Other	Other	Other		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori. Submitter thanks and acknowledge the councils withdrawal of development of Reserves for housing. I continue to support the stance that Reserve lands were received for a specific purpose, and when that purpose is no longer deemed of use, then the whenua needs to be returned to the original owners.	Allow submission 2.1	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
5	Taiatini, J	2	2			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Oppose	Doesn't fully agree with opening up other Māori land that not connected with marae. Originally housing was centred around Marae that is the traditional land development. Without a marae there is no hub, it isn't Papakāinga.	If use of Maori land is being considered for housing away from Marae then this shouldn't be called Papakāinga.	Reject Enable papakāinga to be established when not located adjacent to a Marae. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
6	Taiatini, J (FS)	2	2	5	2	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori and states that Papakāinga under the Reservations Act were for the enjoyment of our people, and to support our cultural values, and is not a commercial activity. Reservations Act allows non rateable use.		Noted. No relief sought.
7	Gwendolyn Thomas, R	3	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Support	I support the PC9 change in its entirety but can specifically comment on RESZ-R1. I fully support the changes set out in the documents. I am a resident of Residential 1 Zone 1 and know that for sustainability reasons we need to have more dense housing closer to amenities and services – to reduce carbon emissions and increase wellbeing through active transport options. The changes make complete sense.	Retain the provision as worded.	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
8	Gifford, S (FS)	3	1	150	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission. High density is needed but PC9 is not the suitable solution as the adverse effects are too great.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 3.1 above.
9	Kershaw, J	4	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Submission in relation to proposals for existing Residential 1 Zone in Rotorua and in particular to Lynmore and Holden's bay submitter has particular interest: The submitter's opinion is one household unit for 300m2 of land and he strongly disagrees with the proposed yard and height (building envelope) rules under Plan Change 9. Reasons: * Existing yard and height rules have been in place for a long time in Rotorua and have helped protect sunlight, privacy and outlook. The changes will have a huge impact on adjoining owners - sunlight, privacy, views. Rotorua has a cold climate and sunlight penetration to dwellings is very important or personal wellbeing and reducing energy costs. * Increasing density allowance alone, while maintaining the existing envelope will allow for more intensification and housing choice * Solar is becoming very important for reducing energy cost and feeding power back to the grid. Existing houses with panels will be greatly affected with the proposed yards and height changes. * Properties adjoining new developments and properties adjoining those with new upper level additions would be devalued with no compensation. *Reducing the front yard requirement will increase danger to pedestrians and cyclists from cars exiting properties because of reduced visibility. * In places like Lynmore wealthy owners will do major upper level additions. It will create larger and taller houses greatly upsetting adjoining owners. It will not enable housing supply. * Because of a loss of sunlight and privacy etc. there could be an exodus of people affected by a development to move to new subdivisions in outlying areas where building covenants will ensure sunlight, privacy and views are not lost. This will create pressure for development of fringe farming land. The Government's mandate/law is ill-conceived and has been rushed	Oppose the mandate/law and allow for one household unit per 300m2 of land in the low density residential zone. Existing yard, height, daylight angles should be retained.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
10	Haley, D (FS)	4	1	32	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission regarding yard and height rules.	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
11	Murray, J (FS)	4	1	38	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission regarding yard and height rules.	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
12	Ronayne, T (FS)	4	1	51	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission regarding yard and height rules. They state that it aligns with their experience of living with high density housing.	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
13	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	4	1	64	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a residential in Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission and the reasons given.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
14	Irwin, W (FS)	4	1	83	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission regarding yard and height rules. They state that it aligns with their experience of living with high density housing.	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
15	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	4	1	91	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		mith	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
16	Murray, P (FS)	4	1	102	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission, stating it is an extremely important viewpoint.	Support submission	Refer submission 4.1 above.
17	Marshall, D (FS)	4	1	110	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
18	Bennett, A (FS)	4	1	115	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone and supports the initial submission. Suburban communities should remain that, suburban, with low density housing and green spaces. High density and multi-storey dwellings belong in the CBD.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
19	Oxley, M (FS)	4	1	119	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission, stating it is an extremely important viewpoint.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
20	Shekell G (FS)	4	1	121	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
21	Cameron, S (FS)	4	1	130	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission. They state they invested heavily in their home that was designed to maximise the sun. Under the proposed rule change, their neighbour could chose to build a 3 story dwelling that would ensure that they had very little light, no privacy and no outlook. For those who think they wouldn't be affected by the change, there is nothing to stop your neighbour knocking down a house/removing a house and replacing it with one that is 3 stories high. With respect to privacy, there would be none. As the original submitter stated, a house could potentially lose significant value if sunlight, privacy and outlook were affected. They agree that the Plan 9 and MDRS changes have been rushed through with many homeowners unaware of the consequences of the changes.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
22	Ross, P (FS)	4	1	134	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.
23	Gould, M and D (FS)	4	1	157	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports this submission. Height will also cause problems of mould and thus results in more cases requiring Urgent Hospital treatment. Peoples health is very important. The Labour Government would be better not to send anyone else (Homeless) to Rotorua. House the people we have. Double Story places when and where required. Use smaller transportable houses on sections (2 onto 1 Section) like Exeter homes off Lake Road Rotorua. If 6 story units/houses Mental Health issues will increase and the Rotorua Hospital can not cope with many more cases. More Police will be needed and more call outs like noise by Rotorua Lakes Council. Rotorua is not a dumping ground for Homeless. Other Solutions Will have to be found.	Support submission.	Refer submission 4.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
24	Kershaw, J	4	2			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1	Oppose	The lack of requirement for on-site parking will result in further parking on the roadside and on berms. The car will remain the main form of transport in New Zealand and there should be on-site parking requirement. I strongly disagree with the proposed lack of a requirement for on-site parking.	Existing parking rules should be retained.	Reject. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
25	Marshall, D (FS)	4	2	110	2	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the plan change.	Support submission.	Reject. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
26	Duncan, M and T (FS)	4	2	143	1	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. Parking issues - cars already on the footpath, verges. Making it hard for pedestrians.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
27	Morley, J (FS)	4	2	153	1	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission. The plan change does not take into account parking for the people who are going to live in the housing that will be built	Support submission.	Accept in part. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
28	Marsh, I (FS)	4	2	155	1	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating that NZers like their cars	Support submission.	Accept in part. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
29	McIndoe, L (FS)	4	2	162	1	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating that NZers like their cars, stating: Parking issues - cars already on the footpath, verges. Making it hard for pedestrians.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
30	Ronayne, C (FS)	4	2	164	1	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5 and Appendix 1		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, asking where residents are supposed to park and noting that people don't feel safe to park their cars on the street in recent times. The submitter is also concerned about the impact of parked cars on traffic.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Make no changes. There are no on-site minimum parking standards that can be retained as these have already been removed to give effect to national direction. Note however the discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A report about the proposed requirement for a transport assessment for 20 or more units. Through this assessment there is the potential to consider effects of four or more residential units on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road network due to parking on the street.
31	France-Goss, J	5	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	Not all suburban areas of the Rotorua lakes community are suited or have the necessary access to services and infrastructure to handle these types of developments. Need a variety of urban and suburban areas for people to choose to live Cannot see how the changes to the plan will 'Achieve a well-functioning urban environment;' As stated in the proposal. There is no guarantee that intensification of housing will provide this unless the housing is controlled by the council with rules and expectations set out and policing of these rules. My experience of housing intensification is opposite to this as increasing the number of dwelling and therefore people within a smaller area brings other issues and problems. Not everyone lives within the same rules and social order. It is naïve to believe that changing the plan to allow carte blanche development will create this idyllic notion.	Amend the provision to only include the cbd to Sala street to the east, across to Sophia street and Old Taupo road and lake road. These areas are more suitable for intensification of housing as they are closer to services, work and play areas and do not rely on additional infrastructure to be developed.	Reject The site or area identified within the submission is located within a relevant residential zone, and the MDRS are required to be incorporated in accordance with section 77G of the RMA. No qualifying matters have been identified within the submission.
32	Haley, D (FS)	5	1	32	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support the whole of this submission	Refer submission 5.1 above.
33	Murray, J (FS)	5	1	38	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission	Refer submission 5.1 above.
34	Ronayne, T (FS)	5	1	51	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. Rotorua's poor infrastructure is not suitable for high density housing. Flooding, drainage and wastewater issues have not been addressed.	Support submission.	Refer submission 5.1 above.
35	Irwin, W (FS)	5	1	83	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. Rotorua's poor infrastructure is not suitable for high density housing. Flooding, drainage and wastewater issues have not been addressed.	Support submission.	Refer submission 5.1 above.
36	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	5	1	91	2	Residential	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It wishes to amend the provision to only include the CBD and adjacent area bounded by Ti, Victoria and Pererika streets to the south, Ranolf, Pukuatua and Amohau streets to the west, Ohinemutu to the north and Government Gardens to the East. These areas are more suitable for intensification as they are closer to services, work and play areas and do not rely on additional infrastructure to be developed. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 5.1 above.
37	Murray, P (FS)	5	1	102	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Complimentary development can be supported with the appropriate consultation of those already invested and living in the community.	Support the whole of this submission	Refer submission 5.1 above.
38	Oxley, M (FS)	5	1	119	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support the whole of this submission	Refer submission 5.1 above.
39	Cameron, S (FS)	5	1	130	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Not everyone lives harmoniously with their neighbours. Intensifying any neighbourhood will potentially create problems with noise and other disturbances.	Support submission.	Refer submission 5.1 above.
40	Ross, P (FS)	5	1	134	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports intensification only closer to the CBD and adjacent area. They consider it a crucial point because an infrastructure assessment has not been provided with PC9.	Support submission. Amend the provision to only include the CBD and the adjacent area bounded by Ti, Victoria and Pererika streets to the south, Ranolf, Pukuatua and Amohau streets to the West, Ohinemutu to the North and Government Gardens to the East. These areas are more suitable for intensification as they are closer to services, work and play areas and do not rely on additional infrastructure to be developed.	Refer submission 5.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
41	Gifford, S (FS)	5	1	150	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. It considers the submission should be allowed to the extent it challenges PC9 achieving a well-functioning urban environment.	Support submission.	Refer submission 5.1 above.
42	France-Goss, J	5	2			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	How will the plan change 9 ensure risks of flooding and other natural hazards are managed. The current system is not managing these well either. E.g. if developing medium density housing in the Hannah's bay area what does this plan offer to manage the flooding problem this area already faces? What infrastructure can be put in place to mitigate the problems of storm water excess for any future developments that aren't already in place for those residing within the community.	Clarify how risks of flooding and other natural hazards are managed.	Accept. Clarification of management of hazards is not a specific relief that can be granted in terms of the provisions of the District Plan. However the Section 42A Report and evidence of P Meredith provides further explanation.
43	Ronayne, C (FS)	5	2	164	2	Natural Hazards	Other	Other		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and supports the submission. Devon Street in particular experiences bad flooding when there is significant rainstorm, due to issues with the drains. Increased usage of on-street parking will just exacerbate the issue. Until the council have had the funds to resolve these drainage issues, intensified street parking should not be allowed	Support submission.	Accept. Clarification of management of hazards is not a specific relief that can be granted in terms of the provisions of the District Plan. However the Section 42A Report and evidence of P Meredith provides further explanation.
44	Jones,S	6	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Other	Other	Oppose	Oppose the direction of RESZ R1 &2 Until support services have improved to a level that provide sustainable help to families in need.	Delete the provision.	Reject The site or area identified within the submission is located within a relevant residential zone, and the MDRS are required to be incorporated in accordance with section 77G of the RMA. No qualifying matters have been identified within the submission.
45	Jones,S	6	2			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	Also this would allow for multi storey buildings to be erected, blocking sun views of single storey buildings. Parking for these dwellings will be out on the road.	Delete the provision.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
46	Hatcher, J (FS)	6	2	8	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter lives in Fenton Park and agrees with the comments in the original submission. With no provision required for off street parking vehicles can and will block access by parking on both sides of the street. Traffic will be reduced to a single lane down the middle of the road. This already happens in some central streets and occasionally in the submitter's neighbourhood. It makes things difficult for emergency vehicles.	Support submission	Refer submission 6.1 above.
47	Gifford, S (FS)	6	2	150	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. The importance of sunlight to homes should not be underestimated, for both natural heating and well-being. As an example of a one size fits all approach that is not good policy, the adjoining section is higher than their section, so a 3 storey house will be even higher next to their house. The submitter is also concerned about the lack of parking - e.g. where it affects parking opportunities for nearby shops.	Support submission.	Refer submission 6.1 above.
48	Jones,S	6	3			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Oppose	Currently Rotorua's infrastructure including storm water and sewerage cannot handle the current demands and improvements will require significant rate payer contribution which is already significant burden.	Delete the provision [plan change].	Reject. Do not delete. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
49	Jones,S	6	4			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose	CCZ1&2: Oppose the direction as this will require significant investment in infrastructure at rate payer expense with little benefit to residential zone ratepayers	Delete the provision	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
50	Conder, J and Z	7	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Oppose PC9 which removes the requirement for a resource consent allowing up to three dwellings of up to three storey's each to be built on a second land parcel for following reasons: 1. 3 x 3 housing is not the best instrument for an amenable increase in housing supply. While we could see an increase in dwelling numbers as a result of this plan change, in the long term we could also see a less amenable community resulting within long-established suburban areas. The suburban areas most a risk are those made up of single dwellings on what would be considered (by modern urban standards) large sections. This lower density of housing provides a specific amenity that home owners and renters living in these areas have actively sought out. Increased density of housing would negatively affect the amenity of existing neighbourhoods in terms of privacy (multi storied homes overlooking single story dwellings, for example), proximity to neighbours, noise pollution, light pollution, obstruction of existing views, new shade from three storied buildings being cast on existing homes/gardens, additional traffic resulting from additional people and so on. These affects cannot be understated. Nothing would stop a developer buying several homes in a cul-de-sac, bowling the existing houses, and building 3 x 3 story homes on each section – creating a totally different amenity in the street. We believe that undeveloped green space, or central city areas are more suited to this style of housing as it is less likely to impinge on the amenity of existing neighbourhoods. 2. The removal of the need for a resource consent removes the ability for directly affected neighbours to be consulted, or have a chance to oppose. Homeowners should retain the right to oppose such buildings and we oppose the removal of this opportunity under Plan Change 9. It is easy to dismiss our objection as NIMBY-ism but we have worked hard	Delete [Plan Change 9]	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
51	Casey, P (FS)	7	1	4	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and considers the submission reflects the views of ratepayers	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
52	Haley, D (FS)	7	1	32	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it supports their view.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
53	Murray, J (FS)	7	1	38	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it supports their view.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
54	Ronayne, T (FS)	7	1	51	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. It aligns with their personal experience of living in a neighbourhood with high density housing.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
55	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	7	1	58	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. They are concerned about the increase in traffic congestion, noise and greenhouse gas emissions.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
56	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	7	1	64	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a resident in Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission, which they believe identifies the important amenity values that are important in city living, which would be destroyed in large measure by PC9.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
57	Irwin, W (FS)	7	1	83	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. It aligns with their personal experience of living in a neighbourhood with high density housing.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
58	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	7	1	91	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states this argument reflects the views of RDRR's members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
59	Dimock, J (FS)	7	1	101	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission - purchasers bought properties with understanding of what could be developed on surrounding properties and PC9 takes away rights of existing owners.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
60	Murray, P (FS)	7	1	102	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
61	Oxley, M (FS)	7	1	119	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
62	Shekell G (FS)	7	1	121	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
63	Cameron, S (FS)	7	1	130	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. I agree that those most likely to be impacted negatively by the plan change to allow up to three dwellings of three storeys would be those living in the Residential Zone 1. In many cases, homeowners have paid a premium price for the privilege of living in these areas. The submitter states that they worked their way up the housing ladder and is concerned about sunlight, privacy or outlook. They agree that the plan changes would be more appropriate to new sub-divisions where people would be under no illusion as to what they were getting. They question the wisdom of building/investing in a three story building in a geothermal area (Old Taupo Road/Sophia Street areas) and in a city where there is a risk of earthquakes.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
64	Ross, P (FS)	7	1	134	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission	Refer submission 7.1 above.
65	Duncan, M and T (FS)	7	1	143	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They ask why centralised government planners are making legislation for Rotorua, where the same big city environment is not relevant.	Support submission	Refer submission 7.1 above.
66	Morley, J (FS)	7	1	153	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. The plan change does not take into account existing lighting levels in suburbs. The plan does not take into account the road usage of turning small residential streets with lots of kids and families, and turning them into giant access-ways for hundreds/thousands of vehicles per day to use those existing streets.	Support submission.	Refer submission 7.1 above.
67	Marsh, I (FS)	7	1	155	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating: Increased traffic in and out of this area with an extra 93 homes will create many issues on an already busy main road. The number of vehicles entering and leaving the area will result in increased traffic congestion, noise, greenhouse gas emissions and road traffic safety concerns particularly for children and the elderly.		Refer submission 7.1 above.
68	McIndoe, L (FS)	7	1	162	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter lives in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They ask why centralised government planners are making legislation for Rotorua, where the same big city environment is not relevant.		Refer submission 7.1 above.
69	Weinberg,R	8	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Oppose houses being built too close together and too many on one section. The reasons are: A) 3 homes per section leads to overcrowding, social issues due to people being crowded and living in close confines, less green space, blocked sunlight for neighbours, greater risk of noise issues, greater risk of crime. This is not a “well-functioning urban environment” as you claim to be aiming for. B) We have spent our lifetime saving up to build our own home and have finally managed to build our forever home in a neighbourhood that is quiet, safe and the standard of homes is high. We feel that by allowing medium density housing in our street, it will devalue our home and compromise our own peace and quiet and lifestyle that we have chosen and have paid for. We chose to spend the extra money to live where we are and this plan change will basically put everything we have worked towards at risk. C) The empty section next to our house is being built on within the near future. The owners approached us to ask permission to build within 1 metre of the boundary instead of the current 2.5 m. The house they designed was too large for the section. We declined to approve this. We did not want houses that close to us and feel it would take away from the home we have built and impinge on our privacy and also cut out our sunlight. This plan change will now allow neighbours to do this and takes away our right to object to it. D) Suburbs that have houses very close together such as Papamoa and parts of Auckland, look terrible. You can basically shake hands with your neighbour through their window. It turns them into overcrowded slums in some cases. Our youth have nowhere to play and people lose their privacy with people living so close to them. It is totally killing the NZ dream of	We are seeking to retain the status quo, with no change. We do not want medium density housing or houses being able to be built any closer to existing houses than they already are, without neighbour’s permission.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
70	Casey, P (FS)	8	1	4	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme] and supports the submission. They are concerned about the quality of intensification in residential areas - space for kids to play, parking. They state that the recent Ranolf /Malfroy Sts development (“the Barracks”) looks like a ghetto in waiting. If people are corralled into ghetto-like neighbourhoods they will feel no pride in their surrounds meaning it will only be a matter of time before anti-social behaviour develops. There is space to develop, whereas tower blocks become horrible.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
71	Haley, D (FS)	8	1	32	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating that it supports their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
72	Murray, J (FS)	8	1	38	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating that it supports their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
73	Ronayne, T (FS)	8	1	51	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owners property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood. Small units closely packed is barely better than the current motel housing which has caused infinite issues for both those living in them and the surrounding areas.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
74	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	8	1	64	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a residential in Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission and the reasons given - particularly a, b, and d.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
75	Irwin, W (FS)	8	1	83	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood. Small units closely packed is barely better than the current motel housing which has caused infinite issues for both those living in them and the surrounding areas.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
76	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	8	1	91	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this position coheres with the views of RDRR members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
77	Murray, P (FS)	8	1	102	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating that it supports their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
78	Ward, K (FS)	8	1	106	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
79	Oxley, M (FS)	8	1	119	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating that it supports their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
80	Cameron, S (FS)	8	1	130	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. Those wanting to build as close to the boundary as permitted will be investors who are wanting to maximise their profits. In a country the size of New Zealand there is absolutely no need to intensify land and be living so close to your neighbours that you can hear every conversation.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
81	Ross, P (FS)	8	1	134	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
82	Duncan, M and T (FS)	8	1	143	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They object to the blanket cover of the area stated all in Res 1. This will demand infrastructure all over, rather than planned cohesive development - this is not affordable. Solution would be to concentrate on medium to high density and infrastructure upgrade. 2. Intensification needs transport hubs, we do not have the population to support. Recent reports this year show population falling	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
83	McIndoe, L (FS)	8	1	162	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They object to the blanket cover of the area stated all in Res 1. This will demand infrastructure all over, rather than planned cohesive development - this is not affordable. Solution would be to concentrate on medium to high density and infrastructure upgrade. 2. Intensification needs transport hubs, we do not have the population to support. Recent reports this year show population falling	Support submission.	Refer submission 8.1 above.
84	Grant, V	9	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to 3 level residences	Not provide for 3 level residences	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
85	Ward, K (FS)	9	1	106	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 9.1 above.
86	Gifford, S (FS)	9	1	150	4	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. There are more suitable ways to achieve density than a blanket allowance of 3 storey houses that will potentially have detrimental effect on both sun, amenity and wind. There may be some areas within Residential 1 that are suitable, but this should be considered on a more specific basis rather than as permitted by PC9	Allow submission.	Refer submission 9.1 above.
87	Garraway, D and L	10	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Concerned about three storey and how it will affect areas with existing housing - light and views become restricted. Very general language [used in zone description]- use of word "generally" up to three storeys - what does that mean? Very general language used in the issue statement about the design and appearance of residential sites. How can one be sure that the considerations will be carried out in particular to light and views? We would suggest that the Residential 1 Zone changes will particularly change the appearance of neighbourhoods over time - not just in Residential 2 Zone.	Seek clarification	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
88	Onwukwe, G	11	1			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the direction of the Residential 2 Zone as long as it is optional for a landowner about whether they are willing to sell or not.	Support Residential 2 Zone direction provided it is optional for landowners to sell or not.	Noted.
89	Hutcheson, M	12	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Resource consent waiver - it will devalue our property. State housing - will block all sunshine to our house. Tenants will not be screened and gang members will move back and sell drugs and be loud and abusive again. As a home owner here in rotorua I strongly oppose this plan 9. my wife and I have put our life and sole into our house. We have a state house next door [to 38 Meadowbank Crescent] and we finally have good respectable neighbours and nor gang members selling drugs. If you/the council build what your proposal shows it will destroy our home, take away out sunlight and devalue our property, not to mention that the people who are chosen to live there will most likely be un screened and the gangs will be back.	Do not allow Plan Change 9 to continue	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
90	Walford, B (FS)	12	1	23	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They supports the original submission and states that at present there are no houses with more than 2 stories so an increase to 3 stories would be a significant development. The submitter is resigned to the eventuality of this suburb [Glenholme] being converted to multi-storey apartments but not within the next century. Allowing construction of 6 stories is a significant departure from the general character of Glenholme (unless you are seeking to have a suburb looking like San Gimignano), a change that would detract from the appeal of the suburb and, as a consequence, from property values.	Support submission	Refer submission 12.1 above.
91	Haley, D (FS)	12	1	32	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating it is very relevant and reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
92	Murray, J (FS)	12	1	38	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating it is very relevant and reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
93	Ronayne, T (FS)	12	1	51	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owners property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
94	Irwin, W (FS)	12	1	83	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owners property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
95	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	12	1	91	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this position coheres with the views of RDRR members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
96	Murray, P (FS)	12	1	102	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating it is very relevant and reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.
97	Oxley, M (FS)	12	1	119	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission, stating it is very relevant and reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 12.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
98	Mataatua Marae Trustees	13	1			Historical & Cultural Values	Other	Other	Oppose	Oppose housing development in close proximity to the marae in its entirety. Increased people traffic in the vicinity of the marae can impinge of the cultural safety and wellbeing of the marae, its people and its facilities Marae functions (tangihana, hura kōhatu, karakia, wananga) could see imposition of restrictive bylaws being imposed restricting the marae ability to manaaki ngā manuhiri e.g. noise control, curfews, hours of operation etc. Inability to host ngā manuhiri with increased housing, people, and traffic restricting available parking etc. The area of Mataatua Marae was a gift to the people of Tūhoe from the Mana Whenua Ngāti Whakaue as a place for Tūhoe to uphold, sustain and nurture their Tūhoetanga whilst away from the cultural homeland, in particular Te Urewera. The expression, or the ability to express ones Tūhoetanga is quintessential to being Tuhoe - Te Rangihau. Tuhoe cannot, nor should not be restricted in the articulation of their Tūhoetanga With no other land resources available to Tūhoe in Rotorua, Papakāinga development for Tuhoe becomes a non-event, especially around the marae The marae trustees consider that the setting of a marae is integral to the cultural values and heritage of its beneficiaries that includes the nga whare (tupuna, tupuna kuia) and it is incumbent of local council to ensure these surroundings are respects, protected and preserved [Submitter refers also to s6 and s8 of the RMA, District Plan Objective -O1 - Protection of Cultural Heritage Features and Policy HH-P1.	No new houses in the vicinity, delete provision [medium density residential development and high density residential development and height rules]	Reject. Invite submitter to consider providing an evaluation of potential qualifying matters under section 77J to L of the RMA. Marae protection overlay provides protection. Retain as notified. Refer to Other Potential Qualifying Matters Section of the Section 42 Report.
99	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	13	1	97	1	Historical & Cultural Values	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora opposes, in part, submission point 13.1 insofar the submission does not state the proposed intensification exclusion zone it is seeking to impose around the area of Mataatua Marae.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Reject original submission.
100	Rotorua Seventh-day Adventist School Board	14	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	We are a school located on 3 tilsley Street, behind 311 Fenton Street and we are directly affected by the proposed change. We have concerns over the privacy and safety of vulnerable children should properties be permitted to extent to a height where buildings overlook the school. the school already had document problems where occupants of two-storey emergency housing motel have been seen in windows closely watching pupils. In addition we have multiple incidents where hazardous or obscene items thrown into school grounds from emergency housing on Fenton Street. Even if residential buildings are surrounded by open space, the impact on the lives of staff and students will be detrimental by allowing 3-storey buildings to look own into our school and directly observe children playing.	Amend to prohibit the following addresses from being permitted to extent to 3 storeys because of concerns over student safety: 2,4,5,6,7,8,9 Tilsley Street 6,8,10,12 Holland Street 305-309, 311, 313, 315-317 Fenton Street	Reject. Refer to other potential qualifying matters section of this report. Disallow submission.
101	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	14	1	97	2	Other	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 14.1 on the basis that the relief sought in the submission essentially seeks to recognise 'proximity to school' as a qualifying matter. This is not considered an appropriate qualifying matter'.	Disallow submission.	Accept Refer to other potential qualifying matters section of this report. Disallow submission
102	Clouston,C	15	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Our heritage will be wiped out. Buildings and the world that we live in are what makes us kiwis. I don't want the quality of our privacy and sunlight diminished so we become like other poor countries where people are subjected to just surviving in little homes without areas outside for grass, flowers, trees.	Delete the provisions	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
103	Shekell G (FS)	15	1	121	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission	Refer submission 15.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
104	Johnson, A	16	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	I would like Tarewa Place to be included in the Residential 2 Zone PC9	Include Tarewa Place in the Residential 2 Zone.	Reject The spatial extent of the Residential 2 zone has been applied to areas with the highest levels of accessibility to ensure that high density development can be focussed to these areas. See the urban design evidence for further information on the Accessibility and Demand Assessment undertaken. Economic Analysis which has informed PC9 concludes that if the spatial application is too extensive, then it may not adequately encourage the concentration of higher density development into areas which support the function of key nodes. Refer section 42A Report, Accessibility and Demand Assessment, and Economic Assessment.
105	Buckleigh, D	17	1			Residential 1 Zone	Introduction	Zone Description	Oppose	I strongly oppose the change [to the zone description]. It will destroy the existing amenity environment where people want to live in the RESZ1 zone.	Retain the existing zone description: <i>Low density residential areas, such as Ngongotahā, Kāwaha Point, Western Heights, Hillcrest, Springfield and Lynmore. There is a mix of single storey and two-storey houses of various styles and materials. There is a balance between the built and natural elements of the environment in this zone. There is a sense of space around buildings, which is enhanced by the landscaping on site and trees within the road reserve. Other characteristics include generally low levels of noise and low traffic levels.</i> Delete the following zone description: <i>Areas used predominantly for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities.</i> <i>A medium density residential built character is expected, comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys, surrounded by open space.</i>	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA.
106	Bennett, V (FS)	17	1	56	1	Residential 1 Zone	Introduction	Zone Description		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They support the original submission. Permitting 3 storey residential development in an adhoc manner across the entire Residential 1 Zone will destroy the existing amenity environment across the city.	Support submission.	Refer submission 17.1 above.
107	Davies, T	18	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	Rotorua residential development does not need to go above 2 stories high as of right. These should remain as status quo in residential and rural areas. It affects neighbours and should be required to get consent	Height, intensity of use restricts and setbacks as of right should remain as status quo in residential and rural areas. Provide mitigation if greater intensity of buildings in surrounding neighbours or communities.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
108	Haley, D (FS)	18	1	32	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
109	Murray, J (FS)	18	1	38	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
110	Marshall, A (FS)	18	1	41	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		the submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They say that this reflects their views and the fact that two storeys is much more in keeping with the character of the town.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
111	Ronayne, T (FS)	18	1	51	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
112	Irwin, W (FS)	18	1	83	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high density neighbourhood.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
113	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	18	1	91	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states this argument reflects the views of RDRR's members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
114	Murray, P (FS)	18	1	102	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
115	Oxley, M (FS)	18	1	119	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, stating it reflects their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
116	Gifford, S (FS)	18	1	150	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees that above 2 storeys as of right is too high and fails to give opportunity o address adverse effects.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
117	Davies, T	18	3			General	General	General	Oppose	Planning should encourage consistent intensity in all parts of the district. Submitter opposes intensive development on land that is out of character of an area, as of right. Submitter opposes significant intensive uses where they affect neighbours. No landowner should get zoning to enable use and development and use of infrastructure which allows intensification of their land over other land in that community.	Should have to get neighbour consent if change affects neighbours. Broaden the opportunity for all suburbs and rural areas to solve the housing crisis than intensify individual areas.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
118	Taiatini, J (FS)	18	3	5	3	General	General	General		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori and states that the restrictions of homes to land size provisions in regards rural zoning needs amending.	Amend	Reject The scope of PC9 as notified does not include amendments to the Rural Zone provisions.
119	Marshall, J (FS)	18	3	167	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission. They state that they gave approval for their neighbour to build closer to the boundary than permitted under the District Plan but with the height rules under the MDRS privacy and light would be severely affected - allowing buildings as close but a lot higher. Shading of the yard, deck, garden would be significant. It would likely severely impact the view they paid a premium for.	Support submission.	Refer submission 18.1 above.
120	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	1			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	In the haste to respond to the housing crisis, Rotorua Lakes Council must ensure fundamental principles including Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership and kaitiakitanga are not ignored through the process. RLC has legal obligations to Maori regarding engagement and decision-making under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002.	Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to agree on values-based solutions and approaches to housing and development planning, strategy, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This includes working in partnership with Te Arawa hapū to agree on the scope and development of the Housing Plan Change. Rotorua Lakes Council allocates appropriate resourcing and support to enable Te Arawa to access the necessary expertise to assist our engagement; ensure appropriate processes and outcomes for Te Arawa; and provide technical reviews and analysis of any working draft provisions relating to the Housing Plan Change.	Noted. While no relief relating to the provisions of PC9 is requested, the request for partnership is acknowledged.
121	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	1	125	1	Other	Other	Other		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. They support the original submission, stating that Rotorua Lakes Council must ensure fundamental principles including Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership and kaitiakitanga are not ignored through the process.	Support submission	Reject. Relief cannot be provided in PC9.
122	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	2			Papakāinga	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Thriving hapū and iwi require the protection of existing pā/marae/hapū/Papakāinga housing communities surrounding marae from exploitation and degradation by non-iwi-owned businesses and developers, in particular from the tourism and accommodation sectors, and even more obviously from the catastrophic impacts of commercial and factory industries.	This requires residential buffer zones around pā (with boundaries as agreed by hapū) to be written into policy and budgeted for within the district’s 30 to 50-year plans. These must identify the non-residential aspects that need staged removal out of hapū residential living areas, and appropriate initiatives to support the return of whānau to these traditional Papakāinga communities.	Reject. To be considered through development of the Future Development Strategy
123	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	3			Papakāinga	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Rezoning of pā/marae/hapu/Papakāinga residential communities such as Te Koutu, Tarewa Pounamu, Whakarewarewa, Ngāpuna, Ōwhata and Ngongotahā from residential to commercial and industrial has for too long supported non-Maori to benefit and make money off the culture and significant sites of Te Arawa as well as take advantage of the limited capacity and capability of Te Arawa hapu and iwi to engage, by moving commercial and industrial business onto residential streets within traditional tribal communities, disrupting communal lifestyles; and often driving house prices up to irrevocable levels.	Opportunities to allow more whanau to increase the number of family members living in Papakāinga and to create Papakāinga for whanau within their current living spaces and exiting pa/marae/hapu/Papakāinga residential communities should be prioritised.	Accept PC9 seeks to better enable the development of papakāinga. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
124	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	19	3	97	3	Papakāinga	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora generally supports submissions point 19.3, which generally aligns with Kāinga Ora's submission also seeking appropriate provision for Papakāinga housing.	Allow submission.	Accept PC9 seeks to better enable the development of papakāinga. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
125	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	4			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated		Council must partner with Te Arawa to ensure appropriate objectives, policies and rules are put in place for the relocation of all industry away from, and the cleaning up of all contaminated sites within Ngāpuna, Te Koutu, Ngongotahā and near any waterways. Adequate funding must also be allocated, including via long-term plans and budgets.	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
126	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	5			Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission notes concern about the impact of intensification on freshwater bodies.	Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to ensure any future development, increased housing and population within Rotorua does not have a negative impact on our lakes, waterways, ngāwhā, natural environment and indigenous taonga species.	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
127	Taiatini, J (FS)	19	5	5	4	Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori. Submitter states there has been little thought into mitigation especially for the environment in Plan Change 9 developments.	Allow submission	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
128	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	5	125	2	Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. They support the original submission, stating that it is critical that increased housing density does not increase stormwater contaminants and sediment being discharged into freshwater bodies. Any further increases in contaminants and sediment restrict Te Arawa’s ability to exercise Kaitiakitanga over Rotorua’s freshwater bodies.		Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
129	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	6			Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated		RLC partner with Te Arawa to incorporate the restoration and protection of wetlands, native forests and indigenous taonga species into all aspects of Rotorua housing and development planning	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
130	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	7			General	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Intense development may not be appropriate for some existing pā/marae/hapū/Papakāinga housing communities and hapū and iwi values. While qualifying matters and permitted standards can be used, the Medium Density Residential Standards will remove the ability for hapū and iwi to assess the effects of developments on our whānau and tribal communities through a resource consenting process.	Hapū and iwi be involved in the development and decision-making on ‘Intensification Planning Instruments’ as this will be a key pathway through which hapū and iwi can directly influence developments through setting permitted activity standards. The Trust also considers that it is critical that hapū and iwi are able to jointly make decisions with Council on “Qualifying Matters”. Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to identify opportunities to ensure existing and future zoning, planning and developments enhance and align with cultural values, and support and enhance Papakāinga communities, rather than impacting on and further taking away from them.	Noted.
131	Taiatini, J (FS)	19	7	5	5	General	General	General		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori. They agree that Iwi can and are making inroads into Housing for their own people, and in consultation with their people. I would ask what considerations have been made in regards affordability. Subdivisions and leaseholds may not be/are not Papakāinga. Who are the homes for? Iwi may need to consider housing developments to meet in some cases, the complex needs of our people.	Amend	Refer submission 19.7 above.
132	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	8			Infrastructure	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission acknowledges that the housing legislation does not address infrastructure to supporting housing developments; and while it will enabling financial contributions, this will not be enough. The Trust believes it critical that increased housing density does not increase stormwater contaminants and sediment being discharged to our freshwater bodies. Currently, urban stormwater is discharged to the Utuhina stream and the Mangakakahi stream and eventually released to Lake Rotorua. As a result, our awa and lake are highly contaminated which restricts Te Arawa hungatiaki ability to exercise kaitiakitanga over our freshwater bodies. The Trust considers it critical that Council partners with Te Arawa to co-develop a work programme around the Infrastructure Acceleration Funding that meets the aspirations of both parties and ensures optimal spending on mutual priorities.	That Council work with Te Arawa Lakes Trust and Te Arawa iwi and hapū to map, plan and budget for the upgrading of Rotorua’s stormwater, wastewater and waste management systems to green, biophyllic, water-sensitive infrastructure to ensure iwi aspirations outlined within Te Tuāpapa o Ngā Wai o Te Arawa and council obligations to implement Te Mana o Te Wai are achieved within the district’s 30 to 50-year plans. Rotorua Lakes Council partner with Te Arawa to co-develop a work programme for the ‘Infrastructure Acceleration Funding’ that Rotorua is allocated to meet the aspirations of both parties and ensures optimal spending on mutual priorities.	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
133	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	8	125	3	Infrastructure	General	General		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. They support the original submission, stating that Council will need to work together with Te Arawa to map, plan and budget for the upgrading of Rotorua’s stormwater, wastewater, fresh water supply and waste management systems to ensure Iwi/Hapu aspirations and Council obligations to implement Te Mana o te Wai are achieved within the district’s 30 to 50 year plans.	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
134	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	9			Natural Hazards	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Intensification of housing in urban zones will increase the amount of stormwater being discharged from development. This increases flooding risks, an issue that will be exacerbated through climate change. Urban stormwater is discharged into the Utuhina and Mangakakahi and downstream of these catchments are Te Arawa pā and Papakāinga communities. It is vital that stormwater infrastructure is provided for and planned ahead of any urban intensification to ensure that our Te Arawa pā and Papakāinga communities are not further impacted by these developments. The Trust considers it critical that Council partners with Te Arawa to co-develop a work programme around the Infrastructure Acceleration Funding that meets the aspirations of both parties and ensures optimal spending on mutual priorities.	That Council work with Te Arawa Lakes Trust and Te Arawa iwi and hapū to map, plan and budget for the upgrading of Rotorua’s stormwater, wastewater and waste management systems to green, biophyllic, water-sensitive infrastructure to ensure iwi aspirations outlined within Te Tuāpapa o Ngā Wai o Te Arawa and council obligations to implement Te Mana o Te Wai are achieved within the district’s 30 to 50-year plans.	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
135	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	10			General	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The Trust considers it critical that Council shares its evidence base, including any modelling and rationale, with Te Arawa regarding the environmental sustainability of its proposed medium and high-density compact	Rotorua Lakes Council share its evidence base, including any modelling and rationale with Te Arawa Lakes Trust to consider and share with the iwi regarding the environmental sustainability of the proposed medium and high-density compact housing. Provide detail on the following: ➤ What analysis has been done on how much population growth the district, waterways and our natural resources can sustain? ➤ What controls will there be on development to ensure water quality improves rather than becomes adversely affected? ➤ What positive and negative impacts have been identified nationally and internationally of the proposed medium and high-density compact housing on the health and wellbeing of natural environments including water sources, waterways, geothermal fields, soils, indigenous taonga species and associated ecosystems?	Accept. Refer to Section 42A Report for the information relied upon in PC9.
136	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	10	125	4	General	Other	Other		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Accept. Refer to Section 42A Report for the information relied upon in PC9.
137	Te Arawa Lakes Trust	19	11			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Central to Te Arawa concerns regarding the proposed Housing Plan Change is climate change adaptation, mitigation and resilience building. The iwi considers that continued 20th century style development which is entirely dependent on the private motor vehicle for transportation and has no regard for water, energy or resource efficiency must be prevented. Future developments need to contribute to carbon neutral energy and resource use while also being adaptable to both current and future climate patterns.. The Trust considers it critical that Council partners with Te Arawa to develop and embed climate breakdown adaptation and mitigation solutions that align with iwi priorities and values into all Rotorua zoning, housing and urban development plans. This means identifying and embedding mātauranga Māori in urban design and construction to manage climate-related hazards. This action will increase the resilience of public housing by identifying where retrofitting is needed and ensuring new dwellings are built away from areas prone to climate hazards. It will also promote effective planning and the design of resilient infrastructure as part of public housing activities.	Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to develop and embed climate breakdown adaptation and mitigation solutions that align with iwi priorities and values into all Rotorua zoning, housing and urban development plans; and to ensure future housing and development plans enable community resilience to the potential impacts of climate breakdown by supporting sustainable water and energy management and use; accommodating food growing and sharing; and restoring connections with nature.	Noted. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
138	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	11	125	5	Other	Other	Other		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. The submitter supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 19.11 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
139	Casey, P (FS)	19	Various	4	3	General	General	General		The submitter opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating against non-Maori.	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
140	Haley, D (FS)	19	Various	32	7	General	General	General		The submitter opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating against non-Maori.	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
141	Murray, J (FS)	19	Various	38	7	General	General	General		The submitter opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating against non-Maori.	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
142	Marshall, A (FS)	19	Various	41	2	General	General	General		The submitter opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all fairly with effective and democratic decision making, irrespective of ethnicity. The Council and central government must govern for all the people of New Zealand on an equal basis.	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
143	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	19	Various	91	7	General	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating against non-Maori. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
144	Murray, P (FS)	19	Various	102	7	General	General	General		The submitter states that local government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating non-Maori. The role and importance of mana whenua is already fully accepted and entrenched for the future development of Rotorua.	Oppose submission.	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.
145	Oxley, M (FS)	19	Various	119	7	General	General	General		The submitter opposes the original submission stating it seeks extensive planning and consenting privileges for mana whenua alleging obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and Local Government Act. They state that Local Government must serve the interests of all in democratic decision making processes. This is seen as co-governance giving disproportionate power. The AG has ruled against discriminating against non-Maori.	Oppose submission	Accept in part Plan Change 9 seeks to address housing the current housing issues for all Rotorua residents.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
146	Habitat for Humanity Central Region NZ (FS)	19	Various	125	6	General	General	General		Habitat for Humanity Central Region and our organisation is a registered charity and a Community Housing Provider working to develop social housing solutions within the Rotorua Lakes Council catchment area. They support the original submission, stating that It is important that the work already undertaken by Te Arawa in the housing space is recognised and that council processes enable pathways through which Te Arawa can implement the work they have already undertaken. The direct relationship and decision-making role Te Arawa holds with both Regional and Local Councils as a partner to the Rotorua Te Arawa Lakes Strategy Group should be replicated on one of the biggest issues affecting Rotorua currently, ie. Housing. In accordance with the partnership approach taken by the Fenton Agreement in establishing Rotorua as a township in the 1800’s, and given the large current land blocks in Rotorua still in Hapu/Iwi ownership deemed suitable for housing by the owners, it makes perfect sense that Iwi/Hapu should have a voice as an equal partner to Council in making decisions on the future use of land for housing in Rotorua. Any decisions by Council about the housing needs of Rotorua should be made in conjunction with Te Arawa who have the best on the ground knowledge of their housing needs. Habitat support all nine recommendations from TALT and believe that enacting all of these recommendations would meet RLC’s obligations as a treaty partner to Te Teriti o Waitangi and also be consistent with the partnership expectations that Te Arawa entered into the Fenton Agreement in the 1800’s which established Rotorua as a township. Further, it would also recognise Te Arawa Hapu/Iwi have a very substantial part to play in the solution to Rotorua’s housing crisis, both as a partner to Council and also as the major landholder of subdividable land within the RLC district.	Support all the recommendations in the Te Arawa Lakes Trust submission.	Accept in part. Refer to other submission responses.
147	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submission expresses concern about the legitimacy of the decision by the outgoing Council to notify Plan Change 9 and powerless amongst RDRR members, associates and friends against Council decisions.	Ask the incoming Council to review its support for PC9.	Reject. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a ‘specified territorial authority’ under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
148	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	20	1	97	4	Other	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 20.1 and supports the Council's notification of Plan Change 9.	Disallow submission.	Accept. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a ‘specified territorial authority’ under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
149	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	2			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submission expresses concern that the housing crisis may be exaggerated; that high growth assumptions have been adopted without explanation; that housing shortages were based on outdated information; that emigration and churn have not been sufficiently considered in demand; that artificial demand from Ministry of Housing applications may have been included.	Ask the incoming Council to validate the projections of housing demand in PC9.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan. Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
150	Taiatini, J (FS)	20	2	5	6	Other	Other	Other		Submitter has whānau who whakapapa and belong here and mokopuna who live here and need to continue a legacy that supports Te Ao Maori. Submitter believes the councils view has not been fully thought through, and has been a knee jerk reaction to the homelessness created through the Covid 19 Pandemic.	Allow submission 20.2	Refer submission 20.2 above.
151	McKay, K and Reed, S (FS)	20	2	62	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitters own property in Rotorua. They support the original submission	Support submission 20.2.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
152	Holmes, W (FS)	20	2	82	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. They state that there is no proof that Rotorua has an acute housing shortage. The last census showed a population decline. The shortage has been fabricated to attract \$85M for infrastructure. Rotorua has had typical population growth over the last 10 years. Council hasn't deducted the residential building consents over the past 10 years.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
153	Gifford, S (FS)	20	2	150	6	Other	Other	Other		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Information on such a fundamental plan change must be robustly tested and there are concerns as to the quality of information.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
154	Hamill, W (FS)	20	2	154	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. The housing shortage is not the issue.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
155	McIndoe, L (FS)	20	2	162	4	Other	Other	Other		The submitter lives in a residential zone and supports the original submission. Intensification needs transport hubs, we do not have the population to support. Recent reports this year show population falling		Refer submission 20.2 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
156	Holmes, R (FS)	20	2	172	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. They state that there is no proof that Rotorua has an acute housing shortage. The last census showed a population decline. The shortage has been fabricated to attract \$85M for infrastructure. Rotorua has had typical population growth over the last 10 years. Council hasn't deducted the residential building consents over the past 10 years.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
157	Holmes, T (FS)	20	2	173	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. They state that there is no proof that Rotorua has an acute housing shortage. The last census showed a population decline. The shortage has been fabricated to attract \$85M for infrastructure. Rotorua has had typical population growth over the last 10 years. Council hasn't deducted the residential building consents over the past 10 years.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.2 above.
158	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	3			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submission expresses concern that the Council did not follow its own policy in deciding to sell reserves or parts of reserves; purchase of reserves by social housing providers; and the first right of refusal given to mana whenua. There is concern that the Council is not making evidence-based decisions in relation to housing issues.	Ask the incoming Council to review its commitment to the revocation and sale of reserves and part reserves and using a Local Bill to obtain exceptions to the Reserves Act.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
159	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	4			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submission expresses concern that the new laws are forcing unwelcome changes to Rotorua's District Plan. Rotorua's District Plan was devised and incrementally refined to ensure a balanced consideration of local economic, social, cultural and environmental factors, and to provide transparent decision making and local accountability for functional and aesthetic housing outcomes that are tailored to the particular character desired by the residents of Rotorua. A tripling of density is effectively permitted, with a significant relaxation of the current bulk and location rules. They will generate significant, abrupt and adverse effects on amenity across all of Rotorua's currently low-density Residential 1 areas. This is a major departure from current controls which have been carefully calibrated to the requirements of Rotorua. Developments built to these standards will have a major negative impact on the amenity of adjoining residents. Suddenly, three-storey buildings can be built close to the boundary, with no restrictions on overlooking and loss of privacy for the unfortunate neighbours who happen to live next to one. The small size of the outdoor living area required for each of the new dwellings will also ensure that the amenity for occupants of these new developments will be nowhere near the relatively high standard that Rotorua residents have come to enjoy. Enjoyment of outdoor spaces will be shifted onto public reserves, which the out-going Council has been actively seeking to sell.	That the commissioners evaluate the loss of amenity in Rotorua's currently low-density Residential 1 areas against a proposed tripling of density.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
160	Hatcher, J (FS)	20	4	8	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter lives in Fenton Park and agrees with the comments in the submission, especially "Developments built to these standards will have a major negative impact on the amenity of adjoining residents. Suddenly, three-storey buildings can be built close to the boundary, with no restrictions on overlooking and loss of privacy for the unfortunate neighbours who happen to live next to one" - submitter says that they have worked hard to own a house, paying a mortgage without assistance, and is extremely concerned that the neighbourhood could be inundated with six story transition housing.	Support submission	Refer submission 20.4 above.
161	McKay, K and Reed, S (FS)	20	4	62	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters own property in Rotorua. They support the original submission	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
162	Holmes, W (FS)	20	4	82	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. High density (3 storey + bulk and location) will generate significant and abrupt adverse effects on amenities in long established density residential areas.	Evaluate the loss of amenity in Rotorua's current low-Residential 1 and 2 areas from the effects of increased density.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
163	Shekell G (FS)	20	4	121	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
164	Gifford, S (FS)	20	4	150	7	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.4 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
165	Ronayne, C (FS)	20	4	164	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Not enough consideration about the issues concerning high density within suburban areas has been taken and that the implementation of Plan 9 should be cancelled or, at minimum, delayed until these can be addressed. High density is not suitable outside of the CBD. The issues have already presented themselves in certain suburbs of Auckland and I have seen it in person. Please take into account these problems before you pass Plan change 9.	Support submission.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
166	Holmes, R (FS)	20	4	172	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. High density (3 storey + bulk and location) will generate significant and abrupt adverse effects on amenities in long established density residential areas.	Evaluate the loss of amenity in Rotorua's current low-Residential 1 and 2 areas from the effects of increased density.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
167	Holmes, T (FS)	20	4	173	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission. High density (3 storey + bulk and location) will generate significant and abrupt adverse effects on amenities in long established density residential areas.	Evaluate the loss of amenity in Rotorua's current low-Residential 1 and 2 areas from the effects of increased density.	Refer submission 20.4 above.
168	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	5			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submission expresses concern that the Council decided to invite the Government to apply the Medium Density Residential Standards across the board in Rotorua, which they say was intended for bigger urban areas such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. In those cities an increase of the density now permitted is more understandable because of the higher inner-city amenity of those cities helps offset the negative effects of density. Proximity to nightlife, museums and shopping are all important drawcards for inner city living but are not present to nearly the same degree in Rotorua, where most amenity is derived from the low-density residential environment and access to the outdoors. Certainly not Rotorua's CBD in its current state. Higher densities that bring with them benefits such as increased concentration, more efficient use of infrastructure, better access etc. will only be realised where provisions concentrate higher densities into specific locations. Enabling higher densities everywhere will only spread development across Rotorua's urban area slowly, with infrastructure provision in perpetual "catch up" mode, without any of the attendant benefits of higher density. In a lower density environment like Rotorua, where few of the preconditions exist to encourage higher density, it is even more important to concentrate any higher density in specific locations to maximise the benefits of potential changes. The submission refers to the Market Economics economic assessment provided to support the plan change in relation to advice on the High Density Residential Zone.	Invite Council to revise PC9 to confine its intensification plans to the CBD and immediately associated areas. Invite the incoming Council to amend zones to define the distance within which higher density would access services by pedestrians (frequently 400m is used).	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
169	Bennett, V (FS)	20	5	56	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme and supports the original submission. Higher intensification across the Residential 1 Zone is unnecessary and poorly thought through and not supported by demonstrated demand. Furthermore, the cost of building to 3 storeys on residential sections is high and cannot be justified by owners or commercial investors unless land values increase well beyond current levels. The scattered and adhoc intensification that would be permitted within the entire Residential 1 Zone would negatively impact the amenity value for residents and exacerbate the challenges of providing infrastructure and services. Higher density living is already permitted in the inner city area close to amenities and services but the update has been low.	Support submission 20.5.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
170	McKay, K and Reed, S (FS)	20	5	62	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters own residential property in Rotorua. They support the original submission.	Support submission 20.5.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
171	Elad Trustee Limited (FS)	20	5	81	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission 20.5.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
172	Holmes, W (FS)	20	5	82	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission, stating the Council has not peer reviewed the Market Economic Report and that the amenity and character of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones will be destroyed with 3 storey houses jammed into small sections.	Support relief sought by submitter - confine intensification to the CBD and immediately adjoining areas only, with those areas determined by proximity of pedestrian access to services.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
173	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	20	5	97	5	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 20.5 and supports the Council's notification of Plan Change 9.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 20.5 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
174	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	20	5	104	1	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitters are a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring that appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. They support the original submission and state that this could be achieved using accessibility as a qualifying matter.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
175	Gifford, S (FS)	20	5	150	8	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Allow submission but preference is for a tailor made approach to Rotorua. If PC9 were to be implemented it should be limited to CBD.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
176	Holmes, R (FS)	20	5	172	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission, stating the Council has not peer reviewed the Market Economic Report and that the amenity and character of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones will be destroyed with 3 storey houses jammed into small sections.	Support relief sought by submitter - confine intensification to the CBD and immediately adjoining areas only, with those areas determined by proximity of pedestrian access to services.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
177	Holmes, T (FS)	20	5	173	3	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission, stating the Council has not peer reviewed the Market Economic Report and that the amenity and character of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones will be destroyed with 3 storey houses jammed into small sections.	Support relief sought by submitter - confine intensification to the CBD and immediately adjoining areas only, with those areas determined by proximity of pedestrian access to services.	Refer submission 20.5 above.
178	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	6			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Oppose	The submission states concern about the analysis of infrastructure capacity to support the proposed changes, saying that there are only a few short paragraphs around p. 16 of the Section 32 report that deal with this question. While increase will not happen overnight, there is a risk that pockets of increased density are developed anywhere within the Residential 1 zone, isolated from infrastructure planning and upgrades. The submission considers that the lack of an infrastructure assessment is a flow in the PC9 process. While the Council response may be to levy Development Contributions, how can that be carried out in an integrated and anticipated way when such development can happen anywhere? Instead of integrated forward planning, Council would be forever playing “catch up” by reacting to and therefore following the higher-density developments, which is profoundly bad planning, and will cost the city dearly in the future. The ability to service higher densities should have been properly examined as part of the preparation of this PC9. It has not been done and should have been, at least to inform ratepayers as to likely costs and impact on rates.	Invite Council to revise PC9 in the light of an independent Infrastructure Assessment yet to be conducted.	Reject. Make no specific revision in light of an independent infrastructure assessment. Refer to Infrastructure section of this report and the evidence of G Manzano for discussion of infrastructure.
179	McKay, K and Reed, S (FS)	20	6	62	4	Infrastructure	Other	Other		The submitters own residential property in Rotorua. They support the original submission, stating that the ability to service higher densities should have been properly examined - at least to inform ratepayers as to likely costs and impacts on rates.	Support submission 20.6. That Council revise PC9 in light of an independent infrastructure assessment yet to be conducted.	Reject. Make no specific revision in light of an independent infrastructure assessment. Refer to Infrastructure section of this report and the evidence of G Manzano for discussion of infrastructure.
180	Irwin, W (FS)	20	6	83	7	Infrastructure	Other	Other		Infrastructure will not cope with the introduction of high density housing in the suburbs. This must be addressed before any decision to move ahead with PC9.	Agree with submission.	Reject. Make no specific revision in light of an independent infrastructure assessment. Refer to Infrastructure section of this report and the evidence of G Manzano for discussion of infrastructure.
181	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	20	6	104	2	Infrastructure	Other	Other		The submitters are a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring that appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. They support the original submission and state that infrastructure could be used as a qualifying matter where there is inadequate infrastructural capacity to service development or as a performance standard.	Allow submission.	Reject. Make no specific revision in light of an independent infrastructure assessment. Refer to Infrastructure section of this report and the evidence of G Manzano for discussion of infrastructure.
182	Duncan, M and T (FS)	20	6	143	4	Infrastructure	Other	Other		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change and supports the original submission. Intensification needs transport hubs, we do not have the population to support. Recent reports this year show population falling.	Support submission.	Reject. Make no specific revision in light of an independent infrastructure assessment. Refer to Infrastructure section of this report and the evidence of G Manzano for discussion of infrastructure.
183	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	20	7			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submission expresses concern that the adverse effects have not been anticipated or have been treated overly optimistically in terms of impacts on sunlight, privacy, views, protection of heritage and character, infrastructure funding and substandard housing.	Invite Council to revise PC9 in the light of potentially adverse effects that have not been anticipated.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
184	Holmes, W (FS)	20	7	82	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support relief sought by submitter - revise PC9 in light of potential adverse effects that have not been anticipated.	Refer submission 20.7 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
185	Gifford, S (FS)	20	7	150	9	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Agrees with concerns of sweeping removal of existing protections.	Allow submission	Refer submission 20.7 above.
186	Holmes, R (FS)	20	7	172	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support relief sought by submitter - revise PC9 in light of potential adverse effects that have not been anticipated.	Refer submission 20.7 above.
187	Holmes, T (FS)	20	7	173	4	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support relief sought by submitter - revise PC9 in light of potential adverse effects that have not been anticipated.	Refer submission 20.7 above.
188	Marshall, D (FS)	20	Various	110	3	Various	various	various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission of the Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
189	Oxley, M (FS)	20	Various	119	8	Various	various	various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission of the Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
190	Staite, P	21	1			Papakāinga	Standards	PK-R1(1)(a)	Support	The provision is unwarranted, unnecessary and achieves nothing but confinement of tangata whenua to a specific location within their rohe. If you didn't notice, some hapu don't have a marae so what about them? This old restriction is a known breach of the Treaty of Waitangi and is racist in application. Delete It!	Delete the performance standard that requires Papakāinga to locate on land that adjoins or is adjacent to a marae. Strikethrough all the text of the first three bullet-points of text.	Accept Remove performance standard PK-R1(1)(c)
191	Staite, P	21	2			Papakāinga	Standards	PK-R1(3)(b)	Oppose	Applying one residential unit per 2000m2 of net area for Papakāinga is not consistent with tikanga Maori for Papakāinga dwelling house (whare) spacing. Historically whare are closely arranged on site for security and well-being of koeke inhabitants, meaning in normal voice range of each other for emergency or similar support care for attention. A closer design network of whare also reduces the maintenance area around the house, which is important with increasing fuel costs and less income. 2000m2 is a waste of Maori land area with big sections and separates koeke from whanau. If adopted without consultation as required by the Local Government Act it is considered institutional racism, out of touch and a breach of the Treaty of Waitangi. Provisions for clusters of units (Kāinga) would be more practical and fitting at one residential unit (whare) per 400m2 minimum area for koeke to live and maintain upkeep. For example a perimeter boundary of 20 meters x 20 meters square, or other nominal length sides and configurations to provide the equivalent 400m2 to enable close proximity koeke dwelling clusters.	I seek the deletion and substitute area size to your stated land area amendment setting the density standard to enable greater density of Papakāinga development. Strikethrough the text at pullet-point two of three stipulating 2,000m2 I suggest amendment to 400m2.	Reject. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report. Do not make the change sought.
192	Paget, M and J (FS)	21	2	149	1	Papakāinga	Standards	PK-R1(3)(b)		The submitters own property in the Rural Zone adjacent to Maori land and oppose in part the original submission. They state that while they understand the suggestion for smaller lots for better use of the land and closer living to foster greater communal/support activities, property owners surrounding Maori land have bought their properties because they want to live in a rural setting. Housing density that exceeds current rural rules next to rural properties is not going to work.	Oppose submission in part. Consider suggestion to allow denser development in central part of land blocks, away from surrounding rural properties (depending on land size, configuration, utility availability etc), with density decreasing towards edge to reflect larger lot sizes of surrounding rural land.	Accept in part Refer to proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development in Papakaing section of the Section 42A Report.
193	Staite, P	21	3			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission expressed concerns about the level of detail included in the notification letter.	Seek clarification	Noted. No relief sought within the plan change, only clarification of process.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
194	Bear,C	22	1			Residential	General	General	Support	The submitter states that she lives near High Street Reserve and is affected by the plan change; that she has worked for 2 decades as a senior adviser in central government, in building/ housing and environmental Ministries; is aware of international evidence (from UK, Melbourne etc.) that SUPPORTS medium density housing policies in urban areas (particularly along main transport corridors) for improved social, environmental and economic /infrastructure outcomes. She is satisfied it is a balanced proposal enabling solutions for the housing crisis, and changing demographics towards smaller, older households – while still retaining plenty of parks and reserves in and around Rotorua to enjoy, and retain the essential character of Rotorua neighbourhoods overall. The key is to enforce HIGH (above minimum Building Code) QUALITY design standards, e.g. Durable materials and flexible use design for future users. Not cheap crappy exterior cladding materials that need replacing within 20 years (as seen in many recent Lower Hutt developments), and inadequate insulation/ ventilation or storage. She considers that there are too many ‘NIMBY’ submitters – complaining about housing issues in Rotorua but not wanting to actually change anything in their own backyard.	Adopt the plan change	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
195	Gifford, S (FS)	22	1	150	10	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission, stating that PC9 is not a balanced proposal. PC9 removes planning protections that were put in place to address issues and those issues remain relevant.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 22.1 above.
196	Mansell, W	23	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	This is a one-size-fits-all aimed solely at Auckland and should not be considered outside of Auckland. This is simply central government imposing itself on regional cities without consultation. This plan change is an unchartered new era of tree felling, character killing, sunlight blocking and privacy destroying housing rules that are about to be fostered upon suburbs that don't need it. Imagine how cold houses will be. There will be pressure on power sources. Windows will look into existing bedrooms. Neighbours will look down over private areas (spa pools).	Do not invoke Plan Change 9 in any form.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
197	Gifford, S (FS)	23	1	150	11	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission - concern of adverse effects of lack of height requirements of PC9	Allow submission.	Refer submission 23.1 above.
198	The NZ Seventh-Day Adventist Schools Association Ltd	24	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	We are a school located on 3 tilsley Street, behind 311 Fenton Street and we are directly affected by the proposed change. We have concerns over the privacy and safety of vulnerable children should properties be permitted to extent to a height where buildings overlook the school. the school already had document problems where occupants of two-storey emergency housing motel have been seen in windows closely watching pupils. In addition we have multiple incidents where hazardous or obscene items thrown into school grounds from emergency housing on Fenton Street. Even if residential buildings are surrounded by open space, the impact on the lives of staff and students will be detrimental by allowing 3-storey buildings to look own into our school and directly observe children playing.	Amend to prohibit the following addresses from being permitted to extent to 3 storeys because of concerns over student safety: 2,4,5,6,7,8,9 Tilsley Street 6,8,10,12 Holland Street 305-309, 311, 313, 315-317 Fenton Street	Reject. Does not meet the requirements of a qualifying matter as specified under s77I of the RMA. Refer to other potential qualifying matters section of this report. Disallow submission.
199	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	24	1	97	6	Other	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 24.1 on the basis that the relief sought in the submission essentially seeks to recognise 'proximity to school' as a qualifying matter. This is not considered an appropriate qualifying matter'.	Disallow submission.	Accept Refer to other potential qualifying matters section of this report. Disallow submission

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
200	Graham, N	25	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	I oppose changing the definitions of a residential 1 zone, particularly in established neighbourhoods. These changes would have detrimental effects on the existing houses, which have been designed to factor in privacy, light and general character requirements of the old RESZ1 definitions. Due to the slope of the area, my property already has a limited outlook with limited direct sunlight due to shading from neighbouring properties. This would become extremely unpleasant if further intensification was allowed on a blanket basis without considering each neighbourhood and section on a case by case basis. For NEW developments, housing can be designed and built to take this into account, but this does not work for old established neighbourhoods, where this proposal would fundamentally negatively alter the character of the neighbourhood.	Retain the OLD definitions of RESZ1. Allow intensification as suggested in the amendments for NEW developments but NOT old and established neighbourhoods.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
201	Gifford, S (FS)	25	1	150	12	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission - concern of adverse effects of blanket approach to PC9.	Allow submission, although other solutions to higher density should be considered.	Refer submission 25.1 above.
202	Nelson, L	26	1			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"Access site" and "access way" are straight out of the Auckland Unitary Plan and not simple to apply and add unneeded complexity where it is not warranted.	The purpose of these is generally in relation to net site area or otherwise. Hamilton CC's net site area and TCC's nett site area are much more user friendly and the TCC ones is the simplest of the three so would be preferable, especially TCC's diagram under nett site area which shows what is an accessway clearly. Remove proposed and use TCC's	Reject. Refer to 'Other' section of the Section 42A Report. Retain the proposed definitions
203	Nelson, L	26	2			Natural Hazards	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"AEP" - needs to be updated to reflect the proposed changes in natural hazards chapter	Update to fit PC9 changes	Accept. Remove reference to 2%AEP flood maps in the District Plan.
204	Nelson, L	26	3			Natural Hazards	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"Building" for NHZ appears to exclude motorhomes but includes caravans.	Inconsistency needs addressed.	Reject. The definition is from the National Planning Standards.
205	Nelson, L	26	4			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"building footprint" / "building coverage" - the removal of the eave overhang will encourage buildings without eaves which are known to be a risk for weather tightness	Allow eaves overhang as both TCC and HCC do and it should allow guttering to be included. HCC definition the better of the two.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
206	Nelson, L	26	5			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"daylight envelope" - while this may no longer be relevant for residential it is still applicable in rural zone for example; can't be removed in its entirety	Leave and note residential is in specific chapter. Create more legible diagram with font size old eyes can see.	Accept Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
207	Nelson, L	26	6			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"minor residential unit" - this provision should be removed entirely as the rural chapter has an inconsistent performance standard to this definition (it has 72m² gross whereas residential was net) and the MDRS makes it irrelevant in residential zone. Only reason to keep it is for financial contributions in residential which I argue elsewhere ought to be removed at this opportunity anyway and reserves contribution policy dumped into Development Contribution policy	Remove	Accept in part. Retain definition for minor residential unit but amend. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
208	Nelson, L	26	7			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	"net site area" - similar to HCC/Auckland definitions which is fine, just not the access definitions that it links to above/below	Fix 'access' definitions as above	Reject. Retain proposed amendments. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
209	Nelson, L	26	8			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"rear site" - again HCC/TCC definitions much better than the Auckland ones. The definition of "yard" already has a better diagram (although one that needs to be made better quality; ask to pinch TCC's!)	Use HCC/TCC definitions/diagrams. Both plans have better diagrams than Auckland!	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
210	Nelson, L	26	9			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	"yard" - see above regarding building footprint etc.	Allow eaves overhang as both TCC and HCC do and it should allow guttering to be included. HCC definition the better of the two.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
211	Nelson, L	26	10			Strategic Direction	Objectives and Policies	SPUD-O1, SPUD-O2, SPUD-P4, SPUD-P21	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Can see why these have been put here as very generic (basically Section 5 of RMA restated!) but aren't all the MDRS objectives and policies supposed to be in the residential chapter?	Confirm appropriateness of location	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
212	Nelson, L	26	11			Natural Hazards	Objectives and Policies	NH-PA, NH-PB, NH-PC	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	While these are good polices with the reformatting of the plan they now don't have objectives to sit under which is against the hierarchy of RMA	Need relevant objectives for polices to sit under.	Reject. Do not adopt an additional objective. Refer to Natural Hazards - Objectives section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
213	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	26	11	84	1	Natural Hazards	Objectives and Policies	NH-PA, NH-PB, NH-PC		Support the relief sought by the submitters.	Support relief. A suggested additional objective is: NH-O2: Subdivision, use and development in the Rotorua District in areas susceptible to natural hazards, including flooding, geothermal and fault line hazards, is managed to minimise risk to people, property and the environment.	Reject. Do not adopt an additional objective. Refer to Natural Hazards - Objectives section of the Section 42A Report.
214	Nelson, L	26	12			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4	Seek amendment / support in part	Generally good but why does NH-R4(4) exist? Surely covered off by NH-R4(1-3) already.	Remove provision as not needed.	Accept Although noting that no relief sought, only clarification. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report for discussion why rule is necessary.
215	Nelson, L	26	13			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43	Oppose	Where is the link to NH-R4 where the 0.3m threshold is mentioned before a change in status up to RD is required?	Needs to line up with permitted activity rule in NH-R4	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
216	Nelson, L	26	14			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(a)	Oppose	250m² net in Residential 1 is too small for vacant lots as a controlled activity without Council first seeing an overall development plan for what actually will be built.	Recommend 300m² net as controlled which still leaves the door open for smaller lots as a discretionary activity ideally where 3d building area polyhedrons are demonstrated on each lot and consent notices imposed. Developers always have the choice to create smaller lots by establishing the buildings first under residential chapter and then apply for subdivision on an existing environment argument.	Reject Refer to Section 6 of the Urban Design Report included at Appendix 9 of the Section 32 Report.
217	Nelson, L	26	15			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(b)	Support	250m² net is appropriate for character of Residential 2	None.	Noted.
218	Nelson, L	26	16			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(2)	Support	Helps prevent unworkable lot shapes as a controlled activity but allows Council discretion where an innovative building design can be accommodated on an odd/awkward lot shape.	None.	Noted.
219	Nelson, L	26	17			Transport	Standards	SUB-S1(4) & SUB-S3(3)	Oppose	addition of "front doors" seems unnecessary and parking close to a front door is important for members of the community with limited mobility. Discriminatory provision without clear urban design outcomes that are positive.	Remove addition.	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
220	Nelson, L	26	18			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2)(b)	Oppose	See comments for RESZ-S5(4) also. This change will make a rod for Council's back as over the long term the owners will not be able to agree and unlike Unit Title development there are no easy ways to force difficult owners to pay their share so owners in desperation will petition Council to take over ownership/maintenance. Talk to TCC about the problems with similar rights of way around Brookfield etc. with around the 10+ users, am sure they wouldn't allow them again!	Do not add provision as private way but allow more flexibility on legal road widths that Council will take over that align closer with what NZS4404 provides for. I.e. allow more 8-12m legal roads where no further development potential exists.	Accept in part. Increase the performance standard for maximum number of users of private access driveways but also insert a performance standard regarding ongoing maintenance. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
221	Nelson, L	26	19			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC	Oppose in part	The proposed reserve contribution values still very high compared with surrounding Councils and is much more flexible under the DC policy. Support the reduction but think they ought to go further as little transparency currently about where they get spend whereas with a DC policy its clear what they are getting spent on.	Surely Council ought to take the opportunity to remove the reserves contribution policy and dump the existing one into the development contributions regime and then revise when time allows but not leave it in District Plan.	Accept in part. Council intends to consider development contributions for reserves at the next review of the development contributions policy (See current policy para 127). Make no changes.
222	Nelson, L	26	20			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1(iv)(d)	Oppose	still refers to subsidiary dwellings that should have been changed last plan change but got missed.	Update to match current definitions.	Accept. Refer to discussion in Financial Contributions section of the s42A report. Amend FC-R1(iv)(d) as detailed in the Appendix.
223	Nelson, L	26	21			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1(1)	Support	This rule does not seem to offer any benefit to Māori that the MDRS does not already in a residential zone with the density provision for Kaumatua flats being removed. must not be allowed to be used for general (non-Māori freehold land) as would result in private developers just finding an Iwi partner to line their pockets!	Is this rule still of any value now. Further consultation with Iwi needed.	Accept in part Amended PK-R1(1) for clarity. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
224	Nelson, L	26	22			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R2	Support	Rule not clear this is over Māori freehold plan only	Update.	Accept Recommend to delete provision as is considered ultra vires. Refer to Papakaing section of the Section 42A Report.
225	Nelson, L	26	23			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	I can see that the Councillors saw the MDRS as a way to get some quick residential development runs on the board but in practice the implementation of the MDRS will largely not be any quicker than a standard plan change for a lot of higher density developments. Council are now paying for the sins on not moving the District Plan forward in 2016 and mostly rolling over the first generation plan. While the MDRS has some decent points it has some fatal flaws that are going to have significant adverse effects on existing community's; particularly around daylighting and solar access.	Look at what Hamilton/Christchurch have done in forging their own path forward not importing Auckland solutions.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
226	Gifford, S (FS)	26	23	150	13	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. We should be looking at solutions suitable to Rotorua's environment.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 26.23 above.
227	Nelson, L	26	24			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives and Policies	General	Seek amendment / support in part	Some good changes in here other than an overly heavy cycling only focus (coming from an avid cyclist!) which should be broader to non-car options such as e-scooters etc. given not all of the population can use these options	Check if RESZ-P39 should be under the residential 1 section.	Accept RESZ-P39 relates to land within the Residential 1 Zone.
228	Nelson, L	26	25			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Seems unnecessary duplication here and multiple activities with same numbering overlapping	Formatting edits needed.	Accept Refer Appendix 1.
229	Nelson, L	26	26			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)	Oppose	The maximum height on its own is not a problem but when combined with the tiny side yards and the allowable daylighting it will have significant adverse effects for adjoining neighbours in standard poorly insulated/heated/designed New Zealand house that rely on solar access for any degree of comfort and neighbourhood privacy will go the way of the Dodo. This will likely generate more demand for rural lifestyle living for anyone who want to keep their privacy which will result in more commuting the environmental costs that go with that.	Can only hope this will be repealed if Rotorua sticks with MDRS! Both diagrams need to be improved so they are clearer and more legible.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
230	Nelson, L	26	27			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)	Oppose	Again the 12m daylighting will have high adverse effects on adjoin neighbours. The general principle of apartment is ok but developer ought to have to aggregate several properties so they can still comply with the standard MDRS daylighting. Also much of the Residential 2 zone (Hinemoa/Elizabeth Streets etc.) have soft soils and stormwater flooding issues which does not appear to have been considered when developing this rule. This rule also reduces the incentive for offices no longer needed in the CBD to be converted to quality apartments.	Delete rule entirely	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
231	Nelson, L	26	28			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S3(1-2)	Support	Support reduction in impermeable area given increased levels of building are likely to occur had hadn't in the past	None.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to impermeable (renamed impervious) surfaces. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
232	Nelson, L	26	29			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5	Oppose	As noted above for subdivision this many users on a right of way will be a disaster but is not so bad in a Unit Title development like Stillwater which has aged better due to body corporate control/maintenance provisions.	Do not add provision as private way but allow more flexibility on legal road widths that Council will take over that align closer with what NZS4404 provides for. I.e. allow more 8-12m legal roads where no further development potential exists. If Council must proceed with it then need performance standard included about providing onsite area for rubbish bins on pickup day and some mechanism to ensure other residents don't loose all their on street parking or have their berms churned to mud. Suggest a permit system in the street would be required as the developer is just socialising the cost of parking on adjoining residents otherwise.	Accept in part. Increase the performance standard for maximum number of users of private access driveways but also insert a performance standard regarding ongoing maintenance. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
233	Nelson, L	26	30			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)	Support	Necessary to have the minimum sizes as do not want "shoebox" unit but do want to allow softer density increases with studios etc. much like Portland/Vancouver etc.	None.	Noted.
234	Nelson, L	26	31			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(2)(iii)	Seek amendment / support in part	The idea here is good but its very hard to follow.	Can standard be redrafted to be easier to follow?	Accept in Part An amended diagram is recommended to improve clarity on this standard. Refer Appendix 1.
235	Nelson, L	26	32			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	It does not state in the MDRS if this is total site area or net site area, this ought to be clarified, assume total as not specified.	Clarify.	Reject The proposed landscaped area standard is in accordance with the MDRS.
236	Nelson, L	26	33			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)	Seek amendment / support in part	The intent of this rule is good but how on earth are Council going to enforce it? Drive all streets once a year with a google earth Streetview style camera and then send out infringement notices?? Anything short of this will create a two-tier system where if you apply for consent you will have to met the rule but private homeowners will just do what they feel like and ruin the character of the street.	No point imposing this rule unless Council are going to adequately resource the enforcement of it.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
237	Nelson, L	26	34			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Oppose in part	Some typo's. p49 - "outdoor living space" what is a "gradie"; gradient?	Amend.	Accept Refer Appendix 1.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
238	Nelson, L	26	35			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Oppose in part	"shared driveway" needs to include standard about rubbish bins to be onsite on collection day.	Amend.	Accept. Include additional standards relating to manoeuvring and turning to facilitate rubbish collection on site with matters of discretion relating to rubbish collection services where performance standards are not met. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
239	Nelson, L	26	36			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB(4)(f)	Seek amendment / support in part	needs to be wider and futureproofed for new devices (hoverboards?? Etc.)	Amend.	Reject This provision seeks to support active modes of transport in accordance with RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13.
240	Nelson, L	26	37			Infrastructure	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB(5)(b)	Oppose in part	Waste of time asking for this when the point of the MDRS is to shoehorn as many residential units into existing neighbourhoods as possible!	This will need to be done at a catchment level in public reserves.	Accept in part. Retain consideration but as an assessment criteria to encourage solutions that may assist achieve wider outcomes.
241	Nelson, L	26	38			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R24(1)	Oppose	Given the current problems on Fenton Street that have occurred within the currently plan framework this needs to be a controlled activity at least!	Elevate status of activity.	Reject The requested amendment does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or the NPS-UD.
242	Nelson, L	26	39			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule table	COMZ-R33	Support	Good the status is being elevated to RD given current problems on Fenton Street etc.	None.	Noted.
243	Nelson, L	26	40			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)	Oppose	Should retain the 12m limit as taller buildings appropriately fit in the CBD. Reduces incentives for a thriving CBD.	No change to existing standard.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
244	Nelson, L	26	41			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(6)(a)(ii)	Oppose	See comments on RESZ-S1(2) above	Use standard MDRS Height in relation to boundary.	Reject The MDRS height in relation to boundary standard would not enable the building heights proposed within the City centre Zones.
245	Nelson, L	26	42			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2(1)	Support	sensible update to encourage active frontages	None.	Noted.
246	Nelson, L	26	43			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5	Support	good to align with residential	None.	Noted.
247	Nelson, L	26	44			Other	Rule Table	INZ-R41(1)(a)(iv)	Oppose	refers to a provision in the residential chapter which is being removed.	Fix links. One way to improve the rule would be to remove i-v and just leave the reference to residential 1 performance standards.	
248	Nelson, L	26	45			Development Areas	Standards	WHDA-SA3	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	should the yards be updated to match the residential 1 zone standards?	Check.	Reject. Rule table states development shall comply with Residential 1 Zone yards. Refer to development area section of this report.
249	Nelson, L	26	46			Residential 1 Zone	Maps	maps	Oppose in part	All of the Industrial Transition Zone land should be returned to Residential 1 given Lockwood are reducing their industrial footprint with recent sale for motel an example.	Delete Industrial T zone from maps and replace with Residential 1.	Reject Refer to Other - Rezoning to Residential 1 section of the Section 42A Report.
250	Nelson, L	26	47			Residential 2 Zone	Maps	maps	Oppose in part	Should be no Residential 2 west of Old Taupo Road given MDRS applies to that land already which is a significant enough character change as this point. Nor should there be Residential 2 either side of Tarewa Road on both character and natural hazard grounds. Support the areas of Res-2 along the southern edge of the zone changing to Res-1.	Stop Res-2 expansion.	Reject The spatial extent of the Residential 2 zone has been applied to areas with the highest levels of accessibility to ensure that high density development can be focussed to these areas. See the urban design evidence for further information on the Accessibility and Demand Assessment undertaken. Economic Analysis which has informed PC9 concludes that if the spatial application is too extensive, then it may not adequately encourage the concentration of higher density development into areas which support the function of key nodes. Refer section 42A Report, Accessibility and Demand Assessment, and Economic Assessment.
251	Nelson, L	26	48			Residential 1 Zone	Maps	maps	Oppose in part	At the same time the entire Rotorua racecourse should be rezoned Residential-1 and Council ensure a quality need medium density suburb close to town.	Rezone Rotorua racecourse to Res-1	Reject Refer to Other - Rezoning to Residential 1 section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
252	Lakes Water Quality Society	27	1			Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission states that intensification of urban development and raises questions about the impact on the environment and how this will be managed. The submission discusses the following reasons why intensification and population increase is considered to negatively impact water quality: * Increases in nutrient, chemicals and microplastics discharged into the lake from the Rotorua City Treatment plant * Increases in chemicals flowing into stormwater and into the lake from industrial, transport and residential activity * Increases in phosphorous entering streams and the lake with eroded soils * Increased temperature in stormwater flows with increased impervious surfaces * Increases in peak stormwater flows with increased impervious surfaces - causing more nutrient-rich soil to be carried to the lake reticulation of campground * Summer recreational loads - discussion of deteriorating water quality at Lake Tikitapu/Blue Lake despite catchment landuse and The submission also states that although there have been substantial efforts to improve lake water quality climate change is counteracting the improvements	Clarify: * what assurances can RLC give about the additional demands from brownfields and any greenfield developments on Council [infrastructure] systems. * what assurances can be given that the stormwater runoff, effluent disposal and long term water resource sustainability will be well managed for all conditions and at all times for the community.	No relief sought only clarification. Refer to Natural Hazards and Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
253	Shekell G (FS)	27	1	121	5	Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	No relief sought only clarification. Refer to Natural Hazards and Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
254	Lakes Water Quality Society	27	2			Infrastructure	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission expresses concern about the costs of provision of infrastructure in the geography and geothermal environment of Rotorua. It states that it would be reasonable that the Council might have begun a process of housing intensification by identifying the central areas having robust piping of sufficient capacity to accept the greater flows and expanded from this area as warranted.	Make the detail and costings of Plan Change 9 [provision of infrastructure] as transparent as possible.	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to the discussion of infrastructure in the Section 42A Report and the evidence of G Manzano.
255	Lakes Water Quality Society	27	3			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Other	Other	Oppose	The submission states disappointment that the plan change is silent on the sustainable aspects of housing it will allow and states other communities are incorporating sustainability design into design codes e.g. with respect to use of rainwater	No relief stated	Reject No specific relief is sought by the submitter.
256	Gifford, S (FS)	27	3	150	14	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. PC9 makes sweeping changes without addressing fundamental points like sustainability. It is short-sighted. Fundamental planning changes should be done once and done right.	Reject PC9	Refer submission 27.3 above.
257	Johnson, S	28	1			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	I do not want a three storey building that could affect my property built in the vicinity of my property. This could affect my view, privacy, sunlight and have an adverse effect on my property value	Oppose PC9 and medium density residential standards.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
258	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	28	1	58	2	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. The added house height and possible decreased rear boundaries will create privacy issues and over shadowing of their home and property. They live in an area with a large development proposal.	Support submission 28.1	Refer submission 28.1 above.
259	Ward, K (FS)	28	1	106	3	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns two properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agree that they do not want three storey buildings that could affect their property - views, privacy, sunlight - and have an adverse effect on property value.	Support submission.	Refer submission 28.1 above.
260	Gifford, S (FS)	28	1	150	15	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 28.1 above.
261	Marsh, I (FS)	28	1	155	3	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter supports the original submission, stating that they live in a neighbourhood where there is a proposed residential development comprising of 93 dwellings in a variety of sizes and forms. They are opposed to the number of homes being planned for this area under PC9 and the effected the planned 2 storied homes will have on the amenity of their and other neighbour's homes. The added house height and possible decreased rear boundaries proposed will create privacy issues and over shadowing.	Support submission.	Refer submission 28.1 above.
262	Johnson, S	28	2			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The proposed medium density residential standards will allow medium density development to be built across much of the urban area that do not require it.	Oppose PC9 and medium density residential standards.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
263	Johnson, S	28	3			Residential 1 Zone	Other	Other	Oppose	This will bring us more potential school students to areas where schools have already reduced their maximum enrolment. This could mean the schools need to be enlarged. What if there isn't land to do it?	No relief stated	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
264	Fletcher, J	29	1			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter raised concerns around not everyone receiving notification letters	No relief stated	Noted. No relief stated. Notification was sent to all those considered directly affected by the plan change. Refer Plan Change Process submissions for more detail.
265	Fletcher, J	29	2			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter discusses concerns around the effect that 3, three story would have on sunlight onsite - especially if constructed to the north. The existing dwelling on their site has design features to maximise the use of the sunlight including the location of dining/lounge areas, double glazing and a north facing roof. Dwelling also has solar panels on the north side of the house to maximise electricity production. Concerns around the effects that MDRS scale development would have on sunlight throughout the year, with particular concerns during winter.	Request that 23 Tamiki Street is not included in the MDRS and instead retains the previous provisions.	Reject The site or area identified within the submission is located within a relevant residential zone, and the MDRS are required to be incorporated in accordance with section 77G of the RMA. No qualifying matters have been identified within the submission.
266	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	1			Infrastructure	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Transpower supports the change to the definition of national grid sensitive activities [which substitutes the term 'household units' with 'residential units'] to align with changes being made through PC9. This will also assist in ensuring that the National Grid is appropriately applied as a qualifying matter. The proposed amendment is consequential and does not change the intent of the definition.	Retain the proposed change to the definition of national grid sensitive activities [which substitutes the term 'household units' with 'residential units'].	Accept. Make the change in terminology consistent with the national planning standards.
267	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	2			Other	Definitions, Other	Definitions, Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower strongly supports the inclusion of the table at the start of the Residential Zones – Wāhi Noho chapter which clearly sets out what qualifying matters have been identified and what the applicable rules are. However, Transpower understands that this has been included as a guide to PC9, particularly in terms of outlining what provisions have immediate legal effect, and as such would not be included once the PC9 provisions are made operative in full. Given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, the reference to them in the PC9 policy framework, and to assist in ongoing implementation of the Plan, Transpower considers it appropriate to retain the table in some form within the District Plan. Transpower have suggested doing so by including the table in a new definition of qualifying matters, which would link the policy framework referring to qualifying matters with the list of rules. It would benefit plan users to provide a clear list as to what are qualifying matter areas in the DP, such as that included in the plan change document (for explanatory purposes) at the start of the Residential Zones – Wāhi Noho chapter. This will make application of policies which refer to qualifying matters much clearer. This is particularly important given the number of provisions which implement the qualifying matters which sit outside the Residential Zones – Wāhi Noho chapter.	Insert a definition for ‘qualifying matter’ as follows: <u>means a matter referred to in section 77I or 77O of the RMA.</u> <u>Applicable qualifying matters include the rules set out the table below:</u> [refer to full submission - table based on that in the Residential Zones chapter] If the definition is not accepted, otherwise incorporate the table in the Plan provisions, for example as an addition to the ‘Introduction’ to the Residential Zones - Wāhi Noho chapter.	Reject. Do not adopt definition. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
268	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	30	2	80	1	Other	Definitions, Other	Definitions, Other		HNZPT agrees that the plan needs, in an ongoing manner, to reflect the importance of qualifying matters, particularly as this includes historic heritage and the fact that they exempt sites from intensification, or in the alternative design that has to give special consideration to accommodating qualifying matters. This exemption allows greater weight to be given to the impacts of intensification on qualifying matters.	Accept submission 30.2	Reject. Do not adopt definition. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
269	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	30	2	97	7	Other	Definitions, Other	Definitions, Other		Kāinga Ora supports submissions point 30.2 as the proposed definition and table will provide further clarity for plan users as to what qualifying matters apply in the District.	Allow submission.	Reject. Do not adopt definition. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
270	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	3			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1	Support	Transpower supports the objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety. The objective reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA.	Retain SDUD-O1: <i>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.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
271	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	4			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O2	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower generally supports the objective, noting it reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(b) of the RMA. However, given the “relevant residential zones” have been identified within the ODP, it is more appropriate for the objective to explicitly refer to these zones, so that it is clear within the Plan how this part of Schedule 3A is implemented within this particular Plan.	Amend SDUD-O2 as follows: ~~A relevant residential zone~~ <i>The Residential 1 Medium Density Zone and Residential 2 High Density Zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to -</i> <i>i. housing needs and demand; and</i> <i>ii. the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including three storey buildings within the Residential 1 Zone and up to six storeys in the Residential 2 Zone.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
272	Shekell G (FS)	30	4	121	6	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and seeks instead that transmission lines be underground	That transmission lines be under the ground.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
273	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	5			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O9	Support	Transpower supports this objective and in particular the need to ensure that urban development is safe.	Retain SDUD-O9: <i>Urban development results in attractive, safe and healthy environments.</i>	Noted.
274	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	6			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P1	Support	Transpower supports the policy, on the basis that SDUD-P3 sets out how qualifying matters affect density.	Retain SPUD-P1: <i>Enable a variety of housing types and a mix of densities.</i>	Noted.
275	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	7			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P3	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower supports the clear reference within this Policy to those matters that have been applied as qualifying matters. However, Transpower’s preference, to avoid doubt, would be for the policy to explicitly refer to ‘qualifying matters’. This makes their application as a qualifying matter clear in the on-going implementation of the Plan. Transpower specifically supports clause 1, noting the NPS-UD 2020 defines nationally significant infrastructure as including the national grid electricity transmission network.	Amend SDUD-P3 as follows: <i>Within the urban environment, limit heights and densities where it is necessary to recognise and provide for qualifying matters, including matters of national importance, or other matters of significance to Rotorua, including:</i> ...	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
276	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	30	7	80	2	Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P3		HNZPT has made a submission point regarding RESZ-P15 seeking their retention and some amendments, and would be concerned if these matters were deleted/alterd in response to this submission point.	Reject submission 30.7	Accept in part. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
277	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	8			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P4	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower supports the clear reference to qualifying matters, and how they override the height and density standards that would other apply within the relevant residential zones. The policy is also consistent with Schedule 3A, clause 6(2)(b). However, there is an opportunity to make the policy direction within the Plan much clearer, in terms of: - Referring to the Residential 1 Medium Density and Residential 2 High Density Zones, given they appear to be the “relevant residential zones” within the ODP, and referring to it makes it clear within the Plan how this part of Schedule 3A is implemented within this Plan Change. - being explicit about how the qualifying matters have been applied.	Amend SPUD-P4 as follows: <i>Apply the MDRS a ~~cross-all-relevant residential zones in the district plan~~ to the Residential 1 Medium Density Zone and Residential 2 High Density Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter has been identified in accordance with SDUD-P3 ~~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).~~</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
278	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	9			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P6	Support	Transpower supports the clear direction in relation to density, on the basis that Policies SDUD-P3 and SDUD-P4 are clear about the circumstances in which density may be modified by a qualifying matter.	Retain SDUD-P6: <i>Within the urban environment enable:</i> <i>1. The highest density of development within and adjoining the City Centre, recognising that this location has access to the greatest range of commercial activities and community services in Rotorua;</i> <i>2. A high density of development within the suburban centres of Ngongotahā and Owkata;</i> <i>3. A medium density of development elsewhere in residential areas.</i>	Noted.
279	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	10			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction	Seek amendment / support in part	While Transpower supports this general introduction to the residential zones, it considers it necessary to be clear that the permitted level of development may be limited by a qualifying matter.	Amend Introduction as follows: ... <i>This will promote more walkable neighbourhoods, support a sense of community and increase the viability of centres. Unless restricted by a qualifying matter, up to three residential units on a site is a permitted activity in the Residential 1 and 2 zones subject to compliance with standards...</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
280	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	11			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Support	Transpower supports the objective, noting that it refers to development ‘generally’ being up to three storeys. This, in part, acknowledges that this will not be the case throughout the entire zone, including within areas where a qualifying matter applies.	Retain RESZ-O2: <i>Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a medium density residential built character comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys, surrounded by open space.</i>	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
281	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	30	11	80	3	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2		HNZPT supports the submitter, in so far as Historic heritage is a qualifying matter that must be accommodated at the time of intensification.	Accept submission 30.11	Refer submission 30.11 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
282	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	12			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O4	Support	Transpower supports this objective and in particular the need to ensure a safe living environment for residents.	Retain RESZ-O4: <i>Development provides healthy, safe and quality living environments for residents, within the context of a medium density residential environment.</i>	Noted.
283	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	13			Residential	Objectives	RESZ-O22 and RESZ-O33	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower notes that no changes are proposed to the substance of these objectives [previously O7 and O9]. Transpower supports their retention, as it is appropriate that residential property design and development does not have reverse sensitivity effects on network utilities and that subdivision, use and development is managed to ensure the efficient operation of existing activities. However, the sub-title inserted prior to RESZ-O15 of “Activities in the Residential 3, 4 and 5 Zones” appears to result in the objectives no longer applying to the Residential 1 or 2 Zones. Transpower does not support this, as the outcomes sought should apply to all zones. Transpower’s suggested amendment seeks to ensure that RESZ-O22 and RESZ-O23 continue to be applied in the Residential 1 & 2 zones; however it may be that other objectives should also equally continue to apply in all residential zones (for example, RESZ-O17). As an alternate to Transpower’s relief, the re-ordering of some of these provisions may be required, so that more of them continue to apply to the Residential 1 & 2 zones.	Retain RESZ-O22 as notified, but amend subtitle preceding it as follows: <i>Reverse Sensitivity in any Residential Zone</i>	Reject The requested amendment does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or the NPS-UD.
284	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	14			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P1	Seek amendment / support in part	Within the Residential 1 Medium Density Zone, qualifying matters may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within RESZ-P1 is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA), Transpower supports reference to qualifying matters as they directly influence the capacity	Amend Policy RESZ-P1 as follows: <i>Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including three-storey attached and detached dwellings and low-rise apartments ,while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within areas where a qualifying matter applies .</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
285	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	30	14	80	4	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P1		HNZPT supports the submitter, in so far as Historic heritage is a qualifying matter that must be accommodated at the time of intensification.	Accept submission 30.14	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
286	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	30	14	97	8	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P1		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 30.14 and supports the retention of the notified wording of RESZ-P1, which is a policy required to be incorporated via the 'MDRS'.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Do not amend the policy. The reasons give by the further submitter are supported. Refer also to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
287	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	15			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2	Support	Transpower support this policy, subject to a reference to qualifying matters being inserted into RESZ-P1. If such a reference is not added to P1, then Transpower consider that reference may be required in this policy.	Retain RESZ-P2, subject to the RESZ-P1 being amended as above.	Noted.
288	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	16			Residential	Policies	RESZ-P41	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower notes that no changes are proposed to the substance of this policy [previously RESZ-P24]. Transpower supports retention of this policy as it provides clear direction that residential development is to be managed so that existing infrastructure is not constrained by reverse sensitivity effects. In terms of the National Grid, this is relevant to development in any residential zone which the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor traverse; and in terms of the Residential 1 Medium Density Zone, is reflected in the application of the National Grid as a qualifying matter. However, the sub-title inserted prior to RESZ-P19 of “Activities in the Residential 3, 4 and 5 Zones” appears to result in the policy no longer applying to the Residential 1 or 2 Zones. Transpower does not support this, as this is a matter that should continue to be managed in these zones. Transpower’s suggested amendment seeks to ensure that RESZ-P41 and RESZ-P42 continue to be applied in the Residential 1 & 2 zones; however it may be that other policies should also equally continue to apply in all residential zones (for example, RESZ-P28 to RESZ-P32). As an alternate to Transpower’s relief, the re-ordering of some of these provisions may be required.	Retain RESZ-P41 as notified, but amend subtitle preceding it as follows: Reverse Sensitivity in any Residential Zone	Reject The requested amendment does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
289	Transpower New Zealand Limited	30	17			Residential	Policies	RESZ-P42	Seek amendment / support in part	Transpower notes that no changes are proposed to this policy [previously RESZ-P25], except for consequential re-numbering. Transpower supports retention of this policy as it provides clear direction that subdivision, use and development within residential zones is to be managed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities. Note, Transpower’s suggested amendment seeks to ensure that RESZ-P41 and RESZ-P42 continue to be applied in the Residential 1 & 2 zones; however it may be that other policies should also equally continue to apply in all residential zones (for example, RESZ-P28 to RESZ-P32). As an alternate to Transpower’s relief, the re-ordering of some of these provisions may be required.	Retain RESZ-P42 as notified, subject to sub-title being amended as above.	Reject The requested amendment does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or the NPS-UD.
290	Buchanan,C and A	31	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	Reduce interfacial tension created by abrupt height changes with other zones.	A graduation of heights between adjacent zones be adopted; for example: * The Residential 2 zone properties adjoining Residential 1 have a reduced permitted height of 15m; or Residential 1 properties adjoining Residential 2 properties be rezoned to Residential 1(b) with an increased permitted height of 15m * Commercial 4 zone properties adjoining Residential 1 properties have a reduced maximum height of 15m; or Residential 1 zone properties adjoining Commercial 4 zone properties be rezoned to a new Residential 2(b) zone with height of 19.5m * Residential 1 properties adjoining the new Residential 2(b) zone properties have an increased permitted height of 15m Use existing roads as buffers to allow height differences of up to 7.5 m between different zones. [Refer to attached map in full submission for the location of the suggested changes].	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
291	Buchanan,C and A	31	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	Reduce interfacial tension created by abrupt height changes with other zones.	A graduation of heights between adjacent zones be adopted; for example: * Commercial 4 zone properties adjoining Residential 1 properties have a reduced maximum height of 15m; or Residential 1 zone properties adjoining Commercial 4 zone properties be rezoned to a new Residential 2(b) zone with height of 19.5m Use existing roads as buffers to allow height differences of up to 7.5 m between different zones. [Refer to attached map in full submission for the location of the suggested changes].	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
292	Nielson, C	32	1			General	General	General	Support	Overall support for Plan change 9, and agree the city needs to grow up, not out. The consideration of reduced vehicle carbon emissions from living closer in the cities is an important consideration.	Support PC9.	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
293	Lindsay, P	33	1			General	General	General	Oppose	Oppose the direction of PC9 in its entirety.	Delete all provisions in PC9.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
294	Lindsay, P	33	1			General	General	General	Oppose	Oppose the direction of PC9 in its entirety.	Delete all provisions in PC9.	Reject. The IPI is a required plan change and must incorporate the MDRS, subject to qualifying matters evaluated in accordance with the RMA.
295	Turner, C	33	1	18	2	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They oppose PC9 as they consider it a change pushed through by Kāinga Ora to support high rise infill for some sort of centralised homeless capital for NZ. They speak of experience of threats to safety, abusive behaviour and changes in their neighbourhood following the use of motels for housing. They are also concerned about flooding, parking and traffic.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
296	Bradley, J (FS)	33	1	116	1	General	General	General		The submitter supports the original submission, stating that they are opposed to the PC9. They are concerned about the impact on Glenholme .	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
297	Ludgate, G (FS)	33	1	126	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and want their opposition to PC9 recorded.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
298	Ludgate, G (FS)	33	1	126	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and want their opposition to PC9 recorded.	Support submission.	Reject. The IPI is a required plan change and must incorporate the MDRS, subject to qualifying matters evaluated in accordance with the RMA.
299	Hayes, I (FS)	33	1	128	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and supports the original submission. They oppose PC9 for reasons of: - Need to upgrade infrastructure (water, wastewater, stormwater, roading network, power reticulation), services (schools, hospitals), parks/reserves and parking - impact of above on ratepayers - need for additional policing with high density living - need for additional fire services with high density living - impact of high density on emergency access.	Support submission - oppose PC9 in entirety	Refer submission 33.1 above.
300	Sandrey, M (FS)	33	1	129	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They do not agree with PC9	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
301	Sandrey, M (FS)	33	1	129	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They do not agree with PC9	Support submission.	Reject. The IPI is a required plan change and must incorporate the MDRS, subject to qualifying matters evaluated in accordance with the RMA.
302	Caves, T and D (FS)	33	1	131	1	General	General	General		The submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and supports the original submission. They oppose increased density in Glenholme with concerns about storage, reduced parking and impacts on streets and they also are concerned about increased criminal behaviour with density.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
303	Gifford, S (FS)	33	1	150	16	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. PC9 is a rushed reaction - the answer to a housing crisis is not a sweeping change of a one-size-fits-all nature that was designed for big cities already with high density housing. We need a solution suitable to the Rotorua environment. There has been inadequate information creating PC9 with respect to housing needs, the impact of removing protective planning requirements. PC9 is both broad brushed but extremely complex, rushed and inadequate.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
304	White, M and J (FS)	33	1	151	1	General	General	General		The submitters owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the initial submission and oppose Plan Change 9 - Residential/Medium density housing and houses being built close together. Three houses per section is overcrowded which leads to noise issues, lack of sunlight, views and privacy. They consider crime will increase as experienced with temporary motel accommodation and existing properties will be devalued.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
305	Gibson, K (FS)	33	1	152	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission stating: The boundaries should be capped between one side of Old Taupo Rd and one side of Ranolf Street from Malfroy Rd to Totara and Rimu Sts. As by going out any further is going to make our beautiful city starting to look like a slum with the building capped at 3 stories high. I looked at the ones in Pererika St today and 6 stories would be a right eye sore. Look what happened in the U.K. and the problems they have now. We had many people thrust upon us by Kāinga Ora during covid so why should the town now be used once again as a dumping ground for housing in our better areas and the gateway into Rotorua. We are a tourist town and we want people in the town who are prepared to work and help not hinder our growth. Only yesterday I heard about a lady in Grey St who lost all her pot plants overnight and other residents who can't go out into their gardens without having to lock their doors. What a sad day for these people.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
306	Morley, J (FS)	33	1	153	3	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission, opposing PC9 100%	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
307	Morley, J (FS)	33	1	153	3	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission, opposing PC9 100%	Support submission.	Reject. The IPI is a required plan change and must incorporate the MDRS, subject to qualifying matters evaluated in accordance with the RMA.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
308	Hall, C (FS)	33	1	156	1	General	General	General		The submitter owns a home in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission, stating: I am strongly opposed to my rights as a homeowner having plan change 9 remove that right to be informed or oppose any new development on neighbouring properties that directly effects my home or family. Intensification or Infill for a small provincial city like Rotorua is short-sighted. CBD amenities are less that a 5 to 15 min car, bike or bus ride from outer suburbs. As well proven in many large cities, intensification does not always improve our environmental issues, it only increases the stress on parking, rubbish, sewerage etc, and brings an increase in social issues accompanying overcrowding, noise, and a lack of green space. The interface of our city needs to be left alone and intensification should be concentrated in new areas of development, not established in old well-established areas of single-story homes.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
309	Clement, M (FS)	33	1	159	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in a Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission, opposing PC9 in its entirety. The proposed plan change hasn't given due consideration to the impact such intensification will have on the existing residents as to their privacy, sunlight, safety and devalued property. Highly intensified housing often leads to health and safety issues for everyone in the neighbourhood and a deterioration of the area. The increased demand on the infrastructure will put additional pressure on the under resourced facilities and potentially create dangerous situations such as flooding, traffic, sanitary issues all leading to compromised health and wellbeing of residents. We have seen already the impact of the intensified emergency housing in the area and it has increased crime and residents fear for safety. Intensified housing such as this plan change will be no different	Support submission. Oppose PC9 in entirety	Refer submission 33.1 above.
310	Merrylees, V and B (FS)	33	1	160	1	General	General	General		The submitters owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and oppose the plan change - opposed to any higher density or increased height limits in any part of Rotorua.	Support submission. Oppose any increases in density or height.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
311	Rowles, S (FS)	33	1	163	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes Plan Change 9 - proposals for increased density - I am concerned about the creation of slum housing and more dense social housing developments.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
312	Boyle, J (FS)	33	1	165	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in Devon Street and opposes PC9 particularly in Devon Street for the following reasons: 1. We are a well-established residential area, with aesthetically pleasing housing, sections, gardens and appearance and high intensity housing under the MDRS is not in keeping with what we are now or what we want to be in the future. 3. 3 - 6 story high intensity developments in a well established residential area are not aesthetically pleasing and add no value or synergy to and with good placemaking. High buildings affect light, add heat and are environmentally questionable. 4. Generations past built Rotorua with good placemaking in mind. Intensification must be minimised and building design in keeping with what has been established. 5. Devon Street traffic movements are unacceptable. The street has become a major traffic corridor. It is unsafe for residents, pedestrians and cyclists. Children and the elderly must not be subjected to an unsafe environment. Speed, vibrations, noise and pollution are on the increase and it is unacceptable for well established residences to be disadvantaged, Additional intensified housing will create further traffic problems. 6. Capital values and safety are under attack with attraction of social housing and social problems. This is not a NIMBY response - it is a perfectly acceptable response for those that have significant capital and wellbeing invested. Government has no right to destroy value for those that have created that value over a long period of time.	Support submission. Oppose PC9. Good planning and placemaking must focus on new residential areas for growth.	Refer submission 33.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
313	La Grouw, D (FS)	33	1	169	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and does not support Plan change 9. High density housing estates scattered throughout our city is insanity. I would support an extension to high density housing in the CBD within a 2km radius of the CBD. The only thing this plan change will do for Rotorua is destroy our city. We are not Auckland, we do not have issues with securing land, we have loads of land. I do not support the idea of putting families in apartments, not in this country. Kids need room to run around, space to have pets - to grow gardens.	Support submission.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
314	Peato, E (FS)	33	1	170	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone support in part the original submission - they are concerned about safety and privacy.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
315	Filipo, S (FS)	33	1	171	1	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone support in part the original submission - they are concerned about safety and privacy.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 33.1 above.
316	Residents of Rangitaitaia Road	34	1			Residential	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	Submitter would like the whenua, which has always been Papakāinga, adjacent to the marae/heritage structure to allow for more families to live and build on sections. Submitter would like the zoning to change to reflect this use, and allow for more family living on their Papakāinga/land/section/whenua. Submitter would like the current Rural 1 Zone of Rangitaitaia Road and the wider area of Mourea to change to residential to allow for more than one house to be build on land. Submitter outlines high levels of poverty and problems with housing and supports the change in direction to make it easier for their whanau to live and build on their own whenua with the support of whanau. Submitter encourages change to allow further development of our land for future generations.	Change the zoning of Rangitaitaia Road and the greater Mourea from Rural 1 to Residential.	Reject Refer to Other - Rezoning to Residential 1 section of the Section 42A Report.
317	Residents of Rangitaitaia Road	34	2			Papakāinga	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	The submitter expresses concern that the Rural 1 Zone only allows them to have one dwelling on their land and states the whenua has always been Papakāinga but Council regulations are not consistent.	See relief sought in other submission point , i.e. to change the zoning of Rangitaitaia Road and the greater Mourea.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakainga development in Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
318	Residents of Rangitaitaia Road	34	3			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter seeks clarification around the minimum building levels for 1% AEP, new flooding rule and associated matters of discretion.	Seek clarification	Noted. The submitter seeks only clarification and no specific relief. Refer to the Natural Hazards section of the Section 42A Report.
319	Residents of Rangitaitaia Road	34	4			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter would like to be included in RLC Flood Protection Plan	For Rangitaitaia Road and the greater Mourea to be included in the RLC Flood Protection Plan.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
320	Edwards, J	35	1			General	General	General	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns about building houses for people not associated with Rotorua which may result in undesirable outcomes - for example Fenton Street and the damage that has been caused to the hotels.	Submitter would prefer for these people to be housed in other centres.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
321	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	Lakeview Villas objects to becoming a tier 1 authority. The submitter raises concerns about the lack of consultation of being included in the amendment act as requested by Council. The decision was made to insure investment in infrastructure, but did not take into account the impacts of the residents of Rotorua.	No relief stated	Noted. No relief stated. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a 'specified territorial authority' under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
322	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas (FS)	36	1	7	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitter supports their original submission, stating that outgoing council and outgoing Mayor should not have been able to make this decision on behalf of our city, so close to the election. This decision should have been delayed once the new Mayor and new council had been appointed. This decision needs to be revoked / reversed and then should be discussed by the new council and then decided to be part of or not part of Tier One - Change Plan 9 (as the council will have a clear understanding from the submission from the citizens of Rotorua). Rotorua has plenty of land and the RLC needs to look at the subdivision resource consent and allow residents to build single story homes on the existing land. Rotorua does not need to go up (Taupo is a great example of subdivision resource consent). Please understand that the infrastructure needs to be able to provide the support to all residents and the best example is Tauranga. Over populated and has issues with their infrastructure.	Support submission - reverse decision to be included with Tier One Councils and pursue PC9. Develop land instead of going up.	Reject. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a 'specified territorial authority' under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
323	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	36	1	58	3	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the submission. The MDRS disregards the rights and well-being of residents. There was no notices or letter regarding Council's decision to request to be included as subject to the Amendment Act. Greater consultation would have been appropriate. Council should seek to reverse the decision.	Support submission. Reverse the decision to be subject to the MDRS and develop an acceptable alternative plan or offer compensation to existing home owners.	Reject. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a 'specified territorial authority' under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
324	Marsh, I (FS)	36	1	155	4	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission expressing concern about the disregarding of existing owners with the implementation of the MDRS and the lack of consultation about the inclusion of Rotorua in the legislation	RLC should seek tor reverse decision to be included in the MDRS legislation and instead consult and develop an alternative, acceptable plan change. Alternative offer financial compensation to owners affected with devaluation of properties.	Reject. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a 'specified territorial authority' under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
325	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	2			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about the speed of the process undertaken by council. The process and the time allowed to make submission clearly shows the lack of understanding of the areas chosen and / or considering the impact on areas selected and not looking for other areas.	No relief stated	Noted. No relief stated. The Order in Council recognised Rotorua as a 'specified territorial authority' under the RMA Amendment Act, and was therefore required to incorporate the MDRS.
326	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	3			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns that there was no site visit made to 285 Vaughan Road to understand the residential activity on site. Council approved the resource consent in 2001 for 51 free title residential units. The impact on the residential residents of Lakeview Villas has not been taken into consideration.	No relief stated	Noted. Council was unable to do a site visit of every site affected by the plan change. No relief stated. Refer to Plan Change Process section for more detail.
327	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	4			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about the communications that was sent out to the Residents of Rotorua but in particular 285 Vaughan Road. The submitter states that there was no individual communications highlighting the impact of the proposed plan change on their lifestyle and their investment. Instead the blanket communication was sent out and was not understood by most residents due to the language. Lakeview villa objects to the changes as there has not been enough time to understand and consider other options.	No relief stated	Noted. Notification was sent to all those considered directly affected by the plan change and meet all the requirements of the RMA. Refer Plan Change Process submissions for more detail.
328	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	5			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)	Oppose	Lakeview Villas opposes to the proposed heights of 20 meters, 12 meters and to allowing no yard setbacks at 285 Vaughan Road which is seen as out of character and also due to: - Noise effects - with the proposed changes to the plan future uses on neighbouring properties have the potential to establish noise generating activities that will impact the current residential development. - Reverse sensitivity effects - Traffic/parking - Increased traffic congestion, associated noise, fuel consumption and emissions. Not implementing the Rotorua Eastern Arterial Route has already impacted on the level of traffic, road safety, fuel consumption, and emissions. PC9 will increases the number of commercial and residential cars within the Commercial 2 Zone which Lakeview Villas are opposed to. An increased population in the area would cause greater concerns to road safety, congestion and parking for the residents on surrounding roads. - Approved Landuse Consent - Sunlight/Daylight/Sky Views - suburban properties having decreased direct sunlight and severe shading, this will especially be the case during the winter months or if development is to the north. The impact of this is a decrease in the quality of life for those living in the village as being able to see the sky from windows is important to the mental and physical welfare. - Village Demographics - The change in rules are unfair to the residents of the village, who are mostly retired/of the older generation, who have purchased properties and understood that their lifestyle would not be affected. - Privacy/safety - Not being able to sit in your backyard, not feel secure, or to have no privacy is unacceptable. - Quality of life - Residents reside 80% of their time in their home in the	Height - No specific relief stated. Setbacks - Boundaries need to be a minimum 20 metres from 285 Vaughan Road Boundary. Noise consideration - see full submission for details Any new buildings in the commercial zone or /and internal renovated buildings which border the existing residential properties - along any boundaries with a consented residential development must comply with the residential noise standards. Traffic - New noise generating activities need to consider the distance to the nearest neighbours, traffic routes and other relevant factors when determining he layout, design and operation of there activities. Approved landuse consent - In this case proposals to change should not be allowed due to approval in 2001 allowing single level residential properties. Style of buildings - High quality buildings must be a requirement.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
329	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas (FS)	36	5	7	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)		The submitter supports their original submission, stating that at the time it was written they weren't aware of the Wharenui development. This development could produce 1000 lots and means there is no need to increase height limits to provide for housing.	Support submission - do not allow height increase in vicinity of Lakeview Villas Vaughn Road / Te Ngae Road.	Refer submission 36.5 above.
330	Ward, K (FS)	36	5	106	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 36.5 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
331	Duncan, M and T (FS)	36	5	143	5	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change and support the original submission regarding social impacts. they states that Rotorua has done its time with Emergency housing and it is time for a reset. Plan Change 9 is not the answer. We do not want to be the government's social housing hub for NZ.	Support submission (re social issues)	Refer submission 36.5 above.
332	McIndoe, L (FS)	36	5	162	5	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)		The submitter lives in a residential zone affected by the plan change and support the original submission regarding social impacts. they states that Rotorua has done its time with Emergency housing and it is time for a reset. Plan Change 9 is not the answer. We do not want to be the government's social housing hub for NZ.	Support submission (re social issues)	Refer submission 36.5 above.
333	Ronayne, C (FS)	36	5	164	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1)(a) COMZ-S2(1)		The submitter lives in a residential zone affected by the plan change and support the original submission regarding rubbish collection: Rubbish Collection In intensified suburban areas there are major issues with rubbish collection services. Cars blocking up the street means that the rubbish and recycling trucks are unable to use their side arms to access the bins. This means that there had to be an extra individual or individuals who can go up behind the cars, move the bins onto the road and physically empty them into the back of the truck. As you can imagine, this causes significant delays. It also causes rubbish to fall onto the street, which make the drainage issues even worse than they are now and it creates a bad environment for all the residents in the street. Bins are often missed or knocked over. Have the waste management services been consulted about the significant impact intensification will cause to them?	Support submission (re rubbish collection)	Refer submission 36.5 above.
334	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	6			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(a) RESZ-S2(1)	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to tier 1 councils not being able to stop people building up to 12m just 1 m from the boundary.	No relief stated	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
335	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	7			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	Waste/environmental impact - Concerns around where the Waste will go through demolition of existing buildings, and the further climate implications this may have. Submitter raises Concerns that local and central government have not given adequate thought to construction and demolition Waste in landfills.		Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
336	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas	36	8			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMS-R32	Oppose	The submitter wants the underlying commercial zoning to be respected by not allowing residential alone.	Do not allow residential activities in the commercial zone.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
337	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	1			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2	Oppose	Pukeroa opposes the new provisions proposed in the city centres zones that require resource consent for “alterations and additions to existing buildings” being proposed in the city centre zones. The district planning framework should be relaxed to encourage development or redevelopment. Removing the resource consenting process would assist towards this, while also reducing time and costs associated with the process. The District Plan can still be drafted in such a way that any permitted activity still has to meet certain performance standards to ensure the design of a building is controlled.	Retain Building Alterations as Permitted activities.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
338	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	37	1	109	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2		The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD. However, the RVA seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with the RVA’s primary submission). The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with the RVA’s primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 37.1 above
339	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	37	1	111	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2		Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD. However, Ryman seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with Ryman’s primary submission). Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with Ryman’s primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 37.1 above

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
340	Ronayne, C (FS)	37	1	164	5	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission, stating: Extra residents create more rubbish and the aforementioned issues with rubbish collection will mean more waste is dropped in the streets, will go through the drains can cause pollution in the water ways. Is this acceptable? I don't think so. Increased density in suburban areas creates more air and noise pollution. What are the measures that will be taken to deal with these issues?	Support submission.	Refer submission 37.1 above
341	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3	Oppose	Pukeroa opposes the new provisions proposed in the city centres zones that require resource consent for “any new buildings” being proposed in the city centre zones. The district planning framework should be relaxed to encourage development or redevelopment. Removing the resource consenting process would assist towards this, while also reducing time and costs associated with the process. The District Plan can still be drafted in such a way that any permitted activity still has to meet certain performance standards to ensure the design of a building is controlled.	Retain Building Alterations as Permitted activities.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
342	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	37	2	109	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD. However, the RVA seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with the RVA's primary submission). The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with the RVA's primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
343	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	37	2	111	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD. However, Ryman seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with Ryman's primary submission). Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with Ryman's primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
344	Adams, J (FS)	37	2	123	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission, stating that we must continue to regulate buildings otherwise we risk a CTV building collapse	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 37.2 above.
345	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	3			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16	Support	Pukeroa support the current planning framework that allows for residential living in the City Centre 3 zones. Allowing for residential living in the city centre will allow people to live and play in the city, which will increase its vibrancy and vitality. Mixed use development in all city centre zones also helps with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and passive surveillance by virtue of having more people active in the city centre for longer periods of time.	Retain as notified	Noted.
346	Haley, D (FS)	37	3	32	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
347	Murray, J (FS)	37	3	38	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
348	Ronayne, T (FS)	37	3	51	7	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. The CBD is suffering and has become deserted. Auckland CBD was suffering a similar fate until apartments were built in the area.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
349	Irwin, W (FS)	37	3	83	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission. The CBD is suffering and has become deserted. Auckland CBD was suffering a similar fate until apartments were built in the area.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
350	Murray, P (FS)	37	3	102	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
351	Oxley, M (FS)	37	3	119	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.3 above.
352	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	4			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38	Support	Pukeroa support the current planning framework that allows for residential living in the City Centre 1 and 2 zones. Allowing for residential living in the city centre will allow people to live and play in the city, which will increase its vibrancy and vitality. Mixed use development in all city centre zones also helps with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and passive surveillance by virtue of having more people active in the city centre for longer periods of time.	Retain as notified	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
353	Haley, D (FS)	37	4	32	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.4 above.
354	Murray, J (FS)	37	4	38	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.4 above.
355	Ronayne, T (FS)	37	4	51	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.4 above.
356	Irwin, W (FS)	37	4	83	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.4 above.
357	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	37	4	91	8	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this position coheres with the views of RDRR members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 37.4 above.
358	Murray, P (FS)	37	4	102	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 37.4 above.
359	Oxley, M (FS)	37	4	119	10	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R38		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission	Refer submission 37.4 above.
360	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	5			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Support	Pukeroa supports the increase in building heights in the city centre zones. This will allow for more flexibility to developers. Pukeroa, however, argues that there should be no height limits in the city centre zones at all. This would allow for buildings to be designed for their purpose rather than to meet a certain height criteria. It may also provide for the opportunity for an iconic taller building/feature to be established in the city centre.	Retain as notified, or remove maximum height limits all together.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
361	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	37	5	104	3	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1		The submitters are a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring that appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. They oppose the original submission. As set out in Sigma's submission, setting an appropriate maximum height is essential to facilitate development within the city centre while protecting amenity for those working, living and visiting the city centre.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 37.5 above.
362	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	6			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2	Oppose	Pukeroa opposes the new provisions proposed in the commercial zones that require resource consent for “alterations and additions to existing buildings” being proposed in the commercial zones. The district planning framework should be relaxed to encourage development. Removing the resource consenting process would assist towards this, while also reducing time and costs associated with the process. The District Plan can still be drafted in such a way that any permitted activity still has to meet certain performance standards to ensure the design of a building is controlled.	Retain Building Alterations as Permitted activities.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
363	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	37	6	91	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. While many in RDRR favour a relaxation of consenting, the modifications of the District Planning framework will have to be considered and approved by elected members to ensure they serve the interests of everyone. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Cautiously support submission	Refer submission 27.6 above.
364	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	37	6	109	3	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD. However, the RVA seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with the RVA’s primary submission). The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with the RVA’s primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 27.6 above.
365	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	37	6	111	3	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in enabling greater residential development as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD. However, Ryman seeks that retirement villages are subject to retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (in accordance with Ryman’s primary submission). Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent it aligns with Ryman’s primary submission and is otherwise disallowed.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 27.6 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
366	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	7			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2	Oppose	Pukeroa opposes the new provisions proposed in the commercial zones that require resource consent for “any new buildings” being proposed in the commercial zones. The district planning framework should be relaxed to encourage development. Removing the resource consenting process would assist towards this, while also reducing time and costs associated with the process. The District Plan can still be drafted in such a way that any permitted activity still has to meet certain performance standards to ensure the design of a building is controlled.	Retain Building Alterations as Permitted activities.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
367	Adams, J (FS)	37	7	123	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission, stating that we must continue to regulate buildings otherwise we risk a CTV building collapse	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 37.7 above.
368	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	8			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Support	Pukeroa support the planning framework that allows for residential living in all of the Commercial zones. Mixed use development in all commercial zones also helps with CYPTED and passive surveillance by virtue of having more people active in these commercial locations for longer periods of time. Pukeroa specifically supports: *The provision for residential living on Commercial 4 zoned land, especially in the Froude Street location. This locality currently has residential development on it that provides residential living for Ngati Whakaue beneficiaries. *The Commercial 2 zone provision allowing for residential living which will also assist towards its aspiration to create Ti Street into a mixed-use live-work-play environment. The aspiration is to allow Ti Street to form a mixture of commercial units at ground floor level and residential living above. *The inclusion of residential living in the Commercial 6 zone. Allowing for residential living in the Commercial 6 zone will also assist towards a vibrant mixed-use Trade Central area.	Retain as notified	Noted.
369	Irwin, W (FS)	37	8	83	10	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Noted.
370	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	37	8	91	10	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this position coheres with the views of RDRR members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission	Noted.
371	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	37	8	104	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		The submitters are a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring that appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. They support in part the original submission. There are some commercial zones that are not suitable for residential living or mixed use.	Support submission in part.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
372	Pukeroa Oruawhata Group	37	9			Other	Rule Table	COMZ-R2	Oppose	Although reserve land is not part of PC9, Pukeroa would like Council to consider the provision for residential development within the Reserve 3 (CAZ) zones. For example, Pererika Street reserve is currently used for a mix of commercial, schooling and school accommodation activities. Allowing residential and kaumatua housing development on this land would not be out of character in this locality. It would also complement the nearby commercial activities. Again, this would result in an efficient location for residential development near existing convenience and city centre amenities.	Include residential development in all Reserve 3 (CAZ) zones.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
373	Shekell G (FS)	37	9	121	7	Other	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone is cautious about the relief sought and seeks clarification	Seek clarification.	Refer submission 37.9 above.
374	Adams, J (FS)	37	9	123	3	Other	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission, stating that this is another attempt to sell reserves.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 37.9 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
375	Classic Group	38	1			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	Exclude swimming pools (as they provide storage volume) and engineered soil layers (as they will be impossible to assess/monitor and are therefore uncertain) from the definition of impervious surface.	Amend definition of impervious surfaces as follows: <i>Impervious surface an area with a surface which prevents the infiltration of rainfall into the ground. For the purposes of this definition impervious surfaces include:</i> <i>a. roofs;</i> <i>b. paved areas including driveways and sealed/compacted unsealed parking areas;</i> <i>c. ~~swimming pools;~~</i> <i>d. sealed and compacted unsealed roads; and</i> <i>e. ~~soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay.~~</i> <i>For the purposes of this definition impervious surfaces excludes...</i> We also seek for Council to recognise advances in technology available through permeable paving.	Reject. Do not make the amendments to the definition sought. The reasons of the further submitter are supported. Refer also to the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
376	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	38	1	84	2	Other	Definitions	Definitions		BOPRC opposes the relief sought by the submitter; swimming pools provide negligible flood storage volume because they are already mostly full of water. Both swimming pools and engineered impervious soil layers prevent natural infiltration of water into the ground.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Do not make the amendments to the definition sought. The reasons of the further submitter are supported. Refer also to the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
377	Classic Group	38	2			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The submission seeks an amendment to the definition of principal living room to acknowledge that a family room may be the principal living room and not the main living room	Amend definition of principal living room as follows: <i>Principal living room - The main living ~~and~~ dining ~~or~~ family room in a residential unit. For studio apartments the principal living room is also the principal bedroom.</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
378	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	38	2	97	9	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Definitions	Definitions		Kāinga Ora oppose this submission as this would create a consequent requirement to provide a 4mx4m outlook space from the family room also.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 38.2 above.
379	Classic Group	38	3			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(a) and (b)	Oppose	The submission seeks to remove the minimum lot size requirement of 250m2 net site area for Residential 1 and 2 Zones and that reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcome	Remove the minimum lot size requirement for Residential 1 and 2 Zones and reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcomes.	Reject. However, further information provided through submitter evidence provides the opportunity to consider this matter further
380	Shekell G (FS)	38	3	121	8	Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(a) and (b)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 38.3 above.
381	Classic Group	38	4			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(2)(a) and (b)	Oppose	The submission seeks to removal of the minimum lot site design factors for Residential 1 and 2 Zones and that reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcomes	Remove the minimum lot site design factor requirement for Residential 1 and 2 Zones and reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcomes.	Reject. However, further information provided through submitter evidence provides the opportunity to consider this matter further
382	Classic Group	38	5			Transport	Standards	SUB-S1(4)	Oppose in part	This standard is considered overly restrictive - access to front doors is required from parking, turning and access areas.	Amend standard SUB-S1(4) as follows: <i>Any vehicle access, on-site parking and turning that is required in accordance with the Zone performance standards, site serviceability standards and Appendix APP1 – Parking Turning and Access shall be separate to the area provided for ~~access to front doors~~, outdoor spaces and residential privacy.</i>	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
383	Classic Group	38	6			Transport	Standards	SUB-S2(3)	Oppose in part	This standard is considered overly restrictive - access to front doors is required from parking, turning and access areas.	Amend standard SUB-S2(3) as follows: <i>Any vehicle access, on-site parking and turning that is required in accordance with the Zone performance standards, site serviceability standards and Appendix APP1 – Parking Turning and Access shall be separate to the area provided for ~~access to front doors~~, outdoor spaces and residential privacy.</i>	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
384	Classic Group	38	7			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Oppose in part	What is meant by open space in this context?	Amend objective RESZ-O2 as follows: <i>Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a medium density residential built character comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys, surrounded by ~~open space~~.</i>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
385	Classic Group	38	8			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P5	Oppose in part	Not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Amend policy RESZ-P5 as follows: <i>Require development to achieve quality living environments for residents on site by providing:</i> <i>1. private open space ~~that has access to sunlight;~~</i> <i>2. a reasonable level of visual privacy and outlook;</i> <i>3. opportunities for on-site landscaping; and</i> <i>4. ~~safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street.~~</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
386	Gifford, S (FS)	38	8	150	17	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P5		Sunlight to adjoining properties must be recognised as being of significant value and must be protected.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 38.8 above.
387	Classic Group	38	9			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6	Oppose in part	The need for restrictions on building length and access to daylight rules are not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Amend policy RESZ-P6 as follows: <i>Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned medium density residential built character, including by:</i> <i>1. Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries;</i> <i>2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;</i> <i>3. Providing opportunities for sunlight access to adjoining sites;</i> <i>4. For 4+ residential unit developments, encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along side and rear boundaries.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
388	Gifford, S (FS)	38	9	150	18	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6		Sunlight to adjoining properties must be recognised as being of significant value and must be protected.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 38.9 above.
389	Classic Group	38	10			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P14	Oppose in part	Not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Amend policy RESZ-P14 as follows: <i>Require development to achieve quality living environments for residents on site by providing:</i> <i>1. private open space that has access to sunlight;</i> <i>2. a reasonable level of visual privacy and outlook;</i> <i>3. opportunities for on-site landscaping; and</i> <i>4. safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
390	Classic Group	38	11			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15	Seek amendment / support in part	The need for restrictions on building length and access to daylight rules are not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy RESZ-P15 as follows: <i>Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned high density residential built character, including by:</i> <i>1. Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries;</i> <i>2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;</i> <i>3. Providing opportunities for sunlight access to adjoining sites;</i> <i>4. For 4+ residential unit developments, encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along side and rear boundaries.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
391	Gifford, S (FS)	38	11	150	19	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		Sunlight to adjoining properties must be recognised as being of significant value and must be protected.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 38.11 above.
392	Classic Group	38	12			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)	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 impervious surface requirements for Residential 1 Zone	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
393	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	38	12	84	3	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter because restricting impervious surface area mitigates flooding and water quality effects. The maximum impervious cover is used to quantify flooding extent, flood depth and velocity and associated effects on the receiving environment.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Retain impervious surfaces restrictions. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
394	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	38	12	109	4	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)		The RVA supports this relief sought as it is consistent with the NPSUD and the MDRS, and therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Support Submission	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
395	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	38	12	109	5	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)		The RVA supports this relief sought as it is consistent with the NPSUD and the MDRS, and therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Support Submission	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
396	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	38	12	111	4	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)		Ryman supports this relief sought as it is consistent with the NPSUD and the MDRS, and therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Support Submission	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
397	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	38	12	111	5	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)		Ryman supports this relief sought as it is consistent with the NPSUD and the MDRS, and therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Support Submission	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
398	Classic Group	38	13			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)	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 impervious surface requirements for Residential 2 Zone	Reject. It is not agreed that there is no need for separate impervious surfaces standards. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
399	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	38	13	84	4	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter because restricting impervious surface area mitigates flooding and water quality effects. The maximum impervious cover is used to quantify flooding extent, flood depth and velocity and associated effects on the receiving environment.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Retain impervious surfaces restrictions. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
400	Classic Group	38	14			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6(2)(a)(iii)	Oppose	The MDRS provisions contain separate outdoor living space requirements, and these are accepted. The need for separate outdoor living space requirements in clause iii (which requires that where an outdoor living space at ground floor is located south of any building located on the same site, the southern boundary of that space must be separated from any wall or building by at least 2m + 0.9(h)...) is not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Delete standard	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
401	Classic Group	38	15			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-6SA(4)	Seek amendment / support in part	Policy 3 encourages development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces, including by providing for passive surveillance. Therefore we conclude that the intent of the ‘windows to street’ is to provide passive surveillance of the neighbourhood and also for urban design / streetscape amenity. And this would not be achieved through windows in a roof space or garage, as these aren’t habitable spaces used ‘for people’s living accommodation’.	Amend standard RESZ-6A(4) as follows: <i>Windows to street (Residential 1 and 2 Zones)</i> <i>a. Any residential unit facing the street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</i> <i>b. ~~Front doors may be solid.~~ Garages and gables do ~~ors-~~ do not contribute towards the 20% glazing- do not form part of the habitable facade and are therefore excluded from the calculation.</i> <i>c. ~~For the purpose of this rule, any area of roof space that is fully enclosed by a gable shall not be included in the area of the front façade.~~</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
402	Classic Group	38	16			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)	Oppose	The need for a maximum building length rule is not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.	Delete standard RESZ-S6A(5) Maximum building length	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
403	Classic Group	38	17			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)(c)	Oppose	The need for further rules on landscaping is not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD. Clause c) (which requires that at least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area) is not supported.	Delete standard RESZ-6A(6)(c)	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
404	Classic Group	38	18			Development Areas	Standards	PHDA-SL8	Oppose	The submission seeks the deletion of this standard (which requires a minimum of 5m2 of open space per residential unit, which can accommodate a 2m diameter circle, shall be provided to accommodate storage and services), stating that the need for further rules on open space and its use is not supported by MDRS provisions and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD. This is the only area in the plan subject to this rule which is inconsistent with other development/residential areas.	Delete standard PDA-SL8	Reject. Standard not related to density. Refer to development area section of this report .
405	Classic Group	38	19			Development Areas	Standards	PHDA-SS1	Oppose	This rule (which states that the minimum width of any property where the front boundary faces north, and access is from the north, or is within 25 degrees of north, shall be 18m) should be deleted within the scope of the plan change as it will undermine the ability of medium density development to be undertaken	Delete standard PHDA-SS1	Reject. Standard not related to density. Refer to development area section of this report .
406	Kereopa, L	39	1			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	RLC has legal obligations to Maori regarding engagement and decision-making under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and potentially other relevant policy and legislation. Simply including a statement of iwi and hapu aspirations will not meet basic council requirements and obligations.	Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to agree on values-based solutions and approaches to housing and development planning, strategy, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This includes working in partnership with Te Arawa hapū to agree on the scope and development of the Housing Plan Change. Rotorua Lakes Council allocates appropriate resourcing and support to enable Te Arawa to access the necessary expertise to assist our engagement; ensure appropriate processes and outcomes for Te Arawa; and provide technical reviews and analysis of any working draft provisions relating to the Housing Plan Change.	Accept in part While not part of PC9, statement of iwi aspirations to be included in Future Development Strategy.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
407	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	1	91	11	Other	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that Te Arawa is not a co-governance entity and RLC is not obliged in law to share its decision-making power not allocate Te Arawa veto powers by providing co-governance. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Reject Not relief that can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
408	Oxley, M (FS)	39	1	119	11	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. It states that Te Arawa is not a co-governance entity and RLC is not obliged in law to share its decision-making power not allocate Te Arawa veto powers by providing co-governance.	Oppose submission.	Reject Not relief that can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
409	Kereopa, L	39	2			General	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submitter requests that RLC share its evidence base. Te Arawa needs access to information to be able to work with RLC to undertake an assessment of the current status of Rotorua housing, the needs, and realistic options based on that information.	Rotorua Lakes Council share all relevant data and information with Te Arawa relating to the current housing stock; modelling and rationale regarding its proposed medium and high density housing; current and future housing demand and supply; quality and health of the current housing stock; homeless; environmental sustainability of the proposed medium and high-density compact housing [refer to full submission for specific information sought].	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.
410	Kereopa, L	39	3			Papakāinga	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Our whānau, hapū and iwi must be resourced and supported to identify and ensure implementation of the necessary actions we require to enhance and protect our communities.	We encourage opportunities to allow more whānau to increase the number of family members living in Papakāinga, and to create Papakāinga for their whānau within their current living spaces and existing pā/marae/hapū/Papakāinga residential communities. This should be prioritised and enabled because Papakāinga are a proven way of supporting our ability to live collectively and care for our own families and communities. RLC partner with Te Arawa to identify opportunities to ensure existing and future zoning, planning and developments enhance and align with cultural values rather than impacting on and further taking away from them.	Accept PC9 seeks to better enable the development of papakāinga. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
411	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	3	91	12	Papakāinga	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states it supports the aim provided interests and rights of other groups also respected and opposes a co-governance arrangement. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	partially support submission	Reject Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
412	Oxley, M (FS)	39	3	119	12	Papakāinga	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and ' supports the aim provided interests and rights of other groups also respected and opposes a co-governance arrangement.	partially support submission	Reject Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
413	Kereopa, L	39	4			Papakāinga	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Thriving hapū and iwi require the protection of existing pā/marae/hapū/Papakāinga housing communities surrounding marae from exploitation and degradation by non-iwi-owned businesses and developers, in particular from the tourism and accommodation sectors, and even more obviously from the catastrophic impacts of commercial and factory industries.	Residential buffer zones around pā (with boundaries as agreed by hapū) must be written into policy and budgeted for within the district’s 30 to 50-year plans. These must identify the non-residential aspects that need staged removal out of hapū residential living areas, and appropriate initiatives to support the return of whānau to these traditional Papakāinga communities.	Reject Not relief that can be provided in PC9 , however, to be considered through development of the Future Development Strategy.
414	Kereopa, L	39	5			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Rezoning of pā communities such as Te Koutu, Tarewa Pounamu, Whakarewarewa, Ngāpuna, Ōwhata and Ngongotahā from residential to commercial and industrial has for too long supported non-Maori to benefit and make money off our culture by moving their business into our residential streets, disrupting our communal lifestyles and driving house prices up to irrevocable levels.	Council must partner with Te Arawa to ensure appropriate objectives, policies and rules are put in place for the relocation of all industry away from, and the cleaning up of all contaminated sites within Ngāpuna, Te Koutu, Ngongotahā and near any waterways. Adequate funding must also be allocated, including via long-term plans and budgets.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and may be best addressed in the FDS.. Refer to process section of this report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
415	Kereopa, L	39	6			Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Te Arawa is able to provide unique mātauranga relating to the impacts of over-population on the health and wellbeing of communities and natural environments. RLC's 'Homes & Thriving Communities Strategic Framework' recognises the importance of 'improving lake water quality and ensuring the sustainable use of, and improvement in water quality'. RLC and Te Arawa must work together to determine realistically, how many people can be well supported to live healthy, prosperous lives in Rotorua city and surrounds given that our rivers, lakes and much of our lands are already polluted due to underfunded, outdated and unsustainable city infrastructure and linear local economic systems. If there are shared council and iwi aspirations for further development, then efficient and sustainable infrastructure needs to be planned and constructed before houses are built and people moved in. Any Housing Plan Change will need to ensure Te Mana o te Wai is implemented to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of our lakes and waterways first and foremost. The next priority must be ensuring the health and wellbeing of our existing peoples, communities and ecosystems.	Rotorua Lakes Council partners with Te Arawa to ensure any future development, increased housing and population within Rotorua does not have a negative impact on our lakes, waterways, ngāwhā, natural environment and indigenous taonga species.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
416	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	6	91	13	Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this partnership between iwi and Council would discriminate against other legitimate and non-Maori interest groups. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Accept in part. Relief of original submission cannot be granted in PC9.
417	Oxley, M (FS)	39	6	119	13	Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and states that this partnership between iwi and Council would discriminate against other legitimate and non-Maori interest groups.	Oppose submission.	Accept in part. Relief of original submission cannot be granted in PC9.
418	Kereopa, L	39	7			General	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Central to Te Arawa concerns regarding the proposed plan change is climate change adaptation, mitigation and resilience building. Continued 20th century style development which is entirely dependent on the private motor vehicle for transportation and has no regard for water, energy or resource efficiency must be prevented. Future developments need to contribute to carbon neutral energy and resource use while also being adaptable to both current and future climate patterns. The submitter requests that RLC partners with Te Arawa to develop and embed adaptation solutions that align with iwi priorities and values into all Rotorua zoning, housing and urban development plans. This means identifying and embedding matauranga Maori, identify and values in urban design and construction to manage climate-related hazards. This will increase the resilience of public housing by identifying where retrofitting is needed and ensuring new dwellings are built away from areas prone to climate hazards. It will also promote effective planning and the design of resilient infrastructure as part of public housing activities.	RLC partners with Te Arawa to develop and embed adaptation solutions that align with iwi priorities and values into all Rotorua zoning, housing and urban development plans and to ensure future housing and development plans enable community resilience to the potential impacts of climate change by supporting sustainable water and energy management and use; accommodating food growing and sharing; and restoring connections with nature.	Accept in part. Refer to changes proposed in PC9 with respect to climate change resilience and flooding.
419	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	7	91	14	General	General	General		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. The proposed partnership is tantamount to co-governance. While Te Arawa is a legitimate and highly respected interest group with kaitiakitanga responsibilities it is no a co-governance entity. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Reject Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
420	Oxley, M (FS)	39	7	119	14	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. The proposed partnership is tantamount to co-governance. While Te Arawa is a legitimate and highly respected interest group with kaitiakitanga responsibilities it is no a co-governance entity.	Oppose submission.	Reject Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
421	Kereopa, L	39	8			Natural Environmental Values	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	For Te Arawa, living and connecting with nature does not mean visiting the local playground which features a stand of trees.	RLC partner with Te Arawa to incorporate the restoration and protection of wetlands, native forests and indigenous taonga species into all aspects of Rotorua housing and development planning	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.
422	Kereopa, L	39	9			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submission discusses inequities in the rating system and affordability issues	RLC partner with Te Arawa to remedy and mitigate the inequity and inequality of local government systems still impacting on Te Arawa home ownership, the quality of our homes, and the health and wellbeing of our hapū communities - specifically the submission seeks changes to rating policy.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change. Refer to process section of this report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
423	Kereopa, L	39	10			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated		RLC acknowledge the significant landholdings gifted by Te Arawa whānau to establish the city of Rotorua in any decision-making relating to the town’s reserves. The submission seeks return of reserve lands not sued for the purpose for which they were gifted or taken to the appropriate whānau or hapū to decide whether they will use them for alternative purposes such as housing their own people.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
424	Ronayne, T (FS)	39	10	51	9	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission. The reserves are required green spaces. Communities need these and it is not up to others in power to decide what to do with them. The public views must be taken into account.	Oppose submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
425	Irwin, W (FS)	39	10	83	11	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission. The reserves are required green spaces. Communities need these and it is not up to others in power to decide what to do with them. The public views must be taken into account.	Oppose submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
426	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	10	91	15	Other	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It disputes an obligation, referring to the settlements of the Fenton agreement and reserve protocols and states there is no known impediment to returned reserves being used for tribal housing. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
427	Oxley, M (FS)	39	10	119	15	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and disputes an obligation, referring to the settlements of the Fenton agreement and reserve protocols and states there is no known impediment to returned reserves being used for tribal housing.	Oppose submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
428	Kereopa, L	39	11			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated		RLC partner with Te Arawa to improve the health and wellbeing standards of locally owned houses within our communities. The submission discusses joint lobbying by Council and iwi for funding for housing repairs and flax root initiatives, etc.	Reject. Relief cannot be provided in PC9.
429	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	11	91	16	Other	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states it is critical to healthy intercultural future in Rotorua that Te Arawa acknowledge it is not a co-governance entity and that Council must engage and be on behalf of the whole community. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	partially support submission	Reject Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9.
430	Oxley, M (FS)	39	11	119	16	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and states it is critical to healthy intercultural future in Rotorua that Te Arawa acknowledge it is not a co-governance entity and that Council must engage and be on behalf of the whole community.	partially support submission	Reject: Not a matter than can be considered as part of Plan Change 9. No recommendation
431	Kereopa, L	39	12			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated		RLC partner with Te Arawa to understand and address the Rotorua homeless crisis in a way that aligns with Te Arawa values. RLC work with Te Arawa to facilitate discussions with other iwi, other councils and all the families who were discarded in Rotorua by WINZ from around the country to enable a safe and supported return home to their wider whānau, hapū and care networks	Reject. Relief cannot be provided in PC9.
432	Ronayne, T (FS)	39	12	51	10	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the submission stating that there was active engagement in the Housing Taskforce and the results have been a disaster.	Oppose submission.	Reject. Issues not addressed in PC9.
433	Irwin, W (FS)	39	12	83	12	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the submission stating that there was active engagement in the Housing Taskforce and the results have been a disaster.		Reject. Issues not addressed in PC9.
434	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	12	91	17	Other	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It refers to a homeless industry established with engagement of Te Arawa and the need to move policy making power back to elected members. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Reject. Issues not addressed in PC9.
435	Oxley, M (FS)	39	12	119	17	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and refers to a homeless industry established with engagement of Te Arawa and the need to move policy making power back to elected members.	Oppose submission.	Reject. Issues not addressed in PC9.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
436	Kereopa, L	39	13			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	RLC and Te Arawa must work together to map, plan and budget for the upgrading of Rotorua’s stormwater, wastewater and waste management systems to green, biophyllic, water-sensitive infrastructure to ensure iwi aspirations outlined within Te Tuāpapa o Ngā Wai o Te Arawa and council obligations to implement Te Mana o Te Wai are achieved within the district’s 30 to 50-year plans.	RLC partner with Te Arawa to co-develop a work programme for the ‘Infrastructure Acceleration Funding’ that Rotorua is allocated to meet the aspirations of both parties and ensures optimal spending on mutual priorities.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
437	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	39	13	91	18	Infrastructure	Other	Other		The RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states that this partnership between iwi and Council would discriminate against other legitimate and non-Maori interest groups. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose submission.	Accept in part Accept in part the submission in the respect that the primary relief sought in the original submission cannot be provided within PC9
438	Oxley, M (FS)	39	13	119	18	Infrastructure	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and states that this partnership between iwi and Council would discriminate against other legitimate and non-Maori interest groups.	Oppose submission.	Accept in part Accept in part the submission in the respect that the primary relief sought in the original submission cannot be provided within PC9
439	Donaldson, H (Clan Donaldson Family Trust)	40	1			Residential	General	General	Support	The submitter fully supports PC9 and the MRDS as important instruments to enable greater housing choices for all and efficient use of land. The reasons discussed include: * That the MDRS help those considering intergenerational living arrangements - important in context of people living longer, working from home, high interest rates, inflated living costs. * Making efficient use of our currently zoned residential land and infrastructure without spending millions more on infrastructure for urban sprawl to cater for growth. * Expectations of population growth due to World Population growth projections, world birth rates continuing to outstrip death rates (even during COVID), national labour shortages bringing pressure to allow immigration, return of tourism to Rotorua. * Exacerbation of housing shortage by climate change - NZ coastline and pacific neighbours impacted by sea level rise, extreme weather in parts of the world - NZ, as a good global citizen, with 5 million population in a country with 10% more land area than the UK which has over 60 million people [as one example], the writing is on the wall for Aotearoa to come under pressure to accept more. * Intensification makes alternative transport modes [walking/cycling/buses etc.] more practicable and reduces the reliance on private motor vehicles with their associated negative impacts on health, climate and congestion.	Support PC9	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
440	Gifford, S (FS)	40	1	150	20	Residential	General	General		the submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission. While higher density housing is important in Rotorua, the adverse effects of PC9 are too great. We should not be introducing a system that ignores adverse effects - we need a better system to both achieve higher density and avoid/minimise adverse effects.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 40.1 above.
441	Matai-Ngatai, H	41	1			Natural Hazards	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9, stating that it will directly affect their house, which is built on a bank - the change would bring even more runoff of water which in turn will cause my house to fall down the bank.	Oppose PC9	Accept in part. Refer to new qualifying matter and other changes proposed in Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
442	Richards, C	42	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Support	The intent and purpose of the plan change and the driver behind it (the NPS) to achieve denser more environmentally sustainable living and assist as one of the tools to improve housing availability and cost is generally accepted with the caveats listed in other submission points.	Refer to other submission points for specific relief sought.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
443	Richards, C	42	2			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	The recession plane standard of 60deg above 4m and 11m building height in some cases is too high and could lead to complete sun deprivation for large portions of the year. For a proportion of the houses in the RESZ1 areas, there is a further fraction that are likely to have been well oriented and designed to maximise the northern sunshine. Based on a low density scenario where the existing property wall may be 4m from the boundary, plus the new yard requirement under medium density rules, an 11m high building could be built just 5m away. Based on the solar height path for Rotorua, calculation indicates that the example house would see no sun from approximately mid to late March to mid to late September (approx. 6 months) until the sun rose above 51 deg. An Appendix is provided to illustrate shading effects of a N / NW oriented neighbouring property with sun completely excluded for 6 months due to proximity of a MDRS compliant unit - a house positioned perfectly for the northern sun would see no sun above the 11m roofline of an MDRS compliant house between late February and the beginning of October. The situation will be worse for any house less well oriented and for southern latitudes elsewhere in the Country. Developers are not going into these intensification opportunities out of the goodness of their hearts. Their objective is to make a profit and simple construction solutions pushing the MDRSs standard to the very limit will be an inevitable outcome in many cases. The submitter believes there is no reason why further standards could not be codified requiring developers and architects to have to design to meet minimum full sun hours over extended periods of the year. Putting such onus on the developer architect will do two things: 1. The design envelope will have to adjust automatically for the latitude where the development is to take place.	The submitter acknowledges that the standards are in the [MDRS] but seeks that the Council push back and require that further standards are introduced to prevent the complete blockage of sunlight over much of the year. This might require that full sun not be excluded from North or NW aspects of the primary living areas of a home between the hours of 11am and 1pm for more than 3 or 4 months - an appendix provided to illustrate that 2 storeys at the same recession plane only could meet this constraint.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
444	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	42	2	64	4	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission, stating that they point out that a house built to maximise northern sunshine may not see sun for six months of the year. This is a severe impact.	Support the submission.	Refer submission 42.2 above.
445	Bidois, J (FS)	42	2	103	1	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter is a trustee for a trust that owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission stating that they are concerned about sunlight, warmth, light, wellbeing, quality of life, solar installations, food growing conditions. The submitter would like to see 2 storeys instead of three but supports the submitters more refined relief to require further standards to be introduced and codified to prevent the complete blockage of sunlight.	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.2 above.
446	Richards, C	42	3			Residential 1 Zone	Introduction	Zone Description	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the deletion of any reference to “the balance between built and natural elements of the environment in this zone” and the zone being “enhanced by the landscaping on site and trees within the road reserve" and states this indicates a complete capitulation by the Council to the MDRS and a lack of commitment to retain wider amenity.	Reinstate modified clauses to reflect a commitment that Council (and existing residents) expect to see high levels of amenity maintained.	Reject PC9 seeks to include the MDRS and recognise Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.
447	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	42	3	64	5	Residential 1 Zone	Introduction	Zone Description		the submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission - deletion of reference to balance between built and natural elements indicates a complete capitulation by the Council to the MDRS and a lack of commitment to retain wider amenity. The effects are even worse for the Residential 2 Zone.	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.3 above.
448	Richards, C	42	4			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the deletion of paragraphs in the issue statement RESZ-I2 related to the maintenance of amenity and replacement with the text “This will change the amenity values experienced by neighbouring sites, including the potential loss of existing views and sunlight. While this consequence is anticipated, development should seek to mitigate these effects though building placement and design features, where it would not limit the ability to achieve medium to high density residential development”. AND “The design response to the above matters is likely to vary from site to site depending on the particular features and characteristics, such as site size, orientation and topography. These factors, together with a site-specific assessment for more intensive development, will inform how many residential units can be achieved on a site” is opposed. This is unacceptable as there is no enforceable mechanism to require mitigation or limit site specific design characteristics that may on occasion be severely disadvantageous to neighbours.	Modify clauses to strengthen the importance of protecting sun shafts for neighbours and push back to Government on the [MDRS] to have codified standards to protect minimum levels of sun.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
449	Bidois, J (FS)	42	4	103	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2		The submitter is a trustee for a trust that owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and the importance of protecting sun for neighbours and pushback to government on the codified standards to protect minimum levels of sun.	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.4 above.
450	Gifford, S (FS)	42	4	150	21	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Protection of sun shafts for neighbouring properties is a fundamental protection. The importance of sun must not be underestimated.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 42.4 above.
451	Richards, C	42	5			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Oppose in part	The submitters' concern, notwithstanding the reserve contributions and /or donations of land, is that it is very unclear how Council would coalesce these contributions into viable and effective community green space within the bounds of an already “occupied” landscape. The 20% site landscaping in the form of slivers of land between buildings does not of itself constitute liveable greenspace though it does add to amenity. With much increased population density over time what is the wider “living green space plan” and how is it to be implemented?	Amend PC 9 to be much more specific as to how necessary green space is to be acquired and integrated into higher density areas. Cease immediately the sale of current reserves until long-term plans for their development and strategies for integration of new reserve and open green space are completed.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
452	Richards, C	42	6			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose in part	As is common around the country there remains an inertia against providing for and enabling “tiny home” solutions as a contribution to diversity choice, affordability and housing for everyone”	Enlarge the scope of PC 9 to encompass pathways for introduction of small tiny house settlements or communities within wider housing developments. Envisaged is the potential for small shared land (possibly leased) settlements within fully landscaped enclaves, possibly with some shared structural assets and codes to ensure modern, eco-friendly tiny homes (to exclude unsightly and semi derelict busses etc.). Part of the housing crisis is not just cost but insecurity of rental tenure and there would be a proportion of individuals, couples without children or even solo parents with single children who could benefit from this solution.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
453	Ronayne, T (FS)	42	6	51	11	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and a diversity of solutions, including tiny homes and tiny home settlements, to address the diversity of housing needs.	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.6 above.
454	Irwin, W (FS)	42	6	83	13	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and a diversity of solutions, including tiny homes and tiny home settlements, to address the diversity of housing needs.	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.6 above.
455	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	42	6	91	19	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		RDRR members support a diversity of solutions, including tiny homes and tiny home settlements, to address the diversity of housing needs. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.6 above.
456	Gifford, S (FS)	42	6	150	22	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They say it raises a good contributing solution to the housing problem. Tiny houses on a controlled scale will provide solutions for some people. Blanket ability for 3 storey houses that adversely affect neighbouring properties do not need to be the solution for increased housing density.	Allow submission to the extent provision is made for tiny homes, but otherwise PC9 should be rejected.	Refer submission 42.6 above.
457	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	42	various	91	20	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		RDRR states that the technical caveats in the submission by C Richards should be given close consideration. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 42.6 above.
458	Witehira, D and Mitchell, J	43	1			Development Areas	Standards	PHDA-SL2	Support	The submitter supports the retention of the 30m yard adjacent to forestry identified in the structure plan for the Pukehangi Heights Development Area (which is identified as a qualifying matter). The submission states that requiring a separation distance between the plantings and new buildings on the neighbouring land assists to protect the plantings from reverse sensitivity, consistent with policies 1.3.10.1 and 13.3.1.1 of the District Plan. A separation distance would also assist to protect future buildings and residents from the nuisance and risks. As the trees have been considered in nitrogen allocations for the larger property, the protection of the forestry against reverse sensitivity from neighbouring residential development has relevance to the protection of the productive activities (grazing) on this property, in terms of policy UG 20B of the Regional Policy Statement.	Retain the current 30m yard standard adjacent to forestry in PHDA-SL2	Accept. Noting that no amendments proposed through the Plan Change. Refer development area section of this report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
459	Witehira, D and Mitchell, J	43	2			Development Areas	Policies	PHDA-P7	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to the policy, stating that retention of open space near to the RL 385m and management of building form and design along the sensitive interface between the terrace and escarpment is consistent with the district wide policy on the caldera landscape value.	Retain the proposed amendments to PHDA-P7	Accept. Adopt the proposed policy. Refer development area section of this report.
460	Mitchell, J (Nataria and Zealand Mitchell Lands Trust)	44	1			Natural Hazards	General	General	Oppose	The Mitchell industrial Lands are located in the industrial zone between 74 Clayton Road and 9 Old Taupo Road Rotorua. The land borders other industrial zoned land and industrial land used for residential housing. During heavy rainfall events, surface water has flooded the rear and lower lying boundaries bordering the Clayton Road side of the Mitchell Lands. A part covered/part open drain is located on the Mitchell lands and is connected to storm water and overland flow paths from surrounding industrial lands and part of the residential zoned Mangakahia catchment; Amies Road, Evan Street and Milne Road. PC9 MDRS enables construction of up to three units of three stories in height per site. Rainfall no longer has the ability to infiltrate into the soil and must either pond or flow off the surface. This will generally increase the total amount of rainfall that is able to become runoff into the drainage system. The increase in impervious coverage of each site will have a 'down-flow' effect on the operating capacity of the drainage system on the Mitchell Lands. Where the MDRS activities are not expected to have an immediate effect, it is noted however that future permitted activities on Mitchell Lands established as of right may find their operation constrained by the establishment of the MDRS and a reverse sensitivity effect on a drainage system at peak flow capacity.	Maintain the status quo by permitting no further intensification by adopting a buffer around locations of overland flow and discharge to the drainage and stormwater system, or Include a policy objective of financial contribution towards the upgrade of site specific infrastructure and reserve an allocation of peak run off rate and runoff volume for the Mitchell Lands Future Permitted Activities in the performance standards(preference). Inclusion of Mangakahia Industrial Zone as MDRS reverse sensitivity constraint of industrial land use stormwater, noise and air discharges as a qualifying matter.	Accept in part. Council has intends to implement major programme of stormwater infrastructure upgrades through funded by the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund. There is also a programme funded by development contributions. Refer to further discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of this report.
461	Hamill, W	45	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes building close to neighbours without them being able to object to the build and aspects.	Delete the plan change	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
462	Savage, S (FS)	45	1	36	1	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They state that residents should have the right to object to builds and aspects that can have a direct impact on them and their privacy.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 45.1 above.
463	Howard, H (FS)	45	1	85	1	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and states residents should have the right to object to builds and aspects that can have a direct impact on them and their privacy.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 45.1 above.
464	Ward, K (FS)	45	1	106	5	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission. They are opposed to building close to neighbours without them being able to object to the build and aspects.	Support submission.	Refer submission 45.1 above.
465	Hamill, W	45	2			Natural Hazards	General	General	Oppose	Geothermal hazards could impede multi storey dwellings.	Delete the plan change	Accept in part. Refer to proposed changes relating to geothermal hazards in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
466	Duncan, M and T (FS)	45	2	143	6	Natural Hazards	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change and supports the original submission. Geo tech issues, a geothermal field is not the place for it. Have Iwi been consulted? The fields have high cultural, historic, scientific and tourism value. Geothermal fields would be for light weight construction not 6 storey high likely concrete builds It is my understanding that the structure below is not well understood and only this year an intensified study has been undertaken. What are the results? Rotorua is believed to be the only city in the world to be built on a geothermal field. This makes us unique.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed changes relating to geothermal hazards in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
467	Gould, M and D (FS)	45	2	157	2	Natural Hazards	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone and support the original submission expressing concern that land subject to geothermal issues could support 6 storeys.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed changes relating to geothermal hazards in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
468	McIndoe, L (FS)	45	2	162	6	Natural Hazards	General	General		The submitters live in a residential zone and support the original submission expressing concern that land subject to geothermal issues could support 6 storeys.	Support submission.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed changes relating to geothermal hazards in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
469	Campbell, W	46	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submission expresses concern about the impact on property values; states that the submitter does not want to live in a high density housing; and questions why the Council doesn't use the plentiful land that is up for sale in the outer areas instead of targeting already established family homes	Oppose PC9	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
470	Savage, S (FS)	46	1	36	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They state that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on their house value, and this is unfair as they have worked hard to be in a position to purchase a home in the family friendly suburb of Glenholme. It makes sense to use land that is already available in outer areas.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 46.1 above.
471	Howard, H (FS)	46	1	85	2	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They state that the proposed changes will have a negative impact on my house value, and this is unfair as I have worked hard to be in a position to purchase a home in the family friendly suburb of Glenholme. Now they are questioning whether to further development the house. It makes sense to use land that is already available in outer areas.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 46.1 above.
472	Ward, K (FS)	46	1	106	6	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 46.1 above.
473	Campbell, W	46	2			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The submitter questions how their area is in a flood zone when it had never flooded.	No relief stated	Noted. No relief has been sought within the plan change.
474	Hunter, P	47	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about medium density development on the reserve land near Rimuvale Street [part of proposal for sale of reserve land] and the change from low density to medium density in the area. The area could be severely affected and compromised.	That reserve land near Rimuvale Street not be developed with medium density housing.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
475	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	47	1	91	21	Other	Other	Other		RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It states the submitter's concerns have been allayed and refers to Council decision to overturn decision to sell reserves. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
476	Winters, K	48	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submitter disapproves of PC9 in the proposed residential areas, allowing existing residential homes/subdivisions to be capable of 3 stories high. It goes against previous planning documents as having a 3 storey house next to existing single storey buildings affects amenity values considerably. It affects view shafts, sunlight exposure, creating more wind eddy and turbulence and actually they become eye sores.	Use PC9 in new subdivisions / developments [only] as home owners will be able to see what they are buying next to and the associated affects.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
477	Casey, P (FS)	48	1	4	4	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and states it would be wiser to use PC9 in new subdivisions / developments only (with the exception of the CBD and adjacent areas) as homeowners will be able to see what they are buying next to and the associated affects.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
478	Hatcher, J (FS)	48	1	8	3	Residential	General	General		The submitter lives in Fenton Park and supports the original submission. They agree with the statement "having a 3 storey house next to existing single storey buildings affects amenity values considerably. It affects view shafts, sunlight exposure, creating more wind eddy and turbulence and actually they become eye sores." Values will decrease if multi-story apartment buildings appear in close vicinity. Will annual rates also decrease? Submitter suggests looking at modern developments to see how damp and dark they are where there is little access to sunlight.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
479	Haley, D (FS)	48	1	32	10	Residential	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
480	Savage, S (FS)	48	1	36	3	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They state that 3+ storey housing buildings next to single storey residential homes will devalue the homes and will impact the wellbeing of the home residents, who have worked hard to achieve the opportunity to raise their families or to retire in areas that make you feel safe and happy. The eye sore and environmental impact that these structures will create on surrounding residents and homes contradicts why these suburbs are valued by locals.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 48.1 above.
481	Murray, J (FS)	48	1	38	10	Residential	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission accords with their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
482	Marshall, A (FS)	48	1	41	3	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They state that density provisions must be approached with great caution. We have already encountered concerns over lack of tenant car parking issues, difficulties uplifting rubbish/recycling bins with higher density housing. PC9 in an entirely new subdivision offers a 'no surprises' approach to home buyers and allows planning to obviate parking, bins etc and other difficulties.	Support submission	Refer submission 48.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
483	Ronayne, T (FS)	48	1	51	12	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They state that it would be wiser to use PC9 in new subdivision/developments only (with the exception of the CBD and adjacent areas) as homeowners will be able to see what they are buying next to and the associated effects.	Support submission	Refer submission 48.1 above.
484	Irwin, W (FS)	48	1	83	14	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They state that it would be wiser to use PC9 in new subdivision/developments only (with the exception of the CBD and adjacent areas) as homeowners will be able to see what they are buying next to and the associated effects.	Support submission	Refer submission 48.1 above.
485	Howard, H (FS)	48	1	85	3	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They are concerned about behaviour of residents and supports/powers to manage. They are also concerned about provision onsite of areas for children to play. The golf course is unsuitable.	[Support submission], clarify	Refer submission 48.1 above.
486	Lane, B (FS)	48	1	86	1	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They support the original submission and concur with the view that allowing existing residential homes/subdivisions to be capable to 3 storeys high without any resource consent or requiring neighbour approval or consultation is inappropriate in this consultative era.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
487	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	48	1	91	22	Residential	General	General		RDRR states it would be wiser to use PC9 in new subdivisions/developments only (with the exception of the CBD and adjacent areas) as homeowners will be able to see what they are buying into. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
488	Murray, P (FS)	48	1	102	10	Residential	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They state that the original submission adheres with their views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
489	Ward, K (FS)	48	1	106	7	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
490	Bennett, K (FS)	48	1	114	1	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
491	Oxley, M (FS)	48	1	119	19	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
492	Cameron, S (FS)	48	1	130	5	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission. It would be wiser to use PC9 in new subdivisions / developments only (with the exception of the CBD and adjacent areas) as homeowners will be able to see what they are buying next to and the associated affects.	Support submission.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
493	Gifford, S (FS)	48	1	150	23	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They mostly support the original submission. New subdivisions lend themselves to PC9 type rules. Intensification can still occur in existing areas but just not in the sweeping form permitted by PC9. This is where the ability of affected persons should be allowed so solutions can be reached. The current cumbersome process is not an excuse to remove protections that have been implemented for important reasons.	Allow submission only to extent is appropriate for the proposed subdivision.	Refer submission 48.1 above.
494	Lakeshore Investments Limited	49	1			Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	The submitter owns commercial property at 631A Hamaurana Road in Hamurana Road [zoned Commercial 3 Zone]. The submitter contends that the centres/areas for consideration under PC9 should be extended to include small outlying settlements that are currently below the 5000 threshold including Hamurana. The submission refers to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and states that densification within such existing small-town boundaries would take pressure of the destruction of highly productive land and ensure the best use of existing infrastructure. It also refers to post-pandemic shifts in patterns of employment with "work from home" and "4-day week" together with green low-movement energy efficient patterns - walking and biking.	Create greater housing/mixed use density in these small towns within 400m walkable catchment of a shopping centre.	Reject PC9 gives effect to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD, in accordance with the requirements for a Tier 2 authority.
495	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (FS)	49	1	46	1	Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps		Waka Kotahi does not support extending MDRS zoning to small outlying settlements. It is considered that due to factors including location, population base, existing development typologies and community infrastructure, higher density development within these areas would not be conducive to a sustainable transport system supported by the ability of residents to live, learn, play, shop and work locally.	Oppose submission. Do not extend MDRS zoning to small outlying settlements.	Refer submission 49.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
496	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	49	1	64	6	Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 zone. They oppose the original submission, stating it would be equivalent to widespread urban sprawl, which would be poor planning and increase the demand for infrastructure. It would also change the amenity for the people that currently live there.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 49.1 above.
497	Gifford, S (FS)	49	1	150	24	Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and also has property at Hamurana. Anything beyond the scope of PC9 should be subject to a separate process so the appropriate community can be fully engaged. Something like this should not be allowed to slip through via the submission process.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 49.1 above.
498	Lakeshore Investments Limited	49	2			Other	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	The submitter owns commercial property at 631A Hamaurana Road in Hamurana Road [zoned Commercial 3 Zone]. The submitter contends that the centres/areas for consideration under PC9 should be extended to include small outlying settlements that are currently below the 5000 threshold including Hamurana. The submission refers to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and states that densification within such existing small-town boundaries would take pressure of the destruction of highly productive land and ensure the best use of existing infrastructure. It also refers to post-pandemic shifts in patterns of employment with "work from home" and "4-day week" together with green low-movement energy efficient patterns - walking and biking.	Within 400m catchments consideration should also be given to commercial buildings (CZ3) and the scope for greater mixed use activities of small-scale neighbourhood retain, café, farmers outlets, small offices - medical/professional with residential components	Reject PC9 gives effect to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD, in accordance with the requirements for a Tier 2 authority.
499	Kingi, B	50	1			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Oppose in part	Where wastewater reticulation is available e.g. East Rotoiti/Rotoma Sewerage Scheme the density standard should be reduced to a size similar to urban residential, since there is no requirement for a soakage area/field per residential unit. Where there is no Council wastewater reticulated network available, the proposed 2000m2 should be further reduced to 1000m2 (doesn't understand logic for a minimum half acre section per dwelling).	Amend PK-R2 density to at least 1,000m2 where Council sewerage reticulation is not available/used; and to 250m2 where sewerage network reticulation is available/used.	Reject. Refer to proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development in the Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
500	Paget, M and J (FS)	50	1	149	2	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		The submitters own property in the Rural Zone adjacent to Maori land and oppose in part the original submission. They state that while they understand the suggestion for smaller lots for better use of the land and closer living to foster greater communal/support activities, property owners surrounding Maori land have bought their properties because they want to live in a rural setting. Housing density that exceeds current rural rules next to rural properties is not going to work.	Oppose submission in part. Consider suggestion to allow denser development in central part of land blocks, away from surrounding rural properties (depending on land size, configuration, utility availability etc), with density decreasing towards edge to reflect larger lot sizes of surrounding rural land.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development in the Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
501	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	1			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O1	Support	Fire and Emergency support SDUD-O1 insofar that it requires the provision 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 consideration of, and the requirement to provide a water supply sufficient for firefighting and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
502	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	2			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O6	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part SDUD-O6 to the extent that it addresses the need to provide infrastructure. Fire and Emergency however requests that this objective be amended to include the provision of firefighting water supply (not just potable drinking water supply). This will be an important determinant as to whether a site can be adequately serviced and achieve SDUD-O1.	Amend SDUD-O6 as follows: Serviced development that safely connects to the existing road network, utility reticulation, provides a potable drinking water supply, <u>firefighting water supply</u> and sufficiently caters for the future development potential of the site.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
503	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	2	109	6	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O6		The RVA opposes this relief as the amended objective sought is unnecessary and the District Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
504	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	2	111	6	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O6		Ryman opposes this relief as the amended objective sought is unnecessary and the District Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
505	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	3			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P11, SDUD-P12, SDUD-P13, SDUD-P14	Support	Fire and Emergency support this policy framework whereby subdivision and land development are required to connect with the existing infrastructure and transportation network, according to the capacity limitations of that network where available and the potential requirements for upgrading its capacity. It will be important that Council have a suitable model in place to keep track of network capacity limitations, particularly in relation to the water supply network.	Retain as notified.	Noted. Retain the policies, but noting that they are existing and not proposed to be amended by PC9.
506	Duncan, M and T (FS)	51	3	143	7	Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P11, SDUD-P12, SDUD-P13, SDUD-P14		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They question who will pay for improving fire services for high level residential fires.	Support submission.	Accept. Retain the policies, but noting that they are existing and not proposed to be amended by PC9.
507	McIndoe, L (FS)	51	3	162	7	Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P11, SDUD-P12, SDUD-P13, SDUD-P14		The submitter lives in a residential zone affected by the plan change. They support the original submission. They question who will pay for improving fire services for high level residential fires.	Support submission.	Accept. Retain the policies, but noting that they are existing and not proposed to be amended by PC9.
508	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	4			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P20	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support the intent of SDUD-P20 but consider that the wording needs to be strengthened in order to ‘require’ subdivision, use and development to be designed to promote the health, safety and well-being of people and communities to achieve the purpose of the RMA.	Amend SDUD-P20 as follows: ~~Encourage~~ Require subdivision, use and development to be designed to promote the health, safety and well-being of people and communities.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
509	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	5			Transport	Standards	SUB-S1	Support	Fire and Emergency support the amendment to SUB-S1(4) that now requires vehicle access, on-site parking and turning to be separate to the area provided for access to front doors. This is important in providing efficient and unobstructed emergency service personnel access to buildings and meeting the requirements of the NZBC. It will be important that Appendix ‘APP1 – Parking Turning and Access’ adequately provides for emergency service vehicle access in accordance with the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.	Retain as notified.	Reject Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
510	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	6			Transport	Standards	SUB-S3	Support	Fire and Emergency support the amendment to SUB-S3(3) that now requires vehicle access, on-site parking and turning to be separate to the area provided for access to front doors. This is important in providing efficient and unobstructed emergency service personnel access to buildings and meeting the requirements of the NZBC. It will be important that Appendix ‘APP1 – Parking Turning and Access’ adequately provides for emergency service vehicle access in accordance with the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.	Retain as notified.	Reject Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
511	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	7			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9	Seek amendment / support in part	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: ● Minimum roading and carriageway widths- not be less than 4m. ● clear vehicle crossing- no less than 3.5m wide provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings. ● height clearance at vehicle crossings and along carriageways- not be less than 4m. ● Maximum negotiable gradient- 1:5 and in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. (Refer submission for diagram) Fire and Emergency support the addition to SUB - Table 3 Minimum access and formation widths that sets the minimum shared private access formation width serving 8-20 residential units to 5.5m with a minimum legal width of 8m. Fire and Emergency request that the formation width for shared private access serving both 1-2 residential units and 3-4 residential units be increased to 4m to meet the emergency service access requirements. Alternatively, the formation width can be reduced to 3.5m if the shared private accessway length is no more than 50m which will allow for sufficient hose run in a fire emergency. Where driveways exceed 50m in length, a width of 4m will be required or alternatively the requirement to provide an appropriate hardstand designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements. These minimum requirements are set out in F5-02 GD Designers’ guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access.	Amend the minimum formation width for shared private access serving both 1-2 residential units and 3-4 residential units to 4m. Or alternatively, apply a maximum accessway length and where there is exceedance, require a 4m formation width or the provision of a suitable hardstand.	Accept. Adopt the alternative relief of an additional clause inn the access width standards requiring a maximum length of 50m for those accesses less than 4m wide (subject to further explanation from the submitter on why 50m is appropriate) and where, this length is exceeded, provision of a hardstand. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A report and recommended changes to the standards in the appendix.
512	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	8			Infrastructure	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MC1	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support SUB-MC1(1) that allows Council to use the level of compliance with the subdivision performance standards in the subdivision chapter as a matter of control. This is particularly important for subdivision applications that result in non-compliance with the road and access performance standards, and the infrastructure performance standards (water services). Fire and Emergency support SUB-MC1(2) to the extent that (b) allows consideration of the accessibility by all modes of transport, which would include emergency service vehicles and will allow Council to impose conditions to mitigate any actual or potential adverse effects on emergency service access, if required. Fire and Emergency further support SUB-MC1(2)(i) however as strategic infrastructure is not defined in the district plan, Fire and Emergency request that specific reference to the Three Waters infrastructure or alternatively, that the term ‘strategic infrastructure’ be defined to include Three Waters to ensure that consideration is given to the impacts of subdivision on Three Waters, specifically the water supply network. This will award Council the ability to impose suitable conditions of consent relating to Three Waters infrastructure when issuing controlled activity subdivision consents.	Amend SUB-MC1(2)(b) as follows: i. Potential for the activity to adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of strategic infrastructure, <u>including the Three Waters network</u>. or alternatively, Include new definition for ‘strategic infrastructure’ that includes Three Waters infrastructure.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report - already addressed in the performance standards for subdivision.
513	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	51	8	84	5	Infrastructure	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MC1		BOPRC supports the relief sought by the original submitter. Policy E1 4B of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) recognises the benefits from regionally significant infrastructure, including maintaining public health and safety through the provision of three waters.	Support submission.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report - already addressed in the performance standards for subdivision.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
514	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	9			Infrastructure	Assessment Criteria	SUB-AC1	Seek amendment / support in part	Consistent with the above submission point, Fire and Emergency support SUB-AC1(1)(b) to the extent that consideration can be given to accessibility by all modes of transport, which would include emergency service vehicles and will allow Council to impose conditions to mitigate any actual or potential adverse effects on emergency service access, if required. Fire and Emergency further support SUB-AC1(21)(l) however as strategic infrastructure is not defined in the district plan, Fire and Emergency request that specific reference to the Three Waters infrastructure or alternatively, that the term 'strategic infrastructure' be defined to include Three Waters to ensure that consideration is given to the impacts of subdivision on Three Waters, specifically the water supply network. This will award Council the ability to impose suitable conditions of consent relating to Three Waters infrastructure when issuing controlled activity subdivision consents.	Amend SUB-AC1(1)(l) as follows: l. Potential for the activity to adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of strategic infrastructure, <u>including the Three Waters network</u> . Regard should be had to the outcome of any consultation with the infrastructure operator. or alternatively, Include new definition for 'strategic infrastructure' that includes Three Waters infrastructure.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report - already addressed in the performance standards for subdivision.
515	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	51	9	84	6	Infrastructure	Assessment Criteria	SUB-AC1		Policy EI 4B of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) recognises the benefits from regionally significant infrastructure, including maintaining public health and safety through the provision of three waters.	Support submission.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report - already addressed in the performance standards for subdivision.
516	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	10			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support the provision of Papakāinga in the rural zones, however, note the potential gap in the requirement to ensure that Papakāinga developments provide adequate firefighting water supply and emergency service access. Fire and Emergency note that Papakāinga or kaumātua flats will not always be subject to subdivision and therefore the servicing provisions within. A new standard is requested requiring Papakāinga or kaumātua flats to provide a firefighting water supply and that this standard apply to all zones in the district.	Add new standards that require site serviceability relating to roading and access and water services whereby the water supply shall be adequate for firefighting purposes.	Accept Refer to proposed standards to address site serviceability and firefighting water supply in Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
517	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	11			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O4	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-O4 as it seeks to provide for development which provides for healthy, safe and quality living environments for residents in a medium density residential environment. This is important in ensuring emergency services can continue to operate effectively in the urban environment.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
518	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	12			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O5	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-O5 as it requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure and services. It is important that development is supported by adequate transport infrastructure and reticulated water supply for firefighting.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed objective. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
519	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	13			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O11	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-O11 as it seeks to provide for development which provides for healthy, safe and quality living environments for residents in a high density residential environment. This is important in ensuring emergency services can continue to operate effectively in the urban environment.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
520	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	14			Infrastructure	Objectives	RESZ-O12	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-O12 as it requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure and services. It is important that development is supported by adequate transport infrastructure and reticulated water supply for firefighting.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt proposed objective. Refer to Infrastructure section in Section 42A Report.
521	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	15			Transport	Policies	RESZ-P4	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P4 insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed policy but noting that this is a mandatory policy in any case.
522	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	16			Transport	Policies	RESZ-P5	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P5 to the extent that it requires development to achieve safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street. This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
523	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	17			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P7 that require proposals for four or more residential units to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development. It is important to Fire and Emergency that demand on the reticulated water supply network as well as the transport network is carefully managed, and that development does not proceed if there are deficiencies in these networks.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Adopt the proposed policy but with changes as detailed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
524	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	18			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P13	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P13 insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed policy but noting that this is a mandatory policy in any case.
525	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	19			Transport	Policies	RESZ-P14	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P14 to the extent that it requires development to achieve safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street. This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
526	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	20			Infrastructure	Policies	RESZ-P16	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-P16 that require proposals for four or more residential units to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development. It is important to Fire and Emergency that demand on the reticulated water supply network as well as the transport network is carefully managed, and that development does not proceed if there are deficiencies in these networks.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Adopt the proposed policy but with changes as detailed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
527	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	21			Infrastructure	Rule Table	RESZ-R3, RESZ-S8	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of RESZ-S5 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of RESZ-R3 that provides for the development of no more than 3 residential units per site in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones as a permitted activity. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included in RESZ-R3 as a performance standard.	Add new water supply servicing performance standard to RESZ-R3(1) and (3). RESZ-S8 Servicing <u>1. All new developments that will require a water supply must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> <u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u> <u>Note: Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u> or to a similar effect.	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
528	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	21	109	7	Infrastructure	Rule Table	RESZ-R3, RESZ-S8		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
529	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	21	111	7	Infrastructure	Rule Table	RESZ-R3, RESZ-S8		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
530	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	22			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency acknowledge that RESZ-S2 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 (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. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with RESZ-S2 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	Add advice note to RESZ-S2: <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> <u>Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
531	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	22	109	8	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2		The RVA considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.22 above.
532	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	22	111	8	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2		Ryman considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.22 above.
533	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	23			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5	Oppose	Access 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. To accommodate a Fire and Emergency vehicle, carriageways should have a minimum width of 4m which excludes parking bays as parked cars on a narrow road or private way will obstruct Fire and Emergency from moving along the carriageway. This can be reduced to a minimum width of 3.5m at site entrances (vehicle crossings), provided tight turns are not required. Refer to Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide. Fire and Emergency request that the formation width for shared private access serving both 1-2 residential units and 3-4 residential units be increased to 4m to meet the emergency service access requirements. Alternatively, the formation width can be reduced to 3.5m if the shared private accessway length is no more than 50m from a public road which will allow for sufficient hose run in a fire emergency. Where driveways exceed 50m in length, a width of 4m should be required or the provision of an appropriate hardstand designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements to facilitate an emergency service vehicle in the event of a fire or other emergency. This approach is consistent with the amendments sought in the subdivision chapter.	Amend the minimum formation width for shared private access serving both 1-2 residential units and 3-4 residential units to 4m Or alternatively apply a maximum accessway length and where there is exceedance, require a suitable hardstand.	Accept. Adopt the alternative relief of an additional clause inn the access width standards requiring a maximum length of 50m for those accesses less than 4m wide (subject to further explanation from the submitter on why 50m is appropriate) and where, this length is exceeded, provision of a hardstand. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A report and recommended changes to the standards in the appendix.
534	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	23	109	9	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Disallow submission.	Reject Adopt the alternative relief in the primary submission of an additional clause inn the access width standards requiring a maximum length of 50m for those accesses less than 4m wide (subject to further explanation from the submitter on why 50m is appropriate) and where, this length is exceeded, provision of a hardstand. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A report and recommended changes to the standards in the appendix.
535	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	23	111	9	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Disallow submission.	Reject Adopt the alternative relief in the primary submission of an additional clause inn the access width standards requiring a maximum length of 50m for those accesses less than 4m wide (subject to further explanation from the submitter on why 50m is appropriate) and where, this length is exceeded, provision of a hardstand. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A report and recommended changes to the standards in the appendix.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
536	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	24			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support Rule 4.2.5.8 insofar that it requires all residential developments in Residential 1 and 2 Zones to have an outdoor living space and outlooks spaces free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas. While not directly associated, this will go some way in providing efficient emergency service personnel access to buildings. 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) 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 layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent stage 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 RESZ-S6A directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	Add advice note: Advice note: <u>Access 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. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
537	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	24	109	10	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A		The RVA considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.24 above.
538	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	24	111	10	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A		Ryman considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.24 above.
539	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	25			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MC4	Support	Fire and Emergency support RESZ-MC4 as it includes access as a matter of control for residential development. Fire and Emergency strongly support RESZ-MC4(1)(a) and RESZ-MC4(1)(d) that awards council the ability to assess the extent to which on-site design of access can provide for practical use and consideration of the activities to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the function and safe and efficient operation of the transport network for controlled activities.	Retain as notified.	Noted. These provisions were not proposed to be amended in PC9.
540	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	26			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Oppose	Residential units – specific non-compliance matters ‘Yards – front yards’ ‘Yards – side and rear yards’ Fire and Emergency request that an additional matter of discretion be included to ‘Yards – front yards’ and ‘Yards – side and rear yards’ to include consideration of 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.	Add new matter of discretion: <u>4. 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>	Reject The proposed provisions under RESZ-MDA are considered to be the most efficient and effective means of achieving the Residential Zone Objectives (RESZ-O3, RESZ-O4, RESZ-10, RESZ-O11).
541	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	27			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Oppose	Residential units – specific non-compliance matters ‘Shared access driveways’ Fire and Emergency request that an additional matter of discretion be included to ‘Shared access driveways’ to include consideration as to whether there is efficient and effective access for emergency service vehicles.	Add new matter of discretion: <u>5. 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>	Accept in part. Adopt a matter of discretion relating to emergency services, delivery services and rubbish collection. Refer to Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
542	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	28			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Support	Fire and Emergency strongly support RESZ-MDB(4)(e) as it enables council the ability to assess whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently for 4+ residential unit developments.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
543	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	29			Infrastructure	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Support	Fire and Emergency also support RESZ-MDB(5)(a) which requires the consideration of whether the development can be adequately serviced by water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure however, it is unclear how this matter of discretion relates to the rule framework.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Adopt the matter of discretion but also include electricity to reflect broader policy for adequate infrastructure. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
544	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	30			Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R3	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of CCZ-S5 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of CCZ-R3 that provides for the construction of new buildings. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in CCZ-R3. Fire and Emergency also recommend that where compliance cannot be achieved with the specified performance standards, the consequent activity status be discretionary. As drafted, non-compliance still results in a restricted discretionary activity status and it is unclear whether this is intended.	Add new water supply servicing performance standard to CCZ-R16(1). <u>CCZ-S11 Servicing</u> 1. All new developments that will require a water supply <u>must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> 2. Where the new development will not be connected to a <u>public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u> <u>Note: Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u> or to a similar effect.	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
545	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	30	109	11	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
546	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	30	111	11	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
547	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	31			Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of CCZ-S5 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of CCZ-R16 that provides for residential units in the city centre zone. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in CCZ-R16.	Add new water supply servicing standard <u>CCZ-S11 Servicing</u> as sought above to CCZ-R16(1).	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
548	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	31	109	12	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
549	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	31	111	12	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
550	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	32			Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of CCZ-S5 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of CCZ-R16A that provides for the conversion of a building to residential units in the city centre zone. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in CCZ-R16A.	Add new water supply servicing standard <u>CCZ-S11 Servicing</u> as sought above to CCZ-R16A(1).	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
551	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	32	109	13	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
552	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	32	111	13	Infrastructure	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
553	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	33			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support CCZ-MDA(13) that provides the ability for council to consider whether safe and direct pedestrian access that is easily identifiable is provided from the street to activities on the site. Fire and Emergency further support CCZ-MDA(14) insofar that it requires consideration of whether suitable provision is made for on-site rubbish storage and sorting and is accessible for rubbish collection which goes some way in recognising the needs of larger vehicles. However, Fire and Emergency request that specific consideration is given to the needs of emergency service vehicles.	Add new matter of discretion: Whether access for emergency service vehicles is <u>appropriately designed so that emergency service personnel can access the site safely and efficiently.</u>	Accept in part Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
554	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	34			Transport	Assessment Criteria	COMZ-03A	Support	Fire and Emergency support COMZ-03A that requires residential development to provide healthy, safe, and quality living environments for residents. This includes ensuring emergency services can continue to operate effectively in the urban environment.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
555	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	35			Transport	Policies	COMZ-P13	Support	Fire and Emergency support COMZ-P13 as it requires the design of residential buildings to achieve quality on site living environments for people by providing safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street. This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
556	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	36			Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R3	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of COMZ-S6 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of COMZ-R3 that provides for new buildings in the commercial zones. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in COMZ-R3.	Add new water supply servicing performance standard to COMZ-R3(1). <u>COMZ-S10 Servicing</u> <u>1. All new developments that will require a water supply must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> <u>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u> <u>Note: Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u> or to a similar effect.	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
557	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	36	109	14	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R3		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
558	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	36	111	14	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R3		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
559	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	37			Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of COMZ-S6 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of COMZ-R32 that provides for residential units in the commercial zones. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in COMZ-R32.	Add new water supply servicing standard <u>CCZ-S10 Servicing</u> as sought above to COMZ-R32(1).	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
560	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	37	109	15	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
561	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	37	111	15	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
562	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	38			Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R33	Oppose	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of COMZ-S6 (parking, access and turning) as a performance standard of COMZ-R33 that provides for the conversion of buildings to residential units in the commercial zones. Fire and Emergency however note that there are no water supply servicing standards for land use activities and request that a new standard be included to address water supply and that this be included as a performance standard in COMZ-R33.	Add new water supply servicing standard <u>CCZ-S10 Servicing</u> as sought above to COMZ-R33(1).	Accept in part. Adopt a new performance standard but with some changes to the wording sought. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure Section of the 42A report.
563	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	38	109	16	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R33		The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. The RVA seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
564	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	38	111	16	Infrastructure	Rule Table	COMZ-R33		Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change. Ryman seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
565	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	39			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency acknowledge that COMZ-S2 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 (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. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with COMZ-S2 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.	Add advice note to COMZ-S2: <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> <u>Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
566	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	39	109	17	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2		The RVA considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.39 above.
567	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	39	111	17	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2		Ryman considers that this additional advice not is unnecessary.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 51.39 above.
568	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	40			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support COMZ-MD1(10) that provides the ability for council to consider whether safe and direct pedestrian access that is easily identifiable is provided from the street to activities on the site. Fire and Emergency further support COMZ-MD1(11) insofar that it requires consideration of whether suitable provision is made for on-site rubbish storage and sorting and is accessible for rubbish collection which goes some way in recognising the needs of larger vehicles. However, Fire and Emergency request that specific consideration is given to the needs of emergency service vehicles.	Add new matter of discretion: <u>Whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that emergency service personnel can access the site safely and efficiently.</u>	Accept in part Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
569	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	41			Transport	Other	APP1(3)(b)(i)	Seek amendment / support in part	Fire and Emergency support Section 3 insofar that it sets out the design and construction of access. Fire and Emergency request that the specific access requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances be added to 3(b) to provide for emergency service access in all zones.	Add new driveway design requirements to 3(b)(i): 3. A clear vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide <u>should be provided at site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings.</u> 4. A height clearance at vehicle crossings and along carriageways should not be less than 4m. 5. The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. 6. Where a driveway exceeds 50m in length, a hardstand in accordance with Fire and Emergency’s ‘Designer’s Guide’ to Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access’ (December 2021) must be provided every 50m.	Accept in part. Vehicle crossings are managed by separate process. A height clearance along driveways is recommended to be added to the residential zones. See the Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
570	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	51	41	109	18	Transport	Other	APP1(3)(b)(i)		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Oppose submission in part.	Accept in part. Vehicle crossings are managed by separate process. A height clearance along driveways is recommended to be added to the residential zones. See the Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
571	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	51	41	111	18	Transport	Other	APP1(3)(b)(i)		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.	Oppose submission in part.	Accept in part. Vehicle crossings are managed by separate process. A height clearance along driveways is recommended to be added to the residential zones. See the Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
572	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	51	42			Transport	Other	APP1(4)(b)	Support	Fire and Emergency support the addition of subsection (b) that adds information requirements for 20-100 residential units or lots for a transport assessment. This includes specific consideration of the effects of the development on the safe and efficient operation of the adjacent road network, including ensuring the road network can accommodate emergency service vehicles.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed requirement for a transport assessment. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
573	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (FS)	51	42	46	2	Transport	Other	APP1(4)(b)		Waka Kotahi supports this point and seeks that the provisions of APP1.4B be retained as notified.	Support submission. Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed requirement for a transport assessment. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
574	Ministry of Education	52	1			Other	General	General	Oppose	Applying a qualifying matter to the Ministry’s designations is contrary to the clear requirements of Section 77I(g), as it is not necessary to apply a qualifying matter in order to ensure that the Ministry’s designations are given effect to. Applying a qualifying matter to the Minister’s designations in our view is contrary to the intent of the MDRS, as the qualifying matter constrains the Ministry’s ability to utilise its designation over time in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding future planned built environment and is inconsistent with the provisions of Section 77M of the RMA. This provision allows the Ministry to develop their sites to the same standards that are applied to the immediately adjoining residential neighbourhoods. This ensures that schools are able to provide for growth over time and recognises that development on school sites should not be unduly constrained in a manner inconsistent with the existing and future planned built environment in which they are located. Applying the same standards to school sites as is applied to the surrounding land ensures that school development will be consistent with anticipated amenity outcomes within the surrounding environment. Currently under PC9, Council has identified all designations as a qualifying matter. This may unnecessarily result in section 77M(6) not being available to the Ministry until after the plan change becomes operative.	The Ministry therefore requests that the Council confirm that the qualifying matter does not apply to Minister of Education designations, such that in the absence of any other qualifying matters applying to Schools, section 77M(6) can be immediately relied upon by the Ministry.	Accept. No changes are considered necessary. Refer to discussion in the Other section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
575	Ministry of Education	52	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The Ministry requests the addition of the definition for ‘additional infrastructure’ to the Plan. This definition is from the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). Educational facilities are included within the definition of ‘additional infrastructure’. The use of the broad definition of ‘additional infrastructure’ rather than a lower tier definition of educational facilities will enable a wider category of infrastructure to be captured by inclusions of the definition within the provisions of the plan. It will allow for activities that provide broadly for communities’ social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, to be captured within specific policies and objectives and will be consistent with the NPS-UD wording.	Add to definitions: Additional infrastructure means: <u>a. Public open space.</u> <u>b. Community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002.</u> <u>c. Land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities.</u> <u>d. Social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities.</u> <u>e. A network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001).</u> <u>f. A network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas.</u>	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
576	Ministry of Education	52	3			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The Ministry acknowledges that the definition for educational facilities is not proposed to be amended through PC9 and is an existing definition under the Plan. However, the Ministry opposes the current definition of educational facilities and requests that the definition is updated so that it is consistent with the definition provided in the National Planning Standards.	Amend definitions: educational facilities ~~includes learning activities such as pre-school, primary, secondary and tertiary institutions and institutions delivering educational services for groups such as unemployed people, youth, elderly or groups with special educational needs.~~ <u>means land or buildings used for teaching or training by child care services, schools, or tertiary education services, including any ancillary activities.</u>	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
577	Ministry of Education	52	4			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O5	Seek amendment / support in part	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient ‘additional infrastructure’ (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular). Educational facilities should therefore be enabled in the Plan to service the growth enabled by PC9. The Ministry therefore recommends that objective RESZ-O5 is amended to include additional infrastructure such as educational facilities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. It is recommended that the definition of ‘additional infrastructure’ (as defined in the NPS UD) should subsequently be included in the definitions chapter of the Operative District Plan.	Amend RESZ-O5: Development is supported by <u>adequate infrastructure,</u> <u>additional infrastructure,</u> and services.	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
578	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	52	4	109	19	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O5		The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however the RVA seeks for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis and that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are provided for (e.g. retirement villages already provide open space and community infrastructure within their developments).	Support submission in part / oppose submission in part. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective. If retirement villages are not excluded, disallow submission point and allow the relief sought in the RVA’s primary submission.	Refer submission 52.4 above.
579	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	52	4	111	19	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O5		Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however Ryman seeks for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis and that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are provided for (e.g. retirement villages already provide open space and community infrastructure within their developments).	Support submission in part / oppose submission in part. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective. If retirement villages are not excluded, disallow submission point and allow the relief sought in Ryman’s primary submission.	Refer submission 52.4 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
580	Ministry of Education	52	5			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O12	Seek amendment / support in part	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient ‘additional infrastructure’ (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular). Educational facilities should therefore be enabled in the Plan to service the growth enabled by PC9. The Ministry therefore recommends that objective RESZ-O12 is amended to include additional infrastructure such as educational facilities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. It is recommended that the definition of ‘additional infrastructure’ (as defined in the NPS UD) should subsequently be included in the definitions chapter of the Operative District Plan.	Amend RESZ-O12 Development is supported by adequate infrastructure, <u>additional infrastructure</u> , and services.	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
581	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	52	5	109	20	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O12		The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however the RVA seeks for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis and that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are provided for (e.g. retirement villages already provide open space and community infrastructure within their developments).	Support submission in part / oppose submission in part. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective. If retirement villages are not excluded, disallow submission point and allow the relief sought in the RVA’s primary submission.	Refer submission 52.5 above.
582	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	52	5	111	20	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O12		Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however Ryman seeks for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis and that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are provided for (e.g. retirement villages already provide open space and community infrastructure within their developments).	Support submission in part / oppose submission in part. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed, subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective. If retirement villages are not excluded, disallow submission point and allow the relief sought in Ryman’s primary submission.	Refer submission 52.5 above.
583	Ministry of Education	52	6			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-PX	Seek amendment / support in part	Educational facilities typically locate in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments. The Ministry therefore recommends that additional policies are added to Residential 1 Zone to specifically enable educational facilities as non-residential activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. The proposed amendment is also necessary to support the Ministry’s suggested amendments to objective RESZ-O5.	Add new policy for Medium Density Residential Zone: <u>RESZ-Px</u> . <u>Enable additional infrastructure including educational facilities</u>	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
584	Ministry of Education	52	7			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-PX	Seek amendment / support in part	Educational facilities typically locate in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments. The Ministry therefore recommends that additional policies are added to Residential 2 Zone to specifically enable educational facilities as non-residential activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. The proposed amendment is also necessary to support the Ministry’s suggested amendments to objective RESZ-O12.	Add new policy for High Density Residential Zone: <u>RESZ-Px</u> . <u>Enable additional infrastructure including educational facilities</u>	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
585	Ministry of Education	52	8			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R12	Oppose	The definition of daycare facilities fits within the Ministry’s proposed new definition for educational facilities. The Ministry therefore recommends that RESZ-R12 for daycare centres is deleted from the Plan as RESZ-R13 already provided for educational facilities.	Delete Rule RESZ-R12: ~~RESZ-R12 Daycare centres~~ ~~Applicable Spatial Layers All Residential Zones~~ ~~1. Activity Status: Discretionary~~ ~~Assessment Criteria:~~ ~~a. General RESZ-AC1.~~	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
586	Ministry of Education	52	9			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R13	Oppose	Educational facilities typically locate in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments. Educational facilities are considered necessary social infrastructure that support the wellbeing of these residential communities. The Ministry considers Rule RESZ-R13 unnecessarily restrictive and proposes a permitted activity status where the GFA is no more that 200m2 subject to compliance with performance standards. This will enable educational facilities such as day care centres and childcare services of a smaller scale to establish in residential zones where required. The Ministry recommends a restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved and matters of discretion appropriate for education facilities. This activity status will support the needs and demands of these residential communities and also aligns with the Ministry’s suggested objective amendments and new policies.	Amend RESZ-R13 Educational facilities Applicable Spatial Layers All Residential Zones 1. Activity Status: ~~Discretionary~~ <u>Permitted</u> ~~Assessment Criteria:~~ ~~a. General RESZ-AC1:~~ ~~Where:~~ ~~a. GFA no more than 200m2~~ ~~Performance Standards:~~ ~~a. Height RESZ-S1;~~ ~~b. Yards RESZ-S2;~~ ~~c. Site coverage RESZ-S3; and~~ ~~d. Parking, access and turning RESZ-S5.~~ ~~2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary~~ ~~Where:~~ ~~a. GFA more than 200m2 and/or~~ ~~b. Compliance is not achieved with the performance standards for RESZ-R13(1)~~ ~~Matters of Restricted Discretion:~~ ~~a. The reason for the non-compliance with performance standards and the extent to which the activity will avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the non-compliance in achieving the purpose of the relevant performance standard and the objectives and policies relevant to the matter of discretion;~~ ~~b. The extent to which the activity adversely affects the character and amenity values of the zone; and~~ ~~c. Natural hazards RESZ-MD1.~~	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
587	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	53	1			Infrastructure	Standards	RESZ-S2	Oppose in part	There is a designated but not currently operational rail corridor within the Rotorua District and the submitter states this designation has been given effect. KiwiRail seeks to ensure that its ability to maintain, operate and upgrade his line is protected both now and into the future. KiwiRail supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors. However, the submitter states it is critical that Plan Change 9 provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway and road network - for healthy living environments; so the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint; and so the transport network can support increasing growth and housing intensification. The nature of railway operations means that the effects cannot be fully internalised within the railway corridor boundaries and the submitter states caselaw recognises the legality of such effects. With the increased density enabled by PC9, KiwiRail is concerned that, without appropriate planning measures, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects and reverse sensitivity constraining KiwiRail operations is significantly elevated. The two primary ways in which KiwiRail seek to manage the interface is through noise and vibration controls to be installed in new sensitive uses adjacent to the rail corridor and boundary 'no build' setbacks within 5m of the railway corridor to ensure people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without the need to extend into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Under the MDRS setbacks for side and rear yards are reduced to 1m, but are effectively 400mm as the definition of yard enables eaves to be located in a yard up to 600mm. It is considered that the side and rear yards	KiwiRail seeks that the side and rear yard setback be increased to enable maintenance of buildings without requiring landowners to encroach onto adjoining land in order to do so and such further or consequential relief as may be necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
588	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	53	1	97	10	Infrastructure	Standards	RESZ-S2		Kāinga Ora broadly opposes an overall framework of provisions in urban areas where 'sensitive activities' would be required to manage effects of / provide potential mitigation for adverse effects (noise and vibration) created by the infrastructure network itself. Moreover, Kāinga Ora broadly oppose a proposed approach of using a 'default' effects corridor / buffer (e.g. rules applying within a generic 100m buffer) when it is more appropriate, as well as achievable, to model the actual spatial extent of a potential effect and have any district plan provisions apply to those identified / modelled locations where any potential effect would be present and warrant mitigation.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Reject primary submission. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
589	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	1			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is supportive in part limit height and density in relation to matters of national importance (qualifying matters) in SDUD P3: <i>“Within the urban environment, limit height and densities where it is necessary to recognise and provide for matters of national importance, or other matters of significance to Rotorua including:</i> <i>1.Nationally significant infrastructure;</i> <i>2.Historic heritage;</i> <i>3.Sites of significance to Māori and identified cultural values;</i> <i>4.Outstanding natural features and landscapes;</i> <i>5.Significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;</i> <i>6.Maintanace and enhancement of public access along lakes and rivers;</i> <i>7.Managment of significant risks from natural hazards, including flooding and geothermal hazards .”</i> HNZPT is concerned that there is no direct consideration of archaeology, which is a part of historic heritage and is already included in the Plan, within HH-Sched 1-Archaeological sites Schedule. As matters of national importance can be considered as reasons to limit height or density, HNZPT considers that there should specific consideration of this matter in SDUD-P3. It maybe that the more intensive development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site. The Plan needs a policy, rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites. This will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national	That SDUD is retained and amended with the following additions; “8. Archaeological sites”	Reject. Archaeological sites is covered by the definition of 'historic heritage' and is therefore not necessary, Retain as notified.
590	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	2			Historical & Cultural Values	Issues	HH-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports in part the proposed addition to the first paragraph that includes recognition of the importance of the “setting”, however HNZPT is concerned that this appears to be a limited application of the idea of “setting” for an historic place, and there is not sufficient recognition of the values of the “setting” in of themselves as part of the historic heritage place, being the setting and the structure or building. HNZPT considers that the definition of “setting” from the “ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010 ” provides helpful direction on this important matter: “Setting means the area around and/or adjacent to a place of cultural heritage value that is integral to its function, meaning, and relationships. Setting includes the structures, outbuildings, features, gardens, curtilage, airspace, and access ways forming the spatial context of the place or used in association with the place. Setting also includes cultural landscapes, townscapes, and streetscapes; perspectives, views, and view shafts to and from a place; and relationships with other places which contribute to the cultural heritage value of the place. Setting may extend beyond the area defined by legal title and may include a buffer zone necessary for the long-term protection of the cultural heritage value of the place.” HNZPT considers that the proposed addition is amended to better reflect the breadth of the term “setting.”	That the proposed addition to the first paragraph is retained and amended as follows: “This includes the setting of the historic structure, which extends to the land <u>and features</u> surrounding the historic structure that <u>forms part of or</u> contributes to its historical, <u>cultural and other</u> heritage values “	Accept. Issue statement better provide for the importance of historic heritage setting and matters of national importance. Refer to Historic Heritage section of this report.
591	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	3			Historical & Cultural Values	Rule Table	HH-R2(A)	Seek amendment / support in part	While HNZPT supports the proposed rule HH-R2A and its restricted discretionary activity status; “New building on the same site as a heritage structure listed in the Historic Structures schedule or specified adjacent site, Applicable Spatial Areas Residential 1 Zone, Residential 2 Zones, Commercial 4 Zone” HNZPT is concerned at the limited spatial application of the rule and considers that given heritage scheduled items are in numerous other zones that are subject to growth, for example City Centres, that its scope is applied district wide as additional development could occur on any type of site.	That HH-R2A and its restricted discretionary activity status is retained, and its applicable spatial application is amended to cover all zones.	Reject. Adopt extent of rule as notified in PC9. Refer to Historic Heritage section of this report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
592	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	4			Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	HH-MD1	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports in part the proposed matters of discretion, however, considers that there should be amendments to the matters of discretion to: • reduce the blanket nature of the consideration of new or contemporary design as all appropriate, changing the assessment criteria (c) in part to consider more sensitive contemporary interpretations that may be appropriate, which is a more appropriate approach in the context of historic heritage, and • criteria “f” to enable an improved retention setting. HNZPT considers that “adequate” is not a robust term, and • to criteria “g” to better assess the impacts of any new building on both the heritage structure and its setting-i.e., the heritage place, and • criteria ‘h’ to better address not just height but also dominance, both of which can have adverse effects on historic heritage. The proposed amendments will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the matters of discretion for HH-R2A are retained and amended as follows; <i>“a. Zone specific HH-MD1; b. Whether the new building compliments the form and fabric which contributes to, or is associated with, the heritage values of the structure. c. Whether the new building uses materials and/or design details that respect rather than replicate any features of the heritage structure. ~~New and contemporary interpretations in from and detail are encouraged.~~ Sensitive contemporary interpretations in terms of form and detail may be considered’ d. Whether the new building will not compromise the ability to interpretive the heritage structure and its setting. e. Whether the new building maintains visual linkages between the buildings or structure, and the street where relevant. f. ~~Whether the location of the building and associated site works allows for an adequate setting for the heritage item place.~~ f. Whether the location of the building and associated site works allows enables the heritage values of the place and setting to be maintained. g. Whether other structures or features associated with the heritage item place are retained and are complemented. h. ~~Whether the new building is the same height or lower than the heritage building.”~~</i>	Accept. Matters of discretion better provide for the importance of historic heritage setting and matters of national importance. Refer to Historic Heritage section of this report.
593	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	4	97	11	Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	HH-MD1		Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 54.4 to refine the matters of discretion for the rationale provided in Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga's submission point, however does not support the inclusions within subclause f to include the 'place and setting' as this is considered ambiguous and it is unclear what the 'setting' would be. Further, the words "such as being equal or lower in height" within subclause h is considered unnecessary given that the word 'comparatively' is already within the sentence.	Allow submission.	Reject. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Historic Heritage section of the Section 42A Report.
594	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	5			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	General	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT considers that the suite of Objectives should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. This is of particular importance as it has been identified within a specialist supporting report for the Plan Change “Medium Density Residential Standard and Heritage Report by Salmon Reed Architects” that there are several buildings within the Commercial 4 zone that could be vulnerable at the time of onsite or adjacent development. The proposed addition to the suite of Objectives would enable a cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework and will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the heading is amended as follows: <u>“Context, Design and Appearance of buildings”</u> and a new Objective is included as follows: <u>“COMZ-04A Development in Commercial zones ensures the retention of the important values of qualifying matters.”</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
595	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	5	97	12	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.5 on the basis that "context" and "important values" is vague and subjective. Rather, "identified heritage values" would be a more appropriate approach as this will link the objective to evidenced based values that have been assessed / identified within Council's heritage assessment.	Disallow submission.	Refer Section 54.5 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
596	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	6			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT considers that the suite of Policies should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. This is of particular importance as it has been identified within a specialist supporting report for the Plan Change “Medium Density Residential Standard and Heritage Report by Salmon Reed Architects” that there are several buildings within the Commercial zone 4 that could be vulnerable at the time of on site or adjacent development. The proposed addition to the suite of policies would assist the cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework and will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the heading is amended as follows: “Context, Design and Appearance of buildings” New Policy <u>COMZ-P13</u> “ <u>New buildings are located and designed to retain the values of qualifying matters on both their own and adjacent sites.</u> ”	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
597	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	6			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT considers that the suite of Policies should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. This is of particular importance as it has been identified within a specialist supporting report for the Plan Change “Medium Density Residential Standard and Heritage Report by Salmon Reed Architects” that there are several buildings within the Commercial zone 4 that could be vulnerable at the time of on site or adjacent development. The proposed addition to the suite of policies would assist the cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework and will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the heading is amended as follows: “Context, Design and Appearance of buildings” New Policy <u>COMZ-P13</u> “ <u>New buildings are located and designed to retain the values of qualifying matters on both their own and adjacent sites.</u> ”	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
598	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	6	97	13	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.6 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Further, including "context" within the heading is vague and subjective and does not provide a specific area to consider within such an assessment	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 54.6 above.
599	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	54	6	109	21	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		The RVA opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 54.6 above.
600	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	54	6	111	21	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		Ryman opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 54.6 above.
601	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	7			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	Subject to related submission points elsewhere in this submission, HNZPT supports in part matters of discretion: d. Height-specific non-compliance matters COMZ-MDA, and e. Building design and site layout-COMZ-MDA that are listed in full at the end of the chapter as they give regard to the impact of development on adjacent sites.	Subject to submission points sought elsewhere in this submission that the matters of discretion “d” and “e” are retained in COMZ-R3.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
602	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	8			Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports that the proposed matters of discretion give regard to the potential effects that new, over height buildings will have on adjacent sites, however, HNZPT considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage, archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori, as they are matters of national importance. It maybe that the more intensive, over height development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site. The Plan needs a policy, rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.	That the matter of discretion is retained and amended as follows: 1. <i>“vii. Whether the infringement detracts from the recognised values of any qualifying matters located on adjacent sites.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
603	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	8	97	14	Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MDA		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.8 on the basis that "recognised values" is vague and subjective. Rather, "identified heritage values" would be a more appropriate approach as this will link the matter of discretion to evidenced based values that have been assessed / identified within Council's heritage assessment. Further, qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
604	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	9			Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports that the proposed matters of discretion give regard to the potential effects that new buildings will have on adjacent sites, however, HNZPT considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage, archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori, as they are matters of national importance. It maybe that the more intensive development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site. The Plan needs a policy, rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.	That the assessment criteria are amended as follows: “7. Whether a. The location of buildings and structures and location of outdoor activities mitigates potential adverse cumulative effects on adjoining sites, <i>including on sites that contain qualifying matters</i> ”	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
605	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	10			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	General	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT considers that the suite of Objectives should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. This is of particular importance as the City Centre zones contain HNZPT Listed historic heritage items, RLC scheduled historic heritage items, and the City Centre zones are also located adjacent to or over the road from the HNZPT listed and RLC scheduled Rotorua Government Gardens Historic area and the HNZPT listed Wahi Tapu area Paepaehakumanu Motutara. The proposed addition to the suite of Objectives would enable a cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework, in particular in relation to the reduced building height when adjacent to buildings that are part of the heritage schedule found in performance standard CCZ-S1. Further amendments are suggested elsewhere in this submission for CCZ-S1 to address inappropriate building height adjacent Government Gardens. The proposed changes will assist the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the heading is amended as follows: <i>“Context, Design and Appearance of buildings”</i> and a new Objective is included as follows: <i>“CCZ-05A Development in City Centre zones ensures the retention of the important values of qualifying matters.”</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
606	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	10	97	15	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.10 on the basis that "context" and "important values" is vague and subjective. Rather, "identified heritage values" would be a more appropriate approach as this will link the objective to evidenced based values that have been assessed / identified within Council's heritage assessment	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 54.10 above.
607	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	11			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT considers that the suite of Policies should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. This is of particular importance as the City Centre zones contain HNZPT Listed historic heritage items, and RLC scheduled historic heritage items. The City Centre zones are also located adjacent to or over the road from the HNZPT listed and RLC scheduled Rotorua Government Gardens Historic area and the HNZPT listed Wahi Tapu area Paepaehakumanu Motutara. The proposed addition to the suite of Policies would enable a cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework, in particular in relation to the reduced building heights when adjacent to buildings that are part of the heritage schedule, as contained in existing performance standard CCZ-S1. Further amendments are suggested elsewhere in this submission for assessment criteria to address the impact of over height buildings when adjacent to the Government Gardens. The proposed change will assist the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the heading is amended as follows: <u>"Context, Design and Appearance of buildings"</u> New Policy <u>CCZ-P13A</u> <u>"New buildings are located and designed to retain the values of qualifying matters on both their own and adjacent sites."</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
608	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	11	97	16	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.11 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Further, including "context" within the heading is vague and subjective and does not provide a specific area to consider within such an assessment.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 54.11 above.
609	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	54	11	109	22	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		The RVA opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 54.11 above.
610	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	54	11	111	22	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	General		Ryman opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.		Refer submission 54.11 above.
611	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	12			Historical & Cultural Values	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned about the impacts of tall building on sensitive locations such as the Government Gardens that contains the HNZPT listed Government Gardens Historic area and the HNZPT listed Wahi Tapu area Paepaehakumanu Motutara. HNZPT considers that as there are certain area/s in the Gardens that are sensitive for Mana Whenua, it would be appropriate for Mana Whenua to be consulted at the time of development applications adjacent or opposite this site and similar sensitive sites, to ensure that Mana Whenua have a level of comfort with the proposed development. HNZPT proposes that a new assessment is included to capture this concern. HNZPT should also be considered as an affected party for developments on the Government Gardens due to the HNZPT listed Government Gardens Historic area and the HNZPT listed Wahi Tapu area Paepaehakumanu Motutara.	That new matters of control are included as follows: <u>"17. Whether consultation has been undertaken with Mana Whenua regarding the impact of the proposed development on the cultural values of adjacent sites."</u> <u>18. Whether consultation has been undertaken with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga."</u>	Reject. Refer to Historic Heritage section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
612	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	13			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned that the Issues section of the Residential Zones chapter, makes no reference to “qualifying matters,” which include historic heritage cultural, archaeological and built heritage values. Given that these matters can be exceptions to the MDRS and also have to be considered by those developing adjacent sites, it is important that the users of the Plan are alerted to this to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal at the earliest stage possible. This is important as there are qualifying matters (historic heritage), within the Medium Density Residential Zones. HNZPT considers that an additional sentence at the end of the fourth paragraph is required to acknowledge this important matter.	That Issues, RESZ-I2(Page 7), is amended, with the addition of an additional sentence at the end of the 4th paragraph as follows: <i>“Buildings densities, design and layout should be amended to better accommodate the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent to it.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
613	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	13	97	17	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.13 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
614	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	54	13	109	23	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2		The RVA opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. The RVA, therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
615	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	54	13	111	23	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2		Ryman opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. Ryman, therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
616	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	14			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O1	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned that the Objectives for the Residential zones do not make any reference to accommodating “qualifying matters” at the time of development in the Residential zones. Given that these matters can be exceptions to the MDRS and also have to be considered by those developing adjacent sites, it is important that the users of the Plan are alerted to this to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal at the earliest stage possible. This is important as there are qualifying matters (historic heritage), within the Residential Zones. This is of particular importance as it has been identified within a specialist supporting report for the Plan Change “Medium Density Residential Standard and Heritage Report by Salmon Reed Architects” that there are several buildings within the Residential Zones that could be vulnerable at the time of on site or adjacent development. The proposed approach will ensure a more integrated approach and enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That Objective RESZ-O1 is retained and amended as follows; <i>“Land is used efficiently for medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice, while accommodating qualifying matters on and adjacent to development sites.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
617	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	14	97	18	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-01		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.14 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
618	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	54	14	109	24	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-01		The RVA opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
619	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	54	14	111	24	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-01		Ryman opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
620	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	15			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RES-08	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned that the Objectives for the Residential zones do not make any reference to accommodating “qualifying matters” at the time of development in the Residential zones. Given that these matters can be exceptions to the MDRS and also have to be considered by those developing adjacent sites, it is important that the users of the Plan are alerted to this to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal at the earliest stage possible. This is important as there are qualifying matters (historic heritage), within the Residential Zones. This is of particular importance as it has been identified within a specialist supporting report for the Plan Change “Medium Density Residential Standard and Heritage Report by Salmon Reed Architects” that there are several buildings within the Residential Zones that could be vulnerable at the time of on site or adjacent development. The proposed approach will ensure a more integrated approach and enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That Objective RESZ-08 retained and amended as follows: <i>“Land that has good accessibility by existing or planned active and public transport to a range of commercial activities, public open space and community services, is efficiently used for high density urban living that increases housing supply and choice, while accommodating qualifying matters on and adjacent to development sites.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
621	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	15	97	19	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RES-08		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.15 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
622	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	54	15	109	25	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RES-08		The RVA opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements and the RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
623	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	54	15	111	25	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RES-08		Ryman opposes the consideration of qualifying matters being extended beyond the boundary of the site. Qualifying matters are defined by certain areas and should not be extended to capture other sites beyond the heritage itself, as it will lead to subjective assessment requirements and Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
624	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	16			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned that the policy does not give any consideration to the potential impacts that qualifying matters may have on achieving density. As qualifying matters can result in reduced density it is appropriate that this part of this policy suite. HNZPT considers that it is not sufficient to rely on the rule framework in the historic heritage section and an integrated approach is preferred. An addition is proposed to the policy to assist an integrated decision-making approach. The proposed approach will ensure a more integrated approach and enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That Policy RESZ-P2 is retained and amended as follows: <i>“Except in the instances of qualifying matters on the site such as historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, Cultural sites and Archaeological sites , achieve the planned medium density residential character by: 1. Enabling buildings of generally up to three storeys; and 2.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
625	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	16	97	20	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.13 as it is not considered appropriate to identify a handful of qualifying matters and omit the rest. This may potentially create a perception that some qualifying matters have a greater weighting than others. Rather, it would be more appropriately to simply state "Except in the instances of qualifying matters on the site".	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
626	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	17			Historical & Cultural Values	Policies	RESZ-P6	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports in part the policy that considers the potential effects that new buildings will have on adjacent sites, however, HNZPT considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage, archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori, as they are matters of national importance. It maybe that the more intensive development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site and so on. The Plan needs a policy, rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites. The inclusion of qualifying matters in the policies will enable the consideration of qualifying matters as part of the assessment where many criteria focus on the impacts of activities on adjacent sites.	That Policy RESZ-P6 is retained and amended as follows: <i>“Mitigate the potential of adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, including on sites containing qualifying matters such as historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, Cultural sites and Archaeological site s, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned medium density residential built character, including by:”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
627	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	17	97	21	Historical & Cultural Values	Policies	RESZ-P6		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.17 on the basis that qualifying matters are identified as overlays - noting that overlays are to be applied to issues that have spatial extents - and that the related rules should be used for those spatial extents only (rather than applying to adjacent sites). Therefore, if the adjacent site is not subject to an overlay / qualifying matter, it is not considered appropriate to apply the restrictions of an adjoining overlay / qualifying matter to that site. The objectives and policies and relevant bulk and location rules will ensure any potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
628	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	18			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P11	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT is concerned that the policy does not give any consideration to the potential impacts that qualifying matters may have on achieving density. As qualifying matters can result in reduced density it is appropriate that this part of this policy suite. HNZPT considers that it is not sufficient to rely on the rule framework in the historic heritage section and an integrated approach is preferred. An addition is proposed to the policy to assist an integrated decision-making approach. The proposed approach will ensure a more integrated approach and enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and s6(f):the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That Policy RESZ-P11 is retained and amended as follows: <i>“Except in the instances of qualifying matters on the site such as historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, Cultural sites and Archaeological sites , achieve the planned high density residential character by: 1. Enabling buildings of generally up to six storeys; and 2.”</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
629	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	18	97	22	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P11		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.18 as it is not considered appropriate to identify a handful of qualifying matters and omit the rest. This may potentially create a perception that some qualifying matters have a greater weighting than others. Rather, it would be more appropriately to simply state "Except in the instances of qualifying matters on the site".	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
630	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	19			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports in part the policy that considers the potential impact that new buildings will have on adjacent sites, however, HNZPT considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage, archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori, as they are matters of national importance. It maybe that the more intensive development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site and so on. The Plan needs a policy, rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites. The inclusion of qualifying matters in the policies will enable the consideration of qualifying matters as part of the assessment where many criteria focus on the impacts of activities on adjacent sites.	That Policy RESZ-P15 is retained and amended as follows: <i>"Mitigate the potential of adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, including on sites containing qualifying matters such as historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, Cultural sites and Archaeological sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned high density residential built character, including by:"</i>	Reject. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
631	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	54	19	97	23	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 54.19 as it is not considered appropriate to identify a handful of qualifying matters and omit the rest. This may potentially create a perception that some qualifying matters have a greater weighting than others. Rather, it would be more appropriately to simply state "including on sites containing qualifying matters".	Disallow submission.	Accept. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
632	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	20			Historical & Cultural Values	Other	Other	Support	HNZPT supports the retention of the existing qualifying matters, and the related amended controls as follows; "Historic and Cultural Values-Built Historic Heritage, Built Historic Heritage-Subdivision, Archaeological Sites and Historic sites, Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori, Marae Protection Overlay, and Development Areas-Pukehangi Heights Development Area" as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the Qualifying matters found in the following sections of the Assessment report are retained: Historic and Cultural Values-Built Historic Heritage, Built Historic Heritage-Subdivision, Archaeological Sites and Historic sites, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, Marae Protection Overlay, and Development Areas-Pukehangi Heights Development Area.	Accept. Retain notified qualifying matters as listed in submission point. Refer to Historic Heritage Section of the Section 42A Report and Appendix assessing qualifying matters.
633	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	21			Other	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	HNZPT supports in part (subject to amendments sought elsewhere in this submission) the new qualifying matter of a new rule related to building on the same site/s as historic structures as this will assist the Plan to provide for RMA s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the proposed Heritage Structures rule is retained (subject to the amendments sought elsewhere in this submission) and applied to all zones where intensification is proposed as part of Plan Change 9	Accept in part. Retain qualifying matter as notified and extent. Adopt a new performance standard as sought in the original submission but with some wording changes. Refer to Historic Heritage section of the Section 42A Report.
634	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	22			Residential 3 Zone	General	General	Support	HNZPT has noted in Appendix 19-Consultation Report, concerns had been expressed by Mana Whenua regarding the imposition of the MDRS in Ohinemutu, Whakarewarewa and Ngapuna Villages. Given the historical and current sensitivity of these locations, HNZPT is supportive of the retention of the existing Residential 3 zone, as opposed to the introduction of the more intensive MDRS development levels for the villages of Ohinemutu, Whakarewarewa and Ngapuna. This zoning approach will assist the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of National Importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	That the new qualifying matter-the retention of the Residential 3 Zoning in Ohinemutu, Whakarewarewa and Ngapuna villages, is retained.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
635	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	54	23			Historical & Cultural Values	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Section 32 Report - Salmond Reed - Heritage Assessment- While HNZPT is supportive that RLC sought specialist heritage advice as part of the preparation for Plan Change 9, they are concerned that no consultation was undertaken with HNZPT, particularly regarding the proposed “extents” of several heritage properties, some of which are formally entered on the New Zealand Heritage List as historic places. HNZPT is also concerned regarding the approach in the Salmond Reed Architects report where it appears that only the buildings are being treated as being of heritage value. In general, entries on the New Zealand Heritage List include associated land (such as historic curtilages) as well as buildings and potentially other features of heritage value contained on that land. In addition, the report does not specify which heritage values have been taken into account in any conclusions. Listing as historic places on the New Zealand Heritage List takes into account a wide range of heritage values, which may be both tangible and intangible. These are outlined in s.66 of the HNZPT Act 2014. These values can apply to associated land (such as historic curtilages) as well as buildings, structures and other features contained on that land. The importance of yet wider historical and cultural landscape settings can further add to the heritage significance of a place, and consequently also forms an integral component of assessment that identifies historic places under the HNZPT Act 2014.	That subject to meeting with HNZPT, the report contained in Appendix 15-Salmond Reed-Heritage Assessment, is amended to better reflect both the importance of immediate setting (such as historic curtilages) as integral parts of a listed or scheduled historic place, and all relevant heritage values that might apply to a place (including those relating to immediate and wider settings); and any consequential changes as required to the report recommendations.	Reject The Salmond Reed Architects Heritage Report is a supporting document and does not form part of the plan change. Refer to Historic Heritage section of the Section 42A Report.
636	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	55	1			Residential	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	The intensification of the surrounding residential zones will give rise to an increased cumulative community expectation on neighbouring land use activities. This has potential to create difficulties for existing land use activities to comply with performance standards attached to their use. In addition to this, reverse sensitivity issues will be created for land use activities established as a permitted activity with Code of Compliance issued. The NZMCA is concerned neighbouring residents may complain about the park, including noise, traffic and amenity effects generated by members camping on site. This may require the NZMCA to restrict its operation or constrain future development plans. The residential chapter of the RDP has specific objectives and policies (RESZ – 09 and RESZ – 26) relating to reverse sensitivity including assessment criteria which requires consideration to ... “the extent to which the activity will avoid, remedy, or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities or existing infrastructure”. These objectives and policies are applicable to all residential zones. The objectives and policies specifically relating to reverse sensitivity are no longer applicable within Residential 1 zone and is only considered relevant to Residential 3, 4 and 5 zones. We are opposed to this change. Moreover, the RDP states that reverse sensitivity is one of the key issues influencing the policy framework in residential zones and the plan has provided an explanation relating to it (RESZ-13). The RDP’s anticipated environment results also include avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects. However, under the amendments proposed by PC 9, this is now only specifically applicable to Residential 3, 4 and 5 zones. It is also unclear whether the Council is referring to reverse sensitivity associated with activities located just within the residential zone or other	The relief sought is for reverse sensitivity rules, objectives, and policies to be relevant and applied to all residential zones including Residential 1 zone (but particularly around residential developments and zones located next to non-residential zones and non-residential activities). These should address the need to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD. It is also considered that NZMCA activities are also residential in nature.
637	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	55	1	97	24	Residential	General	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 55.1 that requires residential activities within a Residential Zone to be restricted by reverse sensitivity effects within it on the basis that a non-res activity exists within the zone.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 55.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
638	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	55	2			Residential	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	The intensification of the surrounding residential zones will give rise to an increased cumulative community expectation on neighbouring land use activities. This has potential to create difficulties for existing land use activities to comply with performance standards attached to their use. In addition to this, reverse sensitivity issues will be created for land use activities established as a permitted activity with Code of Compliance issued. The NZMCA is concerned neighbouring residents may complain about the park, including noise, traffic and amenity effects generated by members camping on site. This may require the NZMCA to restrict its operation or constrain future development plans.	Written approvals or agreement should be obtained for new residential developments located adjacent to lawfully establishment non-residential activities to avoid any reverse sensitivity effects. For example to address reverse sensitivity issues on the site adjacent to NZMCA park, the planning maps can be annotated to make it clear that the owner/developer of the adjacent site must enter into a no complaints agreement with the NZMCA.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD. It is also considered that NZMCA activities are also residential in nature.
639	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	55	2	97	25	Residential	Other	Other		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 55.2 as this is considered contrary to the purpose of a Residential Zone (that is, primarily providing for residential activities).	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 55.2 above.
640	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	55	3			Residential & Industrial Interface	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	The noise assessment undertaken by Styles Group Acoustics & Vibration consultants concludes the industrial zones are still required to meet the residential noise limits applying in residential zones (as per the operative plan). The noise limits will remain and do not change. However, the key potential noise issue arising from the MDRS is the increase in residential development height. For example, if three-storey high (12m) residential developments are established on or near industrial zones, the industrial zone will be required to meet noise limits at second and third floor of the dwellings. The consultants determine it will be difficult to effectively comply with the noise standards therefore MDRS may give rise to new non-compliances at the zoning interface. The yard rules have also slightly changed as part of the MDRS. Under the operative plan, developments were required to meet the 5m front and 2.5m side yard requirements. However, under the MDRS, this has decreased to 1.5m front and 1m for all other yards i.e.. residential developments are required to only be 1m away from industrial boundaries. In addition to the above, the council have not taken other matters such as vehicle movement and visual amenity into consideration and reverse sensitivity implications of these on residential zones. Locating a high-density residential zone next to the industrial zone in particular our campground park may cause reverse sensitivity issues for us. For example, the inability to screen the activity from residential developments of 2 – 3 storeys high.	The Council should undertake further assessments to address reverse sensitivity effects and implications of PC 9 on non-residential activities in or near residential zones.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD. IT is also noted that the MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matters applies.
641	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	1			Natural Hazards	Maps	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Several flood level studies are currently underway that will change the extent of some qualifying matter (QM) areas. The District Plan/Qualifying Matter maps should be updated to reflect the new information when it is received, because the information relates to a human safety risk. As well as the modelling information, certain areas that have recently flooded should be indicated on the plans, including the 2018 Ngongotahā Stream flood The following information is available and should be included in the QM information: 1. A 2007 flood model; not all areas have been modelled to the 1% RCP8.5 (climate change) standard yet. 2. Flood level surveys following the 2018 Ngongotahā event. 3. Information contained in the Ngongotaha flood event independent review . The following two factors are likely to result in increases to the predicted flood levels: 1. The 2007 model does not include climate change RCP8.5 to 2130; and 2. Subdivision carried out since 2007 has resulted in some contouring of the land. Flood mitigation measures are yet to be implemented, and so flood risk is still expected in this area. Further modelling is underway by Rotorua Lakes Council (RLC). Refer to maps in submission	Revise the Appendix 18 Qualifying Matters Map to reflect the findings of the following information once it becomes available: 1. A 2007 flood model; not all areas have been modelled to the 1% RCP8.5 (climate change) standard yet. 2. Flood level surveys following the 2018 Ngongotahā event. 3. Information contained in the Ngongotaha flood event independent review .	Reject. This map does not form part of the plan change. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
642	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	1	97	26	Natural Hazards	Maps	Other		Kāinga Ora generally support submission point 56.1 which ensures qualifying matters are informed by the most up to date evidence base. But in keeping with the primary Kāinga Ora submission, flood maps must sit outside of the District Plan, so as to allow for updates like that requested by BOPRC without the need of a Schedule 1 process.	Allow submission in part.	Accept. It is agreed that up to date information is used to assess rules such as minimum floor levels and whether the proposed threshold for a flood assessment is triggered. No changes are considered necessary.
643	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	2			Natural Hazards	Maps	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	RLC and Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Regional Council) are undertaking flood risk assessments to include climate change. Regional Council is looking at lake level inundation and Rotorua stream capacity . Capacity reviews investigate the performance of the flood protection assets or stream flow capacity (not necessarily the entire floodplain). Studies consist of hydrological and hydraulic modelling. Refer to maps in submission	Revise the Appendix 18 Qualifying Matters Map to reflect the findings of the following information once it becomes available: 1. A 2007 flood model; not all areas have been modelled to the 1% RCP8.5 (climate change) standard yet. 2. Flood level surveys following the 2018 Ngongotahā event. 3. Information contained in the Ngongotaha flood event independent review .	Accept in part. It is agreed that up to date information is used to assess rules such as minimum floor levels and whether the proposed threshold for a flood assessment is triggered. No changes are considered necessary.
644	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	2	97	27	Natural Hazards	Maps	Other		Kāinga Ora generally support submission point 56.2 which ensures qualifying matters are informed by the most up to date evidence base.	Allow submission.	Accept. It is agreed that up to date information is used to assess rules such as minimum floor levels and whether the proposed threshold for a flood assessment is triggered. No changes are considered necessary.
645	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	2	104	5	Natural Hazards	Maps	Other		The submitters are a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring that appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. They agree that additional areas susceptible to flooding should be added to Appendix 18 – Qualifying matters, but only if that information is now available. If it is not, the plan change should not necessarily be held up waiting for the additional flood risk assessments to be completed. The information could be incorporated later as a variation to PC9 or a subsequent plan change.	Support submission in part.	Accept. No changes are considered necessary. It is agreed that the plan change should proceed with the proposed provisions although not all flood hazard mapping is complete.
646	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	3			Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	This issue statement discusses what are well functioning environments. Regional Council considers that there are other matters that contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and that these could be added into this issue statement. Examples include supporting a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and development that is resilient to the effects of climate change.	Request that SDUC-I1 includes more commentary on the other factors that contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, in particular: - urban environments which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions though reduced number of vehicle trips (refer to Emissions Reduction Plan) - urban design which is resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change (Policy 1 NPS-UD).	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
647	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	3	97	28	Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I1		Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 56.3 as it is appropriate to recognise climate change / greenhouse gas emissions as a factor contributing to well-functioning urban environments	Allow submission.	Refer submission 56.3 above.
648	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	4			Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I6	Support	Regional Council supports the amendments proposed to this issue statement to recognise that neighbourhoods will change over time as more intensive development occurs and that this will change the amenity values appreciated by some in the neighbourhoods.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
649	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	5			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O1, SDUD-O2, SDUD-O3, SDUD-O4 and SDUD-O9	Support	Regional Council supports these new and amended objectives as they respond to the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
650	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	6			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O11	Oppose	Regional Council considers that SDUD-O11 may no longer be necessary as it appears to overlap with proposed amended and renumbered SDUD-O3. Both deal with the need to provide sufficient development capacity.	Delete SDUD-O11.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
651	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	6	97	29	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O11		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 56.6 on the basis it is considered out of scope (noting the notified Plan Change only sought to amend the number reference of SDUD-O11)	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 56.6 above.
652	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	7			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P1 and SDUD-P2	Support	Regional Council supports these new policies as they respond to the NPS-UD and seek to ensure planning decisions relating to urban development take into account Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles and Treaty settlement outcomes, as well as recognising tangata whenua values and aspirations for urban development.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
653	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	8			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3 and SDUD-P4	Seek amendment / support in part	SDUD-P3 appears to repeat the mandatory policy SDUD-P4 in referencing the exceptions for qualifying matters.	Either delete SDUD-P3 or amend it to avoid the overlap between these two policies.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
654	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	56	8	80	5	Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3 and SDUD-P4		HNZPT has made a submission point regarding SPUD-P13, seeking retention and some amendments to the policy and would be concerned if these matters were deleted/altered in response to the submission point.	Reject submission 56.8	Refer submission 56.8 above.
655	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	8	97	30	Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3 and SDUD-P4		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 56.8 as it is considered that the policies, albeit seemingly similar, in fact deal with two separate matters (being heights and densities and the spatial application of the MDRS).	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 56.8 above.
656	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	9			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P6 and SDUD-P20	Support	Regional Council supports these polices as they apply good planning practice and seek to implement the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
657	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	10			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P31	Support	Regional Council supports SUB-P31 as it provides flexibility in site size and shape in the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
658	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	11			Subdivision	Other	SUB-AER6	Support	Regional Council supports SUB-AER6 as it anticipates an increase in the density and diversity of housing in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones, thereby supporting the implementation of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
659	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	12			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4	Seek amendment / support in part	Appendix 18 to the s32 report (Qualifying Matters map) appears to provide a setback from rivers/streams, however the maps are too broad-scale to accurately indicate how wide the setback is. Building setbacks from rivers/streams and wetlands should be specified in Rule NH-R4 to provide clarity to plan users. Regional Council supports the provision of setbacks between new development and rivers/streams/wetlands and notes that: - 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. Provision of an appropriately sized, intact riparian/wetland margin 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: - Improvements in water quality by filtering sediment and contaminants	Rule NH-R4 New buildings and additions to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding 1 Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. This activity is: i. building within the Electricity Generation Core Site; or ii. a buildings of low importance; or iii. an addition of less than 20 m2 to an existing building; <u>and</u> <u>iv. is set back a minimum of 10 metres from the edge of a bank of a permanently flowing river or stream, or wetland.</u> Rule NH-R4 2 Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity is not permitted by NH-R4(1); and b. The maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is no more than 300 mm from: i. The 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows, and/or the 1% AEP lake flood level; and ii. Taking into account climate change, based on RCP8.5 (or most recent national or regional guidance), to the year 2130; <u>and</u> <u>iii. the activity is set back a minimum of 10 metres from the edge of a bank of a permanently flowing river or stream, or wetland.</u>	Reject. Do not include the setback. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the section 42A Report.
660	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	12	97	31	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4		Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 56.12 given the current rule framework does not provide any setbacks for new buildings in areas susceptible to flooding and in proximity to permanently flowing rivers, streams or wetlands. However, Kāinga Ora notes that this rule pertains to buildings of low importance (i.e. not habitable buildings) and will only have limited applicability.	Allow submission.	Reject. Do not include the setback. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the section 42A Report.
661	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	12	104	6	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4		The submitters are a group of planning professionals. They agree that the qualifying matters map is too broad scale. Do not agree that building setbacks from rivers/streams and wetlands should be specified in Rule NH-R4. A 10m setback is an unreasonable restriction on a residential property, where many are only 17-20m wide. The 10m setback would result in many developments requiring Resource Consent for buildings of a low importance category and small additions to existing buildings. There are already rules under the District Plan which relate to buildings and earthworks within 25m from the margin of a lake, wetland, river or stream (NATC-R2(1) and (2)). PA-R1(2) also captures buildings and structures located within 25m from the margin of a lake, wetland, river or stream, but only those identified as an esplanade reserve priority area.	Oppose submission in part.	Accept. Do not include the setback. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
662	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	13			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4	Seek amendment / support in part	Urban land use practices can reduce the resilience of flood protection assets, for example by introducing seepage paths or hindering maintenance. For sites bordering streams with existing flood protection assets, the Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw protection area (Figure 1) applies. An advice note should be added to rule NH-R4 (1), (2), (3) and (4) to advise applicants that works within this area are subject to Bylaw authority. Activities that may require bylaw authority in an urban environment include: • Subdividing a property • Geotechnical investigations • Planting/removing trees or shrubs • Building/removing fences, garden sheds • Building/extending a house, shed, or adding a deck • Constructing/removing a retaining wall • Constructing/removing an in-ground swimming pool Regional Council’s interactive map shows which properties the Bylaws cover. Refer to figure for Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw areas	Add the following advice note to NH-R4 (1), (2), (3) and (4): <u>Advice note: Any buildings and construction activities within Flood Protection and Drainage Applicable areas require Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw authority from Bay of Plenty Regional Council to ensure flood protection and drainage infrastructure assets are not damaged or compromised. Regional Council’s interactive map shows which properties the Bylaws cover.</u>	Accept in part. Include the advice note but only at the end of the rule not after ach clause.
663	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	13	97	32	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4		Kāinga Ora generally support the submission point as this provides clarity to plan users regarding the applicable bylaw.	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Include the advice note but only at the end of the rule not after each clause.
664	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	14			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Zone Description	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed changes to the Introduction, including zone descriptions, as they seek to implement the NPS-UD.	Retain the Introduction and the Residential 1 and Residential 2 zone descriptions as notified.	Noted.
665	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	15			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I1	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed changes to RESZ-I1 as they seek to implement the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
666	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	16			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed changes to RESZ-I2 as they seek to implement the NPS-UD. Whilst increased density will result in amenity changes, well-designed developments will continue to provide benefits to the community. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS).	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
667	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	17			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O1, RESZ-O2, RESZ-O3, RESZ-O4, RESZ-O5, RESZ-O6, RESZ-O8, RESZ-O9, RESZ-O10, RESZ-O11, RESZ-O12, RESZ-O13	Support	Regional Council supports proposed objectives RESZ-O1 to O6 and RESZ-O8 to O13 that set out the outcomes expected for the Residential 1 and 2 zones, particularly RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13 that refer to public and active transport, consistent with Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
668	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	18			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P1, RESZ-P2, RESZ-P3, RESZ-P4, RESZ-P5, RESZ-P6, RESZ-P7, RESZ-P8, RESZ-P9, RESZ-P10, RESZ-P11, RESZ-P12, RESZ-P13, RESZ-P14, RESZ-P15, RESZ-P16, RESZ-P17, RESZ-P18	Support	Regional Council supports RESZ-P1 to RESZ-P18 as they support achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD whilst still achieving good design outcomes. Well-designed developments will support higher density living, consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
669	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	19			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3(1)	Support	Regional Council supports the provision of no more than three residential units per site as a permitted activity subject to performance standards, as this gives effect to the NPS-UD and Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
670	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	20			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	RESZ-R3(2)(c) and RESZ-R3(4)(d)	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of natural hazards as a matter of discretion for residential units. Natural hazards are a matter of national importance.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Retain natural hazards as a matter of discretion.
671	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	21			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed Residential 2 standards as these provide for greater density in the Residential 2 zone as justified by RLC, consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
672	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	22			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S3 Site coverage	Support	Reducing limits for impermeable surfaces and introducing maximum site coverage for buildings will help to limit the effects of urban development on water quality (reduction of pollutions) and water quantity (reduction in erosion and flooding).	Retain as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
673	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	23			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1), RESZ-S6A(2), RESZ-6A(3) and RESZ-S6A(4)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed minimum size of residential units, outdoor living space and outlook requirements and glazing requirements as they support achieving the NPS-UD and higher density living. In addition, the changes on glazing clarify how glazing is to be calculated. This is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and provision remains unchanged
674	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	24			Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)	Seek amendment / support in part	Solid fences and walls within a flood hazard area or overland flow path can divert flood flows and overland flow path. Increasing the density of buildings is also likely to increase the number of fences/walls constructed in flood hazard areas and overland flow paths. Provisions should be added to ensure that flood flow is not obstructed by solid fences/walls, which may lead to additional flood hazards and put people and buildings at risk.	7. Fencing (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) a. Maximum height within front yard or adjacent to a boundary within a public open space: i. 1.2 m; or ii. 1.8 m for no more than 50% of the site iii. 1.8 m if the fence is at least 50% visually open. b. No solid fences or walls within a flood hazard area or overland flow path (to ensure flood flow is not obstructed).	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Include additional clarification of site works in matters of discretion
675	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	24	97	33	Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 56.24 given this is a practical and appropriate requirement for fences within identified flood hazard areas.	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Include additional clarification of site works in matters of discretion
676	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	25			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA and RESZ-MDB	Support	Regional Council supports RESZ-MDA and RESZ-MDB as these provisions support achieving the residential zone policies and objectives and help achieve a well-functioning urban environment, consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
677	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	26			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Other	RESZ-AER11 and RESZ-AER12	Support	Regional Council supports these anticipated environmental results as they are aligned with achieving higher density living in accordance with the NPS-UD and Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
678	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	27			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA	Seek amendment / support in part	Regional Council supports the introduction and scope of new flood management policies to specifically manage overland flow paths, impervious surfaces and the introduction of an acceptable risk threshold of the 1% AEP flood event taking into account climate change (RCP8.5 projection to 2130). Regional Council also supports RLC identifying flood management as a new Qualifying Matter (Section 77I of the RMA) because we consider the potential risk to life from flooding to be a significant risk (matter of national importance under Section 6(h) of the RMA). Stronger direction should be provided in new policy NH-PA to ensure flood risk is managed to an acceptable level through either an avoidance or mitigation approach (in accordance with the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement Policy NH 4B). This risk management approach is also set out in the Strategic Direction chapter of the operative Rotorua District Plan (RDP) under Policy SDNH-P1: Avoid or mitigate natural hazards to an acceptable level of risk to life and property. The proposed policy approach of NH-PA to minimise flood risk and only require consideration of impacts may not necessarily achieve the risk management outcome set in Policy SDNH-P1 of the RDP and RPS Policy NH 4B. Therefore, changing the risk approach from minimise to manage to provide stronger direction that risk avoidance and risk mitigation are both appropriate responses. This is important for flood risk management decisions where development may need to be avoided in areas where risk cannot be reduced to acceptable levels. Amendments to NH-PA sub-clauses (b)(i-iii) are suggested to clarify the risk management outcomes. While (b)(i) refers to ‘appropriateness’ it may not provide sufficient strength to refuse a resource consent where increases in risk on site are unacceptable. To this end, manage is considered to be a more appropriate	NH-PA Buildings susceptible to flooding <u>Manage</u> ~~Minimise~~ the risks to people and property associated with development in areas susceptible to flooding by: a. In areas where the anticipated flood ~~depths~~ <u>levels</u> are low and, therefore, the likely risks to people and property are less, requiring new buildings and larger additions to existing buildings to have floor levels above the flood level for the 1% AEP event with an allowance for climate change and freeboard. b. In areas where anticipated <u>flood depths</u> ~~levels~~ are higher and, therefore the potential risks to people and property are greater, requiring a broad <u>flood risk</u> assessment for new buildings and larger additions to existing buildings and their associated site works that corresponds to the nature and scale of the anticipated flooding on site, ~~to ensure including consideration of:~~ i. The appropriateness of the proposed development, and the extent to which the flood risks on site are ~~mitigated-~~ <u>managed to an acceptable level</u> ; ii. ~~Whether~~ the development <u>does not will</u> increase risks to other people, property or infrastructure; iii. ~~Whether there is a need~~ <u>provision of</u> for safe evacuation routes <u>and</u> ~~or~~ refuges; and iv. Impacts on overland flowpaths and river corridors. <u>Advice note: an ‘acceptable’ level of risk in relation to flooding means buildings are not functionally compromised and there is no risk to life in a 1% AEP flood.</u>	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.
679	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	27	97	34	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA		Kāinga Ora generally support submission point 56.27. Of note, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of the word "minimise" and its replacement with "manage", as sought by the submitter - - noting that potential risks can be reduced through building design. Kāinga Ora however opposes the inclusion of the specific references within the advice note to RCP8.5 and to 2130 as these reference may change over time and would require a Schedule 1 process to be altered.	Allow submission in part.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
680	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	28			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1	Seek amendment / support in part	Regional Council supports the introduction and scope of new flood management matters of discretion. Regional Council suggests amendments to NH-MD1 to reflect the stronger direction on risk management suggested to proposed Policy NH-PA. It is important to have a standalone matter to ensure safe evacuation is provided, which is a key issue for flood risk management (potential risk to life) as a Qualifying Matter (i.e. Significant Risk - matter of national importance under Section 6(h) of the RMA). Flood depth mapping for the Utuhina Catchment identifies approximately 500 residential properties in this catchment with a flood depth >500 mm across the entire property. Flood depth >500 mm is a threshold for risk to life . Development should be avoided in these areas if safe evacuation cannot be provided.	NH-MD1 Building in areas susceptible to flooding 1. Where new buildings or building additions do not meet the minimum floor levels for permitted activities: the extent to which the proposal minimises the risks to people and property on site from flooding; 2. Where new buildings or additions are proposed in areas where the anticipated flood levels during the 1%AEP event with an allowance for climate change are greater than 300 mm: a. The appropriateness of the proposed development (including the associated site works) and the extent to which the proposal achieves an acceptable level of risk ~~minimises the risks~~ to people and property on site from flooding through <u>avoidance or mitigation measures such as building design and provision of safe evacuation routes or refuge</u>; b. Provision of a safe evacuation route and refuge where flood depths are >500 mm; c. ~~b.~~ The extent to which the development <u>does not will</u> increase risks from flooding to people and property on other sites or infrastructure ~~and the extent to which the proposal minimises this effect~~; and d. ~~e.~~ Whether the proposal will affect the carrying capacity and storage capacity of any river corridor or major overland flowpath. <u>Advice note: an ‘acceptable’ level of risk in relation to flooding means buildings are not functionally compromised and there is no risk to life in a 1% AEP flood</u>	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.
681	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	28	97	35	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1		Kāinga Ora generally support submission point 56.28. Of note Kāinga Ora supports the removal of the word "minimise" and its replacement with the phrase "achieves an acceptable level of risk", as sought by the submitter - noting that potential risks can be reduced through building design. Kāinga Ora also question whether the words within subclause b should read "and/or" refuge, given that staying in place if safe to do so is also considered appropriate. Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of the specific references within the advice note to RCP8.5 and to 2130 as these reference may change over time and would require a Schedule 1 process to be altered.	Allow submission in part.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.
682	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	29			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2	Seek amendment / support in part	Regional Council supports the introduction and scope of new flood management matters of discretion. Regional Council suggests amendments to SUB-MD2 to reflect the stronger direction on risk management suggested to proposed Policy NH-PA. It is important to have a standalone matter to ensure safe evacuation is provided, which is a key issue for flood risk management (potential risk to life) as a Qualifying Matter (i.e. Significant Risk - matter of national importance under Section 6(h) of the RMA). Flood depth mapping for the Utuhina Catchment identifies approximately 500 residential properties in this catchment with a flood depth >500 mm across the entire property. Flood depth >500 mm is a threshold for risk to life . Development should be avoided in these areas if safe evacuation cannot be provided. Regional Council also suggests a minor amendment to change ‘inundation’ to flooding to reflect the hazard description used throughout the District Plan.	SUB-MD2 Areas susceptible to flooding inundation a. The appropriateness of the proposed building locations and the extent to which the proposal achieves an acceptable level of risk ~~minimizes the risks~~ to people and property on the site from flooding; b. The extent to which development of the site <u>does not will</u> increase risks from flooding to people and property on other sites or infrastructure ~~and the extent to which the proposal mitigates this effect~~; c. Whether the development of the site will reduce the carrying capacity and storage capacity of any river corridor or major overland flowpath; and d. Where overland flowpaths affect the site: a. the extent to which the development of the site will provide for the continued conveyance of water; b. whether the development of the site will change the entry and/or exit points of the overland flowpaths and the impact on other sites and infrastructure; c. management of any potential erosion caused by any overland flowpaths; and d. provision for access and maintenance to the overland flowpaths. <u>Advice note: an ‘acceptable’ level of risk in relation to flooding means buildings are not functionally compromised and there is no risk to life in a 1% AEP flood event allowing for climate change to 2130 using the RCP 8.5 median projection.</u>	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
683	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	29	97	36	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2		Kāinga Ora generally support submission point 56.29. Of note Kāinga Ora supports the removal of the word "minimise" and its replacement with the phrase "achieves an acceptable level of risk", as sought by the submitter - noting that potential risks can be reduced through building design. Kāinga Ora however opposes the inclusion of the specific references within the advice note to RCP8.5 and to 2130 as these reference may change over time and would require a Schedule 1 process to be altered.	Allow submission in part.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding for changes recommended and reasons.
684	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	30			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4	Seek amendment / support in part	NH-P4 appears to relate only to the proposed venting structures rule. Regional Council have suggested some amendments to the Geothermal Hazards rules and suggest that Policy NH-P4 is updated to be consistent with the suggested amendments to the rules.	NH-P4 Minimise the risks to people and property from geothermal hazards, ~~including by locating the discharge of any geothermal gas away from confined spaces on site,~~ by requiring site-specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
685	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	30	97	37	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of submission point 56.30 however, Kāinga Ora consider further refinement of the proposed framework is required - specifically, what would these assessment entail? Who do you get to undertake such an assessment? Notwithstanding the above, Kāinga Ora also question whether this exercise would be more effective if undertaken by Council themselves? This would provide a consistent approach to assessing the potential geothermal risks without placing the onus (including costs and time) on landowners to demonstrate there is no geothermal risk for their developments / activities. Kāinga Ora note that the Geothermal Systems Overlay applies to the majority of the proposed Residential 1 and 2 Zones within Rotorua Centre - that is, to the majority of the proposed high and medium density residential areas.	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
686	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	30	104	7	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4		Refer to further submission on submission 56.35	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
687	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	31			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PX	Seek amendment / support in part	The permitted standard for impervious surfaces may not be appropriate on all sites in the Geothermal System Overlay. Appendix 145 to the s32 report references reducing site coverage so as not to exacerbate the geothermal hazard, although no recommendations were made about what impervious surface coverage should be reduced to. No work has been undertaken to determine an appropriate/safe level of impervious surface in the geothermal system overlay; it may vary from site to site. It would be challenging to apply this broadly; Regional Council considers that site-specific assessment will be the best tool to ensure the best outcomes for each development.	Insert new policy: NH-PX Reduce impervious surfaces on sites in the Geothermal System Overlay where site-specific assessments determine that it is required to mitigate risk from geothermal hazards. Advice note: Construction of impervious surfaces can reduce rainwater percolation which can then reduce the cooling effect rainwater provides to heated ground, as well as creating a barrier that reduces the release of geothermal heat from the ground into the air. This can worsen geothermal hazard risk of warm/hot ground.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
688	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	31	97	38	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PX		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of this submission however echoes the rationale put forward in its' further submission point on 56.30. Specific to this submission, Kāinga Ora query who and how it would be determined that 'enough' rainwater is able to percolate?	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
689	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	31	104	8	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PX		Refer to further submission on submission 56.35	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
690	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	32			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R6	Seek amendment / support in part	Geothermal surface features are rare on a global scale and are vulnerable to land use activities including earthworks, infrastructure development, as well as indirect impacts on the geothermal landscape and amenity values through intensification. Geothermal features need to be protected. In addition, construction of buildings and impervious surfaces close to geothermal surface features may worsen geothermal hazard risk. The rules enabling intensification of development could lead to more buildings and impervious surfaces being erected near geothermal features. We recommend rule NH-R6 is amended to require 20 m setback from the edge of any Significant Geothermal Feature, which would align with Waikato Regional Plan (WRP) Rule 7.6.6.3 Discretionary Activity Rule – activities in the Vicinity of Significant Geothermal Features. We also recommend the rule is expanded to include all impervious surfaces, not just buildings.	Amend rule title as follows: “Buildings erected within <u>5 20</u> metres of the edge of a Geothermal Surface Feature” Add “ <u>and/or impervious surfaces</u> ” throughout the rule where it refers to buildings.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
691	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	32	97	39	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R6		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 56.32 as it is considered appropriate to align the set back distance with the Regional Plan	Allow submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
692	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	33			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7	Oppose	Appendix 14[1] (section 5.2) to the Section 32 Report recommends the 90% site coverage trigger for an assessment is deleted. Regional Council agrees and supports deletion of this provision as the 90% surface coverage trigger is no longer appropriate given the proposed new HDRZ and MDRS environment. The general foundation of this rule forms the basis of the suggested new rule outlined below.	Delete NH-R7. Integrate into suggested new rule NH-RX in the submission point below.	Accept. Delete existing rule NH-R7. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
693	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	33	97	40	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of this submission however echoes the rationale put forward in its' further submission point on 56.30.	Allow submission.	Accept. Delete existing rule NH-R7. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
694	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	34			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R8	Oppose	It is unclear how rule NH-R8 would work in practice and effectively reduce risk from geothermal hazards to an acceptable level. The provision is not clear that the purpose is to avoid gas accumulating in confined spaces and does not prevent a confined space being constructed around the vent later. Geothermal gas also discharges diffusely through the ground, which is not addressed by Rule NH-R8. As outlined Appendix 14[1] to the s32 report, “Gas is not solely emitted from a point source, such as a spring or a fumarole, but is also diffusely emitted through soil within a geothermal system. As such, gas is a constant and always present hazard in geothermal areas” Constructing buildings on piles to avoid warm-hot ground effects from a concrete slab creates gas seepage potential at each pile. Geothermal hazards should be considered together to ensure addressing one issue does not inadvertently create another. Use of venting structures to mitigate gas accumulation is included in the suggested new rule (below).	Delete NH-R8. Integrate into suggested new rule NH-RX in the submission point below.	Accept. Delete rule NH-R8. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
695	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	34	97	41	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R8		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of this submission however echoes the rationale put forward in its' further submission point on 56.30.	Allow submission.	Accept. Delete rule NH-R8. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
696	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	35			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 and NH-R8	Seek amendment / support in part	Regional Council seeks to ensure that higher density developments on sites within the Geothermal Systems Overlay are suitable and achieve an acceptable level of risk from geothermal hazards. We do not seek to limit development under the MDRS or HDRZ, however developments, particularly at medium/high density, are about more than just buildings. It is not appropriate to solely rely on the Building Act - it covers a range of geothermal issues, but related to buildings; the coverage of the Building Act in relation to some geothermal hazards is uncertain. For example, s71 covers building on land subject to natural hazards, but geothermal hazards are not included in the definition ‘natural hazards’ for this provision and sections 72-74. As discussed in Appendix 14 to the s32 report, warm-hot ground hazards to buildings and their occupants are likely to be addressed through Clause F1 of the Building Code, however site coverage on sites subject to this hazard may need to be reduced to avoid exacerbating the hazard. A new rule is proposed NH-RX to reflect that on-going mitigation may be required to manage risk because a building that complies with the Building Act will not remove all risk to the site and occupants and will not enable ongoing mitigation of geothermal hazards. Impervious surfaces are not covered by the Building Act but are a key factor for geothermal hazard. The proposed provisions do not work to reduce site coverage on sites subject to geothermal hazards, and so are considered inadequate to address risk from geothermal hazard. Regional Council recommends that a permitted activity standard requires all development within the Geothermal Systems Overlay provides a site-specific geothermal hazards assessment. This assessment should be submitted with a building consent application so that risks related to building design and layout can be assessed and mitigated. We also	Insert new rule: <u>Rule NH-RX New buildings and additions to buildings in the Geothermal Systems Overlay</u> <u>1. New buildings and additions to buildings in the Rotorua Geothermal Systems Overlay</u> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Subject to the following conditions:</u> <u>a. The development shall be designed to mitigate risk from geothermal hazards, including gas, hot ground and acid ground [in accordance with the Geothermal guidelines/standard].</u> <u>b. A report by a suitably qualified and experienced person shall be submitted alongside the building consent application, for written certification by a Council geothermal specialist, which addresses the following:</u> <u>i. Identification and extent of geothermal hazards on the site, including:</u> <u>1. Geothermal surface features;</u> <u>2. Geothermal gas;</u> <u>3. Heated ground; and</u> <u>4. Corrosive ground.</u> <u>ii. Measures to mitigate geothermal risks to people and property on the site and surrounding sites including:</u> <u>a. Site and building design;</u> <u>b. Impervious site coverage and surface treatment controls to mitigate the impact on natural gas flow and heat flux from the ground;</u> <u>c. Controls [Refer to full submission for remainder of the</u>	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
697	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	56	35	91	23	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 and NH-R8		RDRR states it is the voice of residents and ratepayers. It supports the proposed new rule, with contingent regulation changes, extensions to the overlay and workshops because it seeks to enable ongoing mitigation of geothermal hazards in addition to the requirements of the Building Act. Greater clarity is needed to help accelerate industrial geothermal development. It is regarded as a unique and natural resource available to help counter climate change. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
698	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	35	97	42	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 and NH-R8		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of this submission however echoes the rationale put forward in its' further submission point on 56.30	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
699	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	35	104	9	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 and NH-R8		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that the relief requested would impose significant and unnecessary costs to developers and applicants by requiring site specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay regardless of the type, scale and nature of development or potential for adverse effects. The overlay covers a significant area of the city and proposed rule would have significant consequences. The need for a site-specific geothermal assessment will stymie development and the efficient provision of new housing, cause additional delays in the development process and costs. There does not appear to be the evidential basis to demonstrate that there is an existing issue with development within or over the Geothermal Systems Overlay to justify the need for the proposed rule. There is no specific need for site specific geothermal assessments on every development within the overlay. Geotechnical investigations are undertaken either at the time of subdivision or building consent. Often any geothermal risks or issues are identified at the time of these investigations. If the geotechnical engineer or RLC’s reviewer has cause to believe that there could be geothermal hazards this is then investigated and site-specific recommendations are given, which may include specific foundation design, venting, or that corrosion, geothermal gas and heat resistant building materials are used.	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
700	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	36			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R42	Seek amendment / support in part	With the addition of NH-RX, SUB-R42 would need to be amended to be consistent with suggested new rule NH-RX by explicitly referencing the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Amend to be consistent with suggested new rule NH-RX: Rule SUB-R42 Subdivision of sites and buildings susceptible to natural hazards The subdivision of sites or buildings on land <u>within the Geothermal Systems Overlay</u> , affected by a geothermal feature, geothermal activity or bore.	Accept in part. Adopt change but limited to Rotorua Geothermal System. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
701	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	36	104	10	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R42		Refer to further submission on submission 56.35	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
702	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	37			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S8(3)	Seek amendment / support in part	With the addition of NH-RX, SUB-S8 would need to be amended to be consistent with suggested new rule NH-RX by explicitly referencing the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Amend to be consistent with suggested new rule NH-RX SUB-S8: 3. Subdivision of land or buildings in areas within the Geothermal Systems Overlay or subject to geothermal activity a. For the subdivision of any land or buildings on land <u>within the Geothermal Systems Overlay</u> known to be susceptible to geothermal activity, the following shall apply:	Accept in part. Refer to wording in Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
703	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	56	37	104	11	Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S8(3)		Refer to further submission on submission 56.35	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
704	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	38			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Support	Regional Council supports the creation of practice notes (paragraph 13.1(8) and Table 26)to help plan users to understand the process and expectations around the geothermal hazard assessment and achieving an acceptable level of risk in the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. The development of practice notes is supported, however this is not relief that can be provided in the plan change.
705	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	39			Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S3	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Impervious surface coverage is a key matter to consider when assessing and mitigating geothermal hazard risk on a site. Impervious surfaces, including paving, will increase as development on a site is intensified. It is not clear how increases in impervious surface coverage from paved areas beyond permitted limits in RESZ-S3 (site coverage) will be managed for geothermal hazard risk. Exceeding the maximum impervious surface requirement with additional paving may increase geothermal hazard risk on a site so should trigger the requirement for an assessment of geothermal hazard risk on the site. Where a development covers the maximum permitted impervious coverage for the relevant Zone, future occupants may incrementally add additional impermeable areas. It is unclear how the District Plan would define incremental impervious paving additions (since paving is not defined as a building) – would it be an accessory activity? This is unlikely to be clear to plan users, particularly those inexperienced with development in a geothermal area. Buildings of low importance do not require building consent and additional impermeable paving and are often constructed without consideration of applicable RDP matters. The matters of discretion for non-compliance with the impervious standard for activities in the Residential Zone point to RESZ-MD1, which requires adverse effects from natural hazards or the worsening of any hazard identified on the planning maps to be managed. However, there is not necessarily a clear understanding or pathway for these activities, as public perception is often that the planning rules don't apply and there is no backstop of a building consent to capture the activity. Suggested rule NH-RX would require a site-specific assessment of all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay and any mitigation measures future site occupants must maintain in perpetuity. This rule	The District Plan must make it clear that additional impervious surfaces within the Geothermal Systems Overlay may increase geothermal hazard risk on a site. Regional Council is keen to workshop District Plan options with the RLC Consents team.	Accept in part. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
706	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	39	97	43	Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S3		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 56.39 recognising the increased risk of geothermal hazards resulting from additional impervious surfaces on a sit	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
707	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	40			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A	Support	Regional Council supports the conversion of a building to residential units being a permitted activity subject to standards. This rule supports the provision of additional residential activities and is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
708	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	41			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1(1)	Support	Regional Council supports the increase in maximum height for City Centre zones 2 and 3 to 24m, and the height limit of 32m for the Centre 1 zone. The NPS-UD requires district plans in Tier 1 urban environments to enable as much development capacity as possible in the city centre zones, to maximise the benefits of intensification. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
709	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	42			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed outlook space requirements from habitable rooms to provide better quality living environments, which is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
710	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	43			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA(9) and CCCZ-MDA(16)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed matter of discretion to enable consideration of the effects of increased height, given the proposed increase in maximum height limits in commercial zones. Regional Council supports the proposed matter of discretion to enable consideration of the effects of residential units located at ground floor, their orientation and provision of cycle storage, which is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
711	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	44			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Introduction	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of the wording “Opportunities for accommodation above ground floor are provided” in commercial zones 1, 2, 3 and 6 and the amendments to COMZ4 regarding tourist accommodation and residential activities. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
712	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	45			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I1	Support	Regional Council supports including reference to the provision of living opportunities within commercial centres. This approach aligns with the concept of a 15-minute neighbourhood that provides residents access to most, if not all, of their needs within a short walk or bike ride from their home. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
713	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	46			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I2	Support	Regional Council supports the additions and amendments to COMZ-I2 as this provides for residential activity and a high density urban environment and is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
714	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	47			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed amendments to COMZ-O2 as they shift the focus away from adverse effects towards positively contributing to commercial areas. This is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
715	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	48			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P1	Support	Regional Council supports COMZ-P1 as an increase in the density and scale of development in identified zones can help support the creation of focal points for the community and maximise the benefits of accessibility. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
716	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	49			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P5	Support	Regional Council supports COMZ-P5 as street safety and attractiveness and quality of onsite living environments are components of well-functioning urban environments. This is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
717	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	50			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P8	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of this policy. High quality development that positively contributes to the safety and attractiveness of streets and public open spaces support well-functioning urban environments. This is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
718	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	51			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of this policy. A 15-minute neighbourhood may be dense, but the more important thing is that it is fine-grained and truly mixes homes, businesses, and public spaces seamlessly instead of segregating them into zones. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
719	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	52			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of residential units above the ground floor of buildings in the commercial zones 1, 2, 3, and 4 and 6 as a permitted activity. This helps support the implementation of NPS-UD policy 1 factors which contribute to well-functioning urban environments and contributes to increased density in areas of identified demand in accordance with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
720	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	53			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(1), COMZ-S1(3), COMZ-S1(4) and COMZ-S1(5)	Support	Regional Council supports the increase in height limits for these commercial zones to maximise the benefits of intensification, consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
721	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	54			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1(6)	Support	Regional Council supports the inclusion of recession plane standards for buildings along boundaries with residential zones. These standards support the achievement of well-functioning urban environments, consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
722	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	55			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2(1)(b)	Support	Regional Council supports the requirement for yards when sites adjoin the Residential 1 or 2 Zone and no yards in other circumstances unless specified. This approach helps achieve efficiency of land use and provides some protection of residential amenity from the adverse effects of commercial activities and is consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS and Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
723	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	56			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed outlook space requirements from habitable rooms to provide better quality living environments, consistent with Policy UG 8B of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
724	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	57			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MDA	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed matter of discretion to enable consideration of the effects of increased height, given the proposed increase in maximum height limits in commercial zones. This is consistent with Policy UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
725	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	58			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1(14)	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed matter of discretion to enable consideration of the effects of residential units located at ground floor, their orientation and provision of cycle storage. This is consistent with Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
726	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	59			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Other	COMZ-AER11	Support	Regional Council supports the proposed anticipated environmental result as it anticipates an increase in residential activity within commercial zones, consistent with UG 7Ax of Proposed Change 6 to the Bay of Plenty RPS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
727	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	60			Natural Hazards	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	Map 212 Geothermal Systems of the Rotorua District Appendix 14[1] to the s32 Report notes that the current District Plan Rotorua Geothermal System is appropriate to use as a hazard overlay but should be extended to include two additional areas (southwest of Kuirau Park and areas to the east of Whakarewarewa, identified in Figures 1 and 2 of the report) of high gas and temperature and/or containing surface geothermal features. Please clarify if the overlay will be updated. Regional Council supports inclusion of the area to the south-west of Kuirau Park as this is residentially zoned and so the MDRS will apply.	Update the Geothermal Systems Overlay of Map 212 to include the area to the south-west of Kuirau Park shown in Figure 1 of Appendix 147 to the s32 Report. Part of this area is obscured by the legend, and Tonkin+Taylor should be approached to confirm the extent of their recommendation. The map layer in Geyserview should be updated to match that referenced in suggested policy NH-PX and suggested rule NH-RX. Planning Map 212 should be updated to be consistent with the layer shown on Geyserview and should be a scale suitable to show which properties are in or out of this area.	Reject. Do not update map at the present time. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
728	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	60	97	44	Natural Hazards	Maps	Maps		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 56.60 insofar as aligning Map 212 to match the s32 report	Allow submission.	Reject. Do not update map at the present time. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
729	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	61			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Section 32 Report Section 13.3(1). This section states that ‘The District Plan provides an approximate indication of the extent of this system based on reflexivity...’. The correct term is resistivity.	‘The District Plan provides an approximate indication of the extent of this system based on reflexivity resistivity....’	Accept in part. The error in the section 32 report is noted but as this does not form part of the District Plan this is not relief that can be provided on the plan change
730	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	62			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Support	Section 32 Report Section 13.3(9). Regional Council supports not including a rule in the District Plan for any interference with a geothermal surface feature as this is already covered by the Regional Plan.	Retain as notified.	Noted. The support for the section 32 report is noted but as this does not form part of the District Plan there is no relief to be provided.
731	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	63			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Support	Section 32 Report - Appendix 14 Section 5.4, page 20. Regional Council supports the inclusion of a rule to make it clear that residential site layouts need to allow access to existing geothermal bores (5m) and be free of permanent buildings to enable maintenance to be undertaken. The Geothermal Bylaw contains an access provision (access to any well shall be maintained to allow access to the well by a drilling rig at all times), however it would be prudent to repeat this clearly in the District Plan, given the impact it could have on site layout as development on a site is intensified. Site access to existing geothermal bores would be required by the site-specific assessment under suggested new rule NH-RX.	Retain as notified.	Noted. The support for the section 32 report is noted but as this does not form part of the District Plan there is no relief to be provided.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
732	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	64			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Section 32 Report - Appendix 5 Geothermal Resources section and Natural Hazards section. The appendices only contain assessment and reference to a proposed Restricted Discretionary rule and a new Geothermal Hazard Assessment Overlay, rather than the geothermal hazards provisions contained in the s32 report and notified PC9 provisions. It is therefore unclear whether appropriate assessment has been undertaken in relation to the proposed provisions. Please clarify.	Include full assessment of the provisions as proposed. We are unable to assess the adequacy of the plan in the absence of this information. We reserve our position to include further provisions upon receipt of this information.	Noted. The request for further assessment is acknowledged. Refer to section 42A Report Natural Hazards - Geothermal.
733	Bay of Plenty Regional Council, supported by Waikato Regional Council	56	65			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	Residential units – specific non-compliance matters. Standard not achieved: site coverage – impervious surfaces. Exceedance of the impervious surface standard should link back to the site-specific assessment requirement under Rule NH-RX for sites within the Geothermal System Overlay to ensure that appropriate assessment is undertaken.	Site coverage – impervious surfaces 1. Effects, including cumulative effects... 2. Whether sufficient space... 3. <u>In the Geothermal System Overlay, whether the site-specific assessment required under NH-RX has found the increased impervious surface to be appropriate for the site in relation to potential geothermal hazards.</u>	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
734	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	65	97	45	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA		Kāinga Ora generally supports submission point 56.65 regarding reference to proposed rule NH-RX (which is similarly generally supported). However, Kāinga Ora reiterates the matters raised in its further submission on submission point 56.310 and 56.311 .	Allow submission	Accept in part. Refer to recommended wording and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of this report.
735	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	66			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	RESZ-R1.2(c) and RESZ-R9.2(d)	Seek amendment / support in part	An incorrect reference is provided for Natural Hazards in these two sections. It states RESZ-MD4 (which does not exist) and RES-MD3 (which refers to lake structures). The reference should be RESZ-MD1 (natural hazards) in both cases.	RESZ-R1 An activity accessory to a permitted activity 2. c. Natural Hazards RESZ-MD4 ~~1~~ RESZ-R9 Community housing 2.d. Natural hazards RESZ-MD ~~3~~ ~~1~~	Accept. Make corrections sought to matter of discretion numbering.
736	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	67			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Support	Regional Council supports the general effort of the plan change to ensure high density residential development is concentrated in accessible areas to allow for increased walking, cycling and public transport use, which should help to reduce vehicle emissions.	Retain as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged.
737	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	68			Residential & Industrial Interface	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	Regional Council continues to work to reduce air pollution in the Rotorua Airshed, including from industrial sources, as it is recognised that there is no safe level of particulate matter pollution. However, there are still air quality issues where residential and industrial areas are located closely together. Enabling additional residential density adjacent to areas of Industrial zoning is not good practice. It is also contrary to RPS Policy AQ 1A, which actively discourages locating new sensitive activities (i.e. residential) near activities that discharge offensive and objectionable odours. As outlined in Appendix 16[1] to the s32 report (p11), “provision of appropriate separation distances is an important mitigation measure to avoid adverse effects of unintended odour and dust emissions from industrial facilities. Separation distances do not replace the need for good on-site controls of air discharges. Instead, they are intended to minimise the effects of unintended or “residual” air emissions, which can occur from unplanned events, such as equipment failure, or particularly adverse weather conditions”.	Regional Council suggests an advice note (or similar form of acknowledgement) is included in the residential chapter to acknowledge intensification in residential areas adjoining industrial zones is likely to lead to a greater number of people who may be exposed to air quality impacts. Any alternative, similar or consequential amendments, including to other provisions, that would give effect to the relief sought or address the matters raised.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
738	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	68	97	46	Residential & Industrial Interface	General	General		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 56.68 insofar the proposed approach is not considered to constitute 'good practice' regarding advice notes - specifically, using an advice note to state the outcome of a rule framework. Rather, it is considered more appropriate to address this through the zone framework.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 56.68 above.
739	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	69			Other	General	Section 32 Report	Support	Section 15.2(5). Regional Council supports the approach to explore more appropriate locations for the Ngongotahā and Ngāpuna industrial zones.	Retain as notified.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change, however acknowledge that this may be best picked up in the FDS.
740	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	70			Residential 3 Zone	General	Section 32 Report	Support	Section 15.2(6). Regional Council supports not locating incompatible activities near each other. Regional Council continues to work to reduce air pollution in the Rotorua Airshed, including from industrial sources. However, there are still issues where residential and industrial areas are located closely together. Enabling additional residential density adjacent to areas of Industrial use or zoning is not good planning practice. Therefore, we support the exclusion of the Ngāpuna village (Residential 3 Zone) from the MDRS.	Retain as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
741	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	71			Residential 3 Zone	Maps	Section 32 Report	Seek amendment / support in part	Figure 3: Map of Qualifying Matters for PC9 – Eastern. The Ngāpuna residential area should be shown as completely red because the entire area is subject to a qualifying matter (QM). The map has some small areas of green – these are presumed to be road parcels, however not all roads in the Ngāpuna area are shown in this way, and this may cause confusion as to the extent of the QM. This should be clarified.	Change the Ngāpuna residential area to be completely red to show that the entire area is subject to a qualifying matter.	Reject Figure 3 and the term 'qualifying matters' is not proposed to be included in the District Plan once PC9 is operative.
742	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	56	71	97	47	Residential 3 Zone	Maps	Section 32 Report		Kāinga Ora opposes, in part, submission point 56.71 on the basis that qualifying matters should not apply to roads. Rather, it would be considered more appropriate to apply a consistent approach to mapping qualifying matters within land parcels and, therefore, remove the red from all roads within the Ngāpuna residential area.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 56.71 above.
743	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	72			Other	Other	Section 32 Report – Appendix 16	Support	Tonkin & Taylor – Potential Reverse Sensitivity Effects to Air Quality Assessment. Regional Council agrees that PC 9 is unlikely to give rise to a large-scale installation of pellet burners in the Airshed and that therefore, there should be minimal increase of particulate matter from pellet burners in the Airshed as a result.	Retain as notified.	Accept Make no changes.
744	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	56	73			Other	Other	Section 32 Report - Appendix 5	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Regional Policy Statement Objectives and Policies Assessment - Page 1 (Air Quality assessment). The assessment of air quality is not complete – the final three paragraphs are about noise instead. We seek the full assessment.	Include full air quality assessment. We are unable to assess the adequacy of the plan in the absence of this information. We reserve our position to include further provisions upon receipt of this information.	Noted. Full assessment provided as appendix to section 32 report.
745	Ronayne, T (FS)	56	73	51	13	Other	Other	Section 32 Report - Appendix 5		The owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 be delayed until an air assessment has been received.	Reject. Full assessment provided as appendix to section 32 report.
746	Irwin, W (FS)	56	73	82	15	Other	Other	Section 32 Report - Appendix 5		The owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 be delayed until an air assessment has been received.	Reject. Full assessment provided as appendix to section 32 report.
747	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	56	73	91	24	Other	Other	Section 32 Report - Appendix 5		RDRR supports the original submission. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 be delayed until an air assessment has been received.	Reject Full assessment provided as appendix to section 32 report.
748	Paul,K (Taheke Paengaroa Trust, Tautara Matawhaura Trust, Rotoiti 15 Trust, Paehinahina Mourea Trust, Te Takinga Marae Trust)	57	1			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Support	Supports the removal of the requirement to build Papakāinga homes on lands adjacent to marae. States that many lands are not located adjacent or near marae.	Support amendment to remove requirement to build Papakāinga homes on lands adjacent to marae.	Accept. Remove performance standard PK-R1(1)(c)
749	Paul,K (Taheke Paengaroa Trust, Tautara Matawhaura Trust, Rotoiti 15 Trust, Paehinahina Mourea Trust, Te Takinga Marae Trust)	57	2			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	Amend the District Plan Change to allow Maori owners to build or place more than 1 dwelling on lands designated for Papakāinga. The submitter would like the same proposed medium density proposals for District Plan Change 9 to apply to their Papakāinga designated Lands around Lakes Rotoiti and Rotorua.	Medium density proposals for District Plan Change 9 to apply to their Papakāinga designated Lands around Lakes Rotoiti and Rotorua.	Accept in part. Refer to proposed changes to density in Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report however no amendments proposed to Residential 4 zone density.
750	McKinley, R and A	58	1			Other	General	Other	Oppose	Tihi-o-tonga is a satellite suburb with one road in and out and not an accessible location near many amenities. ● very steep hill to access ● 5km (50 min) walk to town ● approx 5km to medical centre ● approx 4km to primary, intermediate and secondary schools ● 3.5km to supermarkets ● 2.5km to dairy ● Tihi-o-tonga does not fully feature on Accessibility Heat Map provided by Council ● vehicle carbon emissions would increase for this area as few people are prepared to walk or cycle up Tihi-o-tonga hill.	Tihi-o-tonga to have qualifying matter status due to being separated from main suburbs/areas, topography and steep road up to this suburb. Higher priority for densification in more central and accessible areas.	Reject A qualifying matter must meet the requirements of Section 771 of the RMA.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
751	McKinley, R and A	58	1			Other	General	Other	Oppose	Tihi-o-tonga is a satellite suburb with one road in and out and not an accessible location near many amenities. • very steep hill to access • 5km (50 min) walk to town • approx 5km to medical centre • approx 4km to primary, intermediate and secondary schools • 3.5km to supermarkets • 2.5km to dairy • Tihi-o-tonga does not fully feature on Accessibility Heat Map provided by Council • vehicle carbon emissions would increase for this area as few people are prepared to walk or cycle up Tihi-o-tonga hill.	Tihi-o-tonga to have qualifying matter status due to being separated from main suburbs/areas, topography and steep road up to this suburb. Higher priority for densification in more central and accessible areas.	Reject A qualifying matter must meet the requirements of Section 77I of the RMA.
752	McKinley, R and A	58	1			Other	General	Other	Oppose	Tihi-o-tonga is a satellite suburb with one road in and out and not an accessible location near many amenities. • very steep hill to access • 5km (50 min) walk to town • approx 5km to medical centre • approx 4km to primary, intermediate and secondary schools • 3.5km to supermarkets • 2.5km to dairy • Tihi-o-tonga does not fully feature on Accessibility Heat Map provided by Council • vehicle carbon emissions would increase for this area as few people are prepared to walk or cycle up Tihi-o-tonga hill.	Tihi-o-tonga to have qualifying matter status due to being separated from main suburbs/areas, topography and steep road up to this suburb. Higher priority for densification in more central and accessible areas.	Reject. Refer to other potential qualifying matters section of this report. Disallow submission.
753	Ronayne, T (FS)	58	1	51	14	Other	General	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. High-rise densification would fundamentally and irremediably alter the character and amenities of this suburb and Rotorua.	Support submission.	Refer submission 58.1 above.
754	Irwin, W (FS)	58	1	83	16	Other	General	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. High-rise densification would fundamentally and irremediably alter the character and amenities of this suburb and Rotorua.	Support submission.	Refer submission 58.1 above.
755	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	58	1	91	25	Other	General	Other		RDRR supports the original submission. High-rise densification would fundamentally and irremediably alter the character and amenities of this suburb and Rotorua. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 58.1 above.
756	Hamill, W (FS)	58	1	154	2	Other	General	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Sun and shading is crucial to good wellbeing and needs to be catered for.	Support submission.	Refer submission 58.1 above.
757	McKinley, R and A	58	2			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	On-site amenity and character would be compromised with development of 3 units of 3 stories on each site: • with degradation of sunlight and daylight access • additional noise • substantial loss of view of farmland, city, lake and forest • outlook over adjoining sites would impact on privacy and the amenity of existing residents reducing a person's enjoyment of that space. All the of the above would negatively impact on property values.	Consultation with surrounding land owners so development not adversely detrimental to views of affected neighbours and some Council restriction of upper storey living space so view, privacy and amenity not entirely lost.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
758	Ward, K (FS)	58	2	106	8	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 58.2 above.
759	Gifford, S (FS)	58	2	150	25	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Enable affected persons to be involved with the process.	Allow submission to extent it is requiring process to involve persons adversely affected.	Refer submission 58.2 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
760	Musumeci, F	59	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that PC9 has no boundaries and states that resource consents were put in for reasons - to protect, consider others, be sure the layout of a town was safe, usable by it's people, to list a few. No resource consents leaves Rotorua open to exploitation by developers bent on their financial quote. The submitter questions why people don't see the implications of the limitless PC for Rotorua's recovery/demise. The submitter would like to see a layered housing system. The 3 story builds in central city area only. It's close proximity to life's necessities/amenities:- doctors, shopping, bus stops, schooling. On a 1 kilometre radius of the central city a 2 story housing allowance, there after that a capping on how many 2 story houses if any/appropriate, depending the area's, geographical stability, amenities available and considering housing levels there e.g. .if mostly single story already/ how many 2 story there. This is subject to infrastructure capacity/ strength (the submitters states that on the Eastside infrastructure is wanting, with currently another leaking pipe in their street) Not everyone wants to/can live in/near intensification facilities and live on the outskirts for many reasons. Many of us choose this for health, mental health, avoid city bustle as unable to cope with intensification, get claustrophobic. The submitter asks the Council to revisit PC9 before it creates a living hell that cannot be undone. the submitter states that it is not dissimilar to the current issues on the motel highway, where it has been proven that intensification does not work.	That the new council revisit PC9	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
761	Savage, S (FS)	59	1	36	4	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They state [the plan change] strips the rights out of rate paying residents hands to protect their homes from losing value and losing its sense of community safety if this type of resource consent is allowed. Agree with point of only having 3+ story builds in the city to make better use of the empty city space and provide building residents with easiest access to amenities and support.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 59.1 above.
762	Ronayne, C (FS)	59	1	164	6	Residential	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and states: For a city which boasts about having high environmental standards, intensification in suburban areas will have a major impact on this. The wastewater situation in Rotorua is at full capacity already and there will need to be a complete overhaul of this to meet the needs of so many new residents in each suburb. This has not been addressed for years due to lack of funds. Will the council resolve this issue before Plan 9 goes ahead. Will the rate-payers be expected to cover the cost of this? We already have some of the highest rates in the country. When will this be done and how much will we have to pay to do it?	Support submission.	Refer submission 59.1 above.
763	Musumeci, F	59	2			Infrastructure	General	General	Oppose	The submitter states that Rotorua's infrastructure is already taxed, fragile and in continual patch-up mode and asks what will so many more houses in use/condensed do to the workings of the infrastructure.	That the new council revisit PC9	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
764	Ronayne, T (FS)	59	2	51	15	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission.	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 should be delayed until an infrastructure assessment has been received.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
765	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	59	2	58	4	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission. They are concerned about pressure on water, sewerage and surrounding amenities; and increased runoff and pollution with increased impermeable surfaces. They are also concerned about construction effects.	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
766	Irwin, W (FS)	59	2	83	17	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission.	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 should be delayed until an infrastructure assessment has been received.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
767	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	59	2	91	26	Infrastructure	General	General		RDRR supports the submission. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 should be delayed until an infrastructure assessment has been received.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
768	Ward, K (FS)	59	2	106	9	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
769	Marsh, I (FS)	59	2	155	5	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone next to a development site and supports the original submission, stating: Under MDRS the number of houses in this proposed development site could be double that permissible under the previous plan. This places increased pressure on water and sewerage and surrounding amenities, e.g. schools, supermarkets, medical centres, and public transport. Increased house volume as a consequence increased impermeable surfaces contribute to a variety of problems including increased run-off and pollution. This run-off may have adverse effects on existing homes.	Supports submission.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
770	Morrell, S	60	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Support	I support enabling a greater range of housing types and choices within the urban area and commend the work carried out to underpin and create the detail contained within Plan Change 9.	Not specified.	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
771	Morrell, S	60	2			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Support	The submitter acknowledges that while not specifically part of the plan change, she recognises the need to put in place sufficient infrastructure to service growth is important and supports the focus on infrastructure improvements and exploring additional funding mechanisms.	Continue to improve the infrastructure needed to support our growing community and more intense urban environment.	Reject While the relief sought cannot be provided in the Plan Change the need for continuing improvement of infrastructure is acknowledged.
772	Morrell, S	60	3			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Support	the submitter considers that stormwater is a key issue for the future growth of Rotorua - especially when additional hard surfacing associated with growth and climate change are taken into consideration. She supports ensuring infrastructure meets the added stormwater demands of increased hard surfacing and the community level and is concerned that stormwater management may present a barrier to development.	Ensure long term plans for stormwater infrastructure are commensurate with the development needs generated by PC9. Ensure building consent requirements for on-site management of stormwater do not create a development barrier in conflict with the intent of PC9	Reject The long term plans for stormwater infrastructure and building consent requirements cannot be addressed within the Plan Change.
773	Morrell, S	60	4			Transport	Other	Other	Support	Fairy Springs is identified as a neighbourhood warranting increased density through the Barker & Associates Accessibility and Demand Assessment. The Fairy Springs suburb on the eastern side of Fairy Springs Road is “close” to many services (e.g. medical, supermarket, education) on the western side. However, the road itself presents a barrier for pedestrians or cyclists crossing safely. In addition, the fact the Isobel St cul de sac is adjacent to Fairy Springs Rd is not recognised in the report (via walking catchment distances), presumably as there is currently no paved walkway covering the approximately 3 m between the Isobel St and Fairy Springs Rd footpaths. This makes properties such as ours seem further from services than they realistically are for someone walking.	In the transport planning add a paved footpath linking the cul de sac end of Isobel St with Fairy Springs road to substantively improve accessibility to medical services and food outlets. Additional consideration of safe crossing of Fairy Springs Rd would improve accessibility to key services of properties on the Eastern side of Fairy Springs Rd – perhaps a bike and pedestrian overbridge to avoid traffic constriction?	Reject. The relief is not something that can be provided in the plan change.
774	Morrell, S	60	5			Transport	Other	Other	Support	PC9 will enable a different set of amenity values to be realised over time, when compared to those currently associated with suburban environments. In particular the amenity values offered within medium and higher density urban environments include more vibrant areas with residents able to access amenities easily and largely via active modes of transport. I agree we need to change from current ‘spacious’ suburban amenity values to more efficiently provide for increased housing capacity and to weight active modes of transport.	In order to reassure residents who prefer the current amenity values, active facilitation of walking and cycling, and of development that indeed adds vibrancy and enhances the built environment is needed.	Reject. The relief is not something that can be provided in the plan change.
775	Morrell, S	60	6			Other	Other	Other	Support	The submitter supports the urban design guidelines and consider these a useful tool.	Promote the urban design guidance within the community and on the RLC website.	Reject. Not relief that can be provided in the plan change but acknowledge support and agree with submission.
776	Morrell, S	60	7			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the approach in the Section 32 report to refine the MDRS standards to also include building length, minimum dwelling sizes and fencing standards to deliver a quality urban environment.	Implement the refined MDRS provisions promoted in the section 32 report.	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
777	Morrell, S	60	8			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the approach in the Section 32 report to provide a zone to enable higher density than the MDRS. The submitter supports the tailoring of some of the standards to further enable high density typologies as discussed in the Section 32 report.	Implement the Residential 2 Zone.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
778	Morrell, S	60	9			Residential 2 Zone	Maps	Maps	Support	The submitter supports the proposed extension of the Residential 2 Zone around the areas with the highest levels of accessibility	Expand the area for higher density development with good proximity to city centre amenities and to the existing amenities of northern Glenhome area as proposed	Noted.
779	Morrell, S	60	10			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1	Support	The submitter supports the proposed height limit for the Residential 2 Zone stating it recognises expert opinion.	Adopt the proposed height limit for the Residential 2 Zone.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
780	Morrell, S	60	11			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the approach of requiring resource consent for 4+ residential units in Residential Zones 1 and 2. This enables an urban design assessment, which will ensure large scale development at medium and high densities achieves quality built outcomes through enabling the ability to assess the site design and placement of buildings and the site context. This reduces the risk of adverse effects on the quality and amenity of the urban environment.	Adopt the approach proposed of requiring resource consent for 4+ residential units.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
781	Morrell, S	60	12			Residential 3 Zone	General	General	Support	While retaining the current zone for Residential 3 Zone is less efficient at achieving housing capacity it has been arrived at with consultation and is commensurate with kaitiakitanga and other relevant values.	Retain the current zone for Residential 3 Zone.	Accept No change requested by submitter and the provision remains unchanged
782	Morrell, S	60	13			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendment to COMZ-O2	Retain the proposed amendment.	Noted.
783	Morrell, S	60	14			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16, COMZ-R32	Support	the submitter supports the proposal to enable residential development within the City Centre 2 and Commercial 6 Zones to enable increased residential development in accordance with Policy 5 of the NPSUD.	Adopt the proposed changes to rule status of residential development.	Noted.
784	Morrell, S	60	15			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P5	Support	The submitter supports the approach of providing for both residential and accommodation/commercial uses that achieves both higher density and vibrancy for pedestrians.	Adopt the policy and also ensure Council undertakes public realm upgrades along Fenton Street.	Noted.
785	Morrell, S	60	16			Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S3	Oppose in part	Given the opportunity for greater capacity of housing through building ‘up’ in the new Higher Density Zone, this zone should have some restriction to impervious site coverage introduced. However, the Medium Density Zone should have the current provisions within the District Plan retained. To promote feasible development within this zone it needs greater opportunity for spatial coverage. Proposed infrastructure changes that deal with peak flows should be continued. Given development within this zone will take time there is the opportunity to review the fitness of a maximum of 80% site coverage, alongside the planned infrastructure upgrades, over time.	Reduce the maximum pervious surface site coverage standard for Residential 2 Zone from 100% to 80%as proposed but retain the current maximum pervious surface site coverage standards in the Residential 1 Zone.	Accept in part. Retain the changes proposed for Residential 1 Zone (70% maximum). Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
786	Morrell, S	60	17			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	General	Support	The submitter supports the suite of changes proposed to the calculation of financial contributions.	Adopt the proposed changes to the calculation of financial contributions.	Accept in part. Adopt the changes proposed to the financial contribution provisions but with the further amendments detailed in response to submission 26.20. Refer to Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report.
787	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	1			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5, SUB-S9(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	Plan Change 9 proposes to amend the standards for site serviceability, and in particular the standards for shared private access, to better provide for increased housing intensification. Further amendments may be required to the standards to ensure that they are workable in the context of the District Plan and that they make appropriate provision for: • Safe access by residents, delivery trucks and emergency vehicles; • Safe on-site manoeuvring; • Ongoing repairs and maintenance; • On-site rubbish collection.	Such further amendments to SUB-S9(2) and RESZ-S5 that are necessary to ensure that the provisions relating to shared private access are consistent, workable and address the matters identified in this submission.	Accept. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
788	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	1	97	48	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5, SUB-S9(2)		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.1 as these are considered appropriate outcomes / considerations for residential developments	Allow submission.	Accept. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
789	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	61	1	109	26	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5, SUB-S9(2)		The RVA opposes the relief sought as on-site rubbish collection, emergency vehicle access, delivery truck access and on-site manoeuvring are not included in the MDRS and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed. In addition, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are different than those of other residential developments and seeks for these functional and operational needs to be provided for.	Oppose relief	Reject. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
790	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	61	1	109	27	Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5		The RVA opposes the relief sought as on-site rubbish collection, emergency vehicle access, delivery truck access and on-site manoeuvring are not included in the MDRS and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed. In addition, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are different than those of other residential developments and seeks for these functional and operational needs to be provided for.	Oppose relief	Reject. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
791	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	61	1	111	26	Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5, SUB-S9(2)		Ryman opposes the relief sought as on-site rubbish collection, emergency vehicle access, delivery truck access and on-site manoeuvring are not included in the MDRS and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed. In addition, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are different than those of other residential developments and seeks for these functional and operational needs to be provided for.	Oppose relief	Reject. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
792	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	61	1	111	27	Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5		Ryman opposes the relief sought as on-site rubbish collection, emergency vehicle access, delivery truck access and on-site manoeuvring are not included in the MDRS and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed. In addition, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are different than those of other residential developments and seeks for these functional and operational needs to be provided for.	Oppose relief	Reject. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
793	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	2			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5	Seek amendment / support in part	Commute Transportation Consultants, which provided advice to support the amendments to the standards for private accessways, recommended that for 8-20 units there be a requirement for on-site rubbish collection, emergency vehicle access and delivery truck access (RTS-18 8 m MRT), and on-site manoeuvring to prevent reverse manoeuvres to/from the road network.	That if private accessway standards for 8-20 units are retained, that requirement for rubbish collection, emergency vehicle and delivery truck access and on-site manoeuvring be incorporated into the standard as recommended by Commute Transportation Consultants.	Accept. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
794	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	2	97	49	Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 61.2 as this would lead to standards requiring truck manoeuvring space within all developments of 8 units or more which is considered overly onerous. This matter should be dealt with through assessment criteria rather than standards to allow for the most practical or safest option for that development.	Disallow submission.	Reject. Refer to additional clauses in the appendix and discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
795	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	3			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5	Seek amendment / support in part	Clarity is needed over how to calculate the number of units accessing a private accessway for the purpose of these standards, especially in the context of the medium density residential standards, which allow up to three units on a site, as of right.	Amend SUB-S9(2) and RESZ-S5 to identify that, for the purpose of calculating the number of residential lots accessing a private accessway for the purpose of this standard, vacant residential lots shall be considered to contain one residential unit unless a greater number of units has obtained a building or landuse consent, in which case that number shall be used.	Accept. Include an additional clause as sought. Refer discussion in the Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
796	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	3	97	50	Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2), RESZ-S5		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.3 as this is considered an appropriate consideration for residential developments.	Allow submission.	Accept. Include an additional clause as sought. Refer discussion in the Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
797	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	4			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	The proposed changes to rule PK-R1, (which addresses Papakāinga in zones other than in Rural and Industrial Zones) refer to the performance standards for residential units in Residential Zones. However, there is ambiguity about whether permitted Papakāinga are limited to three residential units per site in line with residential units in Residential 1 and 2 Zones because this requirement is written in the ‘where’ statement in Rule RESZ-R3 rather than in the performance standards section.	Amend PK-R1 to clarify that in Residential 1 and 2 Zones permitted activities are limited to three residential units per site.	Accept mend PK-R1 to clarify that in Residential 1 and 2 Zones permitted activities are limited to three residential units per site. Refer to Papakaing section of the Section 42A Report.
798	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	5			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	It is considered that activities related to Papakāinga development should be enabled in the zones addressed in PK-R1(1) (that is, zones other than Rural or Industrial Zones), as is proposed for Rural Zones.	Amend PK-R1(1) performance standards to enable the provision for non-residential activities associated with Papakāinga as is provided for in the rural zones. “Any places of assembly and commercial or industrial activities are established in conjunction with, and are directly associated with, the residential activities of the Papakāinga”.	Accept Amend PK-R1(1) performance standards to enable the provision for non-residential activities associated with papakāinga as is provided for in the rural zones.
799	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	6			Residential	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	Plan Change 9, and particularly the rules and performance standards of the Residential Zone and Subdivision chapters, seek to incorporate the medium density residential standards (MDRS) set out in Schedule 3A to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). It may be necessary to make further amendments to the rules and performance standards to ensure that the requirements of Schedule 3A are incorporated accurately and in a manner which is workable in the context of the Rotorua District Plan.	Such further amendments to Plan Change 9 that are necessary to accurately and effectively incorporate the requirements of Schedule 3A of the Act.	Accept Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
800	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	61	6	104	12	Residential	General	General		The submission does not request or detail any specific changes or amendments to PC9. It only vaguely requests such further amendments to Plan Change 9 that are necessary to accurately and effectively incorporate the requirements of Schedule 3A of the Act. Without any substance the public and further submitters are left to question what such further amendments may be and what their impacts may potentially be. The submission cannot be supported. If further amendments to Plan Change 9 are necessary, they should be done as a variation to PC9 to allow for full transparency and the ability for the public to make submissions or further submissions.	Oppose submission in part.	Refer submission 61.6 above.
801	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	7			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4), Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	There is a lack of clarity over the requirement for 20% glazing of street facing facades under this standard, which was required to be included in the plan as part of the MDRS. The Council was advised by the Ministry that further clarification could be added through a Council submission. Issues that require clarification or reconsideration include: • Whether gabled ends should be subject to an exclusion from the calculation of the façade area. • Whether attached garages or non-habitable rooms should be included in the calculation of the façade area. • How the lower extent of the façade is identified. • Identification of which facades are ‘street facing’ with respect to, for example, distance from the street and orientation on the site. While some additional clauses were inserted with Plan Change 9 to clarify the calculation of façade area with respect to areas enclosed by gables and whether garage doors can contribute towards glazing, these may require further consideration.	Amend standard RESZ-6A and/or insert a definition of street facing façade to clarify the implementation of standard and achieve the intent of the standard.	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
802	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	7	97	51	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4), Definitions		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.7 as it is considered appropriate and pragmatic to provide further guidance to plan users as to the application of the prescribed glazing standard for residential developments.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 61.7 above.
803	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	8			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB(4)	Seek amendment / support in part	In the experience of Council staff, individual recycling bins for each residential unit result in better recycling than communal systems because of the sense of individual ‘ownership’ of the waste and accountability. The provision of space for storage of recycling bins is key to their use and mitigating their visual impact. As the District Plan, in turn, is a key tool influencing development design, consideration could be given to using the District Plan to encourage specifically the provision of space for individual recycling bins (over communal recycling bins) at least for less intensive housing typologies such as units and terraced housing.	Consider whether the District Plan should be amended to encourage space for individual recycling bins, such as by amending matter of discretion RESZ-MDB(4).	Reject RESZ-MDB(4) proposed under PC9 are considered to be the most efficient and effective means of giving effect to RESZ-O4 and RESZ-O11.
804	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	8	97	52	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB(4)		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.7 as this is considered an appropriate outcome that should be articulated through assessment matters for residential developments.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 61.8.
805	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	9			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4	Seek amendment / support in part	The intent of NH-R4 and the associated rules and matters of discretion would be clearer with changes in terminology.	Amend policy NH-PA clauses a and b to refer to ‘flood depths’ instead of ‘flood levels’. Amend NH-R4(2) clause b to read: <i>The maximum anticipated flood ~~level~~ <u>depth</u> at the building site is no more than 300mm from:</i> <i>i. The 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows and/or the 1% AEP <u>maximum</u> lake ~~flood~~ level; and</i> <i>ii. Taking into account climate change, based on RCP8.5 (or most recent national or regional guidance), to the year 2130.</i> Amend NH-R4(4) clause b to read: <i>The maximum anticipated flood ~~level~~ <u>depth</u> at the building site is more than 300mm from:</i> <i>i. The 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows and/or the 1% AEP <u>maximum</u> lake ~~flood~~ level; and</i> <i>ii. Taking into account climate change, based on RCP8.5 (or most recent national or regional guidance), to the year 2130.</i>	Accept. Amend terminology to depth. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
806	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	61	9	84	7	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4		Support relief sought by the submitter because flood depth is a more appropriate parameter to measure impacts than flood level, which is relative to a site ground level.	Support submission.	Accept. Amend terminology to depth. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
807	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	9	97	53	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.9 as the proposed amendments provide further clarity to the intent of the framework.	Allow submission.	Accept. Amend terminology to depth. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
808	Rotorua Lakes Council (Rotorua District Council)	61	10			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	The intent of NH-R4 and the associated rules and matters of discretion would be clearer with changes in terminology.	Amend matter of discretion NH-MD1(2) to refer to ‘anticipated flood depths’ instead of ‘anticipated flood levels’.	Accept. Amend terminology to depths
809	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	61	10	84	8	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1(2)		Support relief sought by the submitter because flood depth is a more appropriate parameter to measure impacts than flood level, which is relative to a site ground level.	Support submission.	Accept. Amend terminology to depths
810	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	61	10	97	54	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1(2)		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 61.10 as the proposed amendments provide further clarity to the intent of the framework.	Allow submission.	Accept. Amend terminology to depths
811	Marshall, A	62	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes PC9 in its current form. Their principal concern is the sudden change from a cumbersome consent process to an unfettered one without checks and balances. There is no gradualism in the change. The submitter also states: * while they acknowledge accounts of difficulties and costs of building under present rules, they question whether an abrupt and wholesale relaxation of rules will truly change things for the better * the changes are not clear to the average resident * they question whether the degree of intensification is viable in Rotorua * they question whether, while we have people in motels, whether they would be in a position to buy any new housing, intense or otherwise * they ask whether there is evidence to suggest that first home buyers would really benefit in terms of price ratios	The submitter says that if the community is prepared to accept a significant change to development rules this should be by an initial and partial relaxation, possibly in a defined and restricted area to begin with to be certain there are no unintended consequences.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
812	Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	63	1			Papakāinga	General	General	Oppose in part	HUD considers it necessary to refine the Papakāinga provisions for rural areas to ensure that RLC’s district plan is sufficiently enabling of Papakāinga development to meet both the aspirations of local iwi and hapū and the outcomes sought by RLC. PC9 provides for Papakāinga development in rural areas as a permitted activity if it complies with relevant performance standards. One of these standards (the standard) requires the number of residential units per site to not exceed one per 2,000m2 of net site area. Non-compliance with the standard requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. HUD understands that RLC designed this standard to ensure developments have sufficient land for on-site effluent treatment fields to comply with on-site effluent treatment (OSET) rules set by the Bay of Plenty and Waikato Regional Councils. The OSET rules effectively require new properties within the Rotorua lakes catchments to install aerated wastewater treatment systems, which treat wastewater to a higher standard than septic tanks, to protect lake-water quality. HUD also understands that the standard is in part intended to preserve the rural character of sites/areas where Papakāinga development occurs. Papakāinga development typically involves the construction of multiple buildings and this is reflected in the definition of Papakāinga in the Rotorua’s operative District Plan: “the provision of more than two household units on Māori land for tangata whenua who have ‘mana whenua’ status and includes kaumātua housing.” As a result, the standard would have the effect of significantly limiting the establishment of Papakāinga in practice. Development would not be permitted or would require a very large amount of land to yield a small number of new homes. This would be a barrier to development, particularly on modest sites, restricting both the ability of iwi and hapū to	HUD considers that the performance standard requiring the number of residential units per site to not exceed one per 2,000m2 of net site area for Papakāinga development, as currently designed, is to heavily restrict Papakāinga in practice. HUD requests that the panel consider; 1. alternative approaches to the current performance standards that enable a greater residential unit density while complying with relevant OSET rules, and/or 2. redraft the matters of discretion and related objectives and policies for Papakāinga to make it clear that that applications for Papakāinga housing will only consider matters related to the OSET rules and potential effects on the local lakes from the wastewater treatment proposed.	Accept in part Proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development. Not specifically focussed on OSET rules. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
813	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	63	1	97	55	Papakāinga	General	General		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 63.1 insofar as the relief sought generally aligns with its submission to also better enable and provide for Papakāinga development within the District Plan framework.	Allow submission.	Accept in part Proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development. Not specifically focussed on OSET rules. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
814	Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	63	2			Other	General	General	Oppose in part	HUD seeks changes to Plan Change 9 to achieve greater clarity around how emergency housing is provided for and assessed within the District Plan. The nature of emergency accommodation contracted by HUD would generally fall within the definition of Community Housing, except in relation to the number of occupants being accommodated. It is understood that Community Housing was the subject of several submissions on the District Plan Review in 2014 from residents concerned about the impact of community housing on amenity in residential zones. The Hearings Committee at that time determined that the definition and performance standards in the ODP would achieve a reasonable level of management and provide for the protection of residential amenity. However, the scale of a Community Housing activity is not managed through the Performance Standards of the District Plan or Plan Change 9, but singularly through the definition of Community Housing. The effect of the definition is that community housing proposals that exceed the 8-person limit fall outside the defined term and as a result any proposal with a site accommodating more than 8 persons automatically elevates to being considered as a non-complying activity, with no further guidance provided within the Plan to clearly assist in decision making around this activity. A key principle in the drafting of definitions is that rules and performance standards should manage the outcome, not the definition. Metrics should not be included in definitions; these instead should be located in standards/rules.	HUD seeks the following changes to more clearly provide for emergency housing within the District Plan: 1. Amend definition of Community Housing to remove the threshold of eight persons from the definition. Alternatively, remove reference to emergency housing within the definition, and instead leave this activity to be provided for within the newly created definition of Residential Activity. 2. Amend the zone based framework to achieve a clear consent pathway, including but not limited to: a. Introduce a maximum occupancy level in the Permitted Activity/Controlled Activity Performance Standards for Community Housing. b. Provide for non-compliance with this new performance standard as a Restricted Activity with relevant matters of discretion. c. Introduce/amend guiding objectives and policies across the residential and commercial zones to provide direction on the outcomes expected to provide guidance in determining appropriateness of such activities. 3. Retain the definitions of Residential Activity and Residential Unit as notified. 4. HUD seeks specific amendments, additions or retentions into Proposed Plan Change 9, including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.	Reject Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
815	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	63	2	64	7	Other	General	General		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission, stating that the Ministry is confused over the difference between emergency housing and transitional housing. The intent of the submission appears to be to make emergency housing a permitted activity. This should be strongly resisted. The evidence on the MHUD's resource consent was that emergency housing should only be used for very short periods and that a range of negative social wellbeing outcomes arise from longer stays in temporary accommodation.	Oppose submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
816	Holmes, W (FS)	63	2	82	5	Other	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission. Non-compliance must remain a restricted discretionary activity otherwise the community will have limited ability to participate in the consenting process.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
817	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	63	2	97	56	Other	General	General		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 63.2 insofar as specifically providing enablement and provision for emergency housing within the District Plan framework	Allow submission.	Reject Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
818	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	63	2	104	13	Other	General	General		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They state that they changes sought would appear to be beyond the scope of the plan change, are unclear in terms of what relief is sought, and given the importance of the issue need careful consideration. The relief sought is therefore opposed.	Oppose submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
819	Gifford, S (FS)	63	2	150	26	Other	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. This is beyond the scope of PC9 and should be subject to a separate process so the whole community can be fully engaged. Such fundamental changes should not be allowed to slip through	Oppose submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
820	Holmes, R (FS)	63	2	172	5	Other	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission. Non-compliance must remain a restricted discretionary activity otherwise the community will have limited ability to participate in the consenting process.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
821	Holmes, T (FS)	63	2	173	5	Other	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission. Non-compliance must remain a restricted discretionary activity otherwise the community will have limited ability to participate in the consenting process.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
822	Adams, J (FS)	63	various	123	4	various	various	various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission, stating that the ministry has already done irreparable damage to Rotorua.	Oppose submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
823	Waikato Regional Council	64	1			Papakāinga	General	PK-P1 PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	Waikato Regional Policy Statement Policy 6.4 is to recognise the historical, cultural and social importance of marae and Papakāinga and to provide for their ongoing use and development. We consider the provisions under section PK are consistent with this policy and its methods and we support their inclusion in the plan change. We consider there is opportunity for the policy and/or rules to go further to align with WRPS method 6.4.2 which encourages territorial authorities to take into account social services such as kōhanga, kura and wānanga, urupā and health services in relation to Papakāinga.	Consider including social services such as kōhanga, kura and wānanga, urupā and health services in the policy/rule framework for Papakāinga.	Accept Inclusion of social services such as kōhanga, kura and wānanga, urupā and health services in PK-R1.3.d. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
824	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	64	1	97	57	Papakāinga	General	PK-P1 PK-R1		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 64.1 insofar as the relief sought generally aligns with its submission to also better enable and provide for Papakāinga development within the District Plan framework.	Allow submission.	Accept Inclusion of social services such as kōhanga, kura and wānanga, urupā and health services in PK-R1.3.d. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
825	Waikato Regional Council	64	2			Natural Hazards	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	The amended definition for “buildings of low importance” includes buildings “posing low risk to human life or the environment, or a low economic cost, should the building fail”. To reduce risk associated with natural hazards, we consider that buildings should meet all three criteria to be considered a building of low importance.	Amend to “means buildings posing low risk to human life ~~or~~ <u>and</u> the environment, ~~or~~ <u>and</u> a low economic cost, should the building fail”.	Accept. Amend definition as sought.
826	Waikato Regional council	64	3			Other	Definitions	Various	Seek amendment / support in part	A definition has been added for the term “Impervious surface” however some parts of the plan (e.g., the Rural Zone chapter RURZ) use the term “impermeable surfaces”. We consider terminology should be consistent throughout the plan.	Amend references to ‘impermeable surfaces’ to “impervious surfaces” to match the definition.	Accept. Amend impermeable surfaces to impervious surfaces throughout the plan.
827	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	64	3	97	58	Other	Definitions	Various		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 64.3 as it provides consistency throughout the plan.	Allow submission.	Accept. Amend impermeable surfaces to impervious surfaces throughout the plan.
828	Waikato Regional Council	64	4			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The plan change does not contain information on flood modelling to support the proposed changes and additions to the natural hazards and flooding provisions. It is unclear how areas susceptible to flooding have been or are supposed to be determined and thus how the provisions will apply. We request flood modelling be made available to enable understanding of the assessments made and assumptions that have driven the changes to these provisions.	Provide WRC with flood modelling information.	Accept in part. This is not relief that can be provided in the plan change but RLC have met with WRC to discuss flood modelling information.
829	Ronayne, T (FS)	64	4	51	16	Natural Hazards	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission. consideration of PC9 be delayed until flood modelling has been received that separates low, medium and high flood risks. High or intolerable risk should be avoided, not minimized nor mitigated.	Accept in part. RLC have met with WRC to discuss flood modelling information.
830	Irwin, W (FS)	64	4	83	18	Natural Hazards	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission. consideration of PC9 be delayed until flood modelling has been received that separates low, medium and high flood risks. High or intolerable risk should be avoided, not minimized nor mitigated.	Accept in part. RLC have met with WRC to discuss flood modelling information.
831	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	64	4	91	27	Natural Hazards	Other	Other		RDRR supports the original submission.H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission. consideration of PC9 be delayed until flood modelling has been received that separates low, medium and high flood risks. High or intolerable risk should be avoided, not minimized nor mitigated.	Accept in part. RLC have met with WRC to discuss flood modelling information.
832	Waikato Regional Council	64	5			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA	Oppose	The direction to minimise rather than avoid risk is contrary to the direction set out in WRPS Policy 13.1 and associated methods which requires avoidance of intolerable risk. The policy appears to separately refer to low flood risk but combines medium and high flood risk, which is inappropriate considering the above WRPS requirement to avoid high risk. Also, as above, due to the lack of information provided on flood modelling it is unclear what classifies as ‘low’ flood levels and risks and whether this aligns with the WRPS.	Amend to separate low, medium and high flood risks. High or intolerable risk should be avoided not minimised or mitigated.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
833	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	64	5	97	59	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 64.5 insofar as providing greater specificity to qualifying matters through evidenced based assessment and further aligning the District Plan framework with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Allow submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
834	Waikato Regional Council	64	6			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PB	Support	We support this policy	Retain	Accept. Adopt policy.
835	Waikato Regional Council	64	7			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PC	Support	We support this policy and the explicit recognition of the cumulative effects of increased impervious surfaces and stormwater run-off on flooding.	Retain	Accept. Adopt policy.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
836	Waikato Regional Council	64	8			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4(1)(a)(ii)	Seek amendment / support in part	The rule contains a grammatical error. 1a.ii. reads “a buildings of low importance”.	Amend 1a. ii. to “a building of low importance”.	Accept. Amend grammatical error.
837	Waikato Regional Council	64	9			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4(2) NH-R4(4)	Oppose	It is unclear how this rule works. The word ‘from’ in 2.b and 4.b implies that there must be an additional flood level of up to 300mm above the calculated 1%AEP flood level, which is confusing, considering the freeboard, which accounts for uncertainty, would be on top of this. We assume it is supposed to mean that the maximum flood level for a permitted activity is 300mm. If so, this should be made clearer. Also, it is unclear whether the 300mm relates to sea level or flood depth. We assume it means depth as indicated in Appendix 13 – Tonkin and Taylor Flood Provisions Memo. It is also unclear how 300mm was determined as the maximum. NZ Standard 4404 uses a 500mm freeboard.	Amend the rule to improve clarity. If our interpretation is correct, it could be reworded as “2 b. The maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is no more than 300mm, <u>calculated</u> from ...” and “4 b. The maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is more than 300mm, <u>calculated</u> from ...” Clarify how 300mm was determined as the maximum and whether the 300mm relates to sea level or flood depth. If it is depth then this should be made clear in the rule.	Accept in part. Amend terminology to 'depth' to avoid confusion. See proposed changes in Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
838	Waikato Regional Council	64	10			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1	Oppose	NH-MD1.1, NH-MD1.2.a. and NH-MD1.2.b. take a people-centric approach and only require risk to be minimised to people and property. This should instead refer to people, property and the environment. This would better align with the principles of Te Mana o te Wai as set out in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is unclear whether the 300mm relates to sea level or flood depth. We assume it means depth as indicated in Appendix 13 – Tonkin and Taylor Flood Provisions Memo. Also, it is important that the matters of discretion distinguish between areas susceptible to flooding and those protected by flood protection infrastructure. WRPS Policy 13.2.d and method 13.2.7 seek to minimise residual risk through district plans.	Amend NH-MD1.1 and NH-MD1.2.a and b. to read “risks ... to people ~~and~~ , property <u>and the environment</u> ...” Clarify whether the 300mm relates to sea level or flood depth. If it is depth then this should be made clear in the matter of discretion. Add a new matter to cover areas of residual risk.	Accept. Include risks to the environment in the matters of discretion and clarify depth v level.
839	Waikato Regional Council	64	11			Natural Hazards	Policies	SUB-P7	Support	We support the amendment to the policy.	Retain	Accept. Adopt proposed change from 'inundation' to 'flooding' in the policy.
840	Waikato Regional Council	64	12			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2	Oppose	SUB-MD2.a. and b. take a people-centric approach and only require risk to be minimised to people and property. This should instead refer to people, property and the environment. This would better align with the principles of Te Mana o te Wai as set out in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. It is important that the matters of discretion discern between areas susceptible to flooding and those protected by flood protection infrastructure. WRPS Policy 13.2.d and method 13.2.7 seek to minimise residual risk through district plans. For consistency across the plan, the clause should be called ‘Areas susceptible to flooding’ not ‘Areas susceptible to inundation’. ‘Inundation’ has been replaced by ‘flooding’ elsewhere in the plan change.	Amend SUB-MD2.a. and b. to read “risks ... to people ~~and~~ , property <u>and the environment</u> ...” Add a new matter to cover areas of residual risk. Amend provision title to “Areas susceptible to <u>flooding</u> ~~inundation~~ ”	Accept. Make the changes proposed. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
841	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	64	12	84	9	Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2		BOPRC supports relief sought by the submitter for the reasons provided in the submission point.	Support submission.	Accept. Make the changes proposed. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
842	Waikato Regional Council	64	13			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S9	Support	We support the amendment.	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes.
843	Waikato Regional Council	64	14			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3	Support	We support SDUD-P3 regarding management of risks from geothermal hazards in the urban environment.	Retain	Accept. Retain policy.
844	Waikato Regional Council	64	15			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4	Seek amendment / support in part	We support the intention of the policy, however, it appears to solely relate to the proposed venting structures rule (NH-R8). We recommend a wording change to require site-specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems overlay.	Amend wording as follows or to same effect:“Minimise the risks to people and property from geothermal hazards, ~~including by locating the discharge of any geothermal gas away from confined spaces on site, by requiring site-specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay.~~ ”	Accept in part. Refer to discussion and recommended wording for policy in Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
845	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	64	15	104	14	Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They state they oppose the submission for the same reasons outlined in the opposition to the BOPRC submission relating to site-specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
846	Waikato Regional Council	64	16			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 NH-R8	Oppose	We recommend combining NH-R7 and NH-R8 and incorporating comprehensive performance standards to address all potential geothermal hazards in a holistic manner, in line with the recommendations of the geothermal hazard risk review in Appendix 14 of the plan change. The geothermal hazard risk review recommends the deletion of NH-R7. We support this position as the 90% surface coverage trigger is no longer appropriate given the proposed new HDRZ and MDRS environment which enables different impervious surface limits. Also, NH-R8 as currently worded is unlikely to be effective at reducing risk from geothermal hazards to an acceptable level for a development. The provision doesn't address different gas sources and issues such as hollows and depressions where heavy gases may accumulate, nor gas venting from hot ground, building piles, cracks in concrete slabs, etc. It is important that geothermal hazards are considered holistically to ensure addressing one issue does not inadvertently create another. The recommended amended rule is consistent with the WRPS: -Method 9.1.7 which requires district plans to ensure that new development and uses of land within and adjacent to geothermal systems are compatible with the classification of the system. -Policy 13.1 and method 13.1.1 which require district plans to holistically manage natural hazards using an integrated risk-based approach to development. -Policy 13.2 which seeks that development is managed to reduce risks from natural hazards by ensuring risk is assessed. The recommended amended rule is consistent with the policy SUB-P7 and standard SUB-S8(3) of the plan change which seek to ensure management of development on land subject to geothermal hazards. Given that there is no material difference between constructing three dwellings on a site or	Delete NH-R7 and NH-R8. Add a new rule which combines the intent of these: <u>NH-RX - New buildings and impervious surfaces in the Rotorua Geothermal Assessment Overlay</u> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Performance standards:</u> <u>a. The development shall be designed to achieve an acceptable level of risk from geothermal hazards, including gas, hot ground and acid ground.</u> <u>This shall be demonstrated by a suitably qualified and experienced person as part of any required building consent application through a geothermal hazards assessment. The assessment shall address:</u> <u>i. the extent to which the site is affected by the following geothermal hazards:</u> <u>1. Geothermal surface features;</u> <u>2. Geothermal gas;</u> <u>3. Heated ground; and</u> <u>4. Corrosive ground</u> <u>ii. The extent to which site design and building design can minimise the potential geothermal risks to people and property on the site and to surrounding sites;</u> <u>iii. Measures to mitigate the risks such as:</u> <u>1. Site coverage and surface treatment controls to reduce the impact on natural gas flow and heat flux from the</u>	Accept in part. Refer to recommended changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
847	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	64	16	97	60	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 NH-R8		Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of this submission however echoes the rationale put forward in its' further submission point on 56.30	Allow submission.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
848	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	64	16	104	15	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R7 NH-R8		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They state they oppose the submission for the same reasons outlined in the opposition to the BOPRC submission relating to site-specific geothermal assessments for all development in the Geothermal Systems Overlay.	Oppose submission.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
849	Simester, A	65	1			Residential	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes PC9 in its current form. Their principal concern is the sudden change from a cumbersome consent process to an unfettered one without checks and balances. There is no gradualism in the change. The submitter also states: * while they acknowledge accounts of difficulties and costs of building under present rules, they question whether an abrupt and wholesale relaxation of rules will truly change things for the better * the changes are not clear to the average resident * they question whether the degree of intensification is viable in Rotorua * they question whether, while we have people in motels, whether they would be in a position to buy any new housing, intense or otherwise * they ask whether there is evidence to suggest that first home buyers would really benefit in terms of price ratios	The submitter says that if the community is prepared to accept a significant change to development rules this should be by an initial and partial relaxation, possibly in a defined and restricted area to begin with to be certain there are no unintended consequences.	Reject The MDRS are required to be incorporated in accordance with section 77G of the RMA into all relevant residential zones. No qualifying matters have been identified within the submission.
850	Gifford, S (FS)	65	1	150	27	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They agreed that the pendulum is being swung too far in the oppose direction from the existing system and problems.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 65.1 above.
851	Merrylees, J	67	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter opposes the sale of any reserves for whatever reasons	Oppose the sale of reserves.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.
852	Merrylees,B	68	1			Other	Other	Other	Oppose	The submitter opposes the sale of any reserves for whatever reasons	Oppose the sale of reserves.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change and the Plan Change is not related to the sale of reserves.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
853	Milne, R	69	1			Natural Environmental Values	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Heavy decrease in tree coverage	Information amended. Councillors educate themselves in these matters.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
854	Milne, R	69	2			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Liquefaction risk, earthquake risk - Refer to Brad Scott Report.	Information amended. Councillors educate themselves in these matters.	Reject. The need to understand hazards is acknowledged but the specific relief cannot be provided in the plan change.
855	Milne, R	69	3			Natural Hazards	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Widespread geothermal risk - Refer to Brad Scott Report.	Information amended. Councillors educate themselves in these matters.	Reject. The need to understand hazards is acknowledged but the specific relief cannot be provided in the plan change.
856	Milne, R	69	4			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Sewerage disposal issues	Information amended. Councillors educate themselves in these matters.	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
857	Murray, J and B; and Jones A and N	70	1			Residential 1 Zone	Matters of Control/Discretion	General	Oppose in part	The submitters do not want to dwell on the aspects in the legislation - stating that this has caused anxiety - but wishes to focus on what the Council will consider when consider when resource consent is required. The submitters emphasis that anxieties of residents regarding development may seem small but are valid and they ask the Council to consider the wellbeing of communities and take careful consideration when granting consent to those building outside the current legislation. As there will be fewer resource consent applications there should be plenty of time to be able to spend the time required to look the projects where resource consent is required and they suggest their is an obligation to residents, both current and future to do so. They have concerns about developers whose concern is to make money.	The following points to be considered on resource consents: - No blank solid walls on boundaries - should have windows - No security lights that shine into windows on other properties - Location of driveway to avoid disruption - Aesthetics, planting - That there always be site visits, not just consideration of consents on the plans - Discussions with all parties and potential for mediation	Reject The suit of amendments proposed to the Residential Zone under PC9 are considered to be the most effective and efficient means to give effect to RESZ-O4 and RESZ-O11.
858	Murray, J and B; and Jones A and N	70	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Ngongotahā Village has a special character. This is a small commercial area. There is lots of traffic congestion and it is the main route to Tauranga. The road in the village is narrow with lots of junctions and pedestrian crossings. The legislation allows buildings up to twenty metres high. To put this in perspective this is double the height of the building where the current post office is. This is a small commercial area. It is not inner city. If council is looking at a combination of commercial and residential housing it needs to be well planned with green space, planned family friendly recreation facilities.	There needs to be a coordinated vision moving into the future that considers the future wellbeing of all residents. Consider the following points when considering resource consents: - Access to medical centres - already difficult - Better public transport - Issues with narrow state highway, pedestrian crossings, intersections - Limited parking and amenities to cope - Safety issues associated with high density housing - many people coming and going. Smaller housing blocks not building to maximum height - Aesthetics, planting - Well planned purpose-built housing incorporating commercial and planned recreation facilities that enhance the village atmosphere.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
859	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	1			Other	Definitions	Definitions	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 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.	Add the following definition to the RDP: <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>	Reject Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
860	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	71	1	97	61	Other	Definitions	Definitions		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 71.1 insofar as recognising and incorporating 'community corrections activities' within the District Plan framework. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports adopting the National Planning Standard definition	Allow submission.	Refer submission 77.1 above.
861	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Plan Change 9 introduces definitions for “residential activities” and “residential unit” consistent with the National Planning Standards definitions. These definitions apply 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.	Retain the proposed definitions for “residential activities” and “residential unit”.	Noted.
862	Gifford, S (FS)	71	2	150	28	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. This is not in the scope of PC9 and should be subject to a separate process so the whole community can be fully engaged. Such fundamental changes should not be allowed to slip through.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 77.1 above.
863	Gifford, S (FS)	71	2	150	29	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. This is not in the scope of PC9 and should be subject to a separate process so the whole community can be fully engaged. Such fundamental changes should not be allowed to slip through.	Oppose submission.	Reject PC9 includes amendments to align the definitions in the operative District Plan with the National Planning Standards.
864	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	3			Other	Definitions	Definitions	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. Plan Change 9 includes both of these definitions, which is supported. However, the definition of “residential unit” refers to a “household” which is not defined in the RDP, nor Plan Change 9. 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 the RDP: <u>household</u> <u>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>	Reject Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
865	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	71	3	97	62	Other	Definitions	Definitions		Kāinga Ora seeks clarity as to how this definition relates to other defined activities within the District Plan e.g. rehabilitation facilities, boarding houses etc	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 71.3 above.
866	Gifford, S (FS)	71	3	150	30	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. This is not in the scope of PC9 and should be subject to a separate process so the whole community can be fully engaged. Such fundamental changes should not be allowed to slip through.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 71.3 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
867	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	4			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	The definition of “community housing” (“a place of residence for a maximum of eight persons (i.e. all residents including resident staff) where some element of care or support is provided for residents. The definition includes emergency housing (including temporary overnight accommodation) and rehabilitation centres, but excludes facilities where the movement of residents is legally restricted”) presents some significant interpretation issues. This includes the potential for confusion to be created in relation to rehabilitation and reintegration services with associated accommodation provided by Ara Poutama (i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama), as well as other supported residential activities. To provide context: • In relation to accommodation activities undertaken by Ara Poutama, in many instances (but not always) the movement of residents may be legally restricted by way of a court order (i.e. a community sentence or parole conditions). In such instances, it would appear that the definition does not apply by way of the exclusion. However, it is then unclear what definition would apply. Ara Poutama’s position is that its activities are a “residential activity” in all instances, regardless of the level of support or supervision provided. Given this, the District Plan would benefit from some clarity in this regard. • By including the reference to “up to eight residents” in the definition, activities such as a single resident in a dwelling, who receives low-level support and no legal restrictions on movement, will be captured and considered a community house. It is unlikely that is the intention of the definition, nonetheless the current wording has the ability to have significant operational impact. Equally, support services provided by Ara Poutama do not always apply to every resident in an individual residential	Remove the definition of “community housing”, and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the RDP.	Reject Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
868	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	71	4	97	63	Other	Definitions	Definitions		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 71.4 and seeks clarity as to what the consequences of deleting this definition would have on existing activities that fall within this definition currently	Disallow submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
869	Gifford, S (FS)	71	4	150	31	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. This is not in the scope of PC9 and should be subject to a separate process so the whole community can be fully engaged. Such fundamental changes should not be allowed to slip through.	Oppose submission.	Accept Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.
870	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	5			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-01 and RESZ-08	Seek amendment / support in part	Ara Poutama requests objectives RESZ-O1 and RESZ-O8 are 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 Residential 1 – Medium Density Residential, and Residential 2 – High Density Residential zones respectively, 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 residential zones 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.	1. Amend proposed Objective RESZ-O1 as follows: RESZ-O1 <i>Land is used efficiently for medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice, <u>for a range of households</u>.</i> 2. Amend proposed Objective RESZ-O8 as follows: RESZ-O8 <i>Land that has good accessibility by existing or planned active or public transport to a range of commercial activities, public open space and community services, is efficiently used for high density urban living that increases housing supply and choice <u>for a range of households</u>.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
871	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	6			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P1 and RESZ-P10	Seek amendment / support in part	Ara Poutama supports policies RESZ-P1 and RESZ-P10 proposed in Plan Change 9, as they include appropriate provision for a variety of housing typologies within for in Residential 1 - Medium Density Residential, and Residential 2 – High Density Residential zones respectively.	Retain proposed Policies RESZ-P1 and RESZ-P10.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
872	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	7			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Support	Ara Poutama requests rule RESZ-R3 is retained. Rule RESZ-R3 provides for “residential activities” and “residential units” as a permitted activity in the Residential 1 – Medium Density Residential, and Residential 2 – High Density Residential zones. This includes 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.	Retain proposed Rule RESZ-R3.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
873	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	71	8			Other	Rule Table	Other	Oppose	Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the City Centre 1 Zone, Commercial 1 Zone, Commercial 6 Zone, Industrial 1 Zone, Industrial 1E Zone and Business and Innovation 3 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	1. Amend the rules in the following zones to enable community corrections activities to be undertaken as permitted activities: • City Centre 1 Zone • Commercial 1 Zone • Commercial 6 Zone • Industrial 1 Zone • Industrial 1E Zone • Business and Innovation 3 Zone.	Reject
874	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	71	8	97	64	Other	Rule Table	Other		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 71.8 insofar as recognising and incorporating 'community corrections activities' within the District Plan framework.	Allow submission.	Refer to the Other Section of the Section 42A Report.
875	Ngati Pikiao Environmental Society	72	1			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Support	For many years, Ngati Pikiao landowners have expressed a desire to build homes to live on ahu whenua lands which are zoned Rural A. However, the District Plan rules and the planning costs associated with these aspirations have been prohibitive. The Society support the Plan Change to remove the requirement to build Papakāinga homes on lands adjacent to marae. Many of our lands are not located adjacent or near the marae.	Support removal of requirement to build Papakāinga homes on lands adjacent to marae.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
876	Ronayne, T (FS)	72	1	51	17	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		the submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
877	Irwin, W (FS)	72	1	83	19	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		the submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
878	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	72	1	91	28	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		RDRR supports the original submission.H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
879	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	72	1	97	65	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 72.1 insofar as the relief sought generally aligns with its submission to also better enable and provide for Papakāinga development within the District Plan framework	Allow submission.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
880	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	72	1	97	66	Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 72.2 insofar as the relief sought generally aligns with its submission to also better enable and provide for Papakāinga development within the District Plan framework	Allow submission.	Accept Adopt proposed change to remove requirement.
881	Ngati Pikiao Environmental Society	72	2			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Oppose in part	The Society wish to amend the Plan Change to allow Ngati Pikiao whanau to build or place more than 1 dwelling on their lands designated for Papakāinga purposes.	The same proposed medium density proposals for District Plan Change 9 to apply to Ngati Pikiao designated Papakāinga lands surrounding Lakes Rotoiti, Rotoehu, Rotoma and Rotorua.	Accept in part Proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development but no changes recommended to Residential 4 Zone

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
882	Summerset Holdings Limited	73	1			Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	PC9 must go further to enable the delivery of quality and affordable housing in Rotorua by unlocking the development of sites that can deliver more higher density and high-quality housing that contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. Summerset requests that the RESZ1 – Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded to maximise the enablement of housing supply in critical growth areas of Rotorua that are a logical extension of existing residential areas and that are well serviced (or readily able to be serviced) by key infrastructure, such as along main transport corridors. Summerset has significant experience in developing sites to provide for a range of aged care housing options. As outlined in the RVA's submission, there are many unique features that retirement villages offer that are typically not provided for or contemplated by planning provisions. As such, available sites in residential areas that are appropriate for retirement villages are extremely rare. 171 Fairy Springs Road is owned by Summerset and it considers it an example of a site that has significant housing supply potential that would be unlocked for development with rezoning (see Appendix 1). The site at 171 Fairy Springs Road provides opportunity for higher density living as contemplated by PC9 in a manner that is well-integrated with the existing residential area. The site adjoins State Highway 5. In Summerset's submission, expansion of the RESZ1 Zone in this area would provide a logical extension of the existing urban area. Commercially zoned land in this area is all located to the west of State Highway 5. The east of State Highway 5, except for 171 Fairy Springs Road, is otherwise dominated by the RESZ1 Zone which would enable any expanded zone to integrate will into the existing residential area. The submitter considers that this rezoning unlock significant economic benefits for Rotorua, attracting investment to the area in the order of \$200 million.	Summerset seeks: • The expansion of the Residential 1 – Medium Density Residential Zone to include 171 Fairy Springs Road; • Constructive engagement with Summerset and the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change.	Reject Refer to Other - Rezoning to Residential 1 section of the Section 42A Report.
883	Steens, M (FS)	73	1	1	1	Residential 1 Zone	Maps	Maps		Withdrawn		N/A - submission withdrawn
884	Mau,K	74	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	3 storied houses in most areas (unless they are new and all the same height) will create privacy issues as well as blocking out sun to neighbours houses and gardens, tall houses are not usually aesthetically pleasing to look at, as well as blocking views and increased noise levels with more people living in these houses.	Delete the provision	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
885	Hunter, P (FS)	74	1	29	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. States that 12m high buildings need to have a subdivision of their own - it shouldn't be allowed to build [to RESZ1 standards] alongside single story. They would lose their views and sun. In the cold weather shaded areas would be very damp.	Support submission 74.1	Refer submission 74.1 above.
886	Mau,K	74	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Support	Unfortunately, previous councils destroyed the inner city retail businesses so we are faced with needing to find alternative uses for these empty buildings or buildings that are leased for a pittance. Hence, I support high density housing in the inner city to help find solutions for building owners who are struggling with decreased rental or no tenants at all. However, the council would need to make it financially viable to develop these buildings into high density housing.	Support high density housing in the inner city.	Noted.
887	Hunter, P (FS)	74	2	29	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. States that he does not oppose CCZ Zone 2 being built in the CBD.	Support submission 74.2	Noted.
888	Gifford, S (FS)	74	2	150	32	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees that a blanket provision of allowing 3 storey houses is just to high to proceed without consideration of adverse effects on neighbouring properties	Allow submission.	Noted.
889	Pore, A	75	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effects the MDRS will have on the residential environment of Tarewa Road (where they have property). Three storey buildings on the boundary would cut off daylight into their living area and intrude into backyard privacy. The submitter also discusses a mental health and mental additional support facility bordering their property and considers that the MDRS invites expansion of the facility.	Not specified.	Reject The site or area identified within the submission is located within a relevant residential zone, and the MDRS are required to be incorporated in accordance with section 77G of the RMA. No qualifying matters have been identified within the submission.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
890	Turner, N	76	1			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed five to six storey high apartments and apartments being crammed into small sections.	Oppose	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. In this case, the MDRS have been amended to enable high density development within the Residential 2 zone. This will contribute to a variety of housing within Rotorua and sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of different households in accordance with Policies 1 and 2 of the NPS-UD. Refer s42A Report.
891	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	1			Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	Submitter supports the issues as it recognises the importance of enabling the greatest level of density around centres, employment opportunities or in areas accessible to existing or planned public or active transport will support a well-functioning urban environment. This section would benefit from specific reference to the fact that mixed use development in the city centre and suburban centres, and higher density housing adjacent to these centres can reduce the need to travel and support public and active transport modes that contribute to a reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) and greenhouse gas emissions consistent with NZ Emissions Reduction Plan transport target 1.	Amend	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
892	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	77	1	84	10	Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I1		BOPR supports relief sought by submitter because this submission point aligns with Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement	Support submission.	Refer submission 77.1 above.
893	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	77	1	97	67	Strategic Direction	Issues	SDUD-I1		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 77.1 insofar as recognising the environmental benefits resulting from the reduced vehicle kilometres travelled resulting from increasing residential densities within city and suburban centres.	Allow	Refer submission 77.1 above.
894	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	2			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O4	Support	Submitter supports intensification within and adjacent to centres or employment opportunities, and well-served by existing or planned public or active transport	Retain	Noted.
895	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	3			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O5, RESZ-O6, RESZ-O12 and RESZ-O13	Support	Submitter supports the objectives as they seek to ensure that development is supported by adequate infrastructure and services, and that development supports the use of public and active transport in the residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure and Transport sections of the Section 42A Report.
896	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	4			Infrastructure	Policies	RESZ-P7 and RESZ-P16	Support	Submitter supports policies as they require proposals for four or more residential units to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development in the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain	Accept in part. Adopt the proposed policy but with changes as detailed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
897	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	5			Transport	Policies	RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17	Support	Submitter supports policies require proposals for four or more residential units to provide adequate storage for cycle parking on site in the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain	Noted.
898	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	6			Transport	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Support	Submitter supports MD as it requires consideration of whether a good level of connectivity is provided within the site to the existing transport network and to local services and facilities.	Retain	Noted.
899	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	7			Strategic Direction	Objectives	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	This section would benefit from a new objective seeking that mixed use and higher density development supports a reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled.	Amend - add new objective	Reject Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
900	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	77	7	97	68	Strategic Direction	Objectives	Other		Kāinga Ora supports, in part, submission point 77.7 noting it agrees that recognition of the environmental benefits resulting from the reduced vehicle kilometres travelled resulting from increasing residential densities within city and suburban centres is appropriate however, notes that no proposed wording has been provided by the submitter. Therefore, Kāinga Ora reserves its support until such wording is provided and reviewed.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 77.7 above.
901	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	77	7	109	28	Strategic Direction	Objectives	Other		The RVA opposes this submission point in so far as it relates to retirement villages. Due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that this new objective should not apply to retirement villages.	Oppose submission. Do not apply objective to retirement villages.	Refer submission 77.7 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
902	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	77	7	111	28	Strategic Direction	Objectives	Other		Ryman opposes this submission point in so far as it relates to retirement villages. Due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman’s primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that this new objective should not apply to retirement villages.	Oppose submission. Do not apply objective to retirement villages.	Refer submission 77.7 above.
903	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	8			Strategic Direction	Policies	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	This section would benefit from a new policy ensuring that higher density and mixed-use development supports and provides for multi modal transport options, with an emphasis on public transport and active travel.	Amend - add new policy	Reject Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
904	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	77	8	84	11	Strategic Direction	Policies	Other		Support relief sought by submitter because this submission point aligns with Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement	Support submission.	Refer submission 77.8 above.
905	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	77	8	97	69	Strategic Direction	Policies	Other		Kāinga Ora supports, in part, submission point 77.8 noting it agrees that recognition of the environmental benefits resulting from the reduced vehicle kilometres travelled resulting from increasing residential densities within city and suburban centres is appropriate however, notes that no proposed wording has been provided by the submitter. Therefore, Kāinga Ora reserves its support until such wording is provided and reviewed.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 77.8 above.
906	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	77	8	109	29	Strategic Direction	Policies	Other		The RVA opposes this submission point in so far as it relates to retirement villages. Due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA’s primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that this new objective should not apply to retirement villages.	Oppose submission. Allow submission point subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective but otherwise disallow submission point	Refer submission 77.8 above.
907	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	77	8	111	29	Strategic Direction	Policies	Other		Ryman opposes this submission point in so far as it relates to retirement villages. Due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman’s primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that this new objective should not apply to retirement villages.	Oppose submission. Allow submission point subject to the exclusion of retirement villages from this objective but otherwise disallow submission point	Refer submission 77.8 above.
908	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	9			General	Maps	General	Support	Overall, PC9 is considered to have struck an appropriate balance by increasing options for intensification within the City Centre 1 and 3 zones, and providing for high density development in the Residential 2 zone on the outskirts of the city centre. Additionally, the MDRS will be applied across the Residential 1 zone, which accounts for the vast majority of the district’s urban area. Facilitating a concentrated population will support existing and future public and active transport mode initiatives, assisting in reducing emissions and vehicle kilometres travelled. With respect to Ngongotaha and Owkata, the proposed Residential 1 zone MDRS is broadly aligned with the District’s Spatial Plan objectives for additional housing	Retain	Accept PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
909	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	10			Transport	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	There are currently limited public transport options for access to key destinations outside of Ngongotaha, and the area’s relatively low accessibility is noted in the Future Development Strategy	In the future it will be important to ensure that intensification supports a reduction in VKT with the support of active modes and public transport.	Noted.
910	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	11			Residential 2 Zone	Maps	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Consideration should be given extending the Residential 2 zone (High Density) along Tarewa Road, connecting the Lake Road entranceway and Tarewa Place high density areas around the fringe of Kuirau Park. This area is identified as being highly accessible. The same consideration applies to the areas south of York Street and Seddon Street.	Expand residential 2 zone to include Tarewa Place, York Street and Seddon Street.	Reject The spatial extent of the Residential 2 zone has been applied to areas with the highest levels of accessibility to ensure that high density development can be focussed to these areas. See the urban design evidence for further information on the Accessibility and Demand Assessment undertaken. Economic Analysis which has informed PC9 concludes that if the spatial application is too extensive, then it may not adequately encourage the concentration of higher density development into areas which support the function of key nodes. Refer section 42A Report, Accessibility and Demand Assessment, and Economic Assessment.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
911	Bennett, M and S (FS)	77	11	65	1	Residential 2 Zone	Maps	Other		The submitter owns property in Tarewa Road. They oppose the Waka Kotahi submission with respect to increasing density. They are concerned about traffic on narrow road, dangers for bike riders, parking, thermal nature of the area which means traffic would compromise road structure.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 77.111 above.
912	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	77	11	97	70	Residential 2 Zone	Maps	Other		Kāinga Ora supports submission point 77.11 as the proposed expansion of the Residential 2 Zone aligns with the spatial extent sought in its submission.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 77.111 above.
913	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	77	11	104	16	Residential 2 Zone	Maps	Other		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They oppose the extension sought of the Residential 2 Zone, stating that there are existing flooding issues in the area. While the area is highly accessible, development potential enabled by the MDRS is appropriate in this location.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 77.111 above.
914	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	12			Infrastructure	Other	Other	Support	Waka Kotahi is of the view that the intent of the NPS-UD is for ‘down-zoning’ or limitations on development potential to be considered only when other options have been assessed and dismissed. Within Plan Change 9, Waka Kotahi supports Council not having infrastructure as a Qualifying matter.	Retain as notified	Accept. Infrastructure is not proposed as a qualifying matter as sought.
915	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	13			Other	Rule Table	Other	Support	Waka Kotahi considers that noise and vibration requirements support the up zoning by protecting the health and amenity of future residents who will live in the new dwellings. Waka Kotahi notes that there are no proposed changes to the existing reverse sensitivity rules through Plan Change 9. Waka Kotahi is supportive of the existing provisions in the Rotorua District as they are generally consistent with best practice.	Retain as notified	Noted.
916	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency	77	14			Financial Contributions	General	General	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions as a financial tool to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and seeks that consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift. PC9 will enable financial contributions to be charged for permitted residential units. It is proposed to use the building consent process as the trigger for assessment. This approach is supported by Waka Kotahi.	Retain as notified	Accept in part. Adopt the changes proposed to the financial contribution provisions but with the further amendments detailed in response to submission 26.20. Refer to Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report.
917	Percival, J	78	1			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA	Seek amendment / support in part	Understand the intent when we are looking at the property being developed. If this property is alongside or even in the area of properties with shown hazards consideration needs to be given to those hazard areas. i.e. a development in Arthur Street of the nature intended under Residential 1 Zone needs to consider the impact of the overall area, especially with the flood hazard in the area. It is not enough to just say their Resource Consent does not allow that development to impact on any property around it and then try and prove this after the development has happened.	Part b reads “anticipated flooding on site” the surrounding area needs to be brought into this requirement. Onus on the developer ensuring they have the correct outcome within the residential zone.	Accept in part. Refer to the proposed matters of discretion for flood assessment - these relate to other sites and are not limited to the subject site.
918	Percival, J	78	2			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part		More division needed between Residential 1 and Residential 2 Zones when describing activity rules (RESZ-R3) to avoid the lines becoming blurred when shown together (i.e. parking, access and turning). Each of the zone descriptions are quite different. If Zone 2 is to be more high density and a property seen as Zone 1 but close to a Zone 2 area, then decisions could be adjusted or reconsidered because of its close proximity to Zone 2. This could be applied to any of the activities shown – landscaping, design or site coverage and height.	Reject RESZ-R3 is in accordance with the MDRS.
919	Percival, J	78	3			Natural Hazards	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Parts of Rotorua, including Glenholme, are basically built on a lakebed. Dense building appears to go against the grain when viewing from a hazard perspective. Intense building on a site under rez1 with 3 to 6 buildings, either as apartments and definitely as three storeys would appear to place more people in the way of hazards.	No relief stated	Noted. No relief is stated but the submitter's concerns are acknowledged. Refer to Natural Hazards for discussion of geothermal and flooding hazards.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
920	Percival, J	78	4			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I1	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns around how this is achieved and who is to say how a neighbourhood should come together. Is there anticipated calls to Council every time there is a considered change to an individual’s perspective of the “planned future character” of their neighbourhood. In the residential area we have properties of all types, including those described under RESZ-I1 most of have been developed well and have good landscaping, are well looked after/well maintained, do not negate the street appeal or the appearance of the street. Others are the complete reverse. Activities onsite have the ability to impact on the nature/activity, landscaping, and street appeal of the property. Under the introduction to “issues” activities in a Residential Zone, the description given of current resz1 properties makes them sound like they are undesirable – talk of reduced privacy, effects on curb side appeal. There is actually the statement “examples of such effects....” The description as it stands in these new standards maybe attainable when a property is developed as a new subdivision or new complete build but as time goes on this description becomes redundant as each member of a neighbourhood does their own thing with their property.	No relief sought	Reject No specific relief is sought by the submitter.
921	Percival, J	78	5			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Oppose	Submitter is concerned about the outcome within a neighbourhood when a developer (as developers are most likely to be the ones doing such developments) comes in and develops three or more buildings on a site. Would like more emphasis to be put in for developers as they do not have to deal with the ongoing consequences in neighbourhoods, especially when intensification is happening in established neighbourhoods.	Guidelines for developers especially around expectations when dealing with those left in their wake – i.e. existing owners around the site being developed especially older owners of properties around them. Guidelines when working with hazards, not just beside or close to their builds but the impact in close proximity. Council may have requirements for someone building in a flood or geothermal zone but does this ensure the site being developed truly looks at the impact on the sites with hazards? I understand reports can be written and submitted for a resource consent, but are these looking at a greater impact than just on the site being developed.	Reject. This is not relief that can be granted in the plan change. However Council is intending to develop guidelines for geothermal hazards.
922	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter	Oppose in part	The descriptions of the Medium Density Residential Zone (RESZ1) and High Density Residential Zone (RESZ2) do not accurately describe or reflect the actual or current character and amenity of these zones. The descriptions are aspirational, describing how each of the zones may look and feel a the new provisions take effect over time. There ought to be some recognition given that in some places / suburbs, the existing character may or will remain the same for many years to come.	Amendments sought: Description RESZ1 <u>Comprises residential areas such as Ngongotahā, Kāwaha Point, Western Heights, Hillcrest, Springfield and Lynmore. Presently these areas are characterized by a mix of single storey and two-storey houses of various styles and materials. Most sites generally comprise 1-2 dwellings. Overtime as an increase in residential density is enabled by the District Plan it is expected that there will be a gradual transition to Areas used predominantly for residential activities with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings..</u> Description RESZ2 <u>Comprises residential areas with good accessibility to commercial activities, public open space and community services. Within this zone there is currently a mix of single storey and two-storey apartment style living, semi-detached dwellings and dwellings located on smaller cross-lease titles. In comparison to the RESZ1 Zone there is a higher residential density and generally smaller lot sizes. The built environment is dominant and much of the space around buildings is taken up by hard surfacing for car parking and turning. Overtime as an increase in residential density is enabled by the District Plan it is expected that there will be a gradual transition to high density residential activities such</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
923	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	1	109	30	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act, and therefore seek that this submission point is disallowed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 79.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
924	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	1	111	30	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act, and therefore seek that this submission point is disallowed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 79.1 above.
925	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	2			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O1, RESZ-O3, RESZ-O4, RESZ-O5, RESZ-O6, RESZ-O7, RESZ-O8, RESZ-O10, RESZ-O11, RESZ-O12	Support	Support the intent of the objectives as they give effect to the NPS-UD and enable greater intensification.	Retain as notified	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
926	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	3			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Oppose in part	The objective seems to place a large emphasis on changing the existing character and amenity of the RESZ1 Zone. Whilst it's recognised that the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) will enable this, the wording of the objective fails to recognise that there will be many examples or instances where the existing low-density character will be kept or maintained as that is what is desired by the existing landowners or developers. Is it fairer to say that there is likely to be a mix between the existing low density character and medium density residential character. The objective reads as though all new residential development or subdivision shall be required to achieve or contribute to a medium density residential character & buildings will generally be required to be up to three storeys high. Where a subdivision or land development is undertaken in the traditional sense of low density i.e. at a 1 dwelling per 450m2 average and single storey one could say that such a development would be contrary to RESZ-O2. It is understood that this would not be the intended outcome of RESZ-O2. However, the wording of the objective seems to point future development in this direction. There is also a misalignment between the wording of RESZ-O2 and RESZ-P1, where RESZ-P1 recognises there will be a variety of housing typologies and a mix of densities. RESZ-O2 does not acknowledge this.	Amend RESZ-O2 to be consistent with RESZ-P1: Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a <u>variety and mix of housing typologies including</u> medium density residential built character ~~comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys~~ , which may include 3-storey attached and <u>detached dwellings</u> , and low-rise apartments surrounded by open space.	Accept in part Refer the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
927	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	3	109	31	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Act, and therefore seek that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 79.3 above.
928	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	3	111	31	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Act, and therefore seek that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 79.3 above.
929	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	4			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O9	Oppose in part	The objective seems to place a large emphasis on changing the existing character and amenity of the Residential 2 Zone. The objective reads as though all new residential development or subdivision shall be required to achieve or contribute to a high-density residential character & buildings will generally be required to be up to six storeys high. This is not realistic. Where a subdivision or land development does not achieve a high-density residential character it could potentially be considered to be contrary to RESZ-O9. It is understood that this would not be the intended outcome of RESZ-O9 and that there shall still be flexibility to develop or subdivide sites to varying degrees of density.	Amend objective RESZ-O9 to read: Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a <u>variety and mix of housing typologies including</u> high density residential built character, comprising residential buildings ~~generally~~ which <u>may be</u> up to six storeys, integrated with on-site landscaped areas	Accept in part Refer the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
930	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	5			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P2, RESZ-P3, RESZ-P4, RESZ-P5, RESZ-P6. RESZ-P11, RESZ-P11	Support	Support the intent of the objectives as they give effect to the NPS-UD and enable greater intensification	Retain as notified	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
931	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	6			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16	Seek amendment / support in part	Due to the wording of the policy it shall only apply to proposals for four or more residential units. However, there could be situations where proposals for a lesser number of residential units also need to demonstrate adequate infrastructure capacity. Whilst up to 3 units on a residentially zoned site will be permitted in many circumstances, there will still be other circumstances where this is not permitted, i.e. due to a site being affected by a qualifying matter or where a development fails to comply with a relevant performance standard.	Amend: Require proposals that require resource consent ~~for four or more residential units~~ to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
932	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	6	104	17	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the submission. As the submission states, the wording of the policy means it shall only apply to proposals for four or more residential units. This would preclude the ability to require proposals for a lesser number of units to demonstrate adequate infrastructural capacity. Amendments are required to RESZ-P7 and P-16 to require any proposal that requires resource consent to demonstrate adequate capacity.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.6 above.
933	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	7			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	It is understood that the newly introduced MDRS height standards only apply to those activities which fall under the definition of a ‘residential unit’ or ‘residential activity’ When adding a stand-alone or detached garage or ancillary building on a site it is understood that the MDRS height and daylight envelope standards do not apply. However, the maximum height and daylight envelope standards which had applied under the Operative District Plan in RESZ-S1(1)(a)&(b) have been struck out under proposed Plan Change 9, leading one to question what standards do apply for non-residential buildings or activities.	Reinstate RESZ-S1as it applies to non-residential activities or; introduce a new subheading in the residential zone chapter where all the MDRS standards are contained, separate to the non-MDRS standards.	Reject It is not considered necessary to apply a separate height standard to non-residential activities.
934	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	7	104	18	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the submission. Confusion arises as the height & yard requirements which had applied under the Operative District Plan in RESZ-S1(1)(a)&(b) and RESZ-S2(1)-(4) have been struck out under proposed Plan Change 9. It is therefore unclear to the plan user what yard and height requirements apply to non-residential activities.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.7 above.
935	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	8			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2	Seek amendment / support in part	It is understood that the newly introduced MDRS yard standards only apply to those activities which fall under the definition of a ‘residential unit’. For example, when adding a stand-alone or detached garage or ancillary building on a site it is understood that the MDRS yard requirements do not apply as a residential unit is defined as “means a building(s) or part of a building that is used for a residential activity exclusively by one household, and must include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities”. Furthermore, a residential activity is defined as “means the use of land and building(s) for people’s living accommodation”. However, the yard requirements which had applied under the Operative District Plan in RESZ-S2(1)-(4) have been struck out under proposed Plan Change 9, leading one to question what standards do apply for non-residential buildings or activities. Significant uncertainty has already been created in this space.	Reinstate RESZ-S2(1)-(4) as they apply to non-residential activities or; introduce a new subheading in the residential zone chapter where all the MDRS standards are contained, separate to the non-MDRS standards.	Reject It is not considered necessary to apply a separate height standard to non-residential activities.
936	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	8	104	19	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the submission. Confusion arises as the height & yard requirements which had applied under the Operative District Plan in RESZ-S1(1)(a)&(b) and RESZ-S2(1)-(4) have been struck out under proposed Plan Change 9. It is therefore unclear to the plan user what yard and height requirements apply to non-residential activities.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.8 above.
937	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	9			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S3	Support	Support reducing the maximum impermeable surface coverage for sites in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones in order to assist with managing flooding/inundation, infrastructure capacity and to encourage or enhance on-site amenity.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to the standards impervious standards.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
938	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	10			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5	Seek amendment / support in part	Enables a greater number of residential units to be accessed from a shared private access / Right of Way without the need to be vested in Council or designed and built to a public road standard. Where previously the threshold was set at 8+ household units. With enabling greater intensification & infill through the District Plan there is a need to provide enabling performance standards in terms of shared private access. However, this support needs to go hand in hand with increasing the construction standards for shared private access that serves 9-20 residential units.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to additional standards regarding maintenance in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report and evidence of P Meredith. Additional construction standards not considered necessary.
939	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	11			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)	Oppose	The requirement for a minimum separation of 4m between any other building on the same site, where the maximum length of a building above ground floor level shall exceed 22m does not sit well or align with the newly introduced yard standards under RESZ-S2. Under RESZ-S2 buildings are only required to be setback 1m from side and rear boundaries. Thus, RESZ-S6A(5) is potentially requiring a greater separation distance between buildings on the same site than what is required between buildings on separate sites (notwithstanding compliance with daylight envelope standards). Furthermore, once or if each building on the same site were to be subdivided off onto separate titles there would presumably be no requirement for the 4m separation between buildings to remain. The diagram under RESZ-S6A(5) is also presumptuous in terms of where the principal living rooms for each residential unit may be, assuming that the living rooms of each unit will be facing one-another and therefore requiring a 4x4m outlook space/separation distance. This may not be so, and the principal living rooms could be located on other facades.	Delete	Accept in Part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
940	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	11	109	32	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)		The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the RVA’s primary submission and consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and MDRS. The RVA seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 79.11 above.
941	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	11	111	32	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)		Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with Ryman’s primary submission and consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and MDRS. Ryman seeks that this submission point is allowed.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 79.11 above.
942	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	12			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)	Seek amendment / support in part	It is unclear whether the 50% of the area of the front yard which must comprise a landscaped area is in addition to or can be included in the minimum 20% which is required under RESZ-S6A(6)(a)	Amend clause c: At least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area. <u>Note: This area may be included in the minimum 20% landscaped area that is required by a. above</u>	Reject The relief sought is not considered necessary to provide clarity on the standard.
943	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	13			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)	Seek amendment / support in part	Support, however a definition or a diagram explaining what 50% visually open means is required.	Include diagram to provide a visual diagram of a 50% visually open fence	Reject This is not considered to be practicable as there are a range of potential design responses. The Design Guidelines may be updated to provide further guidance.
944	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	14			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	Support, however visual dominance needs to be added to the assessment criteria. A front yard infringement can have the same of not greater visual dominance effects particularly on street scape amenity as a side or rear yard infringement. It is also noted that the assessment criteria for side and rear yard infringements includes whether architectural design measures have been incorporated into the design of buildings to mitigate effects, though this is not applicable to front yard infringements. It is just as, if not more important to ensure that where there are front facing yard infringements to the street and public places that architectural design measures are incorporated to mitigate effects. Also, the ability to safely park in front of a garage door clear of the road (if parking is proposed to be provided on a site) needs to be considered. Especially if only a 1.5m front yard is required, it will become even more important to consider potential effects of a non-compliance with RESZ-S5(3) and potential impacts upon the road carriageway.	Amend matters of discretion in RESZ-MDA - Yards – front yards 1. Effects on the attractiveness of the street 2. Effects on the quality of living environments 3. <u>Effects on the safe and efficient functioning of the transportation network.</u> 4. <u>Whether architectural design measures such as setbacks, modulation, or articulation incorporated into the design of the building to mitigate visual dominance effects on the streetscape.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
945	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	15			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Seek amendment / support in part	Introduces an assessment criteria that could be difficult if not impossible for an applicant to be able to assess applications/non-compliances against. It will be well outside the ability of many lay people as well as some smaller consultancies to know and assess what the potential cumulative effects on the capacity of infrastructure networks and flooding may be. This is high level District Wide or strategic information that only the Council is likely to have knowledge of or accessibility to.	Amend RESZ-MDA - impervious surfaces: Effects, ~~including cumulative effects,~~ on the capacity of infrastructure networks and flooding.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
946	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	79	15	84	12	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA		BOPRC opposes the relief sought by the submitter; Policy IR 5B of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement requires consideration of cumulative effects in contributing to increased risk from natural hazards and effects on the function, efficiency and safety of infrastructure. A developer could ask the Council for the required information about cumulative effects.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
947	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	16			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Seek amendment / support in part	Support the intent of the assessment criteria, however the wording of the assessment criteria is vague and introduces ambiguity. The assessment criteria is immeasurable and non-specific. Who is determine whether a development is visually attractive? as this is very subjective. Is a planning consultant preparing the application and AEE able to make this assessment? Or does it require a specific assessment by an architect or urban designer. What one person defines as visually attractive may differ from the next.	Amend RESZ-MDB - effects on adjoining sites a. Without limiting the ability to achieve the planned future character for the zone, whether: i. The development is designed to ~~be visually attractive when viewed from neighbouring sites and~~ mitigate visual ~~and~~ privacy effects on adjoining sites, through the orientation and design of habitable rooms, <u>outlook spaces and windows</u> and outdoor living spaces relative to adjoining sites, and the use of architectural treatments and landscaping. If the term ‘visually attractive’ is to be maintained then it is suggested that regard be given to specific design attributes such as a) Mass and proportions b) Diversity & range of dwelling types and sizes c) Whether repeated building form is avoided d) Façade detailing and materials And specific explanations or guides should be given. See attached example in full submission from Hastings District Plan	Accept The relief sought is considered to improve the clarity of the provision an effective and efficient means to give effect to RESZ-O4 and RESZ-O11.
948	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	16	104	20	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitters are a group of planning consultants that state that the proposed assessment criteria uses vague and subjective text which is immeasurable. If the term ‘visually attractive’ is to be maintained then specific examples, guidelines or assessment criteria needs to be included in the District Plan to demonstrate what is considered to be ‘visually attractive’ and what needs to be incorporated into the design of buildings.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.16 above.
949	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	17			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P35A	Seek amendment / support in part	Provides for subdivision around existing or approved development. This is something that has long been argued for as in general the effects of subdividing or creating a new title around existing or approved developments are less than minor.	Retain as notified	Accept. Adopt the proposed change to the Policy SUB-35A
950	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	17	104	21	Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P35A		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They support the original submission it removes and reduces the existing barriers to subdividing around existing or approved development.	Support submission.	Accept. Adopt the proposed change to the Policy SUB-35A

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
951	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	18			Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R1, SUB-R4	Support in part	The non-notification clause under SUB-R1 & SUB-R4 is ambiguous and not clear around where notification or affected persons consents are or are not required.	Notification Residential 1 and 2 Zones: a. An application for resource consent for subdivision of land in the Residential 1 or 2Zones associated with the construction and use of <u>no more than 3</u> residential units <u>on a site that does not comply with one or more of the performance standards</u> will be considered without public or limited notification or the need to obtain written approval from affected parties (unless the Council decides that special circumstances exist under the Resource Management Act 1991), <u>provided that the activity complies with all the following performance standards:</u> ~~in the following circumstances:~~ ~~i. The subdivision is associated with the construction and use of no more than 3 residential units on a site that do not comply with 1 or more of the following standards and provided other standards are met:~~ 1. Height RESZ-S1: (1) or (1A) 2. Yards RESZ-S2: (1) 3. Site Coverage RESZ-S3: (1)(a) or (2)(a) 4. Design and Landscaping RESZ-S6: (2)(a)(i) to (ii); (3); (4)(a); and (6)(a) to (b). ii. The subdivision is associated with the construction and use of four or more residential units on a site that comply with the standards in (i)(1) to (4) <u>above</u> , providedthat other performance standards are met. b. Any application for resource consent for an activity not captured by	Reject The notification preclusions in SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 are in accordance with the MDRS.
952	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	18	104	22	Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R1, SUB-R4		The submitters are a group of planning consultants. They state that the non-notification criteria are unclear. The Cheal submission recommends amendments to the notification clauses under SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 to provide better clarity on where applications will be considered without public or limited notification.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.18 above.
953	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	19			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)	Support	Reduction in the minimum site area standards and removal of the 450m2 average site area standard will have the effect of opening up more land for potential in-fill development and the provision of housing. Support the removal of any minimum site area / lot size for subdivision that is in accordance with existing or concurrently approved land use consents as this is consistent with the requirements of Schedule 3A, Part 1, Section 8 of the MDRS standards to be incorporated by specified territorial authorities.	Retain as notified.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
954	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	20			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(2)	Support	Support the requirement to accommodate a shape factor on vacant lots which does not protrude into yards, in order to demonstrate that a future building can be established.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
955	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	21			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S9(2)(b)	Support	Enables a greater number of residential units to be accessed from a shared private access / Right of Way without the need to be vested in Council or designed and built to a public road standard. Where previously the threshold was set at 8+ household units. With enabling greater intensification & infill through the District Plan there was a need to provide enabling performance standards in terms of shared private access. However, this support needs to go hand in hand with increasing the construction standards for shared private access that serves 9-20 residential units. For example, it may be appropriate that the access be surfaced in concretewhich is longer lasting than hot mix or chip seal. There is little guidance or requirements under the Regional Technical Infrastructure Standards (RITS) regarding surfacing of shared private access / Rights of Way. RITS largely defers back to District Plan’s stating “Urban residential private ways are to be in accordance with the relevant District Plan (see Appendix 3A: Transportation Corridor Hierarchy Tables).” The Rotorua District Plan is not listed in Appendix 3A of RITS.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to additional standards regarding maintenance in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report and evidence of P Meredith. Additional construction standards not considered necessary.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
956	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	22			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)	Oppose	The proposed changes will make it more difficult to undertake a cross lease update, cross lease subdivision or unit title subdivision. For example, under the currently operative District Plan all applications shall demonstrate to council that all buildings on the lease areas comply with one of a-g. The changes, perhaps inadvertently will introduce a situation where applications instead need to comply with all of a-d as the word ‘and’ as been added on the end of each clause in the place of ‘or’, i.e. a. Have existing use rights; or a land use consent has been granted; <u>and</u> b. Comply with all building consent requirements, or have a Certificate of Acceptance issued in accordance with the Building Act 2004; <u>or and etc.</u>	Amend: 2. Cross lease, unit title, company lease subdivision All applications associated with cross lease, unit title, or company lease applications shall demonstrate to council that all buildings on the lease areas either: a. Have existing use rights; or a land use consent has been granted; <u>or and</u> b. Comply with all building consent requirements, or have a Certificate of Acceptance issued in accordance with the Building Act 2004; <u>or and</u> c. Will not increase the degree of any non compliance with the density standards in the district plan after subdivision ~~will be created~~ unless there is an approved land use consent; <u>or and</u> d. Comply with the other ~~the~~ relevant provisions of the District Plan for the zone in which the site is located; ~~or~~ and	Reject. The clauses should not be alternatives. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
957	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	23			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O2	Support in Part	Support the inclusion of this objective and understand that it must be incorporated into the District Plan as instructed under Schedule 3A of the RMA 1991, however it is not in the most logical chapter of the District Plan and should be transferred to the Residential Zones chapter as the objective is specific to and only relates to residential zones, rather than applying broadly or over many zones.	Amend: Transfer SDUD-O2 to the Residential Zones chapter	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
958	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	24			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1(1)(a)(i)	Support	Support the lowering of the financial contribution value based on the % of the land value of each additional allotment. Particularly as a new Developments Contribution Policy has been adopted and is to take effect in Dec 2022. The lowering of the financial contributions value strikes a fair balance with introducing development contributions. Also support the changes for the reasons as outlined in the s32 analysis.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to the contribution rates for the reasons given in the Section 32 Report and summarised in the Financial Contributions section of the 42A Report.
959	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	25			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1(1)(c)	Support	Support the clarifications and improvements given to how or when financial contributions may or may not apply to cross-lease sites.	Retain as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed clarifications in FC-R1(1)(c) regarding contributions in relation to cross-lease sites. It is noted that these clarifications were made by simply moving existing text into more sensible locations and headings.
960	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	26			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1(1)	Support in part	Support the removal for the need for Papakāinga activities to be located on land that adjoins or is adjacent to a Marae, as this was a significant constraint and limitation to being able to efficiently deliver and establish Papakāinga housing for Maori and restricted peaking developments to very limited areas. Do not support the introduction of a performance standard which permits kaumatua housing to such a high density within the rural zones. Development at such a high density could potentially have adverse or more than minor character and amenity effects and could potentially be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Rural Zones and also establish a high permitted baseline for other activities. There is also a concern that there is not the sufficient infrastructure in the rural zones to support developments of such scale. Whilst providing for the efficient development of multiple owned Maori whenua and removing barriers to Papakāinga and housing for kaumatua is supported, it is important that a balance is achieved with maintaining rural amenity. It is also important that adequate land areas are provided for on-site effluent disposal. Where the proposed changes will enable one kaumātua flat per 150m2 of land area in the rural zones; this could potentially result in 13 units/flats upon a 2,000m2 area. This is not realistic when the effluent disposal area(s) for 13 units would take up a substantial area upon a 2,000m2 area, thus needing a larger land area.	Amend: Delete the following: The density for kaumātua flats shall not exceed one per 150m2 of land area; Introduce similar density performance standards as to the Rural 3 Zone for both Papakāinga and kaumatua flats in rural zones: The number of residential units or kaumatua flats per site does not exceed one residential unit per 2,000m2 of net site area within areas not serviced by public reticulation for wastewater provided that the requirements of the relevant regional council for the treatment and management of wastewater, including any associated disposal field is met	Accept in part Remove reference to kaumatua flats.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
961	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	27			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3	Oppose	Opposed to any rule which elevates the activity standard for the construction of new buildings in the city centre. This will stymie and disincentives investment in new buildings and development within the CBD. The District Plan and Council should be encouraging and supporting new builds and development that will increase activity and vibrancy in the CBD. Good urban design outcomes can be achieved through having good quality matters of control which incorporate specific building design and site layout requirements. Failure to comply with such performance standards would then enable a greater qualitative assessment of development proposals and ability to decline consents via a restricted discretionary activity status or higher.	Retain the controlled activity status for the construction of new buildings in the City Centre 1 Zone. The matters of discretion under CCZ-MDA – Building Design and Layout to be added or incorporated into the matters of control under CCZ-MC1.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
962	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	27	109	33	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent that it aligns with the RVA’s primary submission, however would seek for a retirement village-specific matters of control / discretion to apply for retirement village buildings. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent that it aligns with RVA's primary submission.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 79.27 above.
963	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	27	111	33	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3		Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent that it aligns with Ryman’s primary submission, however would seek for a retirement village-specific matters of control / discretion to apply for retirement village buildings. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is allowed to the extent that it aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 79.27 above.
964	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	28			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16(1), CCZ-R16A(1)	Oppose	Residential units should not be permitted at ground level/ground floor on any street within the City Centre 1 and 2 Zones, not just Tutanekai Street. It is not an appropriate and efficient use of commercially zoned land for residential units to be established and ground level, where prime retail, commercial and business activities ought to be located. Residential units should be encouraged to be above ground level throughout the City Centre 1 and 2 Zones. With enabling greater residential densities throughout the majority of the RESZ 1 & 2 zones to provide greater housing supply, there shall be little need or demand to provide for residential units at ground level in City Centre Zones.	Amend: CCZ-R16(1) & CCZ R16A(1) 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: The residential unit is not located on the ground floor of ~~Tutanekai Street~~ Delete CCZ-R16(2) & CCZ R16A(2) – Restricted Discretionary Status. Amend: CCZ-R16(3) and CCZ-R16A(3) as follows: 3. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: The residential unit is located on the ground floor of ~~Tutanekai Street~~ .	Accept in Part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
965	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	28	104	23	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16(1), CCZ-R16A(1)		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that it is not an appropriate and efficient use of commercially zoned land for residential units to be established at ground level, where prime retail, commercial and business activities ought to be located. Vibrant and thriving City Centre / mixed use zones can still be achieved through enabling/permitting residential uses above ground level.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.28 above.
966	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	29			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R17	Oppose	Community housing should not be permitted at ground level on any street within the City Centre Zones for the same reasons as above.	Amend: 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: The community housing is not located on the ground floor. ~~Of Tutanekai Street.~~ Delete CCZ-R17(2) Restricted Discretionary Status. Amend CCZ-R17(3) as follows: 3. Activity Status: Discretionary Where: The community is located on the ground floor of ~~Tutanekai Street.~~	Accept in Part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
967	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	29	104	24	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R17		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that community housing should not be permitted at ground level on any street within the City Centre Zones for the same reasons as above. Community housing includes emergency housing. The issues with emergency housing in Rotorua are well known. Accommodating emergency housing within the heart of Rotorua’s CBD is not an appropriate or efficient use of commercially zoned land, where commercial, retail and business activities should be prioritised.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.29 above.
968	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	30			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R21	Oppose	Oppose the increase in activity status from controlled to restricted discretionary. As there is a removal of minimum on-site car parking standards from District Plans in accordance with the NPS-UD, the onus should be on providing more public car parking, not making it more difficult. The increase in activity status to restricted discretionary introduces greater complexity and uncertainty at the consenting stage, as a restricted discretionary activity can be declined, whereas a controlled activity cannot.	Retain the controlled activity status.	Reject The proposed amendment to CCZ-R21 is consistent with the proposed amendments to CCZ-R3, which is further detailed in the City Centre and Commercial Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
969	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	30	109	34	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R21		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission and does not align with the intent of the NPS-UD, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 79.30 above.
970	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	30	111	34	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R21		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission and does not align with the intent of the NPS-UD, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 79.30 above.
971	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	31			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Support	Support the intent of the provision.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
972	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	32			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)	Oppose	Oppose the exemption for residential units to provide any outdoor living space where the net internal floor area for a dwelling is at least 40m2 for a studio and 50m2 as this will not promote, encourage or achieve quality living outcomes.	Delete ~~b. Except that an outdoor living space is not required where the net internal floor area for a dwelling is at least 40m2 for a studio and 50m2 for a dwelling with one or more bedrooms~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
973	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	33			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3(1)	Oppose	Opposed to any rule which elevates the activity standard for the construction of new buildings in the commercial zones. This will stymie and disincentives investment in new buildings and development within the commercial zones and will add additional cost and time delays to new builds. The District Plan and Council should be encouraging and supporting new builds and development that will increase activity and vibrancy within commercial zones. Good urban design outcomes can be achieved through having good quality performance standards which incorporate specific building design and site layout requirements. Failure to comply with such performance standards would then enable a greater qualitative assessment of development proposals via a resource consent process.	Delete the Restricted Discretionary activity status. Retain the permitted activity status.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
974	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	79	33	109	35	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3(1)		The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent that it aligns with the RVA’s primary submission, however would seek for a retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (matters of discretion) to apply for retirement village buildings. The RVA therefore seek that this submission point is allowed to the extent that it aligns with the RVA’s primary submission.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 79.33 above.
975	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	79	33	111	35	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3(1)		Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent that it aligns with Ryman’s primary submission, however would seek for a retirement village-specific permitted activity standards (matters of discretion) to apply for retirement village buildings. Ryman therefore seek that this submission point is allowed to the extent that it aligns with Ryman’s primary submission.	Support submission in part.	Refer submission 79.33 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
976	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	34			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33(1)	Oppose	Many of the existing motels along the Fenton Road Strip in the Commercial 4 Zone are not fit for purpose to be converted to permanent residential units. Many conversions will struggle to comply with the relevant performance standards, especially Residential unit design and landscaping (COMZ-S5) and outdoor living space. The conversion of existing buildings to residential units that do not comply with the performance standards should be discouraged through a non-complying activity status, as those such activities are likely to deliver poor standards of living, social-well being and environmental outcomes. Conversion of existing buildings should be discouraged while new residential units should be promoted, as there is a greater opportunity to achieve and ensure quality building and urban design outcomes are cheved through new builds.	Introduce a new rule COMZ-R33(2) as a non complying activity where any of the performance standard COMZ-S5 or COMZ-S9 are not achieved. <u>3. Activity Status: Non Complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>Compliance not achieved with performance standards</u> <u>COMZ-S5 and COMZ-S9</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
977	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	79	34	104	25	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33(1)		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that many of the existing motels along the Fenton Road Strip in the Commercial 4 Zone are not fit for purpose to be converted to permanent residential units. Conversion of existing buildings to residential units that do not comply with the performance standards should be discouraged through a non-complying activity status, as those activities are likely to deliver poor standards of living, social-wellbeing and environmental outcomes.	Support submission.	Refer submission 79.34 above.
978	Cheal Consultants Limited	79	35			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)	Support	Support the intent of the performance standard to ensure adequate provision of outdoor space per unit, outlook space and landscaped areas in Commercial 4 Zone	Retain as notified.	Noted.
979	M Hitchcock	80	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1	Oppose	I oppose the building of 2 or 3 storey housing in areas that are generally single story at present. I consider it unreasonable to impose higher structures upon existing property occupants.	Amend provision	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
980	Ward, K (FS)	80	1	106	10	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 80.1 above.
981	Gifford, S (FS)	80	1	150	33	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and mostly supports the original submission.	Allow submission but delete PC9 as preferred relief.	Refer submission 80.1 above.
982	Glenbrae Village Limited	81	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3, RESZ-R11	Seek amendment / support in part	Glenbrae Village Limited supports in part the enabling of three residential units to be established per site subject to compliance with standards and the rule for 4+ residential units per site but seeks that its intended development in Ensor Place to provide independent retirement villas be assessed under that rule. It considers this development would be consistent with that rule and the definition of residential activity and not as a 'Rest Home' [Discretionary Activity, RESZ-R11]. The submitter seeks the removal of barriers to establish additional independent retirement units which are fundamentally residential in nature. While the MDRS and PC9 introduce a potentially useful permitted baseline argument it is still costly and inefficient to require resource consent for a development that is for all intents and purposes otherwise provided for as a permitted activity.	Provide for the operators of retirement villages, such as Glenbrae Village Ltd to be able to expand or develop sites as a permitted activity under RESZ-R3(1) where no more than 3 residential units are proposed per site and where the development will comply with the relevant performance standards. This may be achieved by undertaking consequential amendments to the definition of ‘residential activity’ and ‘residential unit’ under Part 1 – Definitions	Accept Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
983	Elad Trustee Limited (FS)	81	1	81	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1		The submitter is a resident of the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission that permitted 3 storey residential development in an adhoc manner across the entire Residential 1 Zone will destroy the existing amenity environment across the city.	Support submission.	Refer submission 80.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
984	Glenbrae Village Limited	81	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose in part	Glenbrae Village Limited supports in part the enabling of three residential units to be established per site subject to compliance with standards and the rule for 4+ residential units per site but seeks that its intended development in Ensor Place to provide independent retirement villas be assessed under that rule. It considers this development would be consistent with that rule and the definition of residential activity and not as a 'Rest Home' [Discretionary Activity, RESZ-R11]. The submitter seeks the removal of barriers to establish additional independent retirement units which are fundamentally residential in nature. While the MDRS and PC9 introduce a potentially useful permitted baseline argument it is still costly and inefficient to require resource consent for a development that is for all intents and purposes otherwise provided for as a permitted activity. The submitter seeks to provide further clarity that the term 'residential unit' also applies to self-sufficient or independent retirement units or villas contained within a retirement village. Thus, enabling the provision of this style of dwelling/residential unit through Rule RESZ-R3(1) or Rules RESZ-R3(3) and consequential amendments to the definition of Rest Home.	Amend definition of residential building: means a building(s) or part of a building that is used for a residential activity exclusively by one household, and must include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities. This includes self-sufficient or independent retirement units, apartments or villas contained with a retirement village. Amend definition of Rest Home: A multi-unit housing facility intended for the elderly where additional facilities are provided which may include provision of meals, gathering spaces, recreation, and some form of wellness or medical facilities. For clarification this definition does not apply to situations where independent retirement units, apartments or villas may be established in addition to an existing rest home or retirement village. In this situation refer to the definition of residential unit.	Reject Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
985	Firstgas Limited	82	1							*withdrawn		
986	Shekell, G	83	1			Other	Definitions	General	Oppose	Rotorua does not need a plan change.	Leave definitions as is.	Reject Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
987	Shekell, G	83	2			Strategic Direction	General	General	Oppose	Rotorua does not need this direction. There is plenty of greenfield subdivisions if developers apply.	Delete provisions.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
988	Shekell, G	83	3			Historical & Cultural Values	Rule Table	HH-R2A	Oppose	No new buildings on cultural or historic sites.	Delete provisions.	Reject. Retain rule as notified. Refer to Historic Heritage Section of the Section 42A Report.
989	Shekell, G	83	4			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R8	Support	Support new geothermal standard	Support standard	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
990	Shekell, G	83	5			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1	Oppose	Does not support changes relating to MDRS - should be no amendment to lot sizes in RESZ1 and 2 Zones	No amendment to lot sizes.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
991	Shekell, G	83	6			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43	Support	Support subdivision rules for flood areas	Support changes	Accept in part. Refer to recommended further changes in discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
992	Shekell, G	83	7			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1	Oppose	Opposes reduction in contribution rates.	Delete.	Reject. Adopt the changes proposed to the rate of contributions for the reasons given in the Section 32 Report and the Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report.
993	Shekell, G	83	8			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1	Support	Supports extension of contributions for reserves to permitted activities	Support changes	Accept. Adopt the proposed extension of contributions to permitted activities for the reasons given in the Section 32 Report and Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report.
994	Shekell, G	83	9			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Support	Supports removal of requirement to locate adjacent to marae	Support changes	Accept. Remove performance standard PK-R1(1)(c)
995	Shekell, G	83	10			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Oppose	Opposes changes to densities - use existing densities	Delete. Use existing densities.	Accept in part Refer to recommended amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development in Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
996	Shekell, G	83	11			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Oppose	Associated activities for Papakāinga are too vague. Only residential housing.	Delete.	Accept Refer to recommended changes to clarify associated activities.
997	Shekell, G	83	12			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	Leave Residential 1 and Residential 2 zones as they are.	Delete changes. Don't change the names of the zones.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
998	Shekell, G	83	13			Residential 3 Zone	General	General	Support	Supports leaving Residential 3 zone as it is.	Support leaving Residential 3 as it is.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
999	Shekell, G	83	14			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Oppose	No amendment of activity status – residential supported in city centre but not in neighbourhood centres	Amend activity status commercial 3 Zone.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1000	Shekell, G	83	15			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	Supports 7 stories in the CBD	Supports 7 stories in the CBD.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1001	Shekell, G	83	16			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5	Oppose	Policy for quality design very vague	Amend policy wording - less vague.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1002	Shekell, G	83	17			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4	Support	Supports rules to manage flooding	Support rule	Accept in part. Refer to recommended further changes in discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1003	Shekell, G	83	18			Development Areas	General	General	Oppose	Supports subdivision but keep standards as they were.	Delete.	Reject. Council is required to meet the requirements of the MDRS. Refer to development area section of this report.
1004	Shekell, G	83	19			Development Areas	General	General	Support	Supports rules to prevent building within 400m of any caldera rim.	Support no development at Caldera Rim skyline.	Accept. Noting that no amendments proposed through the Plan Change. Refer development area section of this report.
1005	Shekell, G	83	20			Infrastructure	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	Noise management airport - see relief sought	Lower to 40 db and exclude any exceptions. Change flight path of airport	Reject. Make no changes to these provisions.
1006	Shekell, G	83	21			Transport	Standards	Appendix 1	Support	Support traffic assessment	Support	Accept. Adopt the transport assessment. Refer to Transport section in the Section 42A Report.
1007	Shekell, G	83	22			Natural Hazards	Maps	Maps	Oppose	Hazard information is important.	Leave flood maps in the plan.	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1008	Shekell, G	83	23			Natural Hazards	Standards	RESZ-S3	Oppose	Seeks stricter impervious standards	Require even stricter impervious standards	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1009	Sigma Consultants	84	1			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	The submission supports residential activity in City Centre 1 and 3 Zones but has concerns about height - see separate submission point. Focusing residential development into the CCZ1 and 3 Zones will help bring activity and spending into the CBD. *Council’s Housing and Business Capacity Assessment anticipates that there will be limited demand for apartment living in Rotorua. Focusing this demand into the areas most suitable for it is supported. *As such, the overall approach of the plan change which continues to enable residential units with improved performance standards, and a considered consent framework for new buildings, is supported.	See specific relief sought in other points	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1010	Dahm, J and J (FS)	84	1	61	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They support the need for higher density development from the perspective of both affordable housing and addressing climate change. They support the points made in the original submission, specifically that apartment development is best suited to the City Centre 1 (CBD) and 3 (Lakefront) Zones to help revitalise the CBD (especially post Covid) and given the investment in the CBD (Lakefront SHMPAC, Museum, Government Gardens, Kuirau Park).	Support submission 84.1.	Refer submission 84.1 above.
1011	Brandley, D (FS)	84	1	87	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They support the original submission, recognising the need to support higher density housing from the perspective of affordable housing and climate change. They support the point that such housing is best suited to the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones to help revitalise the CBD and given the investment in the CBD.	Support submission 84.1	Refer submission 84.1 above.
1012	Champan, L (FS)	84	1	88	2	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They support the original submission, recognising the need to support higher density housing from the perspective of affordable housing and climate change. They support the point that such housing is best suited to the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones to help revitalise the CBD and given the investment in the CBD.	Support submission 84.1	Refer submission 84.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1013	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	1	104	26	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state they support high density residential development within the CBD to help revitalise the area, provide housing choice and reduce travel demand.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.1 above.
1014	Sigma Consultants	84	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Oppose	The submission makes the following comments in relation to height in City Centre 1 and 3 Zones: * the height limit has decreased from 35m in the District Scheme (1985) down to 20m in the District Plan (1998). These previous plans also included rules managing sunlight to the footpath opposite the building. * Sunlight access at street level matters in tourist city like Rotorua. Activities within the CBD are likely to be dominated by tourist accommodation, residential activities and supporting activities, retail and hospitality along with offices. * A more refined approach to height is needed taking into consideration: - The tourism focus of Rotorua/aspiration for a more vibrant CBD/hospitality focus e.g. outdoor dining (sunlight at midday and in the evenings, morning less important); public recreation areas e.g. Te Manawa - Orientation of streets - Impact on viewshafts - A stepped height limit to maximise the potential for views from buildings further into the CBD * The change in height proposed in the CCZ3 is limited. However, the lakefront is a sensitive location. The implications on the lakefront, if any, do not appear to have been assessed. See Section 2 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain the current maximum height of 20m or Undertake further assessment of the proposed height limits and amend performance standards to reflect.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1015	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	2	104	27	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They agree that the height limit needs to take into consideration sunlight access to footpaths and key public spaces, consider viewshafts and maximise views.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.2 above.
1016	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	2	109	36	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.2 above.
1017	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	2	111	36	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.2 above.
1018	Sigma Consultants	84	3			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose	The submission opposes residential activity in City Centre 2 Zone. The CCZ2 Zone is focused on ‘large format’ and vehicle orientated retail and smaller retail stores and food and beverage outlets within the main mall precinct’. The proposal to enable residential development has the potential to create reverse sensitivity issues/conflicts between large format business activities and residential activities. The S32 Report identifies the risk of displacement of existing large format businesses. (Development has been occurring in this zone since 1995) The location is also a poor environment for residential activity (see photos in Supporting Document, App 1). The NPS UD is about enabling more residential development especially in accessible locations. But alongside this, it also recognises the importance of businesses in creating well-functioning urban environments. The proposal to enable residential development within the CCZ2 Zone is inconsistent with achieving a well-functioning urban environment. Given the limited demand for vertically stacked apartments within Rotorua it is considered more appropriate that these be located in the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones, while the large format retail zoning is retained. See Section 2 of the supporting document for more information	Retain non-complying activity status for residential units in ODP and see other specific submission points	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1019	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	3	104	28	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the submission for the reasons given in the submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.3 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1020	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	3	109	37	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.3 above.
1021	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	3	111	37	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.3 above.
1022	Sigma Consultants	84	4			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	The proposed 24m height limit for the City Centre 2 Zone is supported. See Section 2 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain the 24m height limit proposed in PC9 for CCZ2.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1023	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	4	104	29	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the proposed 24m height limit in the CCA2 Zone.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.4 above.
1024	Sigma Consultants	84	5			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	The submission supports limited residential activity in the Commercial 1 Zone at Ngongotaha. The Commercial 1 Zone at Ngongotahā may be a suitable location for higher density residential development in future but at present: • there is limited demand for apartment living, • there is a limited range of services and activities, • the location would not provide a good environment for high density residential development. The existing provisions which enable residential development in the COMZ1 to a maximum height of 12m are considered appropriate in the context of both Ngongotahā and Policy 5 of the NPS UD. Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	See relief sought in relation to height in separate submission point. Outside the plan change process: • consider the need, and if appropriate the most suitable location for apartments as part of wider structure planning for Ngongotahā.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1025	Sigma Consultants	84	6			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	The heights proposed are out of proportion with the size and scale of Ngongotahā (population ~ 5000) and are more consistent with a Auckland Zoning (e.g. THAB zone). Rotorua is a Tier 2 Council. Policy 3 of the NPS UD does not apply. The Commercial 1 Zone at Ngongotahā may be a suitable location for higher density residential development in future but at present: • there is limited demand for apartment living, • there is a limited range of services and activities, • the location would not provide a good environment for high density residential development. The existing provisions which enable residential development in the COMZ1 to a maximum height of 12m are considered appropriate in the context of both Ngongotahā and Policy 5 of the NPS UD. Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain the 12m height limit in the ODP.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1026	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	6	104	30	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support retention of the existing 12m height limit for Ngongotaha for the reasons set out in the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.6 above.
1027	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	6	109	38	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.6 above.
1028	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	6	111	38	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.6 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1029	Sigma Consultants	84	7			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose	The submission opposes high density residential activity in COMZ2 Zone. The proposed rule framework for the COMZ2 Zone primarily focuses on the design of individual buildings and assumes that the environment is suitable for high density apartment living. An assessment of the four areas zoned COMZ2 is set out in the Supporting Document (Section 4). Based on this assessment, it is not considered that these areas are necessarily suitable for residential development or that any development would need to be carefully managed (beyond simply considering building design). It is considered that a more robust rule framework should be used to assess applications for apartments within this zone that comprehensively looks at how any proposal fitted within the wider context of activities in the zone, and whether the proposal would create a suitable residential environment. The ODP classes residential units that exceed the height limit as a RD Activity providing a consent pathway for assessing apartments within these areas. The Market Economics Assessment anticipates limited demand for vertically stacked development within the Rotorua market. It is considered that this demand is better located within the City Centre (1 and 3 Zones) given both the amenities within the city centre and the potential for this to add vibrancy. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	See relief sought in relation to height in separate submission points.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1030	Sigma Consultants	84	8			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	The heights proposed for COMZ2 are significantly greater than the current standard (12m) and those of other Tier 2 Councils for town or suburban centres (8 – 12m, one exception in Nelson: 21m). Few buildings in the CBD have been constructed at this height. It is not considered that the height proposed reflects the current or future Rotorua environment. Rotorua is a Tier 2 Council. Policy 3 of the NPS UD does not apply. The proposed rule framework for the COMZ2 Zone primarily focuses on the design of individual buildings and assumes that the environment is suitable for high density apartment living. See Section 3 and 4 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain the 12m height limit in the ODP.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1031	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	8	104	31	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support retention of the existing 12m height limit for the COMZ2 Zone for the reasons set out in the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.8 above.
1032	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	8	109	39	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.8 above.
1033	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	8	111	39	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.8 above.
1034	Sigma Consultants	84	9			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose in part	The height limit for COMZ3 Zone is ambiguous where there is more than 1 ‘immediately adjoining zone’ e.g. along Lake Road. Given the majority of Commercial 3 is surrounded by Residential 1 it is requested that a 11m+1m height limit for the Zone is specified.	a. No building or structure shall exceed ~~the maximum permitted height in the immediately adjoining zone 11m~~ above the natural ground level, except that 50% of a building’s roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1m, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown on the following diagram: {insert diagram used elsewhere}	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1035	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	9	109	40	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as not all of the Commercial 3 Zone is surrounded by Residential 1 Zoned land, and may therefore impose an over-restrictive height limit, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.9 above.
1036	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	9	111	40	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as not all of the Commercial 3 Zone is surrounded by Residential 1 Zoned land, and may therefore impose an over-restrictive height limit, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.9 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1037	Sigma Consultants	84	10			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose in part	The submission seeks to amend the rules relating to residential activities in COMZ4 Zone and the objectives, policies and specific design controls for Fenton Street. Fenton Street Fenton Street is an important tourist gateway to the City. It is reasonable to anticipate the redevelopment of buildings along Fenton Street within the timeframes of the District Plan provisions. The proposed design controls do not adequately recognise the importance of Fenton Street as the tourism gateway to Rotorua. Residential Activity Tourist accommodation needs to be the primary activity enabled along Fenton Street. Cumulative effect The cumulative effect of generic building controls and an increase in the range of activities that occur along Fenton Street will change the character and potentially the ‘tourist gateway’ concept. This needs to be properly thought through, especially in the context of Rotorua. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain current ODP provisions for Fenton Street. OR Develop specific design controls for Fenton Street that recognise the street as a tourist gateway. Consider development of a specific overlay for Fenton Street. Ensure objectives and policies recognise the importance of Fenton Street as a tourist accommodation gateway.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1038	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	10	104	32	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the submission for the reasons given in the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.10 above.
1039	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	10	109	41	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.10 above.
1040	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	10	111	41	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.10 above.
1041	Sigma Consultants	84	11			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	Fenton Street Fenton Street is an important tourist gateway to the City. It is reasonable to anticipate the redevelopment of buildings along Fenton Street within the timeframes of the District Plan provisions. The proposed design controls do not adequately recognise the importance of Fenton Street as the tourism gateway to Rotorua. Greater height may be appropriate but this needs to be carefully considered in light of the surrounding environment/gateway Height in relation to boundary The height in relation to boundary controls, especially in relation to the Residential 2 Zone, have the potential to enable development that will have significant adverse effects on adjoining properties. As such, these standards are opposed. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain current ODP provisions for Fenton Street. OR Ensure height in relation to boundary controls adequately protect the amenity of residential activities in adjoining zones.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1042	Joseph, W (FS)	84	11	93	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitter lives in Glenholme and states that they are potentially affected by the changes to height in Fenton Street. They support the Sigma submission, stating that as the Commercial 4 Zone is only one lot deep the impact on adjacent properties could be significant in terms of loss of privacy, shading and loss of amenity. They support the arguments in the original submission	Support submission 84.11	Refer submission 84.11 above.
1043	Murphy, G and R (FS)	84	11	112	1	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitters are Rotorua residents and support the initial submission for the arguments given.	Support submission 84.11	Refer submission 84.11 above.
1044	Sigma Consultants	84	12			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	Mountain Road The proposed height limit for Mountain Road has the potential to have significant effects on the landscape values associated with Mount Ngongotahā (identified as an Outstanding Natural Landscape). The zoning of this area as a City Entranceway is an existing anomaly in the District Plan. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain 12m height limit for Mountain Road in the ODP.	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1045	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	12	104	33	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that they support the retention of the 12m height limit for the COMZ4 Zone on Mountain Road due to the potential impact on landscape values. It is noted that the maximum height of 12m as set out in the operative District Plan is not in itself supported within a highly visible and sensitive landscape.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.12 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1046	Sigma Consultants	84	13			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	Lake Road The zone is not an ‘entranceway’ in the same sense as Fenton Street is. There are a small number of motels within the zone. The character of the wider environment along Lake Road is predominantly single storey with a mix of light industrial, trade retail, accommodation and housing. Land to the north is low density residential. Enabling 24m high buildings along a short stretch (400m) of this road would be out of character. Finally, there are natural hazards which may, or may not, affect the ability to develop at the heights and densities proposed. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain 12m height limit for Lake Road in the ODP.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1047	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	13	104	34	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They state that they support the retention of the 12m height limit for the COMZ4 Zone on Lake Road for the reasons given in the initial submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.13 above.
1048	Sigma Consultants	84	14			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Oppose	The issues with enabling residential development, especially vertically stacked apartment, in COMZ6 Zone are similar to the City Centre 2 Zone. Residential activities raise issues in relation to: • Potential for reverse sensitivity, and as has been identified in the S32 Report, potential to displace existing businesses • Conflicts between uses • Overall suitability of the environment for residential living. However, the Commercial 6 Zone has some additional issues affecting its suitability for residential use: • The limited accessibility fo the site (See Section 4 of Supporting Document) • Other permitted uses within the area (trade retail, motor vehicle repair garages, and garden centres) • Established uses within the zone, primarily Mitre 10. This combination of issues makes the zone unsuitable for high density residential activities. The proposed changes to the rule framework enabling residential uses is therefore opposed. The additional height proposed is therefore unnecessary. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain ODP non-complying activity status for residential activities.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1049	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	14	109	42	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.14 above.
1050	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	14	111	42	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.14 above.
1051	Sigma Consultants	84	15			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	The issues with enabling residential development, especially vertically stacked apartment, in COMZ6 Zone are similar to the City Centre 2 Zone. Residential activities raise issues in relation to: • Potential for reverse sensivity, and as has been identified in the S32 Report, potential to displace existing businesses • Conflicts between uses • Overall suitability of the environment for residential living. However, the Commercial 6 Zone has some additional issues affecting its suitability for residential use: • The limited accessibility fo the site (See Section 4 of Supporting Document) • Other permitted uses within the area (trade retail, motor vehicle repair garages, and garden centres) • Established uses within the zone, primarily Mitre 10. This combination of issues makes the zone unsuitable for high density residential activities. The proposed changes to the rule framework enabling residential uses is therefore opposed. The additional height proposed is therefore unnecessary. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain ODP height.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1052	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	15	109	43	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.15 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1053	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	15	111	43	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.15 above.
1054	Sigma Consultants	84	16			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the creation of a high density residential zone. Potential for significant amenity effects on surrounding properties. Amenity effects can be considered at the plan change stage under Policy 6 of the NPS UD. Councils economic assessment finds: • Limited demand for high density vertically stacked apartments in Rotorua context. • The capacity for vertically attached dwellings ... is substantive relative to projected demand. (pg 31) • ‘In smaller urban economies, intensification patterns around centres are instead more likely to be characterised by medium density attached dwellings, such as those provided for within the MDR zone or the MDRS provisions’ (pg 51) Given the potential effects on neighbours versus the demand, capacity and likely development patterns it is not considered that this zoning is justified. HBA and future plan changes provided opportunities to review in future. See Section 4 of Supporting Document for more.	Rezone the Residential 2 Zone to Residential 1. Undertake consequential changes to provisions relating to the Residential 2 Zone to reflect this.	Reject The spatial extent of the Residential 2 zone has been applied to areas with the highest levels of accessibility to ensure that high density development can be focussed to these areas. See the urban design evidence for further information on the Accessibility and Demand Assessment undertaken. Economic Analysis which has informed PC9 concludes that if the spatial application is too extensive, then it may not adequately encourage the concentration of higher density development into areas which support the function of key nodes. Refer section 42A Report, Accessibility and Demand Assessment, and Economic Assessment.
1055	McCandlish, S (FS)	84	16	9	1	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the Sigma submission. They oppose high rise development - it will not be a healthy environment to bring up children.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1056	Whimp, D (FS)	84	16	39	1	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns two properties in the Residential 1 Zone [including in Glenholme]. The submitter supports Sigma's position and reasons for why the Residential 2 zoning is not appropriate or needed.	Support submission 84.16	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1057	Berry, C and P (FS)	84	16	57	1	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They support the original submission. They consider that the heights are inappropriate due to concerns about privacy, sunlight and heating. Anything exceeding two stories would have a considerable effect on privacy for neighbouring properties and sense of security. Increased heights and population intensification would lead to stress on services which would have to be addressed by ratepayers.	Support submission 84.16	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1058	Dahm, J and J (FS)	84	16	61	2	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They support the original submission for the reasons give in the submission and consider the zoning is not appropriate and is not needed.	Support submission 84.16	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1059	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	84	16	64	8	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission and consider that the effects on accepted residential amenity values from reclassifying the Residential 2 Zone to 'High density' will be horrendous. The ability to block a neighbour's direct sunlight for up to six months of the year with no requirement for a resource consent will mean a significant drop in the values of affected properties. The submitter supports the comments made by Sigma about the potential for significant effects on the amenity of residents in terms of daylight, sunlight and associated warmth, outlook and privacy.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1060	Brandley, D (FS)	84	16	87	2	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They support the original submission and oppose the high-density zone for the reasons given in the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1061	Chapman, L (FS)	84	16	88	1	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They support the original submission and oppose the high-density zone for the reasons given in the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1062	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	84	16	104	35	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitters are a group of professional planning consultants. They support the concerns raised by the submitter in relation to the proposed high-density zone, and support rezoning this area to Residential 1 or similar changes to strike an appropriate balance between demand for housing and maintaining appropriate amenity levels for existing residents.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1063	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	16	109	44	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1064	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	16	111	44	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1065	Furniss, J (FS)	84	16	132	1	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the plan change. They state their experience with high density living in the UK and consider that it does not work - is associated with crime and becomes slums, whereas examples of housing integrated with social housing in 'normal housing' has been a success. Instead infill on quarter acre sections or build a new town 10km out with public transport.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.16 above.
1066	Sigma Consultants	84	17			Papakāinga	Policies	PK-R1	Oppose	There is a large area (77ha) of residentially zoned whenua Māori located on the eastern side of the lake. The proposed provisions risk enabling adhoc development and compromising the overall development potential of this land. The development of a structure plan would provide better outcomes. See section 5 of Supporting Document.	1. Retain current District plan provisions for Papakāinga in urban areas. 2. Outside the scope of the plan change, a recommendation to local and central government to consider funding the development of a structure plan for this area led by landowners.	Reject Acknowledge that a Council led structure plan for the Eastside could assist in integrating development however the timing for this does not align with PC9.
1067	Sigma Consultants	84	18			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Zone Description	Oppose	Residential development within the CCZ2 Zone has the potential to create: • reverse sensitivity issues and as identified in s32 report: displacement of existing LFR businesses • conflicts between users, and • a poor-quality residential environment unless carefully managed. See Section 2 of Supporting Document for more.	City Centre 2 Zone This zone provides for a range of retail and commercial outlets with a focus on large format and vehicle orientated retail, and smaller retail stores and food and beverage outlets within the main mall precinct. ~~Accommodation is enabled above ground floor level.~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1068	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	84	18	97	71	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Zone Description		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 84.18 as it is considered that it is appropriate to provide for residential activities as one of a range of activities enabled within the City Centre Zone	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.18 above.
1069	Sigma Consultants	84	19			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	CCZ-12	Support	Support consenting framework for new buildings.	Retain wording as notified	Noted.
1070	Sigma Consultants	84	20			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5	Seek amendment / support in part	The City Centre 1 and 3 Zones provide significant development capacity and the potential for high quality living environments. See Section 2 of Supporting Document for more.	Encourage the provision of high amenity residential units ~~within the City Centre 1 and 3 zones.~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1071	Sigma Consultants	84	21			Transport	Policies	CCZ-P5	Seek amendment / support in part	Rotorua is compact, cycle friendly city. Ensuring future workplaces and apartments have facilities for cyclists, walkers, scooter users, etc. will help enable and encourage people to use active transport with associated benefits in reducing carbon emissions.	This will be achieved by ensuring residential units provide good quality outdoor living spaces, outlook spaces, storage spaces (<u>including cycle parking</u>), appropriate noise insulation, and are of a size and shape that will enable for the functional use of the units.	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
1072	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	84	21	84	13	Transport	Policies	CCZ-P5		Support relief sought by submitter. Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement directs to actively promote travel demand management, including by reducing the use of private motor vehicles and ensuring adequate provision for and increased use of cycling networks. If cycling networks are to be provided and their use increased, cycle storage must be provided.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.21 above.
1073	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	21	109	45	Transport	Policies	CCZ-P5		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages (whose residents, due to age and mobility constraints, do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only).	Disallow submission. retirement villages are excluded from the cycle parking provisions, or otherwise seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 84.21 above.
1074	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	21	111	45	Transport	Policies	CCZ-P5		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages (whose residents, due to age and mobility constraints, do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only).	Disallow submission. retirement villages are excluded from the cycle parking provisions, or otherwise seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 84.21 above.
1075	Sigma Consultants	84	22			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2	Support	Support RD activity status for larger alterations to buildings	Note, minor amendment, should 'Exception refer to CCZ-R2' (not R3) (see bottom of table)	Accept This reference has been amended.
1076	Sigma Consultants	84	23			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R15	Oppose	Oppose residential units and associated home based businesses in CCZ2.	Applicable Spatial Layers: City Centre 1 ~~and 2~~ Zones <u>Applicable Spatial Layers City Centre 2 Zone.</u> <u>3. Activity Status: Non-Complying.</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1077	Sigma Consultants	84	24			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16	Seek amendment / support in part	Residential development within the CCZ2 Zone has the potential to create: • reverse sensitivity issues and as identified in s32 report: displacement of existing LFR businesses • conflicts between users, and • a poor-quality residential environment unless carefully managed. Vertically stacked apartments better enabled in CCZ1 and 3 where amenity is higher and would more effectively support vibrancy of central city. See Section 2 of Supporting Document for more.	Applicable Spatial Layers City Centre 1 ~~and 2~~ Zones <u>Applicable Spatial Layers City Centre 2 Zone</u> <u>4. Activity Status: Non-Complying</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1078	Sigma Consultants	84	25			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A	Seek amendment / support in part	Residential development within the CCZ2 Zone has the potential to create: • reverse sensitivity issues and as identified in s32 report: displacement of existing LFR businesses • conflicts between users, and • a poor-quality residential environment unless carefully managed. Vertically stacked apartments better enabled in CCZ1 and 3 where amenity is higher and would more effectively support vibrancy of central city.	Applicable Spatial Layers City Centre 1 ~~and 2~~ Zones- <u>Applicable Spatial Layers City Centre 2 Zone</u> <u>4. Activity Status: Non-Complying</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1079	Sigma Consultants	84	26			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R21	Support	Support the direction of the rule.	Not specified.	Noted.
1080	Sigma Consultants	84	27			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Support	Height CCZ2 Support the direction of the rule re: CCZ2.	Not specified.	Noted.
1081	Sigma Consultants	84	28			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	1. Request inclusion of a minimum floor area where more than 1 bedroom. 2. Include consequential change to the outdoor living exception if Commissioners are minded to provide exemption from requirement for outdoor living. 3. Admin correction	Amend CCZ-S4(1): Minimum size of residential units a. The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 35m2 b. The minimum net floor area of a 1 bedroom unit shall be 45m2 <u>{include minimum floor area for 2+ units}</u> ☐	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1082	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	28	109	46	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. The RVA therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.28 above.
1083	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	28	111	46	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. Ryman therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.28 above.
1084	Sigma Consultants	84	29			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	Outdoor living space: Reasons: In existing buildings: Outdoor living areas would help to support vibrant commercial centres and healthy living environments. Considered reasonable to require in new buildings but not existing. ~~Internal~~ – consistent measurement with s4.1 above. ~~Dwelling~~ – consistent terms.	Amend CCZ-S4(2) Residential units must have an outdoor living space: ... b. Except that an outdoor living space is not required <u>in existing buildings</u> where the net ~~internal~~ floor area for a <u>dwelling residential unit</u> is at least: • 40m2 for a studio ~~and~~ • 50m2 for a dwelling with one ~~or more~~ bedrooms; <u>and</u> • XXm2 for a dwelling with two or more bedrooms. {XX – use same figure as in CCZ-S4 above}	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1085	Sigma Consultants	84	30			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA(14)	Support	Building Design and Site Layout: Consideration of rubbish storage is important.	Retain provision	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1086	Sigma Consultants	84	31			Transport	Standards	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Request inclusion of cycle parking standard for new buildings – adds additional weight to the proposed Matter of Discretion. Proposed standard based broadly on Christchurch City Council provisions.	Include new standard: CCZ-SX <u>Cycle Parking Standard</u> : a. At least the following number of cycle spaces shall be <u>provided</u> : <u>Residential units: 1 space per dwelling</u> <u>Commercial activity: 1 space per 150m2 net floor area,</u> <u>and one locker per cycle park.</u> Consequential changes to ensure references in relevant rules (New Buildings) ☒	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1087	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	31	109	47	Transport	Standards	Other		The RVA considers that the provision of cycle spaces for residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only. Disallow submission point.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.32 above.
1088	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	31	111	47	Transport	Standards	Other		Ryman considers that the provision of cycle spaces for residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only. Disallow submission point.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.32 above.
1089	Sigma Consultants	84	32			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	Mixed use development is appropriate in some zones (Com 1 – 4) while in other zones (Com 5 – 6) this raises potential reverse sensitivity issues. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Amend Issue: Providing living opportunities within <u>some</u> centres supports a greater range of housing choices in Rotorua	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1090	Sigma Consultants	84	33			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I2	Seek amendment / support in part	Lake Road Commercial 4 Zone is a small strip surrounded by a range of other zones and subject to natural hazards. It is too small to be an entranceway and isn’t suitable as a high-density environment – see See Section 3 (3.70 – 3.77) of Supporting Document for more.	Amend Issue: On the southern entranceway to Rotorua along Fenton Street ~~and western entranceway along Lake Road~~ (Commercial 4 Zone), quality design is important to enhance the visual amenity of these key gateways to the city centre ...	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1091	Sigma Consultants	84	34			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2	Seek amendment / support in part	Mixed use development is appropriate in some zones (Com 1 – 4) while in other zones (Com 5 – 6) this raises potential reverse sensitivity issues. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Amend objective: Commercial buildings and activities positively contribute to the ~~mixed use~~ character, safety and efficiency, and attractiveness of commercial centres and entranceways to Rotorua.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1092	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	34	109	48	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.34 above
1093	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	34	111	48	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.34 above
1094	Sigma Consultants	84	35			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O3A	Support		[Retain]: Residential development provides healthy, safe, and quality living environments for residents.	Noted.
1095	Sigma Consultants	84	36			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P1	Oppose	Oppose to the extent that this policy and supporting rules/performance standards are intended to enable 5 – 6 storey buildings and vertically stacked apartments in commercial areas. Consider these heights and densities more appropriate in the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Delete: ~~Enable an increase in the density and scale of development in commercial areas to support the creation of focal points for the community and maximise the benefits of accessibility.~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1096	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	84	36	91	29	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P1		RDRR agrees that the heights and densities are more appropriate in but should be restricted to the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones and adjacent commercial zones. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.36 above.
1097	Sigma Consultants	84	37			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P7	Oppose	Oppose enabling residential development within Commercial 6 Zone. See Section 3 (3.38 – 3.11 of Supporting Document for more.	Amend policy: Southern Edge Commercial Centre Provide for the establishment of a mix of light industrial, ~~residential~~ and commercial activities that are appropriate to the location and amenity of the southern edge commercial centre, and the character and amenity values of other commercial centres.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1098	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	37	109	49	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P7		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.37 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1099	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	37	111	49	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P7		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.37 above.
1100	Sigma Consultants	84	38			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P8	Seek amendment / support in part	Strengthening policy.	Amend Policy: ~~Ensure development is of a high quality development~~ that positively contributes to the safety and attractiveness of streets and public open spaces.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1101	Sigma Consultants	84	39			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10	Seek amendment / support in part	It is not considered that high density apartments are suitable in certain Commercial Zones. Note, Policy: COMZ-P5 addresses high density residential use in COM4. While our submission is that Commercial 1 – 3 Zones should continue to enable residential uses within the existing height limits of the zone. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Amend Policy: ~~Enable an increase in the density, diversity and quality of housing in identified the Commercial 1 - 4 zones,~~ while maintaining their commercial function and managing potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1102	Ronayne, T (FS)	84	39	51	18	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. They agree that these heights and densities should be restricted to the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones, and to adjacent Commercial zones.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.39 above.
1103	Irwin, W (FS)	84	39	83	20	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. They agree that these heights and densities should be restricted to the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones, and to adjacent Commercial zones.	Support submission.	Refer submission 84.39 above.
1104	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	39	109	50	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.39 above.
1105	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	39	111	50	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.39 above.
1106	Sigma Consultants	84	40			Transport	Policies	COMZ-P12	Seek amendment / support in part	Rotorua is compact, cycle friendly city. Ensuring future workplaces and apartments have facilities for cyclists, walkers, scooter users, etc. will help enable and encourage people to use active transport with associated benefits in reducing carbon emissions.	Amend Policy: Require the design of all buildings to <u>enable a transition to lower carbon transport options and</u> positively contribute to the safety and attractiveness of the street by: <u>i) Requiring the provision of cycle parking in new buildings and changing facilities in commercial buildings; ...</u>	Reject It is recommended that the consideration of cycle parking and storage is retained in the matters of discretion for new buildings containing residential units. This is considered to provide design flexibility and therefore the most efficient and effective method to achieve COMZ-O3.
1107	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	40	109	51	Transport	Policies	COMZ-P12		RVA opposes this submission as it is RVA’s primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages (whose residents, due to age and mobility constraints, do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only).	Disallow submission. The RVA seeks that retirement villages are therefore excluded from the cycle parking provisions, or otherwise seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 84.40 above.
1108	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	40	111	51	Transport	Policies	COMZ-P12		Ryman opposes this submission as it is Ryman’s primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages (whose residents, due to age and mobility constraints, do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only).	Disallow submission. Ryman seeks that retirement villages are therefore excluded from the cycle parking provisions, or otherwise seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 84.40 above.
1109	Sigma Consultants	84	41			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P13	Seek amendment / support in part	Inclusion of policy to support performance standard on unit sizes with specific reference to storage.	Amend Policy: Require the design of residential buildings to achieve quality on site living environments for people by providing: <u>i) are of a size and shape that will enable the functional use of the units, including the provision of storage; ...</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1110	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	41	109	52	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P13		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.41 above.
1111	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	41	111	52	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P13		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.41 above.
1112	Sigma Consultants	84	42			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3	Support	RD Activity status for new buildings (Commercial 1 – 4 + 6) placing a greater focus on design quality.	Retain COMZ-R3 as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1113	Sigma Consultants	84	43			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Oppose	Oppose changes enabling residential development in the Commercial 6 Zone. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Delete reference to Com 6 Zone in Permitted Activity Rule as follows: Applicable Spatial Layers Commercial ... ~~and 6~~ Zones Consequential change: COMZ-R32.1 Where: If the units are in Commercial Zones ... ~~or 6~~ they are not ... Consequential Change: COMZ-R32.3 Applicable Spatial Layers Commercial ... ~~and 6~~ ...	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1114	Sigma Consultants	84	44			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33	Seek amendment / support in part	‘Where’ Statement re: ground floor - This simply mirrors the Residential Unit rule (COM-R32) whereby residential units on the ground floor in certain commercial zones are classed as a Non-Complying activity. It is logical that the ‘conversion of buildings’ rule is consistent with this to ensure commercial function of the zone is retained.	Include the following ‘where’ statement: <u>If the units are in Commercial Zones 1, 2 or 3 Zones they are not located on the ground floor.</u> Include an additional Rule COMZ-R33. <u>Applicable Spatial Layers: Commercial 1, 2 and 3</u> <u>3. Activity Status: Non-Complying</u> <u>Where: Residential units are on the ground floor.</u>	Accept. This provision has been amended.
1115	Sigma Consultants	84	45			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33	Seek amendment / support in part	Conversion of Buildings (Matters of Discretion) - Where an existing building is being converted to residential units (Restricted Discretionary Activity) reverse sensitivity is included as a matter that Council can consider in assessing the application (see COMZ-R33). However, no equivalent provision is included where new buildings are proposed with residential activities. This is a relevant consideration.	Include an additional Matter of Discretion under COMZ-R33.2 as follows: Include <u>Mitigation of potential reverse sensitivity effects of the activity on adjoining sites.</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1116	Sigma Consultants	84	46			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33	Oppose	Conversion of Buildings (Commercial 6 Zone changes) : Oppose changes enabling residential development in the Commercial 6 Zone. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain ODP provisions as follows: COMZ-R33 Commercial 6 Zone <u>4. Activity Status: Non-Complying</u>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1117	Sigma Consultants	84	47			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	Oppose proposed height limits. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more.	Retain ODP provisions as follows: Commercial 1 and 2 Zones: 1a. No building or structure shall exceed 12m ~~20m~~ above the natural ground level. Commercial 4 Zone: 4a. No building or structure shall exceed 12m ~~20m~~ above the natural ground level. Commercial 6 Zone: 5a. No building or structure shall exceed 20m ~~24m~~ above the natural ground level	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1118	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	47	109	53	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		RVA opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.47 above.
1119	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	47	111	53	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1		Ryman opposes this submission as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.47 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1120	Sigma Consultants	84	48			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	Oppose proposed height in relation to boundary requirements where a site adjoins the Residential 2 Zone. This would enable a 17m building 3m off the boundary which could have significant effects on daylight, sunlight and outlook. See Section 3 of Supporting Document for more	6. All Commercial Zones: Buildings along any boundary with a Residential zone must not project beyond the recession planes as set out below: i. Boundary with Residential 1 and 2 Zones: 60o measured 4m vertically above ground level ii. ~~Boundary with Residential 2 Zone: 60o degrees measured 12m vertically above ground level~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1121	Sigma Consultants	84	49			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Oppose	The height in relation to boundary standard relating to boundaries with the rural zone has been omitted. The Commercial 4 Zone on Mountain Road adjoins rural boundaries. There may also be other examples.	Reinstate height in relation to boundary controls between Commercial and Rural zones.	Accept Amendments have been made to address the interface with the Rural Zones.
1122	Sigma Consultants	84	50			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	1. Request inclusion of a minimum floor area where more than 1 bedroom. 2. Include consequential change to the outdoor living exception if Commissioners are minded to provide exemption from requirement for outdoor living. 2. Admin correction	Amend COMZ-S5(1) Minimum size of residential units: a. The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 35m2 b. The minimum net floor area <u>of a</u> 1 bedroom unit shall be 45m2 ~~{include minimum floor area for 2+ units}~~ Consequential change to COMZ-S5.2(b) re: outdoor living exception	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1123	Sigma Consultants	84	50			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The plan change proposes that the definition of daylight envelope be deleted. This will have consequential effects, e.g. the Industrial Zone Performance standard for height (INZ-S1) refers to the daylight envelope	That an administrative change is made in all other chapters that refer to a daylight envelope in the performance standards to ensure the standards are not altered by the deletion in the Interpretation section.	Reject Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report. ‘Daylight envelope’ definition to be reinstated .
1124	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	50	109	54	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.50 above.
1125	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	50	111	54	Other	Definitions	Definitions		Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission and does not recognize the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and therefore seeks that this submission point is disallowed	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.50 above.
1126	Sigma Consultants	84	51			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	Performance Standard COMZ-S5(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	Reasons: In existing buildings: Outdoor living areas would help to support vibrant commercial centres and healthy living environments. Considered reasonable to require in new buildings but not existing. ~~Internal~~ – consistent measurement with s4.1 above. ~~Dwelling~~ – consistent terms. ☐	Amend COMZ-S5.2(b) b. Except that an outdoor living space is not required in <u>existing buildings</u> where the net ~~internal~~ floor area for a ~~dwelling~~ residential unit is at least: • 40m2 for a studio ~~and~~ • 50m2 for a dwelling with one ~~or more~~ bedrooms; <u>and</u> • XXm2 for a dwelling with two or more bedrooms. {XX – use same figure as in COMZ-S5 above} ☐	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1127	Sigma Consultants	84	52			Transport	Standards	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	Request inclusion of cycle parking standard for new buildings – adds additional weight to the proposed Matter of Discretion. Proposed standard based broadly on Christchurch City Council provisions	Insert: <u>COMZ-SX Cycle Parking Standard:</u> <u>a. At least the following number of cycle spaces shall be provided:</u> <u>Residential units: 1 space per dwelling.</u> <u>Commercial activity: 1 space per 150m2 net floor area, and one locker per cycle park.</u> <u>Consequential changes to ensure references in relevant rules (New Buildings)</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1128	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	52	109	55	Transport	Standards	Other		The RVA considers that the provision of cycle spaces for residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only. Disallow submission point.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.52 above.
1129	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	52	111	55	Transport	Standards	Other		Ryman considers that the provision of cycle spaces for residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only. Disallow submission point.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.52 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1130	Sigma Consultants	84	53			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5(4)	Seek amendment / support in part	The width of shared driveways to existing rear sites will affect the ability for these sites to be developed under the permitted MDRS standards.	Amend widths of shared driveways: 1 – ~~4~~ 2 residential units ~~3 – 4 residential units~~ Or any other change that recognises the number of likely vehicle movements taking into account the amount of car parking provided on-site and the size of the proposed units and ensures the safety of occupants.	Reject. Refer to Transport section of section 42A Report. Do not amend as sought but retain current widths.
1131	Sigma Consultants	84	54			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	Request inclusion of a minimum floor area where more than 1 bedroom. Minor wording amendments to reflect wording in other zones.	Minimum size of residential units a. The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 35m2 b. The minimum net floor area of <u>a 1 or more</u> bedroom unit shall be 45m2 (include minimum floor area for 2+ units).	Reject Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1132	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	84	54	109	56	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)		RVA opposes as does not recognise functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.54 above.
1133	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	84	54	111	56	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)		Ryman opposes as does not recognise functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 84.54 above.
1134	Sigma Consultants	84	55			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(3)	Seek amendment / support in part	The standard states: Windows to the street (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) a. Any residential unit facing the street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors. b. Front doors may be solid. Unclear what ‘Front doors may be solid’ means in the context of meeting the glazing requirements.	Not specified.	Accept in Part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1135	Sigma Consultants	84	56			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)	Support	Support standard (Fencing)	Not specified.	Noted.
1136	Sigma Consultants	84	57			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	Minor amendment for clarification.	Activity Status: Permitted Where: ... b. The maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is no more than 300mm <u>below from</u> :- i. The 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows, ...	Accept in part. Amend terminology to depth.
1137	Sigma Consultants	84	58			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The plan change proposes that the definition of daylight envelope be deleted. This will have consequential effects, e.g. the Industrial Zone Performance standard for height (INZ-S1) refers to the daylight envelope.	That an administrative change is made in all other chapters that refer to a daylight envelope in the performance standards to ensure the standards are not altered by the deletion in the Interpretation section.	Reject Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report. ‘Daylight envelope’ definition to be reinstated .
1138	Marshall, D (FS)	84	various	110	4	Residential 1 Zone	various	various		the submitter supports the Sigma's position on the residential zone	Support submission parts relating to the residential zone.	Refer submission points 84 above.
1139	Morrison, A	85	1			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R24	Oppose	Providing for Community Housing to be permitted activity in the C4 zone, involving intensive housing at up to 24 metres high is antithetical to a stated objective of C4 zoned areas - in particular Fenton Street and Lake Road – viz that these entranceways should be a showcase for visitors entering the city. Community Housing should be prohibited in the C4 zone. However, if that is a bridge too far because of steps already taken by the previous Council, then it should be a non-complying activity, such that a notified resource consent will need to be sought for any further housing.	Prohibit community housing in the COMZ4 Zone or make it a non-complying activity.	Reject Refer to Other - Community Housing section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1140	Morrison, A	85	2			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	The requirement placed on Rotorua to implement the MDRS occurred in the context of a pandemic and in circumstances where Rotorua was being visibly overwhelmed by returnees and by outsiders seeking emergency housing. This influx was encouraged by central government providing wrap around services. This all presented a temporary and false picture of Rotorua’s real ongoing housing needs. The plan change pre-supposes that demand could be such that eventually the bulk of the city basin will consist of swathes of residential buildings three storeys or more in height. In reality, because the proposed change affects such a wide area, the more likely outcome will be development in a discordant and haphazard manner. For example, a street of mainly single level dwellings will be punctuated by occasional multi-storey high-rises, and with that all the attendant loss of outlook and visual amenity for existing residents. It needs to be recognised that many of the specific requirements of the MDRS are at odds with its own stated first objective (Resource Management Act 1991, Schedule 3A, Part 1, Clause 6(1) Objective 1) which is mirrored by the first objective set out in the NPS-UD. In short, that objective requires the wellbeing of ALL residents – which must include existing residents - to be considered.	Rotorua as a Tier 2 Territorial Authority has made itself subject to the MDRS. It is open to the new Council to seek to reverse that decision. Rotorua can follow Christchurch’s example.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1141	Casey, P (FS)	85	2	4	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the arguments and views in this submission.	Support submission. The new Council seek to reverse the decision to make itself subject to the MDRS.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1142	Hatcher, J (FS)	85	2	8	4	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter lives in Fenton Park and agrees with the comment "requires the wellbeing of ALL residents – which must include existing residents - to be considered." Yes those in emergency housing need support but so do those that have bought in good faith, hoping our investment will help support us later in life. Submitter's 86 year old mother lives with her and submitter is concerned about her being home alone - the thought of what could happen to the neighbourhood terrifies her.	Support submission	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1143	Haley, D (FS)	85	2	32	11	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They strongly support the original submission, stating that Rotorua has made itself subject to the MDRS. The new Council must seek to reverse that decision as has been done by other Councils.	Support submission	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1144	Savage, S (FS)	85	2	36	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They state that the changes will impact the feel and look of the areas, which will be off-putting and create an undesirable market (plus loss of value) of homes for residents that have these types of buildings suddenly surrounding them.	[Support submission]	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1145	Murray, J (FS)	85	2	38	11	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They strongly support the original submission, stating that Rotorua has made itself subject to the MDRS. The new Council must seek to reverse that decision as has been done by other Councils.	Support submission	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1146	Ronayne, T (FS)	85	2	51	19	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1147	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	85	2	58	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. While intensification may help to house some there will be issues of minimal setbacks, privacy, sunlight, noise.	Support submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1148	Irwin, W (FS)	85	2	83	21	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1149	Lane, B (FS)	85	2	86	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They agree with the original submission that the requirement to implement the MDRS occurred in the context of a pandemic and that the likely outcome will be development in a discordant and haphazard manner. Future development should be left to the new Council after more consultation and development of their own strategic views of growth.	Support submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1150	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	85	2	91	30	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		RDRR states it is the voice of ratepayers and residents and that its members are strongly supportive of this analysis. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission. RDRR urges RLC to withdraw from Tier 1 status.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1151	Murray, P (FS)	85	2	102	11	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the arguments and views in this submission.	Support submission. The new Council seek to reverse the decision to make itself subject to the MDRS.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1152	Oxley, M (FS)	85	2	119	20	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the arguments and views in this submission.	Support submission. The new Council seek to reverse the decision to make itself subject to the MDRS.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1153	Ross, P (FS)	85	2	134	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission.	Support submission. The new Council seek to reverse the decision to make itself subject to the MDRS.	Refer submission 85.2 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1154	Gifford, S (FS)	85	2	150	34	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports submission. PC9 is not a suitable method for addressing housing needs while also achieving the required objective of wellbeing of all residents, which must include existing residents.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1155	Marsh, I (FS)	85	2	155	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission, stating: Intensification of housing may help to place people in a house. But, by building houses on small lots with minimal boundary setbacks they too will experience the same issues as their existing neighbours. Lack of privacy and natural sunlight and issues with noise. Ideally, homeowners and/or renters should be able to enjoy their home without these problems. As should existing neighbours.	Support submission.	Refer submission 85.2 above.
1156	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the areas identified for rezoning in Rotorua through PC9. However, Kāinga Ora seeks to increase the spatial extent of the proposed High Density Residential Zone (being the Residential 2 Zone) within Rotorua Central. Specifically, Kāinga Ora seeks that the proposed High Density Residential Zone is extended south toward the Rotorua Golf Club from York Street and Seddon Street (the notified limit of the High Density Residential Zone) – effectively creating a conglomeration of High Density Residential Zoning bound by Fenton Street, Old Taupō Road and Amohau Street within Rotorua Central. If the additional Residential 2 zone expansion sought by Kāinga Ora is not adopted, Kāinga Ora seeks that this area then includes a height variation control to enable building heights of up to 5 stories through a permitted rule framework.	1. Kāinga Ora seeks the Residential 2 Zone is expanded as shown within Appendix 2 to their submission to create High Density Residential Zoning bound by Fenton Street, Old Taupō Road and Amohau Street within Rotorua Central. 2. Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 2 to their submission. 3. Other than the changes sought in this submission and in Appendix 2, retain the zoning and changes proposed in PC9 as notified. 4. If the relief sought in 1 and 2 is not adopted, Kāinga Ora seeks that a height variation control of allowing up to 5 storeys is introduced and inserted into the residential zone provisions of PC9 in the District Plan and over the residential properties/area marked for change in Appendix 2. The height variation control can be a new standard. Kāinga Ora seeks that the activity of building up to five storeys is permitted under this height variation control. 5. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought and this submission.	Reject The spatial extent of the Residential 2 zone has been applied to areas with the highest levels of accessibility to ensure that high density development can be focussed to these areas. See the urban design evidence for further information on the Accessibility and Demand Assessment undertaken. Economic Analysis which has informed PC9 concludes that if the spatial application is too extensive, then it may not adequately encourage the concentration of higher density development into areas which support the function of key nodes. Refer section 42A Report, Accessibility and Demand Assessment, and Economic Assessment.
1157	Herniman, T and Colledge, G (FS)	86	1	3	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose submission of Kāinga Ora with respect to extent of the Residential 1 Zone and Residential 2 Zone and extending Residential 2 Zone throughout Glenholme. This is an established neighbourhood and would highly affect residents already living here through population, shading, noise, rubbish storage and collection, footpath widths, adequate parking, and the high density of traffic. All these things in the town plan have not been designed nor future proofed for this kind of development. Therefore, the impact on the residents if any development like this was to occur, would be huge. Also please note Glenholme has a high population of retirees, and these elderly people would feel vulnerable with high density housing and high density population surrounding them.	Oppose the submission from Kāinga Ora to extend Residential 2 Zone throughout Glenhome.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1158	Casey, P (FS)	86	1	4	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and considers the relief sought is outrageous.	Oppose submission. Reverse decision to be part of MDRS and restrict intensification to CBD and adjacent areas.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1159	Brewer, S (FS)	86	1	6	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter is against high density housing (apartments etc) to be built in the Glenholme area.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1160	Body Corporate of Lakeview Villas (FS)	86	1	7	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a body corporate for a development at Vaughn Road and objects to even 12m let alone 22m height limits for residential areas anywhere in the city. These buildings will change the look and feel of our city and there is no guarantee they will be of high quality. They are also concerned about lack of parking. They are particularly concerned about high rise Kāinga Ora developments.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1161	McCandlish, S (FS)	86	1	9	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns properties in the Residential 1 Zone including in Glenholme and opposes the high density housing being proposed as this will not be a healthy environment to bring up children. For example the proposed housing in Devon St would be better suited to 2 or maybe 3 units not 6 as proposed. Also there needs to be more supervision of tenants to stop annoyance to other residents. I am afraid I will lose a very good tenant with a nervous disposition if there is to many disruptions nearby and a planned retirement in the future to my unit which is only 2 houses away will be put in jeopardy.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1162	Douglas, C (FS)	86	1	10	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and allowance of building heights to 5 stories. Reasons for opposition: -Change the aesthetic nature of the neighbourhood -More traffic congestion and parking issues -More loading on drainage system leading to potential flooding -More noise in the neighbourhood -Safety & security issues -Loss of sunlight to all properties -Loss of community cohesion/harmony	Oppose submission to increase spatial extent of density to Residential 2 in Glenholme	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1163	Dunn, S (FS)	86	1	11	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Glenholme affected by the Kainga Ora submission. The submitter generally supports the original proposal for PC9 as it included all of Rotorua’s suburbs for medium density housing which is fair and considers medium density housing is going to be required across all of New Zealand’s towns and cities to support a growing population and to protect our rural, food producing, lands from urban sprawl. The Kāinga Ora submission, however, is singling out Glenholme for high density housing. If approved, then Glenholme will be targeted by Kāinga Ora for social housing development because it is more efficient for them to house people. They will then in turn bring social housing clients in from all over the country as they have done with the emergency housing. This will, without a doubt, be detrimental to Glenholme and its residents, and ultimately all of Rotorua. Glenholme has born the brunt of the anti-social behaviour associated with emergency housing resulting in property damage, stress and fear among some of the residents. Businesses have had to increase security in a suburb which was once safe and carefree. Intensifying and concentrating social housing in one area is detrimental to the clients themselves. The people in social housing often have complex social issues and need to be around a positive environment rather than housed in densely populated areas with other people with complex issues. The results will be increased violence, crime and general anti social behaviour. This is a known fact as has been seen with the Fenton Street Motels experiment. Kāinga Ora should instead be spreading the social housing clients out across the country in suburbs rich and poor. This is a little less efficient, but is far more beneficial for the clients to be around positive people in neighbourhoods where they are more likely to be provided support by the people in the suburbs themselves. Overall this will achieve a better	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1164	Wenham, J (FS)	86	1	12	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Glenholme and states that allowing building up to 5 levels will mean that there will be lack of light and enjoyment to our homes. This will also impact on anyone's views from their property and will not sit well within an area that is predominantly single level homes. Having a large multi level building built within a meter of our homes boundary will greatly effect the enjoyment of property owners. 1meter is to close to the boundary for a multi level property especially when you are in a single level. There are many older people living in this area and they do not need neighbours in a high density within 1 metre of the fenceline. Adding all the extra tenants this change will bring will reduce the enjoyment of current homeowners.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1165	Hewitson, S (FS)	86	1	13	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone [Springfield]. Submitter opposes the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and alternative allowance of building heights to 5 stories. Reasons for opposition: - traffic congestion, lack of parking - impacts on light - with yard distances of only 1m - building to this density as infill in an area with single story houses will affect privacy - noise from dense development - children deserve to have areas to play and people need outdoor areas - there are already flooding problems - Devon Street doesn't have natural drainage - density will exacerbate this	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1166	Wheeler, B and C (FS)	86	1	14	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitters live in Residential 1 Zone [glenholme]. They state they strongly oppose submission to expand High Density Residential Zone for the following reasons: - it would have a significant effect on the amenity and character of existing areas - existing infrastructure including roading and schools do not have capacity - Council's HBA anticipates that there would be limited demand for apartment living in Rotorua. This demand should be focused close to the inner city where it is more suitable.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1167	Monaghan, R (FS)	86	1	15	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter lives in the Glenholme area and opposes the expansion of the Residential 2 Zone - destruction of the tourist accommodation and image of Rotorua by social housing. Submitter also opposes a height variation of up to 5 stories if High Density Zoning is not adopted - loss of light around adjoining properties. Parking is not adequate and the noise level will increase.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1168	Rose, C (FS)	86	1	16	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme and opposes the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora to increase the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme for the following reasons: - lack of parking - the 1m yard will be uncomfortable and create a lack of privacy - will create congestion, parking and traffic safety problems on narrow suburban streets - there is a lack of green spaces/reserves in Glenholme. Influx of residents will put undue stress on limited resources - high potential for increased risk of community safety - increased noise will have a negative impact on community life Submitter also opposes the relief sought to amend building heights to up to 5 stories if extension of Residential 2 Zone not accepted for the following reasons: - changes to view and light into homes - will destroy the aesthetics of the neighbourhood - which is why the submitter bought there - will destroy the identity of Glenhome as "old Rotorua"	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1169	Walter, A (FS)	86	1	17	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter has lived in Glenholme for over 20 years in Wylie Street - they bought into a desirable neighbourhood and says the price reflected that. There are no high rises and rew rentals and the homes are generally of high quality. She opposes extending the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme for the following reasons: - This is not a big city, it is a small urban area, there is enough land further out to make the unnecessary. - Submitter is concerned about traffic and potential accidents on Devon Street and lack of parking The submitter also opposes the alternative relief of allowing building heights up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - 5 or even 3 stories is not in keeping with the existing character of the community. Why should owners who bought into an established area now have to content with a view of an imposing high structure and resulting light restriction and then by looked down upon by neighbours. The submitter bought into the neighbourhood for its character. It will devalue her home. The submitter is also concerned about Kāinga Ora housing.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1170	Turner, C (FS)	86	1	18	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme and opposes submission 86.1 for the following reasons: - Pressure on infrastructure - sewer and drainage systems that are currently unable to cope. - Flood risk - Glenholme is at the low point of a catchment area that starts in Springfield - submitter says that they have spoken with council engineers who say there is nothing that they can do. The current system cannot remove the water adequately - as seen in 2018 - as weather patterns change this risk will increase. Add to that further density in housing and a plan to fail is imminent. - Inadequate parking will see streets fill with vehicles - as is already occurring in the Malfroy/Ranolf area. Lack of footpaths for pedestrians. - Shading - and resulting further heating costs. - Impact on house prices. - Glenholme and Rotorua have already been through enough with covid and emergency housing. - Semi rural areas are better suited for development - Concerned that will follow the path of intensely developed ghettos created in the 60s and 70s in USA. - Impact on schools that are already under-resourced. - Security, increased risk of violence and dangerous behaviour. - Impact on tourism and Rotorua's reputation. The submitter also opposes the alternative relief to increase heights. Will not create an environment conducive to well-functioning families and community growth. Earthworks would also be extensive in Rotorua geology - concern about compacting and damage to neighbouring properties' stability.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1171	Scholes, M and S (FS)	86	1	19	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitters own a residential home in Glenholme and oppose the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora to increase the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme for the following reasons: - lack of parking. - the 1m yard will be uncomfortable and create a lack of privacy. - Noise increases and parking on narrow streets will add to congestion. Submitter also opposes the alternative relief to allow building heights up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - changes to views and light into homes. - impact on aesthetics of the home and reason why they bought in the suburb of Glenholme. Impact on quiet enjoyment of suburb.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1172	Davis, B (FS)	86	1	20	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter opposes submission 86.1, stating: The past council had an overreaction to Rotorua's building needs and future forecasts for actual houses needed for our population. The actual population growth for Rotorua this year is a negative 300. Rotorua was added to implemented plan change 9 at the request of the then Council. Rotorua's need for more homes is a problem born from the Government's plant o centralize homeless people to one city - Rotorua. the homeless people create a perception that we need to build thousands of houses when he problem is a constant flow of homeless people streaming into the city from all over NZ. The plan to build 5 to 6 story high accommodation is short sighted and will lead to more crime and run-down ghettos that will be unsightly. This will lead to the demise of our tourism industry and residents leaving our city.	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1173	Knight, R (FS)	86	1	21	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora to increase the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme for the following reasons: - lack of parking. - the 1m yard will be uncomfortable and create a lack of privacy. - Noise increases and parking on narrow streets will add to congestion. Submitter also opposes the alternative relief to allow building heights up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - changes to views and light into homes. - impact on aesthetics of the home and reason why they bought in the suburb of Glenholme. Impact on quiet enjoyment of suburb.	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1174	Chand, S (FS)	86	1	22	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenhome] and opposes submission 86.1 for the following reasons: - Concern about social housing - this needs to be spread throughout not concentrated - Dense blocks of community housing will devalue surrounding properties - Plans for housing will attract people from out of town with social and mental issues. - There is a concentration of elderly in the area, making it inappropriate for dense social housing - Geothermal issues makes it unsuitable for dense development - Lessons should be learnt from the 'Projects' in the UK and USA. Building up to 6 stories high is not socially responsible. - Impact on services such as schools that area already at capacity.	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1175	Cameron, C (FS)	86	1	24	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the increase of the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone in Glenholme and the alternative relief of a variation in height to allow up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - traffic congestion and cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing of the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - area is mostly for elderly and retired people and quiet enjoyment - geothermal activity makes Glenholme unsuitable for 5-6 storeys. - High density by Kāinga Ora will become ghettos and concerned about tenants	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1176	Phillips, D (FS)	86	1	25	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the increase of the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone in Glenholme and the alternative relief of a variation in height to allow up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - traffic congestion and cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing of the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - area is mostly for elderly and retired people and quiet enjoyment - geothermal activity makes Glenholme unsuitable for 5-6 storeys. - High density by Kāinga Ora will become ghettos and concerned about tenants	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1177	Cameron, M (FS)	86	1	26	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the increase of the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone in Glenholme and the alternative relief of a variation in height to allow up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - traffic congestion and cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing of the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - area is mostly for elderly and retired people and quiet enjoyment - geothermal activity makes Glenholme unsuitable for 5-6 storeys. - High density by Kāinga Ora will become ghettos and concerned about tenants	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1178	Sole, A (FS)	86	1	27	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the increase of the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone in Glenholme and the alternative relief of a variation in height to allow up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - traffic congestion and cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing of the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - area is mostly for elderly and retired people and quiet enjoyment - geothermal activity makes Glenholme unsuitable for 5-6 storeys. - High density by Kāinga Ora will become ghettos and concerned about tenants	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1179	Sole, L (FS)	86	1	28	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the increase of the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone in Glenholme and the alternative relief of a variation in height to allow up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - traffic congestion and cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing of the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - area is mostly for elderly and retired people and quiet enjoyment - geothermal activity makes Glenholme unsuitable for 5-6 storeys. - High density by Kāinga Ora will become ghettos and concerned about tenants	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1180	Gooding, B (FS)	86	1	30	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission. They state that they are not a NIMBY as don't live in Glenholme but believe that what happens to a part of Rotorua affects the whole. the submitter isn't opposed to high density housing in the city area nor medium density housing in urban areas, but opposes high density housing in urban areas. Reasons for opposing the submission: - high density in existing urban neighbourhoods is detrimental to the people living in those buildings and to the urban neighbourhoods; and will be detrimental to the character and cultural wellbeing of Rotorua as a whole. - Rotorua is built on cultural experience and generosity (e.g. accepting the highest number of MIQ hotels per capita) but what is happening now with motels on Fenton St is causing a fracture to Rotorua. KO believes this to be due to the lack of social and private housing but establishing high density housing would depend the fractures in Rotorua's culture and character. - England has proven that high-density developments in urban areas isolate people, separating them from daily urban life and activities. While medium density still promotes connectivity as you are not too high and connect visually and feel part of what is happening in your neighbourhood. Submitter states scientific reports support this. - Damaging Glenholme is not the answer to a shortage of social or private housing - it will damage perception of Rotorua and people will not want to live here. Tourism will not recover.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1181	Binks, S (FS)	86	1	31	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a Rotorua Resident. They strongly disagree with the original submission and feel it will ruin the area.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1182	Haley, D (FS)	86	1	32	12	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They strongly oppose the original submission. They state it looks like KO intends to buy up as much land as it can in the area for the purpose of housing the most needy homeless of New Zealand in Rotorua permanently. We have already seen what has happened when the homeless have been housed temporarily in Rotorua. With permanent housing of homeless it would only invite gang affiliations and often tragic circumstances that can occur through that type of situation, so that it can only get worse. These types of development do not support the long held view that Rotorua is the jewel in the crown of NZ.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1183	Newbrook, T and R (FS)	86	1	33	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission to change the height restriction to allow 5 or 6 storey buildings for the following reasons: -Completely out of character with the suburb. -Most homes in the proposed area are single level. -A lot of elderly people live in this area and moved here because of the character of the quiet leafy suburb. -Loss of daylight / sun. -Lack of parking. Most streets in the area are narrow and currently if cars are parked on both sides of the road there is only room for one car to pass. -Increased traffic and the safety issues related. -Noise of extra traffic. -The stability and safety of such large high building in an area with unstable ground (we built a single level home in Glenholme 8 years ago and had to dig out the ground to 1.5 meters, install geo-matting and bring in hard fill). -Flooding in the area has been an issue in recent years, so extra site coverage for building and parking would be a problem	Oppose submission. No buildings over three stories high should be permitted south of Victoria Street.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1184	Thomas, G (FS)	86	1	34	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission to increase the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme and the alternative relief to amend building heights. Reasons: - shading of neighbouring properties and loss of sunlight - more traffic congestion and more cars parked on narrow streets - noise - changing aesthetics of neighbourhood which is a low building area. - safety and security - less room for children to play - the area is a quiet leafy suburb occupied mostly by elderly retired people and families that treasure their home gardens and quiet neighbourhood close to the city centre.	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1185	Cameron, J (FS)	86	1	35	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - the proposals will create safety issues and wider social issues for them and the residents of the neighbourhood. The emergency housing situation has illustrated that high density housing arrangements impact negatively on surrounding residents. - home-owners like themselves have worked hard to buy homes for families in a quiet and safe area that the proposal takes that away - it will block sunlight to their home (heating and dampness issues) - it will negatively impact on the enjoyment of outdoor space - create access issues - it will force owners out of the neighbourhood - homes will be devalued - it will impact Rotorua's already damaged reputation.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1186	Savage, S (FS)	86	1	36	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. With respect to the original submission they state: - that the lack of parking is going to cause problems - it will cause changes to views and light to homes. - there will be uncomfortable closeness of housing 1m from the boundary and potentially looking into properties - it will destroy the aesthetics of the home and the reason why they bought there - noise will be greater; and - parking on narrow streets will add to congestion.	[oppose submission]	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1187	Lee, A (FS)	86	1	37	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - privacy - noise will increase in a building of up to 5 stories - parking will add to congestion - especially around Glenholme and St Mary's primary schools and St Mary's church - too many tenants in a confined area - it will destroy the aesthetics of the area - reason why they bought there - uncomfortable closeness of housing being very close to boundary - shading to property and house - destroy the fabric of neighbourhood community - will feel unsafe due to the concentration of tenants.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1188	Murray, J (FS)	86	1	38	12	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter co-owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They strongly oppose the original submission. They state it looks like KO intends to buy up as much land as it can in the area for the purpose of housing the most needy homeless of New Zealand in Rotorua permanently. We have already seen what has happened when the homeless have been housed temporarily in Rotorua. With permanent housing of homeless it would only invite gang affiliations and often tragic circumstances that can occur through that type of situation, so that it can only get worse. These types of development do not support the long held view that Rotorua is the jewel in the crown of NZ.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1189	Whimp, D (FS)	86	1	39	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns two properties in the Residential 1 Zone [including in Glenholme]. The submitter opposes the submission of Kāinga Ora and refers to the reasons provided by Sigma for not having Residential 2 Zoning. The submitter states these reasons apply even more to the extension to the Residential 1 Zone.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1190	McPherson, D (FS)	86	1	40	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and states that she does not have a problem with high density, having lived for years in the UK, but does wish to express concern regarding the height variations proposed by Kāinga Ora. Submitter is concerned about unstable ground and suggests there should be no buildings higher than 3 storeys. They also identify shading of neighbouring smaller buildings as a concern and costs of infrastructure. Those undertaking the buildings should be responsible for the cost of the necessary pipes for water, sewage and other links to the Council systems and not ratepayers.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1191	Eyron-Richards, N and J (FS)	86	1	42	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters own property in Glenholme and oppose the submission. Fenton Street is a key thoroughfare for traffic - for both locals and tourists. It is untenable to think that mass-produced housing to a height of 5 or 6 stories would be allowed in this area - the gateway to Rotorua. Fenton Street and the adjoining suburban streets should continue to be treated as an area for tourist accommodation and quality buildings. Glenholme already has considerable in-fill housing - with the medium density rules this will be more than adequate tweaking to achieve additional housing. The submitters also question whether infrastructure in this area would cope and whether Rotorua ratepayers can afford to upgrade the infrastructure to cope with dense housing. There is already flooding in the streets of Fenton Street in Glenholme during heavy rain. With additional development this is likely to occur more frequently. The lack of parking will cause problems - as is occurring with cars parking on the berm and in the cycle land in Ranolf Street near the KO development. Having houses close together will block sun - in a cold climate where sun is essential to warm houses. It will reduce green space for children to play and for people to enjoy their gardens and the natural environment. Having houses and ugly apartment blocks close together will destroy the aesthetics of the existing quality homes and the reasons why people bought in the area.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1192	Knight, K (FS)	86	1	43	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the amendment sought by Kāinga Ora to increase the spatial extent of Residential 2 Zone to Glenholme for the following reasons: - lack of parking. - the 1m yard will be uncomfortable and create a lack of privacy. - Noise increases and parking on narrow streets will add to congestion. Submitter also opposes the alternative relief to allow building heights up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - changes to views and light into homes. - impact on aesthetics of the home and reason why they bought in the suburb of Glenholme. Impact on quiet enjoyment of suburb.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1193	Longbottom, D and J (FS)	86	1	44	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters live in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the submission for the following reasons: - They do not want 3,4,5 or 6 storey buildings - impacts on light and enjoyment of property. They have lived in their property for 35 years and do not want a 6 storey dwelling beside them. - This area contains a lot of retired people that have worked hard for what they have. They have already been under stress with the issues in Fenton Street. - They express concern about the quality of the development by KO in the Ranolf and Malfroy Road sites and think high rise housing in other areas (Wainuimata and Lower Hutt city) looks out of place and does nothing to enhance or add value.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1194	Francis, P and J (FS)	86	1	45	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters own two properties in Glenholme. They oppose the proposed extension to the extent of the Residential 2 zone and height changes to allow even 3 stories for the following reasons: - shading and loss of sunlight - more traffic congestion and cars parked on already narrow streets - problems with noise - changing aesthetics of the neighbourhood , which is a low building area - safety and security - surface flooding - the area is predominantly elderly and retired people.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1195	Buchan, S (FS)	86	1	52	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns two properties with Residential 1 Zoning in Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of - Changes to street scape and character (there are currently no buildings higher than 2 stories in this location) - shading and nuisance, particularly if no off street parking/turning areas are provided	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1196	Peace, J (FS)	86	1	53	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook - Higher density apartments are best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets, community facilities. The southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartment development - so there appears to be no benefit in terms of housing supply in enabling greater development potential. - Impact on character of the area.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1197	Littlejohn, C (FS)	86	1	54	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook - Higher density apartments are best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets, community facilities. The southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartment development - so there appears to be no benefit in terms of housing supply in enabling greater development potential. - Impact on character of the area.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1198	Daiya, H (FS)	86	1	55	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - lack of parking is going to cause problems - will cause changes to views and light to homes - it assumes the inflow of homeless will continue. - impact on aesthetics	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1199	Bennett, V (FS)	86	1	56	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - No justification or demonstrated demand for high density in Rotorua - Developments of 5 stories are completely out of character with the residential landscape and amenity values of the area - It is not clear that the infrastructure is capable of supporting the development; regular flooding - Yard requirements, while potentially appropriate in largest cities, are completely inappropriate in this area - The lack of requirements for on-site carparking will result in cluttered and unsafe urban streets - People bought in RESZ1 for reasons of large family orientated sections, plenty of daylight, no necessity for on street parking	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1200	Ludgate, A (FS)	86	1	59	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. Mental health issues. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - KO housing developments should be pursued on empty properties as normal neighbourhoods - impact on character - impact on storm water (the submitter questions whether tanks should be required for all new development to slowly release stormwater)	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1201	Harvey, D (FS)	86	1	60	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Pukuatua Street. They oppose the original submission stating that there would be a change in feel/vibe of the residential 1 and 2 Zones. Sunlight, privacy and outlook would be severely compromised. The submitter is also concerned about liquefaction and the impact of ground preparation/construction on neighbouring properties, with high water tables; geothermal activity in the area near Ohinemutu and back towards Amohau Street.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1202	Dahm, J and J (FS)	86	1	61	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for the following reasons: - Adverse effect son surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - Impact on character	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1203	Rotorua Seventh Day Adventist School Board (FS)	86	1	63	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters are a school located at 3 Tilsley Street, behind 311 Fenton Street and oppose the original submission to extend the high-density zoning up to 19.5m as far south as the Arikikapakapa Golf Course - which includes the block containing the school. They have concerns about the privacy and safety of the children should buildings extend to a height where buildings overlook the school. There have already been problems where occupants of two-storey emergency housing have been seen in windows closely watching pupils and hazardous or obscene items have been thrown into school grounds.	Oppose submission 86.1. Oppose request to build 6-storeys beyond Seddon and York Streets and do not allow 3 storey buildings at specific addresses adjacent to the school.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1204	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	86	1	64	9	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the relief sought. They state that this is a developer perspective with no regard for maintenance of amenity values in Rotorua.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1205	Hollister-Jones, G (FS)	86	1	66	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the original submission, stating the extension of the Residential 2 Zone would detrimentally affect the residential aesthetic of the neighbourhood, light and views, that the yards would make living feel uncomfortable. They also state that the southern end of Glenholme lacks access to public transport and other services that are required for high density living.	Oppose submission 86.1.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1206	Barkley, A (FS)	86	1	67	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in Glenholme "next door to a proposed 6 storey development". They are opposed to the extension of the Residential 2 Zone for the following reasons: - lack of parking. - the 1m yard will be uncomfortable and create a lack of privacy. - Noise increases and parking on narrow streets will add to congestion. Submitter also opposes the alternative relief to allow building heights up to 5 stories for the following reasons: - changes to views and light into homes. - impact on aesthetics of the home and reason why they bought in the suburb of Glenholme. Impact on quiet enjoyment of suburb. There seems to be no accountability or consideration for the community that will have to deal with the anti-social behaviour, etc.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1207	Ludgate, E (FS)	86	1	68	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. The oppose the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and the alternative relief to amend heights for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - Impact on character	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1208	Young, H (FS)	86	1	69	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of the area in Glenholme that is currently Residential 2 Zone but is proposed in PC9 to be rezoned Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the submission to extend the Residential 2 Zone for the reasons of devaluation property, safety for the elderly, effects on Glenholme primary school and general socioeconomics of the area. They also state that Kāinga Ora have not done research as to the effects of high rise on geothermal land.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1209	Lewis, J (FS)	86	1	70	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for loss of sunlight, traffic, noise issues, surface flooding, safety and security. There are mostly elderly and retired people in the area who want/need quiet enjoyment. The submitter is concerned that high density housing close to town won't help people get jobs and impact on tourism.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1210	Edwards, G (FS)	86	1	71	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission. They consider there are more suitable areas to zone. They oppose varying the height for reasons of overcrowding, privacy, noise, health and safety especially for elderly and children safety.	Oppose submission 86.1	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1211	Grey Power Rotorua (FS)	86	1	72	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter states that they have 1800 members, a significant proportion living in Glenholme. More generally, the nature and history of Glenholme means that many residents are in the older age group (quotes stats NZ median age). The submitter has not had time to consult members due to time constraints but is aware anecdotally of wide concern about the imposition of MDRS provisions across residential areas. They are sure that many older residents of Glenholme will be horrified by the proposal for even higher density. The submitter states that the opportunity provided by PC9 for intensification of the CBD should be used to see if this development is viable and that it is premature to expand beyond until a case for intensification is proven. The submitter is also concerned about a lack of consultation - it isn't reasonable for an average resident to become aware of this major life-changing proposal amongst pages of 99 submissions.	Reject the change requested by Kāinga Ora. If through time the need to expand the Residential 2 Zone becomes apparent it could be pursued through a future plan change with adequate consultation.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1212	Grant, T (FS)	86	1	73	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the submission to build six storeys. They are concerned about infrastructure e.g. schools and Kāinga Ora housing.	Oppose anything higher than two storeys.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1213	Sandrey, J and M (FS)	86	1	74	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for issues of: privacy, sun, changes to the ambience/character of the area (for which they recently moved to the area). They are concerned about decisions being made "way down in Wellington" with no regard to the general public that live in the area. They consider government policy already contributed to a home invasion/burglary they experienced in May.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1214	Oldham, C (FS)	86	1	75	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives on a property near the area sought to be expanded to Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission. They consider the size of the proposed zone is contrary to the premise of creating a cluster of high density which would allow support and wrap around services to be more effectively deployed. Limiting the extent of the zone would also allow effective and efficient use of funding to provide infrastructure. Council would have development in close proximity to the CBD. They also oppose the alternative relief of buildings up to 5 storeys high due to effects on existing people - shading, wind, noise, loss of sightlines, changes to landscape/character, loss of privacy, vehicle access and parking. The submitter is also concerned about development without consent resulting in redirection of stormwater or ponding effecting neighbouring properties.	Do not allow expansion of the Residential 2 Zone as proposed by Kāinga Ora to occur. Do not allow alternative relief sought.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1215	Cyca, R (FS)	86	1	76	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in Glenholme and opposes the original submission. They are concerned about high density housing being concentrated and suggest it should be built close to job opportunities e.g. Te Puke.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1216	Jensen, A (FS)	86	1	77	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter has children and grandchildren attending schools [in the area being proposed to be rezoned]. They oppose the original submission, stating that there is already enough social housing in the area. [Social] housing should be spread to all communities.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1217	Dennison, H (FS)	86	1	78	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter has children and grandchildren attending schools [in the area being proposed to be rezoned]. They oppose the original submission. They are concerned about impact on schools - additional children with special needs. They state that there is already enough social housing in the area. [Social] housing should be spread to all communities.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1218	Kerr, J (FS)	86	1	79	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in Glenholme and opposes the original submission. They state Glenholme is a quiet residential area and it is inappropriate to allow buildings of up to 6 storeys. It will spoil the character.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1219	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	1	80	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		HNZPT is concerned at the impact that 5 storey dwelling blocks will have on historic heritage values within the Rotorua Lakes District in the locations outlined by the submitter. This is very out of scale with existing development, including existing development with historic heritage values. HNZPT is concerned that it would become difficult to mitigate adverse effects, on site or adjacent to historic heritage sites.	Reject submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1220	Elad Trustee Limited (FS)	86	1	81	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone (Tihi Street). The individual representing the company has served as deputy chair on the Rotorua Intermediate School Board and chair of the Rotorua Girls High School Board of Trustees and president of the Rotary Club of Rotorua. Through this they say they have a close association with the area proposed for Residential 2 zone and is a regular visitor to the area. They oppose the original submission stating: - No justification or demonstrated demand for high density in Rotorua - Developments of 5 stories are completely out of character with the residential landscape and amenity values of the area - It is not clear that the infrastructure is capable of supporting the development; regular flooding - Yard requirements, while potentially appropriate in largest cities, are completely inappropriate in this area - The lack of requirements for on-site carparking will result in cluttered and unsafe urban streets	Reject submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1221	Holmes, W (FS)	86	1	82	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of amenity and character, loss of privacy, sunlight and amenity, loss in value of property and destroying people's lives. Currently no houses are higher than 2 storeys.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1222	Howard, H (FS)	86	1	85	4	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission. They are concerned about the impact of 6 storey dwellings on lifestyle, privacy, light and shading, noise, quality of life and mental health. They also question who will pay for the significant associated infrastructure investment and where residents will park.	Oppose submission and clarify.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1223	Lane, B (FS)	86	1	86	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a property owner in Glenholme and opposes the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and the alternative relief for the following reasons: - There is already a character of single storey infill housing in the corridor bound by Fenton and Ranolf and increasing the density would destroy the character - Shading and associated effects on physical and mental health, enjoyment of gardens etc - Impact on property values - Pressure on green spaces - Increased vehicles and safety issues - no justification or demonstrated demand in an area that has already been densified	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1224	Brandley, D (FS)	86	1	87	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and the alternative relief to amend heights for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - Impact on character	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1225	Chapman, L (FS)	86	1	88	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and the alternative relief to amend heights for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - Impact on character	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1226	Lee, K (FS)	86	1	89	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones. They oppose the original submission for reasons of amenity, daylight, sunlight and associated warmth, outlook and privacy.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1227	Dale, J (FS)	86	1	90	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of privacy, light, views, noise. They are also concerned about a lack of support from Kāinga Ora and difficulties evicting tenants and property devaluation.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1228	Burt, D (FS)	86	1	92	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a are residents/owner in Glenholme and oppose the Kāinga Ora submission to expand the High Density Residential Zone, stating it will have a significant adverse effect on the amenity and character of the existing residential area.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1229	Joseph, W (FS)	86	1	93	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the submission to extend the High Density Residential Zone and the alternative relief to increase maximum heights for the following reasons: - Adverse effects in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy and outlook - Higher density should be located close to services e.g. schools and hospitals. - There is limited demand - refers to economic assessment - so little benefit - Incompatibility with existing character - adhoc 'towers' rather than managed intensification close to the city centre. - Increased density should be managed progressively over time not across a wide area now.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1230	Smyth, C (FS)	86	1	94	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident within the area sought for the expanded High Density Residential Zone and opposes the expansion and alternative relief for the following reasons: - devalue existing homes - change in character - loss of privacy - strain on local amenities - impact on sunlight and warmth of other houses.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1231	McGregor, M (FS)	86	1	95	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission for increased height. They oppose anything more than 2 storeys for impact on the appeal of the area and property values.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1232	The NZ Seventh-Day Adventist Schools Association Ltd (FS)	86	1	96	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters are the proprietor of a state integrated primary school located at 3 Tilsley Street, behind 311 Fenton Street and oppose the original submission to extend the high-density zoning up to 19.5m as far south as the Arikikapakapa Golf Course - which includes the block containing the school. They have concerns about the privacy and safety of the children should buildings extend to a height where buildings overlook the school. There have already been problems where occupants of two-storey emergency housing have been seen in windows closely watching pupils and hazardous or obscene items have been thrown into school grounds.	Oppose submission 86.1. Oppose request to build 6-storeys beyond Seddon and York Streets and do not allow 3 storey buildings at specific addresses adjacent to the school.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1233	Lewis, J 2 (FS)	86	1	98	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter opposes the expansion of the HDRZ for the following reasons: - the impact on current residents - change to the peaceful leafy environment - compromise of quiet enjoyable environment - increase in traffic/congestion - parking impacts - less space for children to play - lack of schools with no plan to build more - Pressure on medical centres and doctors The submitter is also opposed to the alternative relief to heights for the following reasons: - Shadowing on neighbouring properties with less daylight/sunlight, resulting in increasing electricity bills in winter for lighting and heating. - Overloading the stormwater and sewerage infrastructure - Impacts associated with rubbish collection with extra bins on the footpaths and rubbish trucks. Collection times will cause additional traffic hazards. - Over population and imbalance	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1234	Calman, H (FS)	86	1	99	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter opposes the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter states that 5 stories or more should not be permitted outside of the CBD. They have concerns and questions around the acute housing need in Rotorua. The submitter explains that higher density inner city developments are better suited to larger cities where amenities are readily available. The submitter is concerned about associated impacts with high density including unsympathetic new builds in an older established suburb, reduced quality of life for the residents, privacy issues, increased traffic, increased noise, stormwater infrastructure issues, blocking sunlight. The submitter believes that no landowner should be able to develop land intensively as of right without consideration/consultation with other property owners.	Oppose the submission and recommend the new council should have time to reconsider the proposals.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1235	Bagnall, R (FS)	86	1	100	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns and lives in Glenholme and is adjacent to one a property being developed by Kāinga Ora. The submitter opposes the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights.	Oppose the submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1236	Murray, P (FS)	86	1	102	12	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters owns property in the Residential 1 Zone which is affected by the plan change. The submitter is strongly opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter states that it seems Kāinga Ora intends to buy as much land as possible between the CBD, Sophia Street, Old Taupo Road to Fenton Street. They are concerned that Kāinga Ora are completely changing the current neighbourhood and impacting the investments of current property owners. The submitter highlights the already present issues with the housing of homeless in Rotorua, increasing this permanent housing would increase gang presence and result in tragic outcomes, creating a "gotham" city. Kāinga Ora have a poor record as a landlord and ensuring that their tenants comply with the terms or contribute positively to their neighbourhoods. The submitter would like to see a better commitment from Kāinga Ora to build better communities.	Oppose the submission and the new Council needs to reverse the decision made by previous Council to be subject to the MDRS. The submitter would like to see a better commitment from Kāinga Ora to build better communities.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1237	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	1	104	36	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions	Oppose the submission. A better approach to achieving well-functioning urban environments would be to focus	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1238	Vaughan, W (FS)	86	1	105	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter own and lives in Glenholme, near proposed developments. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1239	Czabana, S (FS)	86	1	107	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme], which is affected by the plan change. The submitter is opposed to the extension of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to these points for the following reasons: - Rotorua's main focus should be the tourism industry that needs to be revived. - Decrease in Rotorua's population since 2021. - the effects that enabling 5-6 storey apartments next to single story dwellings. - Effects on Glenholme and wider Rotorua - Inappropriate placement of high density zoning - Communities/neighbourhoods changing Submitter raises concerns about RLC's Rotorua Housing Taskforce and would like to see the continuation of the dismantling of Rotorua's homeless industry.	Reverse the decision made by the previous Council to make itself subject to the Medium Density Residential Standards. This reversal should restirt intensification to the CBD and to the adjacent areas. Develop a fresh housing policy in the public intrest. Continue to dismantle Rotorua's homeless industry.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1240	Morrison, A (FS)	86	1	108	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to these amendments for the following reasons: - overlooking the wellbeing of existing residents. - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1241	Murphy, G and R (FS)	86	1	112	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter is resident within the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to these amendments for the following reasons: - concerns around the precedent the proposed plan change will set for other Residential 1 areas in Rotorua	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1242	Corbett, M (FS)	86	1	113	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns a property in Glenholme. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter states that anything higher than 2 storey dwellings in an established suburb which comprises of mainly single storey houses is unfair and would have an impact on the quiet enjoyment, outlook, and privacy. Changing the height would impact those who brought in good	Anything higher than 2 stories should be limited to the existing CBD and not spill into suburbs. No developments should be able to proceed without a consultation process each time with all properties who are affected.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1243	Corbett, M	86	1	113	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		Submitter owns a property in Glenholme. The submitter is opposed to the amendments sought to the height and daylight envelope for the Residential 2 Zone. The submitter states that anything higher than 2 storey dwellings in an established suburb which comprises of mainly single storey houses is unfair and would have an impact on the quiet enjoyment, outlook, and privacy. Changing the height would impact those who brought in good faith and is unreasonable. The submitter states that this change will irreversibly and significantly change the character of Glenholme and Rotorua as a whole.	Anything higher than 2 stories should be limited to the existing CBD and not spill into suburbs. No developments should be able to proceed without a consultation process each time with all properties who are affected.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1244	Bradley, J (FS)	86	1	116	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives within the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ throughout Glenholme. The submitter states that Glenholme was formally a quiet suburb made up of typically single storey homes, comprising of people who have worked hard towards retirement. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ for the following reasons: - Blocking sun and light - Privacy invasion - Associated increases in noise - Increased number of vehicles - Increased crime - Adverse affects to residents way of life - Devalue assets. Submitter also raised concerns about Councils decision making stating that their opinion would not be taken into account and that a decision had already likely been made.	Oppose the submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1245	Steiner, R & E (FS)	86	1	117	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives within the Rotorua District. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - This would detract and reduce the value of Rotorua as a tourist destination - Fenton Street and the Glenholme are has always been recognized as that gateway to Rotorua. High Density Housing would be a major detraction to the entrance to the city - High density housing would create a Ghetto like environment, especially with ongoing social problems all in one area, as has already been shown with the occupation of motels. - Rotorua should not be held to ransom for housing people from other areas, before housing our own people. - Regardless of the protestations of Govt agencies, Rotorua did not have the numbers of homeless that are now housed in motels. - Rotorua previously held the most beautiful city status several years in a row. It now has a reputation as a town accommodating people from all over NZ in motels.	Opposed to the submission, and submitter would like to see Maori owned land released as community housing around Rotorua.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1246	Askes, J (FS)	86	1	118	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - Glenholme has always been a residential and family area - 6 storey developments will change the area - Many of the houses in Glenholme are single storey facing north/south	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1247	Oxley, M (FS)	86	1	119	21	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HZDZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter raises concerns that KO are trying to buy up as much land is possible in the proposed area for the purpose of housing homeless people from throughout New Zealand in Rotorua. Submitter is concerned around the temporary problems that Rotorua is experiencing and permanent housing will see these issues remain. This would result in tragic outcomes that can only get worse and damage the view of Rotorua.	Submitter wishes that the new Council reverse the decision to be subject to the MDRS as has been done by Christchurch City Council.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1248	Chitty, D (FS)	86	1	120	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone which is affected by the plan change and owns a listed heritage building. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is concerned that the issues currently in Fenton Street will move to their neighbourhood. The submitter opposes the submission point for the following reasons: - Loss of sunlight - Increased noise - Increased violent and threatening behaviour - Increased traffic congestion, especially around school hours and associated parking issues. - Safety issues - Changing the aesthetics of low building areas - Loss of value of property - Loss of business (Air BnB) - Impacts on homeowners and tourism industry.	Oppose the submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1249	Gardner, S (FS)	86	1	122	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point as it will change the character of the suburb, bring UK styled housing estates to Rotorua. The submitter raises concerns that the population of Glenholme includes large numbers of retired couples and singles, who choose to live there due to its proximity to the town, who no longer feel that the neighbourhood is safe. The submitter raises that KO's idea of high density in the Glenholme area due to its proximity to the city centre should not occur, instead public transport should be utilised, and Glenholme should be for older people.	The submitter is opposed to the submission point and seeks the following relief: - Send all non-Rotorua people back to their hometowns - Ensure that families are in suburbs with other families - Convert vacant buildings in the inner-city into apartments - Build suitable homes in Glenholme for the elderly.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1250	Jones, P (FS)	86	1	127	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the original submission, expressing concern about KO recommendations and high deprivation	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1251	Sandrey, M (FS)	86	1	129	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the original submission due to light, privacy, sun and character. They consider that there has been no thought about the impact to residents and state they have already been affected by bad policy decisions regarding emergency housing (with a home invasion).	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1252	Caves, T and D (FS)	86	1	131	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and oppose the original submission. They oppose increased density in Glenholme with concerns about storage, reduced parking and impacts on streets and they also are concerned about increased criminal behaviour with density.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1253	Hughes, T (FS)	86	1	133	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in Springfield and cycles through Glenholme. They are concerned about traffic impacts - stating that currently street berms are largely free of cars	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1254	Ross, P (FS)	86	1	134	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission. They consider it not thought through given Glenholme's geothermal and instability issues and consider there must be more viable land for housing. They are also concerned about social issues and peace and quiet.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1255	Beamish, K (FS)	86	1	135	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission. They are concerned about the impact on their property they invested in. They consider issues such as runoff and infrastructure have not been sufficiently considered.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1256	Ryder, S (FS)	86	1	136	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1257	Ryan, C (FS)	86	1	137	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in a Residential 2 Zone [Malfroy - Victoria] and opposes the submission. They are concerned about concentrated social housing and lack of play areas for children. It has been proven overseas that high level housing encourages poverty, crime and dysfunction of societal values. Jamming vulnerable people into this kind of housing is not what we want for our city.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1258	Martin, R and G (FS)	86	1	138	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of impact on the character and surrounding properties	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1259	Menzies, M (FS)	86	1	139	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and is opposed to the initial submission for reasons of: - lack of parking and traffic impacts - shading - lack of consideration of infrastructure - schools, medical, water, wastewater, stormwater electricity. Stormwater in much of the area is disposed with soak holes. - Geothermal issues - character - not necessary because growth projections over inflated.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1260	Minchin, P (FS)	86	1	140	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in Springfield which they feel could be next if this Kāinga Ora proposal for Glenholme & the CBD gets accepted. They oppose the initial submission for reasons of: - concerns about large scale KO housing developments - high density housing in Auckland is causing problems - overloading of services, increased antisocial and criminal behaviour, reduced privacy, lack of sun (and associated health issues) for south facing dwellings, ugliness. With respect to the request for 5 storeys the submitter states this is an eyesore and causes privacy issues and kills light. Housing needs to be done in a way that keeps the city thriving and desirable including for tourists. Would not want high density KO developments as first impression.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1261	Greene, J (FS)	86	1	141	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission. They are concerned about noise, security issues, crime, overloading of infrastructure, parking and shading.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1262	James, C (FS)	86	1	142	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission - extension of high density zone and additional height. Development of that height is not in keeping with the current environment and will have a severe adverse effect on surroundings (shading, privacy, outlook). High density housing is better suited to areas with access to services - this is not true of the area near the golf course. The economic assessment shows there is little demand.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1263	Duncan, M and T (FS)	86	1	143	8	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitters live in a residential zone affected by the plan change [Glenholme]. They oppose the submission with concerns about shading caused by 6 storeys, visual impact, devaluing homes, impacts on demographics - currently mostly retired but social housing and low cost housing would have different needs.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1264	O'Brien, J (FS)	86	1	144	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the original submission. No research on geothermal effects of multi-storey buildings. Also concerned about value of property	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1265	Sinclair, L (FS)	86	1	145	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the original submission. No research on geothermal effects of multi-storey buildings. Also concerned about value of property	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1266	Burt, G (FS)	86	1	146	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the extension of the Residential 2 Zone and the alternative relief to amend heights for the following reasons: - Adverse effects on surrounding properties - sunlight, daylight, outlook. - Higher density is best suited to locations with good access to shops, supermarkets and facilities - the southern edge of Glenholme is remote from these areas - PaknSave is 2km. - The economic assessment supporting the plan change identifies that there is limited demand in Rotorua for apartments - so little benefit in terms of housing supply. - Impact on character - geothermal issues - most properties have bores that cannot be built over; and instability issues for large heavy buildings - Rotorua's services aren't enough to absorb density - medical, hospital, police, fire and emergency. Existing residents will struggle to access services.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1267	Lewis, P (FS)	86	1	147	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and opposes the original submission. There has already been damage to reputation of Rotorua due to influx of homeless and there have been impacts on nearby residents. The submitter is concerned that PC9 will further damage reputation. They do not want to see tenement style housing blocks. They are concerned about concentration leading to disharmony and crime, congestion of roads, and whether current services can handle additional sewage. KO's submission is wrong for Rotorua.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1268	Gifford, S (FS)	86	1	150	35	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. PC9 is unsuitable, let alone expanding it further. Making these changes through this process is also unsuitable as the community need to be involved - it was not part of the original proposal.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1269	Hamill, W (FS)	86	1	154	3	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter resides in a property that will be affected by Plan Change 9. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed as they can see that it would be good in new subdivisions, but is not appropriate in existing neighbourhoods. You must give neighbours a chance to have a say and object. They have a right to have good sun and have control over their neighbours. I have lived next door to a Kāinga Ora house and complained about rubbish accumulation, old furniture and beds in their back yard, yelling and destruction of property and I can see why 6,500 complaints against their tenants have never been actioned or addressed.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1270	Johnson, A (FS)	86	1	158	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point as Glenholme has suffered enough with social housing and the implications in motels. The submitter wishes for Glenholme to be left alone.	If Kāinga Ora wishes to own further property in Rotorua, then it should be in areas that fit the same socio-economic demographics of those they are wanting to house.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1271	Pomare, C (FS)	86	1	161	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and the alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - Increase in theft, vandalism, intimidating activity and domestic violence (all of which have increased with the increase of homeless in the area. Submitter is concerned this will only get worse). - Maintenance of the properties - Whether occupants will contribute to society - Safety of elderly and children - Capacity of Glenholme Primary School - Value of properties - Increase in alcohol related issues - Impacts on privacy The submitter states that the Malfroy Road development is more than enough for Glenholme and that other solutions should be utilised.	The submitter is opposed to the submission and seeks that there are better solutions. For example, there could be homes built in the Te Puke area and there are plenty of seasonal jobs with kiwifruit, these people need further wrap around services.	Refer submission 86.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1272	McIndoe, L (FS)	86	1	162	8	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		Submitter lives in the residential zone. The submitter is opposed to the expansion of the HDRZ and he alternative relief sought to heights. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - Shadowing on lower housing - Impacts on house valuations - Visual impact - Impacts on the appeal of the area. - Implications on the existing demographics of Glenholme - Implications of the different needs and support that low cost housing have	Oppose the submission	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1273	Holmes, R (FS)	86	1	172	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of amenity and character, loss of privacy, sunlight and amenity, loss in value of property and destroying people's lives. Currently no houses are higher than 2 storeys.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1274	Holmes, T (FS)	86	1	173	6	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Maps	Maps		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of amenity and character, loss of privacy, sunlight and amenity, loss in value of property and destroying people's lives. Currently no houses are higher than 2 storeys.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.1 above.
1275	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of National Planning Standards definitions into the District Plan.	Retain the proposed adoption of the National Planning Standard definitions for the following terms: • Building footprint • Building coverage (or site coverage for buildings) • Net-site area • Residential activity, • Residential unit, and • Site coverage	Accept PC9 seeks to further integrate the District Plan with the National Planning Standards and includes amendments to adopt the definitions where this is appropriate within the scope of amendments.
1276	Holmes, W (FS)	86	2	82	7	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of impact on amenity and character of well-established predominantly single storey residential zones.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain status quo and disallow adoption of national planning standard definitions.	Refer submission 86.2 above.
1277	Holmes, R (FS)	86	2	172	7	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of impact on amenity and character of well-established predominantly single storey residential zones.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain status quo and disallow adoption of national planning standard definitions.	Refer submission 86.2 above.
1278	Holmes, T (FS)	86	2	173	7	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission for reasons of impact on amenity and character of well-established predominantly single storey residential zones.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain status quo and disallow adoption of national planning standard definitions.	Refer submission 86.2 above.
1279	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	3			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Kāinga Ora supports amending the definition of ‘building’ to incorporate the National Planning Standard definition. However, Kāinga Ora queries why the operative definition of ‘building’ is retained and the proposed amendments (that is, the adoption of the NPS definition) only relates to ‘natural hazards’ (NHZ chapter).	Delete the operative definition of ‘building’ and amend the proposed amendments to the definition to expand the scope of the definition to the entire District Plan, as follows: <u>For the purpose of NHZ Natural Hazards means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction that is:</u> <u>a. partially or fully roofed; and</u> <u>b. fixed or located on or in land;</u> <u>but excludes any motorised vehicle or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power.</u>	Reject. Limit amended definition of building to the natural hazards chapter. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1280	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	4			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed definition of ‘impervious surface.’	Retain the proposed definition of ‘impervious surface,’ as notified.	Accept. Retain definition.
1281	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	5			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed consequential amendment to the definition of ‘minor residential unit’ to replace “household” with “residential.” However, Kāinga Ora queries why the National Planning Standard definition is not adopted if amending this definition.	Amend the proposed definition of ‘minor residential unit’ to incorporate the same definition as prescribed in the National Planning Standards, as follows: ~~a household residential unit that does not exceed 72m² excluding garaging~~ <u>means a self-contained residential unit that is ancillary to the principal residential unit, and is held in common ownership with the principal residential unit on the same site.</u>	Accept in part. Amend definition as sought but with additional clause for size. Refer to Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1282	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	6			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the definition of ‘landscaping’ and its replacement with ‘landscaped area.’	Retain the proposed deletion of the definition of ‘landscaping’ and its replacement with the definition ‘landscaped area,’ as notified.	Accept The proposed the amendments to include the term and definition of 'landscaped area' align the District Plan with the landscaped area standard under the MDRS.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1283	Morrison, A (FS)	86	6	108	2	Other	Definitions	Definitions		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to the replacement of the 'landscaping' definition to 'landscaped area'. The submitter is opposed to this submission point as the 'landscaped area' definition involves a less satisfactory outcome than landscaping per the original definition.	The original definition of landscaping should be reinstated.	Refer Submission 86.6 above.
1284	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	7			Natural Hazards	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed definition of ‘overland flow path.’ However, Kāinga Ora seeks that a contributing catchment area is included within the definition to reduce the demand for all buildings cutting through an overland flow path require consent.	Amend the newly proposed definition of ‘overland flow path’ to incorporate a contributing catchment threshold, as follows: <u>the land overflown by a concentrated flow of water in an intense rainfall event, as it flows towards the stormwater network, streams, rivers, or lakes with an upstream contributing catchment exceeding 4,000m2. Overland flowpath includes a secondary flowpath which is activated when the primary (often piped) stormwater system gets blocked or when the capacity of the piped system is exceeded. For the purposes of this definition, an overland flowpath includes, but is not limited to, an artificially designed route using formed or hard surfaces.</u>	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1285	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	86	7	84	14	Natural Hazards	Definitions	Definitions		BOPRC opposes in part relief sought by the submitter. Regional Council considers oversight is required for development within overland flowpaths, either through the resource consent process or by imposing additional conditions in a permitted rule. Alteration/diversion of overland flowpaths can transfer flood effects to other people, property or infrastructure, and development in overland flowpaths can reduce the carrying capacity of the overland flowpath.	Oppose submission in part.	Accept. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1286	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	8			Strategic Direction	Issues	SPUD-I1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to issue SDUD-I1 insofar as updating the test to acknowledge and respond to the NPUS-UD’s “well-functioning urban environments”.	Retain the amendments to issue SDUD-I1, as notified.	Noted.
1287	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	9			Strategic Direction	Issues	SPUD-I6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to issue SDUD-I6 to recognise the housing outcomes sought through both the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Supply Act.	Retain the amendments to issue SDUD-I6, as notified.	Noted.
1288	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	10			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1, SPUD-U2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed objectives and policy pertaining to the Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan. In addition, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed addition to clause (ii) to clarify the prescribed three storey enablement will occur within the Residential 1 Zone, and that up to six storeys is enabled in the Residential 2 Zone. This reflects the proposed rule framework within the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain newly proposed Objectives SDUD-O1 and SDUD-O2 and Policies SPUD-P4 and SPUD-P21 where they are consistent with the prescribed MDRS (including the consequential amendments, including deletions, to ensure the correct references within the framework), as notified. Retain the proposed addition clause (ii) of newly proposed Objective SDUD-O2 to recognise six storey enablement in the Residential 2 Zone, as notified.	Noted.
1289	Holmes, W (FS)	86	10	82	8	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1, SPUD-U2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission for reasons of destroying amenity and character. Rotorua has only a handful of 6 storey buildings.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.10 above.
1290	Morrison, A (FS)	86	10	108	3	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1, SPUD-U2		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.10 above.
1291	Holmes, R (FS)	86	10	172	8	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1, SPUD-U2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission for reasons of destroying amenity and character. Rotorua has only a handful of 6 storey buildings.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.10 above.
1292	Holmes, T (FS)	86	10	173	8	Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1, SPUD-U2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission for reasons of destroying amenity and character. Rotorua has only a handful of 6 storey buildings.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.10 above.
1293	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	11			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P4, SPUD-P21	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed objectives and policy pertaining to the Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan. .	Retain newly proposed Objectives SDUD-O1 and SDUD-O2 and Policies SPUD-P4 and SPUD-P21 where they are consistent with the prescribed MDRS (including the consequential amendments, including deletions, to ensure the correct references within the framework), as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1294	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	12			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Objective SDUD-O3 pertaining to ‘sufficient development capacity and land supply’ to recognise the requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain the amendments to Objective SDUD-O3, as notified.	Noted.
1295	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	13			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective SDUD-O4 insofar as it stipulates the rationale behind the spatial extent of the Residential 2 Zone within the District.	Retain newly proposed Objective SDUD-O4, as notified.	Noted.
1296	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	14			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective SDUD-O5 noting this provides a cascade to prescribed Policy SPUD-P21.	Retain newly proposed Objective SDUD-O5, as notified.	Noted.
1297	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	15			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P1 seeking the enablement of a variety of housing types and densities within the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P1, as notified.	Noted.
1298	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	16			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P2 regarding the provision of Papakāinga, marae, Māori customary activities and commercial activities across the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P2, as notified.	Noted.
1299	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	17			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P3 insofar as it outlines the identified qualifying matters within the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P3, as notified.	Noted.
1300	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	17	80		Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3		HNZPT has made a submission point regarding this policy and is concerned to see the changes retained	Support in part the submission 86.17	Refer submission 86.17 above.
1301	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	18			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P6 insofar as it cascades from proposed Objective SDUD-O4 to further inform the spatial extent of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones within the District.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P6, as notified.	Noted.
1302	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	19			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports newly proposed Policy SPUD-P20 on the basis that the policy responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the prescribed MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Policy SPUD-P20 in its entirety.	Noted.
1303	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	20			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PA	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy NH-PA insofar as providing for the development of buildings within areas susceptible to flooding where the risks are low and potential adverse effects can be avoided and or mitigated through design or, where the risks are high, further consideration is had to the design and location of the proposed development. However, Kāinga Ora considers further amendments are required to the policy to both specify that the policy relates to habitable buildings and increase the clarity of the policy to plan users through minor alterations to the language used within the policy.	Amend newly proposed Policy NH-PA to provide additional clarity for plan users, as follows: <u>Minimise the risks to people and property associated with development in areas susceptible to flooding by:</u> <u>a. In areas where the anticipated flood levels are low and, therefore, the likely risks to people and property are less, requiring new habitable buildings and larger additions to existing habitable buildings to have floor levels above the flood level for the 1% AEP event with an allowance for climate change and freeboard.</u> <u>b. In areas where anticipated flood levels are higher and, therefore the potential risks to people and property are greater, requiring a broad assessment for new buildings and larger additions to existing buildings and their associated site works that corresponds to the nature and scale of the anticipated flooding on site, including consideration-assessment of:</u> <u>i. The appropriateness of the proposed development, and the extent to which the flood risks on site are mitigated;</u> <u>ii. Whether the development will increase risks to other people, property or infrastructure;</u> <u>iii. Whether there is a need for safe evacuation routes or refuges; and</u> <u>iv. Impacts on overland flowpaths and river corridors</u>	Accept in part. Refer to recommended further changes in discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1304	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	21			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PB	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy NH-PB seeking to maintain the function of overland flow paths and river corridors. However, Kāinga Ora considers it more appropriate, in the context of the policy, to replace the word “considering” with “assessing.”	Amend newly proposed Policy NH-PB to replace the word “considering” with “assessing,” as follows: <u>Maintain the function of overland flowpaths and river corridors to safely convey flood water and reduce risk to life, property and infrastructure by:</u> <u>a. Maintaining the water carrying capacity of overland flowpaths and river corridors;</u> <u>b. Maintaining the water storage capacity of major overland flowpaths and river corridors;</u> <u>c. Restricting activities that may obstruct an overland flowpath; and</u> <u>d. ~~Considering~~ Assessing the impact of any changes to the entry or exit points of overland flowpaths on a site and the impact on other sites and infrastructure.</u>	Accept. Amend terminology to assessing rather than considering. Refer to other changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1305	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	22			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-PC	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy NH-PC that pertaining to the management of impervious surfaces.'	Retain newly proposed Policy NH-PC, as notified.	Accept. Retain policy.
1306	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	23			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the consequential amendments to Policy NH-P3 to clarify the application of this policy to the residential extent of both Ohinemutu and Whakarewarewa villages	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy NH-P3, as notified.	Accept. Adopt changes.
1307	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	24			Natural Hazards	Policies	NH-P4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy NH-P4 which recognises the risks of geothermal hazards to people and property.	Retain newly proposed NH-P4 as notified	Accept in part. Refer to recommended changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
1308	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	25			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4, NH-R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard NH-R4 pertaining to buildings within areas susceptible to flooding. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports: • a permitted activity pathway for the construction of ‘low importance’ buildings (as per the proposed definition) and / or additions to buildings less than 20m2 within areas identified as susceptible to flooding. • A permitted pathway for development of buildings where the maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is no more than 300m from clause (i) and (ii). • A Restricted Discretionary Activity cascade for development that does not comply with NH-R4.2. • A Restricted Discretionary Activity status for new buildings and additions to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding that do not fall within NH-R4.1 or NH-R4.2.	Retain the deletion of standard NH-R4 and NH-R5, as notified.	Accept. Retain a permitted pathway for buildings of low importance.
1309	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	26			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R4, NH-R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to buildings in areas susceptible to inundation.	Retain newly proposed standard NH-R4, as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1310	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	27			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	NH-R8	Support	mKāinga Ora supports proposed standard NH-R8 to enable the development / installation of necessary venting structures.	Retain newly proposed standard NH-R8, as notified.	Reject Refer to recommended changes and discussion in the Natural Hazards - Geothermal section of the Section 42A Report.
1311	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	28			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	NH-MD1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to buildings in areas susceptible to inundation.	Retain the newly proposed matters of discretion NH-MD1, as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended further changes in discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1312	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	29			Historical & Cultural Values	Rule Table	HH-R2A	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard HH-R2A insofar as it provides a Restricted Discretionary Activity pathway for new buildings to be located on the same site, or a specified site, as an identified heritage structure.	Retain newly proposed standard HH-R2A, as notified.	Accept. Retain rule HH-R2A as notified. Refer to Historic Heritage section of the Section 42A Report.
1313	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	30			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P31	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Policy SUB-P31 to require subdivision of a minimum size and shape to accommodate the intended built form outcomes of the relevant zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy SUB-P31, as notified.	Noted.
1314	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	31			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P35A	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SUB-P35A which provides for both subdivision around existing development and in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain newly proposed Policy SUB-P35A, as notified.	Accept. Retain policy.
1315	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	32			Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the mandatory notification clause to outline the notification requirements prescribed by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain the notification clause inserted into standards SUB-R1, as notified.	Noted.
1316	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	33			Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the mandatory notification clause to outline the notification requirements prescribed by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain the notification clause inserted into standards SUB-R5, as notified.	Noted.
1317	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	34			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of clauses 1.a - b and clause 2 from standard SUB-R43 and their replacement with clause a (i)-(ii) as this reduces the complexity of the rule. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the change in activity status from ‘Discretionary’ to ‘Restricted Discretionary’ and the removal of the ‘non-complying’ activity status.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-R43, as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to recommended further changes in discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1318	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	35			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes minimum vacant lot sizes and for national consistency, seek that a minimum shape factor is required instead as required by Rule SUB-S1.2 below.	Delete SUB-S1.1 in its entirety.	Accept. Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1319	Morrison, A (FS)	86	35	108	4	Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposes the removal of minimum vacant lot sizes. The submitter is opposed to this submission point as it would promote crowding, congestion and overtaxing on infrastructure	Oppose submission.	Refer submission above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1320	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	36			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(2)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S1.2 pertaining to site design factor. Specifically, Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of a shape factor approach to the standard – supporting the proposed 8m by 15m rectangle for both the Residential 1 and Residential 2 Zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S1.2, as notified.	Accept in Part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1321	Morrison, A (FS)	86	36	108	5	Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(2)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.36 above.
1322	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	37			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of standard SUB-S8 pertaining to the subdivision of land or buildings susceptible to inundation from surface water – noting the proposed framework contained within the natural hazards chapter.	Retain the deletion of standard SUB-S8, as notified.	Accept. Retain the deletion of the standard.
1323	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	38			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2)(b)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to SUB-Table 3 – Minimum access and formation widths. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of 8-20 residential units – increasing the maximum number of residential units that may share a private access from ‘8’ to ‘20’.	Retain the proposed amendments to Table 3 – Minimum access and formation widths within standard SUB-S9.2.b, as notified.	Accept in part. Adopt proposed amendments but with further clauses to address other submissions. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1324	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	39			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2, as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to SUB-S14(3)
1325	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	40			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(3)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.3 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2, as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to SUB-S14(2)
1326	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	41			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(6)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.6 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.6, as notified.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to SUB-S14(6)
1327	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	42			Subdivision	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MC1(2)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the matters of control contained in SUB-MC1.2. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of matter (j) and the removal of ‘maintain and enhance’ from matter (g).	Retain the proposed amendments to the matters of control contained in SUB-MC1, as notified.	Noted.
1328	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	43			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed matters of discretion contained in SUB-MD2 on the basis that these matters are addressed within the Natural Hazards chapter. Specifically, these matters are considered when new buildings are proposed within areas susceptible to flooding and / or alterations are proposed to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding and these alterations do not meet the permitted activity criteria.	Delete the proposed matters of discretion contained in SUB-MD2, as follows: ~~a. The appropriateness of the proposed building locations and the extent to which the proposal minimises the risks to people and property on the site from flooding;~~ ~~b. The extent to which development of the site will increase risks from flooding to people and property on other sites or infrastructure; and the extent to which the proposal mitigates this effect;~~ ~~c. Whether the development of the site will reduce the carrying capacity and storage capacity of any river corridor or major overland flowpath; and~~ ~~d. Where overland flowpaths affect the site:~~ ~~a. the extent to which the development of the site will provide for the continued conveyance of water;~~ ~~b. whether the development of the site will change the entry and/or exit points of the overland flowpaths and the impact on other sites and infrastructure;~~ ~~c. management of any potential erosion caused by any overland flowpaths; and~~ ~~d. provision for access and maintenance to the overland flowpaths~~	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1329	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	44			Subdivision	Assessment Criteria	SUB-AC1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the assessment matters contained in SUB-AC1.1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of ‘maintain and enhance’ from matter (j).	Retain the proposed amendments to the assessment matters contained in SUB-AC1, as notified.	Noted.
1330	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	45			Subdivision	Other	SUB-AER6	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports increased density and diversity of housing.	Retain the anticipated environmental result SUB-AER6, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1331	Casey, P (FS)	86	45	4	7	Subdivision	Other	SUB-AER6		Submitter owns property in the Residential 1 zone [Glenholme] and opposes the submission. They are concerned about the quality of intensification in residential areas - space for kids to play, parking. They state that the recent Ranolf /Malfroy Sts development (“the Barracks”) looks like a ghetto in waiting. If people are corralled into ghetto-like neighbourhoods they will feel no pride in their surrounds meaning it will only be a matter of time before anti-social behaviour develops. There is space to develop, whereas tower blocks become horrible.	Oppose submission.	Reject The provisions are specific requirements of the MDRS as set out under Schedule 3A of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1332	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	46			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the approach set out in standard FC – R1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to reduce the operative ‘contribution rate’ for additional residential units from 5%, down to 3.5%. Moreover, Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the following standards: *FC-R1(1) *FC-R1(2)	Retain the notified amendments which seek to reduce the ‘contribution rate’ for residential units from the operative 5%, down to the now proposed 3.5%.	Accept. Adopt the changes proposed to the rate of contributions for the reasons given in the Section 32 Report and Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report.
1333	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	47			Papakāinga	Rule Table	PK-R1	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part, the proposed amendments to standard PK-R1. In particular, Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to: enable Papakāinga to locate on land that does not adjoin or is adjacent to a Marae; ensure that the provisions are consistent with the MDRS, where appropriate; increasing the density of Papakāinga development in rural zones; and providing further clarity around non-residential activities that form part of a Papakāinga development in rural zones. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that both the restriction on locating Papakāinga on Māori multiple-owned land, or land which is otherwise under the jurisdiction of the Māori Land Court is removed and that a revised definition is included within the plan change to allow mana whenua to develop Papakāinga on general title land – noting that the current definition of Papakāinga is limited to land held under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act (1993). Moreover, Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to ensure that provision is made for a permitted level of Papakāinga development, similar to that of general residential developments, with the residential zones. 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.	1. Delete the definition of ‘Papakāinga’ and ‘Papakāinga housing’ and replace with a new definition, as follows: Papakāinga means residential and ancillary activities (including social, cultural, educational, conservation, recreational, and commercial activities) to support the cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua on their ancestral land. 2. Amend standard PK-R1 to remove restrictions on locating Papakāinga on Māori multiple-owned land, or land which is otherwise under the jurisdiction of the Māori Land Court [delete clauses c. and d in PK-R1(1) and clauses g and h in PK-R1(2).	Accept in part. 1. (accept in part) Instead of amending definition have included performance on associated non-residential; 2. (accept in part) include restricted discretionary activity criteria for papakainga that do not meet performance standard for being on multiple owned maori land under jurisdiction of the maori land court. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
1334	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	48			Residential	General	General	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain, as notified, where they are consistent with the prescribed MDRS (including the consequential amendments, including deletions, to ensure the correct references within the framework).	noted.
1335	Morrison, A (FS)	86	48	108	6	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Reject The provisions are specific requirements of the MDRS as set out under Schedule 3A of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1336	Gifford, S (FS)	86	48	150	36	Residential	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. The MDRS is not suitable for the Rotorua environment. Other solutions can be found rather than a scattergun approach that will occur with construction of 3 storey houses and apartments.	Disallow submission	Reject The provisions are specific requirements of the MDRS as set out under Schedule 3A of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1337	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	49			Residential	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the introduction section of the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the corresponding amendments to the Residential Zones framework resulting from the implementation and integration of the prescribed MDRS - as required by the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora seek consequential changes to the zone descriptions to respond to the specific relief sought in this submission.	Amend the proposed amendments to the introduction section of the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the proposed amendments sought in this submission, where appropriate.	Accept in Part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1338	Morrison, A (FS)	86	49	108	7	Residential	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.43 above.
1339	Gifford, S (FS)	86	49	150	37	Residential	Introduction	Introduction Residential Chapter		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. The MDRS is not suitable for the Rotorua environment. Other solutions can be found rather than a scattergun approach that will occur with construction of 3 storey houses and apartments.	Disallow submission	Refer submission 86.43 above.
1340	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	50			Residential	Issues	RESZ-I1, RESZ-I2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the relevant issues contained in the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the corresponding amendments to the Residential Zones framework resulting from the implementation and integration of the prescribed MDRS - as required by the Housing Supply Act.	Retain the proposed amendments to the issues section of the Residential Zones chapter, as notified.	Noted.
1341	Gifford, S (FS)	86	50	150	38	Residential	Issues	RESZ-I1, RESZ-I2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. The MDRS is not suitable for the Rotorua environment. Other solutions can be found rather than a scattergun approach that will occur with construction of 3 storey houses and apartments.	Disallow submission	Refer submission 86.50 above.
1342	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	51			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed Objective RESZ-O1 insofar as recognising the new Medium Density Residential Zone and the subsequent increasing housing supply and choice for the District as a result of the new zone.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O1, as notified.	Noted.
1343	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	52			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Objective RESZ-O2. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the use of the phrase "surrounded by open space" as this could be confused with providing for Open Space Zone around proposed Medium Density Residential developments. Therefore, to avoid confusion, it is considered appropriate to delete reference to "open space" from this Objective and instead borrow the same phrase from RESZ-O9 ("integrated with on-site landscaped areas").	Amend the newly proposed Objective RESZ-O2 to remove reference to "surrounding be open space" and replace with "integrated with on-site landscaped areas", as follows: <u>Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a medium density residential built character comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys, surrounded by open space integrated with on-site landscaped areas.</u>	Accept Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1344	Morrison, A (FS)	86	52	108	8	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.52 above.
1345	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	53			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O3, RESZ-O10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O3 and RESZ-O10 insofar as recognising the influence development has on the interface between the Residential Zone and streets / open space.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O10, as notified.	Noted.
1346	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	54			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O4 insofar as it responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O5, as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
1347	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	55			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O5, RESZ-O12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O12 insofar as ensuring the provisions of adequate infrastructure for residential development.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O12, as notified.	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1348	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	56			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Objectives	RESZ-O6, RESZ-O13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13 insofar as the objectives emphasise the rationale / aim of enabling greater densities of development is to support public and active transport over private transport.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13, as notified.	Noted.
1349	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	57			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O8 insofar as recognising the High Density Residential Zone as an efficient use of land that has good accessibility to those matters identified in the objective.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O8, as notified.	Noted.
1350	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	58			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O9. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports reference of six storeys within the objective.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O9, notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged
1351	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	59			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O11	Support	Kāinga Ora support proposed Objective RESZ-O11 insofar as it responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O11, as notified.	Noted.
1352	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	60			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P2 insofar as outlining the built character resulting from the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P2, as notified.	Accept No change requested by submitter and intent of provision remains unchanged

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1353	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	61			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P5 recognising the proposed rule framework contained within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones which cascade from this policy.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P5, as notified.	Noted.
1354	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	62			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed policy RESZ-P6. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that reference to “4+ residential unit developments” is deleted noting these design techniques should be encouraged for all developments where potential adverse effects on adjoining sites have been identified.	Amend newly proposed Policy RESZ-P6 to extend clause 4 to all development and recognise landscaping on the front boundary may also be appropriate mitigation, as follows: <u>Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned medium density residential built character, including by:</u> <u>1. Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries;</u> <u>2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;</u> <u>3. Providing opportunities for sunlight access to adjoining sites;</u> <u>4. For 4+ residential unit developments, encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along side and rear all boundaries.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1355	Morrison, A (FS)	86	62	108	9	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.62 above.
1356	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	63			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policies RESZ-P7 and RESZ-P16. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that the policy is amended to be more absolute in the requirement for demonstration of adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support development. The amendments proposed better reflect proposed Objective RESZ-O5. Kāinga Ora also seek that infrastructure is confirmed at the point of connection so as to narrow the extent of any infrastructure assessment.	Amend RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17 as follows: ~~Require proposals for four or more residential units to~~ <u>must demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development at the point of connection.</u>	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1357	Holmes, W (FS)	86	63	82	9	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Rotorua's sewage and stormwater capacity issues are not at point of connection, rather downstream.	Reject relief sought.	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1358	Holmes, R (FS)	86	63	172	9	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Rotorua's sewage and stormwater capacity issues are not at point of connection, rather downstream.	Reject relief sought.	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1359	Holmes, T (FS)	86	63	173	9	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P7, RESZ-P16		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Rotorua's sewage and stormwater capacity issues are not at point of connection, rather downstream.	Reject relief sought.	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1360	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	64			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P8, RESZ-P17	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policies RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17. However, Kāinga Ora considered “promoting” provision of cycle parking on site is more appropriate than requiring cycle parking – noting the appropriateness in the context of providing a consent pathway where such requirements cannot be met.	Amend newly proposed Policies RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17, as follows: ~~Require proposals for four or more residential units to~~ <u>Promote the provision of adequate storage for cycle parking on site.</u>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1361	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	86	64	84	15	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Policies	RESZ-P8, RESZ-P17		Oppose relief sought by the submitter. Provision of cycle storage on site aligns with Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement, which directs to actively promote travel demand management, including by reducing the use of private motor vehicles and ensuring adequate provision for and increased use of cycling networks. If cycling networks are to be provided and their use increased, cycle storage must also be provided.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.62 above.
1362	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	65			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P14 recognising the proposed rule framework contained within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones which cascade from this policy.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P14, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1363	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	66			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policy RESZ-P15. However, Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of clause 2 – noting the consequential amendments contained in this submission table regarding the Residential Zone rule framework – and, that reference to “4+ residential unit developments” in clause 4 is deleted - noting these design techniques should be encouraged for all developments where potential adverse effects on adjoining sites have been identified. Consequential renumbering required.	Amend newly proposed Policy RESZ-P15 by deleting clause 2 and amending clause 4, as follows: Mitigate the <u>potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned high density residential built character, including by:</u> <u>1. Setting buildings back from site and rear boundaries;</u> ~~2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;~~ <u>3. Providing opportunities for sunlight access to neighbouring sites.</u> ~~4. For 4+ residential unit development,~~ Encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along ~~side and rear~~ -all boundaries.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1364	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	66	80	8	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		HNZPT has made a submission regarding RESZ-P15, seeking retention and some amendments to the policy, and would be concerned if these matters were deleted/altered in response to this submission point.	Reject submission point 86.66	Refer submission 86.66 above.
1365	Holmes, W (FS)	86	66	82	10	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Providing 'sunlight opportunities' is a way of saying 'some sunlight'. Height of building affects sunlight on neighbouring buildings, as well as appropriate side and front yards.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.66 above.
1366	Holmes, R (FS)	86	66	172	10	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Providing 'sunlight opportunities' is a way of saying 'some sunlight'. Height of building affects sunlight on neighbouring buildings, as well as appropriate side and front yards.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.66 above.
1367	Holmes, T (FS)	86	66	173	10	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Providing 'sunlight opportunities' is a way of saying 'some sunlight'. Height of building affects sunlight on neighbouring buildings, as well as appropriate side and front yards.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.66 above.
1368	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	67			Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed amendments to the residential units' standard RESZ-R3 to reflect the prescribed requirements of the MDRS into the Residential Zones chapter frameworks – as relevant to both the Residential 1 and 2 Zones. However, Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to clause 3 of standard RESZ-R3 to provide for up to six residential units on a site as a permitted activity within the Residential 2 Zone. The amendments proposed as a means to differentiate the enablement of development provided for between the medium density of the Residential 1 Zone and the high density of the Residential 2 Zone. Note Kāinga Ora supports the consequential amendments and deletions of the remaining standards contained in the activity table resulting from these amendments.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-R3.3 to provide for 6 residential units on a site as a permitted activity within the Residential 2 Zone.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1369	Holmes, W (FS)	86	67	82	11	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees ect. 20% minimum is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain site coverage ratios.	Refer submission 86.67 above.
1370	Morrison, A (FS)	86	67	108	10	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.67 above.
1371	Holmes, R (FS)	86	67	172	11	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees ect. 20% minimum is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain site coverage ratios.	Refer submission 86.67 above.
1372	Holmes, T (FS)	86	67	173	11	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees ect. 20% minimum is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission. Retain site coverage ratios.	Refer submission 86.67 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1373	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	68			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the more enabling height and height in relation to boundary provisions for the Residential 2 Zone. However, Kāinga Ora seeks the following changes to better enable flexibility in design choice for developments: - the permitted height is increased from 19.50m to 22m in line with national consistency. - increase clause (i) from 12m to 19m and apply only to side boundaries. - insert a new clause for buildings 25m from the frontage. - delete the height in relation to boundary clause (iii); and - insert a more sympathetic height in relation to boundary when adjoining a lower zone hierarchy	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S1.2 to increase the maximum permitted height within the Residential 2 Zone from 19.5m to 22m and provide more enabling height in relation to boundary standards, as follows: - Buildings must not exceed ~~22.49~~5m in height. - Buildings must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point: 19m ~~2m~~ vertically above ground level along ~~all~~ the side boundaries within 25m ~~3.5m~~ from the <u>road</u> frontage. <u>8m vertically above ground level along the side boundaries 22m from the frontage.</u> ~~4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;~~ - Buildings must not project beyond a 600 recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along boundaries where the Residential 2 Zone interfaces with a lower zone hierarchy (Residential 1 Zone and Reserves 1-3 Zones). - Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way. - This standard does not apply to— - A boundary with a road: - existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site: site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1374	McPherson, D (FS)	86	68	40	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and states that she does not have a problem with high density, having lived for years in the UK, but does wish to express concern regarding the height variations proposed by Kāinga Ora. Submitter is concerned about unstable ground and suggests there should be no buildings higher than 3 storeys. They also identify shading of neighbouring smaller buildings as a concern and costs of infrastructure. Those undertaking the buildings should be responsible for the cost of the necessary pipes for water, sewage and other links to the Council systems and not ratepayers.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1375	Peace, J (FS)	86	68	53	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme and opposes the changes in height limits sought by Kāinga Ora. They state this has the potential to have significant adverse effects on surrounding properties in terms of sunlight, daylight and outlook.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1376	Littlejohn, C (FS)	86	68	54	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident in Glenholme and opposes the changes in height limits sought by Kāinga Ora. They state this has the potential to have significant adverse effects on surrounding properties in terms of sunlight, daylight and outlook.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1377	Berry, C and P (FS)	86	68	57	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of privacy, sunlight and heating.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1378	Ludgate, A (FS)	86	68	59	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of sunlight, daylight and outlook.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1379	Ludgate, E (FS)	86	68	68	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of sunlight, daylight and outlook.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1380	Holmes, W (FS)	86	68	82	12	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission stating that the submitted amendments are too imposing on neighbouring properties, which will result in loss of amenity and daylighting. This will create a visual eyesore and potentially box existing residents in.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1381	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	68	104	37	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the amendments to the height and daylight envelope for the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose this submission point because enabling these heights has the potential to have significant adverse effects on surrounding properties in terms of sunlight, daylight and outlook while not being justified by the demand analysis.	Oppose the submission point.	Refer submission 86.68 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1382	Morrison, A (FS)	86	68	108	11	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1383	James, C (FS)	86	68	142	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of shading, outlook and privacy.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1384	Burt, G (FS)	86	68	146	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of sunlight, daylight and outlook.	Oppose submission 86.68.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1385	Holmes, R (FS)	86	68	172	12	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission stating that the submitted amendments are too imposing on neighbouring properties, which will result in loss of amenity and daylighting. This will create a visual eyesore and potentially box existing residents in.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1386	Holmes, T (FS)	86	68	173	12	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the original submission stating that the submitted amendments are too imposing on neighbouring properties, which will result in loss of amenity and daylighting. This will create a visual eyesore and potentially box existing residents in.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.68 above.
1387	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	69			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part the proposed standard pertaining to yards for the Residential 1 Zone. However, Kāinga Ora does not consider it appropriate for the Residential 2 Zone to comply with a front yard setback and seeks an alternative side and rear yard setback for the Residential 2 Zone when windows are proposed along these boundaries.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S2 to delete the front yard requirement for the Residential 2 Zone and insert the following side and rear yard requirement specific to the Residential 2 Zone: <u>0m unless windows are proposed on side and rear walls, then a 2m setback is required.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1388	Berry, C and P (FS)	86	69	57	3	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose the original submission for reasons of privacy, sunlight and heating.	Oppose submission 86.69.	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1389	Holmes, W (FS)	86	69	82	13	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Windows will not break up a 22m wall if approved. Rear windows would typically be smaller for bathroom and toilets, therefore neighbours would be looking at long walls within uniform small windows.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1390	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	69	104	38	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the proposed deletion of the front yard setback, and the proposed amendment to the side and rear boundaries to 0m unless windows are proposed whereby a 2m setback would be required. They are opposed to this submission point because the changes sought by KO, along with the changes to heights would significantly affect the character of existing residential areas, and outlook from properties. These changes are not justified.	Oppose the submission point.	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1391	Morrison, A (FS)	86	69	108	12	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1392	Holmes, R (FS)	86	69	172	13	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Windows will not break up a 22m wall if approved. Rear windows would typically be smaller for bathroom and toilets, therefore neighbours would be looking at long walls within uniform small windows.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1393	Holmes, T (FS)	86	69	173	13	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Windows will not break up a 22m wall if approved. Rear windows would typically be smaller for bathroom and toilets, therefore neighbours would be looking at long walls within uniform small windows.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.69 above.
1394	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	70			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones from standard RESZ-S4 – insofar as removing residential unit requirements from these two zones.	Retain the deletion of the Residential 1 and 2 Zone requirements from standard RESZ-S4, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1395	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	71			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of the prescribed 50% maximum site coverage for buildings within the Residential 1 Zone. However, given the Residential 2 Zone is a high density residential zone, it is considered more appropriate to differentiate the two zones with increasing the enablement of the Residential 2 Zone. Therefore, Kāinga Ora seeks that the maximum site coverage for buildings in the Residential 2 Zone is increased from 50% to 60%. For clarity, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S3 for the Residential 2 Zone to increase the maximum permitted site coverage for buildings from 50% to 60%, as follows: Residential 1: a. Maximum site coverage for buildings: ~~40%~~ <u>50%</u> of the net site area. b. Maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces: ~~80%~~ ~~70%~~ 80% of the site area. Residential 2: a. Maximum site coverage for buildings: ~~56%~~ <u>60% of the net site area</u> . There is no maximum site coverage. b. Maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces: <u>80%</u> ~~100%~~ of the site area.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1396	Newbrook, T and R (FS)	86	71	33	2	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3		The submitters are residents of Glenholme. They oppose increasing the site coverage for buildings/hard surfaces as proposed. Reasons: - Flooding the area has been a problem and more hard surfaces will only intensify the issue. - such increases in site coverage are completely out of character in the area.	Oppose submission 86.71.	Refer submission 86.71 above.
1397	Holmes, W (FS)	86	71	82	14	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees etc. Retains site coverage rations, which dictate how many houses can be built on any section. 20% is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.71 above.
1398	Morrison, A (FS)	86	71	108	13	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.71 above.
1399	Holmes, R (FS)	86	71	172	14	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees etc. Retains site coverage rations, which dictate how many houses can be built on any section. 20% is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.71 above.
1400	Holmes, T (FS)	86	71	173	14	Residential 2 Zone	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Sites need to have a minimum bulk and location, including appropriate space for landscaping, on-site parking, trees etc. Retains site coverage rations, which dictate how many houses can be built on any section. 20% is not appropriate.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.71 above.
1401	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	72			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the table contained in standard RESZ-S5 outlining the minimum access and formation widths for the residential zones. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of 9-20 residential units – increasing the maximum number of residential units that may share a private access from ‘8’ to ‘20’.	Retain the proposed amendments to the table outlining the minimum access and formation widths within standard RESZ-S5, as notified.	Accept in part. Adopt proposed amendments but with further clauses to address other submissions. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1402	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	73			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the introduction of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within both the Residential 1 and 2 Zone framework. However, Kāinga Ora considers it more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from 35m2 to 30m2 and a 1 or more bedroom units from 45m2 to 40m2 – as consistent with relief sought for both the City Centre and Commercial Zones framework and nationally.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S6A.1 to decrease the minimum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from 35m2 to 30m2 and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m2 to 40m2, as follows: <u>Minimum size of residential units:</u> a. The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be <u>35</u> 0m2 b. The minimum net floor area a 1 or more bedroom units shall be <u>40</u> 5m2	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1403	Morrison, A (FS)	86	73	108	14	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.73 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1404	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	74			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(2)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard RESZ-S6A.2 pertaining to outlook space. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed minimum dimensions noting the differences between both the Residential 1 and 2 Zones.	Retain newly proposed standard RESZ-S6A.2, as notified.	Noted.
1405	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	75			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the additional clauses to the prescribed MDRS glazing standard to enable clarity for plan users as to what constitutes towards glazing.	Retain proposed standard RESZ-S6A.4, as notified.	Noted.
1406	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	76			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed standard pertaining to maximum building length for both Residential 1 and 2. Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of an additional standard to restrict development potential.	Delete standard RESZ-S6A(5) Maximum building length	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1407	Gifford, S (FS)	86	76	150	39	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. PC9 is unsuitable, let alone reducing planning requirements. This process is also unsuitable to do so as it was not part of the original proposal.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 86.76 above.
1408	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	77			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part the proposed standard pertaining to landscaping for the Residential 1 Zone. However, Kāinga Ora does not consider it appropriate for the Residential 2 Zone to comply with clause c of the standard noting the amendments sought in relation to the yard requirements for the Residential 2 Zone (that is, removing the front yard setback requirement)	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S6A.6 to apply clause c to the Residential 1 Zone only.	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1409	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	77	104	39	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the proposed amendment to remove the landscaping standard requiring 50% of the front yard to be landscaped in relation to the Residential 2 Zone. The submitter is opposed to this because landscaping of medium density development, especially adjoining the street will help to integrate development.	Oppose this submission point.	Refer submission 86.77 above.
1410	Morrison, A (FS)	86	77	108	15	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.77 above.
1411	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	78			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally opposes the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to residential units contained in RESZ-MDA. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified – such as referring back to the various matters are discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings.	Delete the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion contained in RESZ-MDA and replace with a simplified set of matters, as per Appendix 3 of their submission.	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1412	Gifford, S (FS)	86	78	150	41	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDA		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. PC9 is unsuitable, let alone reducing planning requirements. This process is also unsuitable to do so as it was not part of the original proposal.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 86.78 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1413	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	79			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to development containing 4+ residential dwellings in RESZ-MDB. However, Kāinga Ora seeks a consequential change to the application of the listed matters of discretion for 6+ residential units within the Residential 2 Zone and seeks for the simplification of these matters as proposed in line with national consistency and to recognise that the objectives and policies of the zones covers many of the matters identified by council. Kāinga Ora notes that any matters pertaining to parking and access should be addressed within the transportation chapter.	Replace the proposed matters of discretion contained in RESZ-MDB to reflect changes sought in this submission, as follows: <u>RESZ-MDB 4+ residential unit developments in the Residential 1 Zone, or 6+ residential units in the Residential 2 Zone</u> <u>1. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u> <u>3. 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.</u> <u>4. The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale; and</u> <u>5. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1414	Holmes, W (FS)	86	79	82	15	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Point 1 and 2 are subjective. Point of connection for 3 waters does not consider downstream effects, capacity and capital upgrade costs.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1415	Morrison, A (FS)	86	79	108	16	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, "one size fits all" approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1416	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	79	109	57	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the amendments proposed to the Matters of Control/Discretion within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones for 6+ residential units within the Residential 2 Zone. The RVA supports this submission point to the extent it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA (i.e. these matters of discretion do not apply to retirement villages).	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1417	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	79	111	57	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the amendments proposed to the Matters of Control/Discretion within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones for 6+ residential units within the Residential 2 Zone. Ryman supports this submission point to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the Ryman (i.e. these matters of discretion do not apply to retirement villages).	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1418	Gifford, S (FS)	86	79	150	42	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission. PC9 is unsuitable, let alone reducing planning requirements. This process is also unsuitable to do so as it was not part of the original proposal.	Disallow submission.	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1419	Holmes, R (FS)	86	79	172	15	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Point 1 and 2 are subjective. Point of connection for 3 waters does not consider downstream effects, capacity and capital upgrade costs.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.79 above.
1420	Holmes, T (FS)	86	79	173	15	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Point 1 and 2 are subjective. Point of connection for 3 waters does not consider downstream effects, capacity and capital upgrade costs.	Oppose relief sought in submission.	Refer submission 86.79 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1421	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	80			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Other	RESZ-AER11to12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed anticipated environmental result pertaining to increasing residential density and diversity of housing in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones and improving the perception of neighbourhoods as safe and attractive with convenient access.	Retain the newly proposed anticipated environmental results contained in AER-11-12, as notified.	Noted.
1422	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	81			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	CCZ-O4, CCZ-O6	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Objective CCZ-O4 and CCZ-O6 and Policies CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14, in response to the proposed amendments to the City Centre Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table. In particular to promote and enable residential activity through the city and taking the opportunity to providing further clarity to the operative objective and policy framework of the City Centre Zone.	Amend Objectives CCZ-O4 and CCZ-O6, as follows: CCZ-O4 Rotorua Central Mall is promoted and retained as having an integral role to the primary commercial and retail centre of the district. CCZ-O6 Subdivision, use and development that enables the continued efficient operation of existing development and activities.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1423	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	82			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Objective CCZ-O4 and CCZ-O6 and Policies CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14, in response to the proposed amendments to the City Centre Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table. In particular to promote and enable residential activity through the city and taking the opportunity to providing further clarity to the operative objective and policy framework of the City Centre Zone.	Amend Policies CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-PP10, amend and combine Policies CCZ-P12 and CCZ- P13, and delete Policy CCZ-P14, as follows: CCZ-P4 :Enable residential, <u>dwellings</u> and tourism accommodation throughout the city centre. <u>Only allow for residential dwellings and tourism accommodation but only</u> on the upper storeys of pedestrian focussed streets <u>identified in the Planning Maps when designed in a manner that to ensure active retail and commercial activity occurs on the street level.</u> ~~avoids reverse sensitivity impacts on commercial activities.~~ CCZ-P8 : <u>Enable T</u> he continued operation and development of the lakefront along the northern interface of the lake where this complements the natural and cultural values associated with Lake Rotorua. CCZ-P10 : <u>Enable and p</u> rovide for Rotorua Central Mall to continue as part of the city centre through maintaining strong pedestrian linkages with Tutane kai Street. CCZ-P12 / CC-P13 (combine) : ~~The application of urban design principles within building design to p~~ Promote <u>and seek for</u> a vibrant, active and safe pedestrian focussed environment, ~~through building design.~~ ~~Seek innovative building design~~ -that provides visual interest and diversity to the streetscape and enhances the walkability of the city centre through the use of prominent entrances and different building elements. CCZ-P14 : ~~Manage the location and design of new~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1424	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	82	109	58	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to the proposed amendments to objectives and policies within the City & Commercial Centre Zones, including amendments to CCZ-P4 which only allows for residential dwellings on the upper storeys of pedestrian focused streets. The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and does not align with the intent of the NPSUD.	The submitter seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 86.82 above.
1425	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	82	111	58	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to the proposed amendments to objectives and policies within the City & Commercial Centre Zones, including amendments to CCZ-P4 which only allows for residential dwellings on the upper storeys of pedestrian focused streets. Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and does not align with the intent of the NPSUD.	The submitter seeks that this submission point is disallowed.	Refer submission 86.82 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1426	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	83			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed amendments to Policy CCZ-P5. However, Kāinga Ora considered that the policy can be further simplified and still retain the outcome (that is, high amenity residential units within the City Centre Zone) that the policy is seeking to enable. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion to references to private open space, storage and outlook space consequential to the deletion sought of those specific standards. Kāinga Ora considers that the proximity of the City Centre to outdoor spaces and amenities is sufficient to provide amenity for residents.	Amend Policy CCZ-P5 to simplify the wording, as follows: ~~Encourage the provision of high amenity residential units accommodation within the City Centre 1 zone above ground level. This will be achieved by e~~ Ensuring residential units provide good access to sunlight from living rooms, good quality outdoor living spaces, outlook spaces, storage spaces, appropriate noise insulation, and are of a size and shape that will enable for the functional use of the units.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1427	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	83	109	59	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the amendment to CCZ-P5 to simplify the policy (deleting references to private open space, storage and outlook space) whilst retaining the key outcomes that the policy is trying to achieve (that is, high amenity residential units within the City Centre Zone). The RVA supports this submission point to the extent it is consistent with the RVA’s primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA.	Refer submission 86.83 above.
1428	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	83	111	59	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the amendment to CCZ-P5 to simplify the policy (deleting references to private open space, storage and outlook space) whilst retaining the key outcomes that the policy is trying to achieve (that is, high amenity residential units within the City Centre Zone). Ryman supports this submission point to the extent it is consistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the Ryman.	Refer submission 86.83 above.
1429	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	84			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R2	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the permitted activity status for the maintenance and repair of a building exterior or the external alterations less than 25m2 for a building within the City Centre Zones 1 and 2. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the cascade to Restricted Discretionary Activity when compliance cannot be achieved with rule COMZ-R2.1. However, Kāinga Ora queries why non-compliance with rule CCZ-R2.3 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	Amend rule CCZ-R2 insofar as refining the matters of discretion for non-compliance with CCZ-R2.1 to avoid two Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the same rule.	Reject CCZ-R2.4 relates to non compliance with the relevant performance standards.
1430	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	85			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to rule CCZ-R3 to change the activity status from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activity for new buildings within City Centre Zones 1 and 2. However, Kāinga Ora queries why non-compliance with rule CCZ-R3.2 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	Amend rule CCZ-R3 insofar as refining the matters of discretion for non-compliance with CCZ-R3.2 to avoid two Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the same rule.	CCZ-R2.4 relates to non compliance with the relevant performance standards.
1431	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	86			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-R16. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of the non-complying activity status for locating residential units within the City Centre 2 Zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-R16, as notified.	Noted.
1432	Gifford, S (FS)	86	86	150	43	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to the removal of the non-complying activity status for locating residential units within the City Centre Zone as supported by Kāinga Ora. The submitter is opposed as they state it is unsuitable to remove planning requirements in Rotorua. The submitter also explains that the community should have new opportunity to be involved since it was not part of the original proposal.	Oppose submission, disallow submission.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1433	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	87			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	CCZ-R16A	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard CCZ-R16A to enable a framework for the conversion of a building within the City Centre 1 and 2 Zones to a residential unit – where it is not located on the ground floor of Tutanekai Street.	Retain newly proposed standard CCZ-R16A, as notified.	Noted.
1434	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	88			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-S1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the increases to the maximum permitted height within City Centre Zone 1 from 20m to 32m and supports the proposed 24m height limit for the City Centre 2 and 3 Zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-S1, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1435	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	89			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S3 pertaining to household unit densities for the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S3, as notified.	Noted.
1436	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	90			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the inclusion of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within the City Centre Zone performance standards. However, Kāinga Ora considers it more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from 35m2 to 30m2 and 1 or more bedroom units from 45m2 to 40m2 – as consistent with relief sought in the Commercial Zone framework.	Amend proposed standard CCZ-S4.1 to decrease the minimum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from 35m2 to 30m2 and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m2 to 40m2	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1437	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	90	104	41	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the reduction of the minimum size of units to 30m2 for a studio and 40m2 for one bedroom in the city centre zone. The submitter is opposed to this due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outdoor living space and no outlook space (no windows?).	Opposed to the submission point.	Refer submission 86.90 above.
1438	Morrison, A (FS)	86	90	108	17	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(1)		The submitter owns a residential property in Rotorua. The submitter is opposed to this submission point for the following reasons: - KO's remit is national not local. Their submissions are self-serving and pay little or no regard to the realities or Rotorua as it is presently constituted and as its existing residents would seek it to develop - Amendments sought by KO to Plan Change 9 are consistent with a maximum intensification, “one size fits all” approach to building standards throughout New Zealand.	Oppose submission	Refer submission 86.90 above.
1439	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	91			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this standard and considers the City Centre is a zone where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities.	Delete CCZ-S4.2.	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1440	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	91	104	42	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the removal for outdoor living space in the city centre zone. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outdoor living space.	Oppose to the submission point.	Refer submission 86.91 above.
1441	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	91	109	60	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outdoor living space standard within the City Centre Zones as it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. The RVA supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA.	Refer submission 86.91 above.
1442	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	91	111	60	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outdoor living space standard within the City Centre Zones as it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. Ryman supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the Ryman's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by Ryman.	Refer submission 86.91 above.
1443	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	92			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(3)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S4.3 pertaining to storage within residential units.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S4.3, as notified.	Noted.
1444	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	93			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(4)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S4.4 pertaining to hearing and ventilation within residential units.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S4.4, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1445	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	94			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. Deletion sought.	Delete standard CCZ-S4.5.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1446	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	94	104	43	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the removal for outlook space in the city centre zone. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outlook space (no windows?).	Oppose to the submission point.	Refer submission 86.94 above.
1447	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	94	109	61	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outlook space standard within the City Centre Zones as it may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. The RVA supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA.	Refer submission 86.94 above.
1448	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	94	111	61	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outlook space standard within the City Centre Zones as it may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. Ryman supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the Ryman's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by Ryman.	Refer submission 86.94 above.
1449	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	95			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S9 pertaining to landscaping within the City Centre 2 Zone.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S9, as notified.	Noted.
1450	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	96			Transport	Standards	CCZ-S5	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to standard CCZ-S5 in response to the proposed amendments to the City Centre Zone through PC9. In particular, reference should be made to the specific standards document (and, therefore, the document should be notified pre-notification of plan change).	Amend standard CCZ-S5 to reference the specific standards document the standard pertains to, as follows: [...] 1. City Centre 1 Zone and City Centre 3 Zone: a. [...] d. All vehicle crossings into local roads shall be provided and constructed to the standard of [insert name of document] Rotorua District Council. Where new vehicle crossings are proposed onto a State Highway, written consent from the New Zealand Transport Agency shall be provided.	Accept in part. Replace the standard with an advice note. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42 Report.
1451	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	97			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally opposes the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion pertaining to building design and site layout, contained in CCZ-MDA. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified – such as referring back to the various matters of discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings.	Amend the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion contained in CCZ-MDA and replace with a simplified set of matters [refer to full submission]:	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1452	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	97	80	9	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MDA		HNZPT opposes the changes sought by Kāinga Ora in so far as the proposed changes may affect mana whenua. HNZPT sought additional assessment criteria for these matters of discretion related to mana whenua.	Reject submission point 86.97	Refer submission 86.97 above.
1453	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	98			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	CCZ-MD2	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part, the proposed deletion of matters 1 – 4 from CCZ-MD2 and their replacement with a revised set of matters. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of “furniture” within the matters of discretion when not achieving standard CCZ-S4.1 – minimum size of residential units and seeks deletion of the outdoor living space and outlook space matters consequential to the deletion sought of these provisions within the CCZ.	Amend the matters of discretion for minimum size of residential units to remove reference to furniture (so reads 'space for internal circulation') and remove matters of outdoor living space and outlook space.	Reject It is considered that the inclusion of 'furniture' within the matters of discretion is relevant to the assessment of effects on the quality of on-site living environments. This provision gives effect to CCZ-O5.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1454	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	99			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Introduction Commercial Chapter	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the introduction section of the Commercial Zones Chapter – specifically, those amendments to the COMZ1, COMZ2, COMZ3, COMZ4 and COMZ6 zone descriptions.	1. Retain the introduction of the statement pertaining to opportunities for residential units to be provided above ground floor within Commercial Zone 1, 2, 3 and 6 descriptions, as notified. 2. Retain the deletion of references to maximum ground floor area and building heights from the Commercial Zone 3 description and the typologies, bulk and location from the Commercial 4 Zone description, as notified. 3. Retain the introduction of reference to ‘high density residential’ within the Commercial Zone 4 description.	Noted.
1455	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	100			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the Commercial Centres issue 1 to represent the revised framework resulting from PC9.	Retain the proposed amendments to issue COMZ-I1, as notified.	Noted.
1456	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	101			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the design and appearance of buildings issue to represent the revised framework resulting from PC9.	Retain the proposed amendments to issue COMZ-I2, as notified.	Noted.
1457	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	102			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O2. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports recognising that the commercial zone is “mixed-use” with the proposed enablement of residential development above the ground floor within the zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O1, as notified.	Noted.
1458	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	103			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports replacing the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O3. Specifically, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed replacement of the word “avoids” with “mitigates.”	Retain the proposed replacement of the word “avoids” with “mitigates” in Objective COMZ-O3, as notified.	Noted.
1459	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	104			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O3A	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the newly proposed Objective COMZ-O3A. The introduction of this objective now establishes a policy framework to recognise the proposed enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial Zone. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the outcomes the proposed objective seeks to achieve.	Retain the newly proposed Objective COMZ-O3A, as notified.	Noted.
1460	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	105			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O4	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Objective COMZ-O4, in response to the proposed amendments to the Commercial Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table.	Amend Objective COMZ-O4, as follows: Subdivision, use and development that enables the continued efficient operation of existing development and activities	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1461	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	106			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P1 insofar as enabling increased density and scale of the Commercial Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P1, as notified.	Noted.
1462	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	107			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Policy COMZ-P2 to enable a range of activities within the Commercial 1 Zone (Ngongotahā Village). In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the word “maintain” from the policy.	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy COMZ-P2, as notified.	Noted.
1463	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	108			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the newly proposed policy COMZ-P5 insofar as the policy recognises the proposed enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial 4 Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P5, as notified.	Noted.
1464	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	109			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment to Policy COMZ-P7 to introduce the word “residential” into the policy. The policy framework for the Southern Edge Commercial Centre would now provide for the establishment of residential activities – thus responding to the enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial Zone.	Retain the proposed amendment to Policy COMZ-P7 to include the word “residential”, as notified.	Noted.
1465	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	110			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P8	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy COMZ-P8 insofar as it recognises the influence of commercial development on streets and public open spaces.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P8, as notified.	Noted.
1466	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	111			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P10 insofar as the policy enables increased density of housing within the Commercial Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P10, as notified.	Noted.
1467	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	112			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P12	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed outcomes sought through proposed Policy COMZ-P12.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P12, as notified.	Noted.
1468	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	113			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P13	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P13 insofar as outlining the criteria to achieve ‘quality’ on site living environments for residential units located within the Commercial Zone. Kāinga Ora seeks deletion of reference to private outdoor space and outlook consequential to the relief sought to delete the relevant private open space and outlook standards within the commercial zone. Consequential renumbering will be required.	Delete clause i in COMZ-P13, which references private open space, and the reference to outlook in clause ii	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1469	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	114			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P9, COMZ-P11, COMZ-P15	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Policies COMZ-P9, COMZ-P11 and COMZ-P15, in response to the proposed amendments to the Commercial Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table. In particular taking the opportunity to providing further clarity to the operative policy framework of the Commercial Zone as it responds to the enablement proposed through PC9.	Amend Policies COMZ-P9, COMZ-P11 and COMZ-P15, as follows: COMZ-P9 Manage the ~~design-location~~ of activities within commercial centres to maintain or enhance the ~~character~~ , public safety and efficient ~~functioning operation~~ of the transport network. COMZ-P11 ~~Manage the effects and design of activities to~~ e-Ensure that the amenity of adjoining residential properties ~~to commercial zones~~ is not adversely affected ~~by the adjacent commercial activities and built form~~ . COMZ-P15 ~~Manage the location and design of new subdivision, use and development within each zone to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities.~~	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1470	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	115			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the permitted activity status for the maintenance and repair of a building exterior or the external alterations less than 25m2 for a building within the Commercial Zones 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. However, seek this also includes Commercial Zone 5 which currently has no permitted pathway for these activities and therefore would fall under rule COMZ-R1 as a non-complying activity.	Amend both COMZ-R2.1 and COMZ-R2.3 to include a reference to 'Commercial 5 Zone' - refer to full submission for track changes sought	Reject The Commercial 5 Zone is excluded from PC9.
1471	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	116			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the change from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activity for new buildings within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zone. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the cascade to Restricted Discretionary Activity when compliance cannot be achieved with rule COMZ-R3.3. However, Kāinga Ora queries why non-compliance with rule COMZ-R3.1 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	Amend rule COMZ-R3 insofar as refining the matters of discretion for non-compliance with COMZ-R3.1 to avoid two Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the same rule.	Reject. COMZ-R3.3 relates to non compliance with the relevant performance criteria.
1472	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	116	80	10	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3		HNZPT opposes this submission point. It has made its own submission regarding COMZ R3 seeking that matters of discretion d-height and e-building design and layout are retained and would be concerned if these matters were to be deleted.	Reject submission point 86.116	Refer submission 88.116 above.
1473	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	117			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R32	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-R32. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the 'Commercial 6 Zone' within the applicable spatial layers – thus enabling residential units within the Commercial 6 Zone as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the relevant performance standards. However, it is noted that while the 'Commercial 4 Zone' is included within the 'applicable spatial layers' column, it is not listed in the clause 1 'where'. Therefore, Kāinga Ora seeks that reference to the 'Commercial 4 Zone' is included within the 'where' statement for standard COMZ-R33.	Amend standard COMZ-R32 to include reference to the 'Commercial 4 Zone' - refer to full submission for track changes sought.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1474	Holmes, W (FS)	86	117	82	16	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Residential accommodation should not be allowed on sites bounding city entranceways, notably Fenton Street and Lake Road where these entranceways re critical for tourism accommodation to support Rotorua's largest GDP earner - tourism.	Oppose submission.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1475	Hamill, W (FS)	86	117	154	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33		The submitter opposes 6 stories and emergency or long term housing especially without resource consents and giving neighbours a right of objection. These are concentrated buildings with no wrap around services and concentrate people in slum housing in the gateway to our city. If you must concentrate this then recreate the Ford block, 'once were warriors', somewhere else other than at our cities gateway.	Not stated.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1476	Holmes, R (FS)	86	117	172	16	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Residential accommodation should not be allowed on sites bounding city entranceways, notably Fenton Street and Lake Road where these entranceways re critical for tourism accommodation to support Rotorua's largest GDP earner - tourism.	Oppose submission.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1477	Holmes, T (FS)	86	117	173	16	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R2		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. Residential accommodation should not be allowed on sites bounding city entranceways, notably Fenton Street and Lake Road where these entranceways re critical for tourism accommodation to support Rotorua's largest GDP earner - tourism.	Oppose submission.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1478	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	118			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora seeks that the conversion of buildings into residential units should be a permitted activity within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 zones to align with COMZ-R32 above. Consequentially, this will provide a consolidated list of matters of discretion.	Amend rule COMZ-R33 to a permitted activity and consolidate the matters of discretion [refer to full submission]	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1479	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	118	104	44	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the conversion of buildings into residential units be classed as a permitted activity in the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outdoor living space and no outlook space (no windows?).	Oppose this submission point.	Refer submission 86.118 above.
1480	Hamill, W (FS)	86	118	154	5	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R33		The submitter opposes 6 stories and emergency or long term housing especially without resource consents and giving neighbours a right of objection. These are concentrated buildings with no wrap around services and concentrate people in slum housing in the gateway to our city. If you must concentrate this then recreate the Ford block, ‘once were warriors’, somewhere else other than at our cities gateway.	Not stated.	Refer submission 86.118 above.
1481	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	119			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Support	Kāinga Ora support the proposed amendments to the performance standard pertaining to maximum height limits in the Commercial Zone. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed increase in height from 12m to 20m in both the Commercial 1 and Commercial 2 zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S1, as notified.	Noted.
1482	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	120			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S2 pertaining to yard requirements within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of front and side yard setbacks for Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones except where the site adjoins a Residential 1 or 2 Zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S2, as notified.	Noted.
1483	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	121			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the site coverage performance standard COMZ-S3 from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S3, as notified.	Noted.
1484	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	122			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S4	Support	Support the proposed deletion of the household unit density performance standard COMZ-S4 from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S4, as notified.	Noted.
1485	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	123			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the introduction of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within the Commercial Zone framework. However, Kāinga Ora considers it is more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from 35m2 to 30m2 and 1 or more bedroom units from 45m2 to 40m2 – as consistent with relief sought for the City Centre Zone framework.	Amend proposed standard COMZ-S5.1 to decrease the minimum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from 35m2 to 30m2 and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m2 to 40m2	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1486	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	123	104	45	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(1)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the reduction of the performance standards for minimum size of units to 30m2 for a studio and 40m2 for a one bedroom in the commercial zone. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outdoor living space and no outlook space (no windows?).	Oppose this submission point.	Refer submission 86.123 above.
1487	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	124			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this standard and considers the Commercial Zones are zones where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities.	Delete standard COMZ-S5.2.	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1488	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	124	104	46	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the removal for outdoor living space in the commercial zone. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outdoor living space.	Oppose this submission point.	Refer submission 86.124 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1489	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	124	109	62	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outdoor living space standard within the Commercial Zones as it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. The RVA supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA.	Refer submission 86.124 above.
1490	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	124	111	62	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)		The submitter has significant interest in how the District Plan Provides for retirement villages and aged care facilities, contribute to housing and healthcare and have experience in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outdoor living space standard within the Commercial Zones as it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. Ryman supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the Ryman's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the Ryman.	Refer submission 86.124 above.
1491	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	125			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard COMZ-S5.2 pertaining to storage within residential units from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S5.2, as notified.	Noted.
1492	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	126			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(3)	Support	Kāinga Ora support the proposed deletion of standard COMZ-S5.3 pertaining to heating and ventilation within residential units from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S5.3, as notified.	Noted.
1493	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	127			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete standard CCZ-S4.5.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1494	Rotorua Planning Consultants (FS)	86	127	104	47	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)		The submitter represents a group of planning professionals with an interest in good urban form and ensuring appropriate planning provisions are included in the District Plan. The submitter is opposed to the removal for outlook space in the city centre zone. The submitter is opposed to this submission point due to the potential for poor quality residential units. The submitter states that they are unaware if the building code contains minimum standards for apartments, but on the surface, this would seem to enable the conversion of existing buildings into 30m2 units with no outlook space (no windows?).	Oppose this submission point.	Refer submission 86.127 above.
1495	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (FS)	86	127	109	63	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outlook space standard within the Commercial Zones as it may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. The RVA supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by the RVA.	Refer submission 86.127 above.
1496	Ryman Healthcare Limited (FS)	86	127	111	63	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)		The submitter represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages, provides housing and healthcare and has specialist experience and expertise in the District Plan within Rotorua. The submitter supports in part the removal of the outlook space standard within the Commercial Zones as it may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. Ryman supports this submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the Ryman's primary submission.	Allow submission point to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought by Ryman.	Refer submission 86.127 above.
1497	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	128			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(5)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed standard COMZ-S5.5 pertaining to landscaping for residential units located on the ground floor within the Commercial 4 Zone – recognising residential units can locate on the ground floor of the Commercial 4 Zone as a Discretionary Activity.	Retain newly proposed standard COMZ-S5.5, as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1498	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	129			Transport	Standards	COMZ-S(6)	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Kāinga Ora considers that COMZ-S6 should refer to the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (or new applicable document).	Amend standard COMZ-S6 to reference the specific standards document the standard pertains to, as follows: [...] 3. All Commercial Zones: All vehicle crossings into local roads shall be provided and constructed to the standard of <u>the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications</u> ~~Rotorua District Council~~ . Where new vehicle crossings are proposed onto a State Highway, written consent from the New Zealand Transport Agency shall be provided.	Accept in part. Replace the standard with an advice note. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42 Report.
1499	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	130			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MDA	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed matters of discretion contained in COMZ-MDA as they relate to non-compliance with the various height standards of the Commercial Zones.	Retain the proposed matters of discretion contained in COMZ-MDA, as notified.	Noted.
1500	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	131			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora generally opposes the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion pertaining to building design and site layout, contained in COMZ-MD1. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified – such as referring back to the various matters are discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings. Consequential renumbering will be required.	Delete the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion contained in COMZ-MD1 and replace with a simplified set of matters [refer to full submission for track changes]	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1501	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	86	131	80	11	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1		HNZPT has made a submission point regarding COMZ-MD1 seeking their retention and some amendments, and would be concerned if these matters were deleted/altered in response to this submission point.	Reject submission point 86.131	Refer submission 86.131 above.
1502	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	132			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD3	Seek amendment / support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed deletion of matters 1 – 4 from COMZ-MD3 and their replacement with a revised set of matters. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of “furniture” within the matters of discretion when not achieving standard COMZ-S5.1 – minimum size of residential units and seeks deletion of the outdoor living space and outlook space matters consequential to the deletions sought of these provisions within the COMZ.	Amend the matters of discretion for minimum size of residential units to remove reference to furniture and delete matters for outdoor living space and outlook space refer to full submission for track changes	Accept in Part. Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Zones Section 42A Report.
1503	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	133			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Other	COMZ-AER11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed anticipated environmental result pertaining to increasing residential activity within centre and commercial areas, where permitted.	Retain the newly proposed anticipated environmental results AER-11, as notified.	Noted.
1504	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	134			Development Areas	General	General	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the Pukehāngi Heights Development Area and the Wharenui Development Area to integrate and implement the Housing Supply Act.	Retain the proposed amendments to the development areas where they are consistent with the prescribed MDRS and seek to integrate and implement the requirements of the Housing Supply Act, as notified.	Accept. Retain provisions and approach as notified. Refer to development areas section of the Section 42A Report.
1505	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	86	135			Transport	Standards	Appendix 1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to APP1.4B to require a transport assessment for 20 or more residential units and considers that in the case of land use consent applications, thresholds for Integrated Transportation Assessments should be tied to number of car parking spaces rather than number of units – noting each residential unit is not required to provide on-site car parking.	Delete the transport assessment requirements in full and retain the requirement for an integrated transport assessment however, the trigger for this assessment should be tied to 100 on-site carparks, rather than 100 residential units. <u>A transport assessment is a simple review of the effects of a development on the road network immediately surrounding the site and must be prepared by a suitably qualified person. Its purpose is to assess the effects of the development on the safe and efficient operation of the adjacent road network, including ensuring the road network can accommodate relevant service vehicles (waste collection trucks, delivery trucks) and emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>A transport assessment is required for a subdivision or land use consent for 20 or more residential units or lots on a site and up to 100 carparks or more residential units or lots, above which an Integrated Transport Assessment will be required in accordance with APP1 (4)(a).</u>	Reject. Retain the transport assessment for 20+ residential units and retain units as the basis for the threshold for an ITA. Refer to discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1506	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (FS)	86	135	46	3	Transport	Standards	Appendix 1		There is a distinction between a Transport Assessment (TIA) and an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA). An ITA is a comprehensive assessment of transport effects considering all modes of transport, including integration between and provision of walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure. ITA's also consider site locality in terms of the proposal's ability to enable residents to work, enjoy recreation, shop and learn locally. ITA's are typically warranted for larger development proposals. A TIA is a more focused assessment, typically focusing primarily on traffic effects on the road network. TIAs are typically warranted for development proposals on the smaller end of the spectrum. Residential developments that require in the order of 100 carparks can be expected to generate in the order of 800 vehicle movements per day. This is well in excess of the scale at which a TIA should be provided to enable Council to properly consider traffic effects. 20 residential units is considered a more appropriate threshold. Carparks are not considered to be an appropriate proxy for transport effects that can be used to determine whether an ITA is warranted. Carparks provide an indication of likely vehicular trip generation, but not the other factors considered in an ITA, such as the need for walking, cycling and public transport provision. For this reason, the number of residential units proposed is considered to be a more appropriate threshold for determining whether an ITA is warranted.	Oppose submission. Retain the provisions of APP1.4B as notified.	Accept. Retain provisions. Refer to discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1507	Holmes, W (FS)	86	135	82	17	Transport	Standards	Appendix 1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. A traffic impact assessment should be required for sites with more than 10 household units. 100 carparks as submitted does not depict the amounts of daily traffic movements, nor does it acknowledge the location or potential constraints or risks.	Oppose submission.	Accept in part. Retain the assessment but for 20 (not 10) residential units.
1508	Holmes, R (FS)	86	135	172	17	Transport	Standards	Appendix 1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. A traffic impact assessment should be required for sites with more than 10 household units. 100 carparks as submitted does not depict the amounts of daily traffic movements, nor does it acknowledge the location or potential constraints or risks.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Retain provisions. Refer to discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1509	Holmes, T (FS)	86	135	172	17	Transport	Standards	Appendix 1		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone and opposes the original submission. A traffic impact assessment should be required for sites with more than 10 household units. 100 carparks as submitted does not depict the amounts of daily traffic movements, nor does it acknowledge the location or potential constraints or risks.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Retain provisions. Refer to discussion in the Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1510	Prescott, K (FS)	86	various	2	1	Various	Various	Various		Submitter lives in 'the zones' [existing Residential 2 zone] and states that they oppose all of Kāinga Ora's submissions. It is not a safe or wise decision to accept any of these submissions. The infrastructure, as well as municipal utility facilities are not up to standard to accommodate the extreme increase in use and demand. Increasing building heights not only have an effect on community continuity. They create extreme shadow/whether disturbance to surrounding housing. Building 5-6 multiple story homes in an earthquake zone, with single access drive ways of up to 20 homes creates a disaster zone for evacuation in the event of an earthquake. Not to mention the consequence of multiple story buildings collapsing and toppling over (example Christchurch). Road congestion and access/use will be increased. Creating traffic jam's in the CBD. The submitter opposes the narrative to house all of NZ homeless, displaced individuals in Rotorua. If this is to be passed it will forever change the beauty of Rotorua. Not only damaging long standing community members peaceful living environments, but will have a profound effect on Rotorua's world renown tourism. To loud, over populated, dark and dreary, congested, living environment. Our current community support that accommodates social, medical, mental health, crime will be severely affected by the strain on current infrastructures.	Oppose all of Kāinga Ora's submission, all proposals to increase building heights to 5-6 stores, all proposals to increase multiple access drive ways from 8-20, allowing 6 residential unit on a site.	Refer submission 86.132 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1511	Marshall, A (FS)	86	various	41	4	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes Kāinga Ora's submission - referring specifically to the proposed expansion of the Residential 2 Zone, alternative relief of amended heights as well as the 'many other sweeping and detailed changes to PC9 based on population growth projections that are obsolete'. The submitter states it assumes that the MSD-managed inflow of homeless will continue with MHUD proposing to process up to 15,000 over the next five years. the submitter is concerned that KO are seeking to intensify housing with little or no apparent sense of gradualism. There could be a catastrophic effect on the e character and nature of Rotorua, one of New Zealand's premier tourist centres.	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1512	Henderson, R (FS)	86	various	47	1	Various	Various	Various		The submitter lives in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the KO submission. They are concerned about the development of high-density housing in prime locations, which they think will significantly impact businesses and the overall character of Rotorua. They are concerned about the impact on already marginalised people being houses in multi-level highly dense unit blocks, as well as their own safety. The submitter already experienced a break-in while they were home. The proposals do not allow sufficient room for children to play or for residents to park their cars. Many side streets in Glenholme are extremely narrow and the safety and children and elderly residents could be compromised. The submitter states they don't have an issue with providing appropriate social housing for 'our own residents' as long as it is safe and in keeping with the current character of the area. KO should be proposing 'homes' not blocks of units to make marginalised people feel even more marginalised.	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission. That the elected members reverse the decision to be subject to the MDRS and develop a fresh housing policy in the public interest.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1513	Clayton, J (FS)	86	various	48	1	Various	Various	Various		The submitter is a resident of Glenholme (Sophia Street) for over 40 years and also states that they own property in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose Kāinga Ora's submission: - it appears to be a hostile attempt to create more social housing for NZ. - the submission would enable high density zoning in well-established neighbourhoods and areas that are inappropriate for this type of housing. - there is a high proportion of elderly in the Glenholme area that are already concerned about emergency housing on Fenton Street and are now worried about the issues being transferred to their own neighbourhood. - concern about reputation of Rotorua and impact on Tourism if Rotorua becomes a housing ghetto for the rest of the country. The submitter says that they have no issue with providing social housing in the neighbourhood for Rotorua people, but it needs to be in keeping with the current character and 'look and feel' of the existing neighbourhood - limited to 1 storey type dwellings (perhaps 3 dwellings per section).	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1514	Weir, T (FS)	86	various	49	1	Various	Various	Various		The submitter lives in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the KO submission. They are concerned about Rotorua losing its vibrancy and reputation and the impact on the economy. They consider Rotorua is being used as a social housing experiment. High-density housing proposed within the quiet and established suburb of Glenholme is unfair to existing residents and also unsafe. The submitter is concerned about parking and traffic, impact on existing character, quality of development (recent Ranolf street buildings used as an example)	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission. That the elected members reverse the decision to be subject to the MDRS and develop a fresh housing policy in the public interest.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1515	Barnett, M and L (FS)	86	various	50	1	Various	Various	Various		The submitters are residents in Glenholme. They oppose the KO submission. They consider that the type of high density development proposed will change the character not just of Glenholme but of the city. They are concerned about building large quantities of social housing, the impact on elderly, blocking of sunlight, traffic congestion, car parking, residents leaving the city. They say they have no issue with providing social housing in the neighbourhood for Rotorua people as long as it is safe and in keeping with the current character of the city - 1 storey, (perhaps 2-3 on a section) not blocks of high rise units.	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission. That the elected members reverse the decision to be subject to the MDRS and develop a fresh housing policy in the public interest.	Refer submission 86.132 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1516	Ronayne, T (FS)	86	various	51	20	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the KO submission.	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission. There should be a reversal of the decision to make Rotorua subject to the MDRS and intensification should be restricted to the CBD and to adjacent areas.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1517	Irwin, W (FS)	86	various	83	22	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They oppose the KO submission.	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission. There should be a reversal of the decision to make Rotorua subject to the MDRS and intensification should be restricted to the CBD and to adjacent areas.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1518	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	86	various	91	31	Various	Various	Various		RDRR states it is the voice for residents and ratepayers and that its members are opposed to Kāinga Ora's proposals. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Oppose Kāinga Ora's submission (various proposals). RLC should reverse the decision to make itself subject to the MDRS and also restrict intensification to the CBD and adjacent areas.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1519	Bennett, K (FS)	86	various	114	2	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to higher density housing and in particular multi-storey properties. The submitter is opposed because of the following reasons: - will change the vibe of the area - increased crime - increased levels of noise - impact peaceful suburban communities. Submitter states that residents need the choice available to live in neighbourhoods with a high standard of housing and that they worked hard to live in the area. The submitter also raises concerns around the management of Kāinga Ora tenants.	Oppose the submission, and plan change 9.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1520	Bennett, A (FS)	86	various	115	2	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to higher density housing and states that communities should remain suburban, with low density housing and green spaces. Higher density housing/multi-storey housing should be limited to the CBD. The submitter raises concerns about Kāinga Ora developments and that there is little care and consideration for residents.	Oppose the submission and that high density housing/multi-storey housing should be limited to the CBD.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1521	Adams, J (FS)	86	various	123	5	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone. The submitter is opposed to the entire KO submission. The submitter is concerned that KO's suggestion of multi-storey buildings across Rotorua suburbs as a solution shows a lack of respect for the residents of Rotorua.	Oppose the submission.	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1522	Hayes, I (FS)	86	various	127	2	Various	Various	Various		The submitter owns property in the Residential 2 Zone. They express concern about KO influence and whether they are promoting what is really in the interests of Rotorua to see it thrive. It is not up to Kāinga Ora to create the community. That is up to each and everyone of us in the community to decide what sort of community we want.	Not stated	Refer submission 86.132 above.
1523	Smith, R and T (FS)	86	various	168	1	Other	Other	Other		The submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone in Kawaha Point adjacent to a proposed Kāinga Ora development and state that Kāinga Ora has asked to purchase their property. They seek clarification of Kāinga Ora policies for assisting those in poverty, Kāinga Ora communications, assistance for them finding another home.	Seek clarification	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
1524	Smith, R and T (FS)	86	various	168	2	Other	Other	Other		The submitters own property in the Residential 1 Zone in Kawaha Point adjacent to a proposed Kāinga Ora development and state that Kāinga Ora has asked to purchase their property. They seek clarification of whether policing will be increased, liquor licences will be revoked, rates reduction and use of bollards in the park.	Seek clarification	Reject. This is not relief that can be provided within the Plan Change.
1525	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	1			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA does not oppose the definitions for 'comprehensive residential development', however the RVA seeks that retirement villages are specifically excluded from these definitions to ensure clarity for rule interpretation.	Amend definition of comprehensive residential development to specifically exclude retirement villages	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1526	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Oppose	The RVA seeks that the definition of a rest home is deleted and replaced with the National Planning Standards definition for a retirement village. The RVA considers that a 'retirement village' definition is required in the District Plan as this term has been sought to be included in multiple provisions in the relief sought by the RVA on PC9. The definition is required to acknowledge the differences between retirement villages and other typical residential activities.	Delete definition of rest home and add definition of retirement village as follows: <u>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>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1527	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	3			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Support	The RVA considers that a ‘retirement unit’ definition is required in the District Plan, as this definition has been sought to be included in multiple provisions in the relief sought by the RVA on PC9. The definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Add definition of retirement unit to the District Plan: <u>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>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1528	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	4			Strategic Direction	Issues	SPUD-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the acknowledgement that a range of housing types need to be enabled to provide for changing demographics and market demands, as this is consistent with the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act. The RVA also supports the specific recognition that Rotorua is projected to have an ageing population. However, the RVA considers that in addition to acknowledging the opportunities that smaller houses on smaller sites can provide for older people looking to downsize, SDUD-I1 should also specifically acknowledge that retirement villages play an important role in accommodating ageing populations in the community (as part of a well-functioning urban environment). The RVA also supports the acknowledgement that existing urban areas will need to change over time to meet the demand for housing by providing a greater density of development than previously provided, as this is consistent with the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend the SDUD-I1 explanatory text to specifically acknowledge that retirement villages and / or accommodation for the ageing population are required and provided for as part of a well-functioning urban environment to respond to the projected ageing population.	Accept SDUD-I1 is amended to recognise that rest homes can provide housing and care options that are suitable for an aging population. Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section s42A Report.
1529	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	5			Strategic Direction	Issues	SPUD-I6	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the intention of SDUD-I6 and the acknowledgement that neighbourhoods will change over time as more intensive development occurs and land is used more efficiently, resulting in change in amenity values, as this is consistent with the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act. The RVA seeks amendments to more accurately reflect the drafting of the MDRS. It is unclear what “well-designed development” means, and if it is different from Policy 5 of the MDRS, which is to encourage high-quality development. The RVA seeks amendments to align with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Amend SPUD-I6 as follows: ~~Well-designed~~ <u>High-quality</u> development can support quality living environments for people and <u>achieve</u> ~~enhance the visual attractiveness of and safe streets.~~ This is important as Rotorua transitions to a more compact urban form. Neighbourhoods will change over time as more intensive development occurs and land is used more efficiently. This will change the amenity values appreciated by some people in existing neighbourhoods but <u>will may</u> also improve amenity values for future generations, by enabling greater housing choice in the most accessible parts of Rotorua.	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1530	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	6			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O1	Support	The RVA supports SDUD-O1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.	Retain SPUD-O1	Accept PC9 proposes to include mandatory Objectives under the MDRS within the Strategic Direction chapter of the District Plan. Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1531	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	7			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SPUD-O2	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA generally supports SDUD-O2 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS, but seeks amendments to (ii) to recognise that 6 storeys is not a limit (but a permitted standard), consistent with the direction in Policy 3 NPSUD.	Amend SPUD-O2 as follows: A relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to— i. housing needs and demand; and ii. the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including three storey buildings within the Residential 1 Zone and ~~up to~~ six storeys <u>buildings</u> in the Residential 2 Zone.	Accept Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1532	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	8			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O4	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part SDUD-O4 and the primary focus for higher density residential intensification being in areas within and adjacent to centres and employment opportunities, in areas well-served by existing or planned public or active transport or where there is a high demand for housing relative to other urban areas. As described in the submission body, retirement villages need to locate in all residential areas to provide for older persons to “age in place”. A ‘centres and transport linkages’ approach to residential intensification does not recognise this requirement of retirement villages.	Amend SDUD-O4 as notified to recognise that retirement villages need to locate in all residential areas.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1533	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	9			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O7	Oppose in part	The policy direction to maintain amenity values associated with the Rotorua caldera landscape is not opposed, however it is unclear how broad “adjacent zones” extends beyond the Rotorua caldera landscape and if widely interpreted this objective could restrict urban intensification.	Amend SDUD-O7 to delete “and adjacent zones”.	Reject. The strategic direction provisions provide the basis for management of the caldera rim in, for example, the Pukehangi development area and may be relevant to future zone change proposals..

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1534	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	10			Strategic Direction	Objectives	SDUD-O9	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA notes that SDUD-O9 reflects aspects of the MDRS, but considers as currently drafted the objective overlaps with several MDRS objectives and policies (including SDUD-O1), but uses different terminology. It is therefore unnecessary and should be deleted to avoid confusion.	Delete SDUD-O9.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1535	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	11			Strategic Direction	Objectives	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	In addition to the current strategic direction objectives for Urban Form and Development, the RVA considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population given the changing demographics of Rotorua and the lack of appropriate housing and care for the ageing population (as set out in detail in the body of this submission).	The RVA seeks that a new objective is inserted in the Strategic Direction objectives for Urban Form and Development that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population as follows: <u>SDUD-Ox Ageing population: Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>	Reject An additional policy is not necessary as SDUD-O1 and SDUD-O2 recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population. Refer to s42A report s1.1.1.
1536	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	12			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P1	Support	The RVA supports SDUD-P1. It considers it is appropriate to include additional detail about housing types and densities in the relevant zone chapters to align with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain SDUD-P1 as notified.	Noted.
1537	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	13			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3	Oppose	The RVA opposes SDUD-P3 as it covers qualifying matters, which are already addressed under SDUD-P4 (which is consistent with Policy 2 of the MDRS). The RVA considers as drafted SDUD-P3 overlaps with, but is inconsistent with, SDUD-P4 and therefore will create interpretation issues when the Plan is applied. SDUD-P3 should be deleted or consolidated with SDUD-P4 if necessary to reflect the qualifying matters relevant in Rotorua.	Delete SDUD-P3 or consolidate with SDUD-P4.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1538	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	88	13	80	12	Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P3		NZHPT has made its own submission on this policy and is concerned that its changes are retained.	Reject submission point 88.13	Refer submission 88.13 above.
1539	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	14			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P4	Support	The RVA supports SDUD-P4 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.	Retain SDUD-P4 as notified.	Noted.
1540	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	15			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P6	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports SDUD-P6 which seeks to provide the highest density of development within and adjoining the City Centre, a high density within suburban centres and a medium density of development throughout residential areas as this reflects the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. However, this policy needs to recognise that within the planned urban built character (be that highest, high or medium density) there will be a variety of types and densities of housing.	Amend SDUD-P6 as notified to replace “of development” with “urban built character”.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1541	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	16			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P7	Oppose in part	The RVA considers SDUD-P7 is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. It considers this policy should be amended to recognise that the character of communities will change as a result of varied housing densities and types, noting that changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect, in line with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend SDUD-P7 as follows: Ensure that development in the areas identified for new growth is carried out in a manner that meets the community’s needs and avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse environmental effects, <u>recognising that the residential nature and character will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD as SDUD-P7 refers to new growth areas.
1542	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	17			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P20	Oppose in part	The RVA does not oppose the intention of SDUD-P20 but suggests as currently drafted includes elements of both Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. As both Objective 1 and Policy 3 are already incorporated in the Plan Change, the RVA considers SDUD-P20 will create interpretation issues and should be deleted.	Delete SDUD-P20.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1543	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	18			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P21	Support	The RVA supports SDUD-P21 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain SDUD-P21 as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1544	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	19			Strategic Direction	Policies	SDUD-P24	Oppose	The RVA opposes SDUD-P24 which seeks to avoid all subdivision, use and development which results in the inefficient and/or uneconomic expansion of existing infrastructure and fragmented residential development. This policy may inadvertently prevent development from occurring based on differing views on what is considered ‘inefficient’ or ‘uneconomic’. This policy does not recognise that development may be able to be provided for through infrastructure upgrades where necessary.	Delete SDUD-P24.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1545	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	20			Strategic Direction	Policies	SPUD-P26	Oppose in part	The RVA considers SDUD-P26 is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. It considers this policy should be amended to recognise that the character of communities will change as a result of increased and varied housing densities and types, noting that changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect, in line with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend SDUD-P26 as follows, or delete as is replicates Policy SDUD-P7: Ensure that development in the areas identified for new growth is carried out in a manner that meets the community’s needs and avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse environmental effects, <u>recognising that the residential nature and character will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD as SDUD-P26 refers to new growth areas.
1546	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	21			Financial Contributions	Rule Table	FC-R1	Oppose	The RVA is concerned that the Financial Contributions section as proposed will result in ‘double dipping’ under the dual financial and development contribution regimes. Under Rules – Purpose of Financial Contributions, Council will require a financial contribution to achieve the objectives set out in the chapter, which include contributing to the upgrade of infrastructure necessary to service the activity. These matters are covered by the Development Contributions Policy adopted August 2022. The RVA also opposes financial contributions for reserves being based on the valuation of land (FC-R1), rather than the demand created by the new activity. It also considers financial contributions being based on the actual cost of infrastructure works creates uncertainty for development (FC-R2). The RVA considers any financial contributions must recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages any works carried out as part of development.	The RVA seeks amendments to: • Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping; • Provide certainty as to the financial contributions that will be required to be paid and ensure contributions are based on actual demand; • 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 that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Accept in part. Refer to the Financial Contributions section of the Section 42A Report. No relief considered necessary - make no changes.
1547	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	22			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction to Residential Chapter	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the purpose of the residential zone as it reflects Objective 1 of the MDRS. However, the RVA seeks amendments to paragraph 3 to better reflect Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend the Residential Zones Introduction as follows: The <u>urban built form visual appearance</u> of the Residential 1 and 2 zones will change over time as they experience an increase in the density and diversity of housing choices. <u>These changes may detract from amenity values experienced by some people, but improve the amenity values appreciated by other people.</u> This will promote more walkable neighbourhoods, support a sense of community and increase the viability of centres.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1548	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	23			Residential 1 Zone	Introduction	Introduction to Residential Chapter	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part the description of the Residential 1 Zone (Medium density residential zone) in so far as it is inconsistent with the MDRS, which does not require residential buildings ‘surrounded by open space’. The RVA also considers amendments to the description are necessary to recognise that three storeys is a permitted standard not a limit. The RVA also considers that specific acknowledgement of retirement villages is required in the introductory text given the important role retirement villages have in accommodating ageing populations in the community.	<i>The RVA seeks to amend the description for the Residential 1 Zone as follows:</i> Areas used predominantly for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, <u>retirement villages</u> , and other compatible activities. A medium density residential built character is expected, ~~comprising residential buildings generally up to including~~ <u>three storey buildings s, surrounded by open space.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1549	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	24			Residential 2 Zone	Introduction	Introduction to Residential Chapter	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part the description of the Residential 2 (High density residential zone) in so far as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD. The RVA considers amendments are necessary to recognise that building heights over six storeys may be appropriate, in accordance with Policy 3 NPSUD. The RVA also considers that specific acknowledgement of retirement villages is required in the introductory text given the important role retirement villages have in accommodating ageing populations in the community.	<i>The RVA seeks to amend the description for the Residential 2 Zone as follows:</i> Areas with good accessibility to commercial activities, public open space and community services, used predominantly for high density residential activities such as apartments, <u>retirement villages</u> , and other compatible activities. A high density residential built character is expected, comprising residential buildings ~~generally up to of at least~~ <u>six storeys.</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1550	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	88	24	64	10	Residential 2 Zone	Introduction	Introduction to Residential Chapter		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the submission. Six storey minimum for buildings in Rotorua is nonsensical and will effectively mean there will be no new buildings.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 88.24 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1551	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	25			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-I1 and the provision for medium density residential development in the Residential 1 Medium Density Residential Zone (to provide greater housing diversity and choice to existing residential neighbourhoods). The RVA also supports the RES-I1 as it recognises the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community, but suggests amendments could be made to the Residential 1 and Residential 2 sections to better align with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	<i>Amend RESZ-I1 as follows:</i> Residential 1 Medium Density Residential Zone The Residential 1 zone is the most widespread zone in Rotorua. Over time, a transition from low density to medium density residential <u>urban built form</u> is expected. This will provide greater housing diversity and choice within existing neighbourhoods that have reasonable access to commercial activities, public open space and community services. This enables future demand for housing in Rotorua to be met in a way that promotes the efficient use of land and resources. This requires greater focus on enabling the planned urban built form ~~future character~~ for the zone rather than maintaining the existing character, <u>which may detract from the amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by others.</u> Residential 2 Zone High Density Residential Zone The Residential 2 zone is located in the most accessible parts of Rotorua where there is good accessibility by existing or planned active or public transport to a range of commercial activities, public open space and community services. The zone enables the efficient use of land in these locations by allowing high density residential uses. <u>This requires greater focus on enabling the planned urban built form for the zone rather than maintaining the existing character, which may detract from the amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by others. which will result in a high-</u>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1552	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	26			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-I2 which recognises the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods which will transition to medium and high density residential areas (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. However, there are aspects of the issue that are inconsistent with the MDRS (e.g. the reference to low or permeable fencing, which the MDRS density standards does not address). In addition, the RVA considers the reference to “private” open space needs to be amended to recognise that communal spaces are provided by developments such as retirement villages. The RVA particularly supports the recognition that loss of amenity is anticipated as part of intensification and that any mitigation is subject to not limiting the ability to achieve medium to high density. It seeks amendments to better recognise the types of residential amenity that are expected to change.	<i>Amend RESZ-I2 as follows:</i> Ensuring development provides a quality frontage to the street, through the use of windows, ~~low or permeable fencing, visible pedestrian entries,~~ and landscaping ~~on the front boundary,~~ promotes a pleasant and safe street environment for pedestrians. Residents also need to have their day-to-day needs met on site including through access to ~~private open outdoor living~~ space, landscaped areas, ~~and sufficiently sized living spaces, that optimise sunlight access.~~ For more intensive development, this requires consideration of the site’s context and how buildings are orientated and placed on the site. Transitioning to medium density and high density living will change the appearance of neighbourhoods over time, particularly in the Residential 2 Zone. This will change the amenity values experienced by neighbouring sites, including the potential loss of existing <u>outlook views,</u> <u>privacy</u> and sunlight. While this consequence is anticipated, development should seek to mitigate these effects though building placement and design features, where it would not limit the ability to achieve medium to high density residential development.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1553	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	27			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O1	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-O1 which seeks that land is used efficiently for medium density residential living that increases housing supply and choice.	<i>Retain RESZ-O1 as notified.</i>	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1554	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	28			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-02	Oppose in part	The RV opposes in part the requirement in RESZ-02 for development in the Medium Density Residential Zone to be ‘generally up to’ three storeys, which is inconsistent with Objective 2 of the MDRS. Three storeys is the permitted standard, not a limit. The requirement for development to be surrounded by open space is also not supported, as it is inconsistent with the MDRS, which provide for attached dwellings and apartments (noting the yard density standard does not apply where there are common walls).	~~Amend RESZ-02 as follows:~~ Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a medium density residential built character <u>including three storey attached and detached dwellings and low-rise apartments</u> ~~comprising residential buildings generally up to three storeys, surrounded by open space.~~	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1555	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	29			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-03	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-03 which seeks that development contributes to attractive and safe streets and open spaces.	<i>Retain RESZ-03 as notified.</i>	Noted.
1556	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	30			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-04	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-04. It is not clear how a ‘healthy, safe and quality living environment’, which is not defined under the Plan, differs from a ‘well-functioning urban environment’ which is defined under the NPSUD. This will lead to interpretation issues when the Plan is applied. The RVA seeks amendments to RESZ-04 to align with the MDRS.	~~Amend RESZ-04 as follows:~~ Development contributes to a <u>well-functioning urban environment</u> ~~provides healthy, safe and quality living environments~~ for residents, within the context of a medium density residential environment.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1557	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	31			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-05	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-05 as it is unclear what “adequate services” is intended to capture.	~~Amend RESZ-05 as follows:~~ Development is supported by adequate infrastructure ~~and services.~~	Accept Amendments have been made to improve clarity.
1558	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	32			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-06	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-06, as it is unclear what would be required of development to ‘support’ the use of public and active transport.	~~Amend RESZ-06 as follows:~~ Development ~~supports~~ <u>encourages</u> the use of public and active transport.	Reject. Make no changes. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1559	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	88	32	84	16	Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-06		BOPRC opposes the relief sought by the submitter. ‘Encourages’ is considered less directive than ‘supports’. Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement directs to actively promote travel demand management, including by increasing public transport use, reducing the use of private motor vehicles and ensuring adequate provision for and increased use of future public transport, walking, cycling networks and corridors, while providing for connectivity. These matters are considered to support the use of public and active transport	Oppose submission	Accept. Make no changes. Refer to Transport section of the Section 42A Report.
1560	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	33			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-08	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-08 which seeks that land that has good accessibility via existing or planned active or public transport to a range of commercial activities, public open space and community services, and therefore has been zoned Residential 2, is efficiently used for high density urban living that increases housing supply and choice.	<i>Retain RESZ-08 as notified.</i>	Noted.
1561	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	34			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-09	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports in part RESZ-09 which seeks that development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a high density residential built character, but seeks amendments to better align RESZ-09 with the NPSUD, which recognises that buildings of at least 6 storeys may be suitable in certain areas under Policy 3.	~~Amend RESZ-09 as follows:~~ Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhoods with a high density residential built character, ~~comprising residential buildings generally up to~~ <u>including</u> six storey residential buildings, integrated with on-site landscaped areas.	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1562	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	35			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-010	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-010 which seeks that development contributes to attractive and safe streets and open spaces.	<i>Retain RESZ-010 as notified.</i>	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1563	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	36			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O11	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-O11. It is not clear how a ‘healthy, safe and quality living environment’, which is not defined under the Plan, differs from a ‘well-functioning urban environment’ which is defined under the NPSUD. This will lead to interpretation issues when the Plan is applied. The RVA seeks amendments to RESZ-O11 to align with the MDRS.	~~Amend RESZ-O11 as follows:~~ Development contributes to a well-functioning urban environment ~~provides healthy, safe, and quality living environments~~ for residents, within the context of a high density residential environment.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1564	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	37			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O12	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-O12 as it is unclear what “adequate services” is intended to capture.	~~Amend RESZ-O12 as follows:~~ Development is supported by adequate infrastructure ~~and services~~ .	Accept Amendments have been made to improve clarity.
1565	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	38			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O13	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-O13, as it is unclear what would be required of development to ‘support’ the use of public and active transport.	~~Amend RESZ-O13 as follows:~~ Development ~~supports~~ <u>encourages</u> the use of public and active transport.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.
1566	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	88	38	84	17	Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O13		Oppose relief sought by the submitter. ‘Encourages’ is considered less directive than ‘supports’. Policy UG 3A of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement directs to actively promote travel demand management, including by increasing public transport use, reducing the use of private motor vehicles and ensuring adequate provision for and increased use of future public transport, walking, cycling networks and corridors, while providing for connectivity. These matters are considered to support the use of public and active transport	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 88.38 above.
1567	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	39			Residential	Objectives	RESZ-O23	Support	The RVA supports these existing objectives being limited to the Residential 3, 4 and 5 zones, on the basis these zones are either subject to qualifying matter or not a relevant residential zone.	Retain as notified.	Noted.
1568	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	40			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P1	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P1 as notified.	Noted.
1569	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	41			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes RESZ-P2 in part, and seeks amendments to better align with Objective 2 of the MDRS, which does not ‘cap’ building height at 3 storeys, and requires a relevant residential zone to ‘respond to’ the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, not ‘achieve’ it. It also seeks amendments to (2) as building orientation and fencing are not a requirement of the MDRS.	Amend RESZ-P2 as follows: ~~Achieve~~ -Respond to the planned medium density residential built character by: 1. Enabling <u>a variety of housing types and sizes, including buildings of generally up to three storeys buildings</u> ; and 2. Encouraging development to provide a quality edge to the street through <u>building orientation</u> , setbacks, windows, ~~low or visually permeable fencing~~ , and landscaping; and 3. Providing opportunities for space around buildings and on-site landscaping.	Accept in part Refer to Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1570	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	42			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P3	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P3 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P3 as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1571	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	43			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P4	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P4 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P4 as notified.	Noted.
1572	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	44			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P5	Oppose in part	The RVA considers on-site amenity is already covered by Policy RESZ-P4 as directed by the MDRS. The RVA opposes the application of any on-site amenity requirements that go beyond the MDRS. 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 also notes that a requirement for “private” open space does not recognise the communal spaces provided by retirement villages and a requirement for pedestrian access to residential units from the street does not recognise the security and layout requirements of retirement villages.	Delete RESZ-P5 or exclude retirement villages from its application.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary as the recommended matters of discretion/assessment criteria for rest homes recognise the functional requirements of rest homes and will provide a clear framework to asses proposal for rest homes.
1573	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	45			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6	Oppose in part	The RVA supports the recognition in RESZ-P6 that mitigating adverse effects on adjoining sites will be limited by the need to achieve medium density development. The RVA opposes REZ-P6 to the extent it is inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS do not control building length. The RVA also considers the policies must provide clear direction that compliance with the MDRS density standards is sufficient management for the purposes of the policy.	~~Mitigate~~ <u>Manage</u> the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned medium density residential character; ~~including by:~~ 1. ~~addressing visual dominance by managing height and setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries;~~ 2. ~~limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;~~ 3. providing opportunities for sunlight access <u>and addressing overlooking to adjoining sites by managing height and height in relation to boundary;</u> 4. for 4+ residential unit developments, encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along side and rear boundaries. <i>Add new policy “Role of density standards” as sought below or integrate that concept into RESZ-P6.</i>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1574	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	46			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P7	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA considers that the RESZ-P7 should be amended to enable the upgrading and/or development of infrastructure to service residential development where the existing services do not have adequate capacity.	<i>Amend RESZ-P7 as follows:</i> Require proposals for four or more residential units to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development <u>or to demonstrate how the residential units will be serviced for infrastructure.</u>	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1575	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	47			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P8	Oppose in part	The RVA considers that the provision of adequate storage for cycle parking on sites with four or more residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only.	<i>The RVA seek to amend REZ-P8 so that it does not apply to retirement villages.</i>	Reject
1576	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	48			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at paragraphs [62-64], the RVA considers that a policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	<i>The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 1 Zone, as follows:</i> RESZ-Px Changing communities <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1577	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	88	48	97	72	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other		Kāinga Ora generally supports the policy direction sought in submission point 88.48.	Allow submission	Refer submission 88.48.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1578	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	49			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at paragraphs [90-92]), the RVA considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites is required.	<i>The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 1 Zone that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites:</i> <u>RESZ-Px Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1579	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	88	49	97	73	Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other		Kāinga Ora generally supports the policy direction sought in submission point 88.49.	Support policy direction in submission.	Refer submission 88.49 above.
1580	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	50			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at [72-89], the RVA considers that a policy to provide for housing for an ageing population and acknowledge the functional and operational needs of retirement villages is required.	The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 1 Zone, as follows: <u>RESZ-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 High Density Residential Areas, 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 a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1581	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	51			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	Other	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at [106-108], the RVA considers that a policy enabling the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments is required.	The RVA seeks that a new policy is inserted in the Residential 1 Zone that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments. <u>RESZ-Px Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1582	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	52			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P10	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P10 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P10 as notified.	Noted.
1583	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	53			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P11	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes RESZ-P11 in part, and seeks amendments to better align with Objective 2 of the MDRS, which does not ‘cap’ building height at 3 storeys, and requires a relevant residential zone to ‘respond to’ the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, not ‘achieve’ it. It also seeks amendments to (2), as building orientation and fencing are not a requirement of the MDRS.	Amend RESZ-P11 as follows: ~~Achieve~~ <u>Respond to</u> the planned high density residential built character by: <u>1. Enabling a variety of housing types and sizes, including at least buildings of generally up to six storeys buildings;</u> <u>2. Encouraging development to provide a quality edge to the street through building orientation, setbacks, windows, low or visually permeable fencing, and landscaping; and</u> <u>3. Providing opportunities for space around buildings and on-site landscaping.</u>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1584	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	54			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P12	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P12 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P12 as notified.	Noted.
1585	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	55			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P13	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-P13 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-P13 as notified.	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1586	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	56			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P14	Oppose in part	The RVA considers on-site amenity is already covered by Policy RESZ-P13 as directed by the MDRS. The RVA opposes the application of any on-site amenity requirements that go beyond the MDRS. 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 also notes that a requirement for “private” open space does not recognise the communal spaces provided by retirement villages and a requirement for pedestrian access to residential units from the street does not recognise the security and layout requirements of retirement villages.	~~Delete RESZ-P14 or exclude retirement villages from its application.~~	Reject The relief sought is not necessary as the recommended matters of discretion/assessment criteria for rest homes recognise the functional requirements of rest homes and will provide a clear framework to asses proposal for rest homes.
1587	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	57			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15	Oppose in part	The RVA supports the recognition in RESZ-P15 that mitigating adverse effects on adjoining sites will be limited by the need to achieve high density development. The RVA opposes REZ-P15 to the extent it is inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS do not control building length. The RVA also considers the policies must provide clear direction that compliance with the MDRS density standards is sufficient management for the purposes of the policy.	~~Mitigate~~ Manage the potential adverse effects of development on adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to achieve the planned medium density residential character, ~~including~~ by: 1. ~~addressing visual dominance by managing height and~~ 2. ~~limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;~~ 3. providing opportunities for sunlight access <u>and addressing overlooking</u> to adjoining sites <u>by managing height and height in relation to boundary;</u> 4. for 4+ residential unit developments, encouraging the use of other design techniques such as building recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscaping along side and rear boundaries. <i>Add new policy “Role of density standards” as sought below or integrate that concept into RESZ-P6.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1588	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	88	57	80	13	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15		HNZPT has made a submission point regarding RESZ-P15 seeking their retention and some amendments, and would be concerned if these matters were deleted/altered in response to this submission point.	Reject submission 88.57	Refer submission 88.57 above.
1589	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	58			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P16	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA considers that the RESZ-P16 should be amended to enable the upgrading and/or development of new infrastructure to service residential development when the existing infrastructure does not have adequate capacity.	<i>Amend RESZ-P16 as follows:</i> Require proposals for four or more residential units to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support the development <u>or to demonstrate how the residential units will be serviced for infrastructure.</u>	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1590	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	59			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P17	Oppose in part	The RVA considers that the provision of adequate storage for cycle parking on sites with four or more residential units should not apply to retirement villages. Residents of retirement villages do not cycle, so any cycle parking facilities are provided for staff and visitors only.	<i>The RVA seek to amend REZ-P17 so that it does not apply to retirement villages.</i>	Reject The relief sought is not necessary as the recommended matters of discretion/assessment criteria for rest homes recognise the functional requirements of rest homes and will provide a clear framework to asses proposal for rest homes.
1591	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	60			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at [62-64], the RVA considers that a policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	<i>The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 2 Zone, as follows:</i> RESZ-Px Changing communities To provide for the diverse <u>and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1592	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	88	60	97	74	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other		Kāinga Ora generally supports the policy direction sought in submission point 88.60.	Allow submission	Refer submission 88.60 above.
1593	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	61			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at paragraphs [90-92]), the RVA considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites is required.	<i>The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 2 Zone that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites:</i> RESZ-Px Larger sites Recognise the intensification <u>opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1594	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	88	61	97	75	Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other		Kāinga Ora generally supports the policy direction sought in submission point 88.61.	Allow submission	Refer submission 88.61 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1595	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	62			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at paragraphs [72-89], the RVA considers that a policy to provide for housing for an ageing population and acknowledge the functional and operational needs of retirement villages is required.	The RVA seeks that a new policy is included in the Residential 2 Zone, as follows: <u>RESZ-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 High Density Residential Areas, 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 a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1596	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	63			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	Other	Oppose in part	For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at [106-108], the RVA considers a policy enabling the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments is required.	The RVA seeks that a new policy is inserted in the Residential 2 Zone that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments. <u>RESZ-Px Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1597	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	64			Residential	Policies	RESZ P19-P42	Support	The RVA supports these existing policies being limited to the Residential 3, 4 and 5 zones, on the basis these zones are either subject to qualifying matter or not a relevant residential zone.	<i>Retain as notified.</i>	Noted.
1598	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	65			Residential	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports permitted activity status for residential units subject to compliance with the MDRS density standards and restricted discretionary activity status for residential units that do not comply with the standards. However, the general residential unit rules are not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages (including the matters of discretion). As retirement villages are a form of “four or more residential units”, the RVA considers the construction of villages must be enabled as a restricted discretionary activity. The RVA seeks this relief in relation to RESZ-R11 and a new policy below as it considers a retirement village-specific rule is better able to respond to the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	<i>The RVA seeks that retirement villages are excluded from RESZ-R3. Amend RESZ-R11 and provide a new rule for construction of retirement village buildings as sought below.</i>	Accept Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1599	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	66			Residential	Rule Table	RESZ-R11	Oppose in part	The RVA acknowledges rest homes are specifically addressed in RESZ-R11. The RVA supports a retirement village specific rule and considers this rule should be amended to refer to retirement villages in line with the RVA’s submission on the definitions chapter. For the reasons set out in the body of the submission at [109-111], the RVA considers that all Residential Zones (including the Residential 1 and 2 Zones) should include a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and 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.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-R11 as follows: RESZ-R11 ~~Rest homes~~ <u>Retirement Villages</u> Applicable Spatial Layers – All Residential Zones x. Activity Status: <u>Permitted Discretionary</u> ~~Assessment Criteria:~~ ~~a. General RESZ-AC1~~	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1600	Steens, M (FS)	88	66	1	2	Residential	Rule Table	RESZ-R11		Submitter owns property in Residential 1 Zone, which is affected by the plan change. Submitter opposes aspects of the Retirement Village Association submission relating to the status of retirement villages in residential zones, stating that retirement villages often contain high density living. They state that RVA's appeal for greater recognition of retirement villages as residential activities is misguided. Instead of placing greater emphasis on the residential nature of retirement villages, the qualifying criteria for each type of residential activities should be the touchstone; it is the nature of the activity, not the name, which concerns decision-makers. Retirement villages are a kind of residential activity - a higher density residential activity. That is how they are currently recognised in the current framework. The NPS-UD and Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 will invariable ease the consent process for retirement village construction and operation. regard must be had to the increasing chance of land intensification in areas rezoned as residential and whether such intensification would adversely affect or diminish the local environment, heritage qualities and natural value of those areas.	Oppose submission.	Refer submission 88.66 above.
1601	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (FS)	88	66	97	76	Residential	Rule Table	RESZ-R11		Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 754.66 as it considers that the activity status should remain RDA as per the activity status for residential development in Residential Zones.	Disallow submission.	Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1602	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	67			Residential	Rule Table	Other	Oppose in part	As noted above, the RVA supports restricted discretionary activity status for the construction of retirement village buildings, but considers retirement villages require 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. The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from being publicly notified, and that in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(2) of the Act a retirement village which is compliant with the relevant standards should also be precluded from limited notification.	<i>The RVA seeks that a new rule is included for the construction of retirement villages as follows:</i> <u>RESZ-RX Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u> <u>Applicable Spatial Layers – All Residential Zones</u> <u>x. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of Discretion:</u> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: RESZ-S1, RESZ-S2, RESZ-S3, RESZ-S6A.2, RESZ-S6A.3, RESZ-S6A.4, RESZ-S6A.6;</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u> <u>Notification status:</u>	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1603	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	68			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S1.1 and the building height and daylight envelope standards for the Residential 1 Zone in principle as it reflects the building height and height in relation to boundary standards of the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S1.1 as follows to include additional exclusions from the standard: RESZ-S1 Maximum height and daylight envelope 1. Residential 1 Zone: ... c. This standard does not apply to – iii. A boundary with a road: iv. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site: v. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed: vi. <u>Boundaries adjoining reserves and water zones, rural zones, city centre zones, commercial and mixed use zones, business and innovation zones and industrial zones.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1604	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	69			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S1.2 and the building height and daylight envelope standards for the Residential 2 Zone in principle as it enables greater building height and height in relation to boundary standards than the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S1.2 as follows to include additional exclusions from the standard: RESZ-S1 Maximum height and daylight envelope 2. Residential 2 Zone: ... d. This standard does not apply to – iii. A boundary with a road: iv. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site: v. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed: vi. <u>Boundaries adjoining reserves and water zones, rural zones, city centre zones, commercial and mixed use zones, business and innovation zones and industrial zones.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1605	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	70			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S2(1)	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-S2.1 and the yard provisions for the Residential 1 and 2 Zones as it reflects the setback standards of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-S2 as notified.	Noted.
1606	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	71			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)	Support	The RVA supports RESZ-S3.1 and the site coverage provision for the Residential 1 Zone as it reflects the building coverage standard of the MDRS.	Retain RESZ-S3.1 as notified.	Noted.
1607	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	72			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part RESZ-S3.2 and the site coverage provision for the Residential 2 Zone as it does not enable a higher density of development than the Residential 1 zone and is more restrictive than the current provisions.	Retain the current site coverage standards for buildings and impervious surfaces in the Residential 2 Zone	Reject. Adopt the proposed changes to impervious surfaces. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1608	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	88	72	64	11	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They oppose the submission to increase maximum impermeable surfaces. The stormwater system is already under pressure	Oppose submission.	Reject. Adopt the proposed changes to impervious surfaces. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1609	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	88	72	84	18	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter because restricting impervious surface area mitigates flooding and water quality effects. The maximum impervious cover is used to quantify flooding extent, flood depth and velocity and associated effects on the receiving environment.	Oppose relief in submission.	Accept. Adopt the proposed changes to impervious surfaces. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1610	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	73			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S4	Support	The RVA supports the deletion of a density standard for the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain deletions	Noted.
1611	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	74			Transport	Standards	RESZ-S5	Oppose in part	RESZ-S5 refers to Appendix 1 – Parking and Turning Standards. The RVA supports the “zero” parking performance standard that applies to residential units, as it is consistent with the NPSUD. However, it considers that standard should explicitly refer to retirement villages. The RVA opposes the information requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment to be provided for the development of more than 100 residential units per site. The RVA considers any requirements applying to retirement villages should reflect their lower transport demand compared to other residential development.	<i>Amend Appendix 1, Table 1 to clarify that no parking performance standard applies to retirement villages. Amend Appendix 1, 4.a so that an Integrated Transport Assessment is not required for retirement villages.</i>	Accept. Retain the requirement for an ITA and, if rest homes are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in response to other submissions, clarify that ITA requirement applies to rest homes. It is not considered necessary to make any clarifications to the disabled parking requirements. There is no specific requirement for rest homes stated and it is clear that residential has a zero requirement.
1612	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	75			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(1)	Oppose	The RVA opposes this standard as the minimum size of residential units is not included in the MDRS.	<i>Delete RESZ-S6A.1.</i>	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
1613	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	76			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S6A.2 and the outdoor living space provisions for the Residential 1 and 2 Zones in principle where they reflect the outdoor living space standards of the MDRS (with smaller outdoor living space area and minimum dimension standards for the Residential 2 Zone). However, the RVA opposes the additional standard for ground floor outdoor living spaces located to the south of buildings located on the same site (RESZ-S6A.2.a.iii) as the MDRS provisions of the Enabling Housing Act do not include this standard. The RVA also considers that, as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to RESZ-S6A.2 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S6.2 as follows: RESZ-S6A Design and Landscaping ... 2. Outdoor living space (per unit) a. Residential 1 and 2 Zones: ~~iii. Where an outdoor living space at ground floor is located south of any building located on the same site, the southern boundary of that space must be separated from any wall or building by at least 2m + 0.9(h), where (h) is the height of the wall or building as shown in the figure below. For the purpose of this standard south is defined as between 135 and 225 degrees.~~ iii. For retirement units, clauses i and ii apply with the following modifications: 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 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.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1614	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	77			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(3)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S6A.3 and the outlook space provisions for the Residential 1 and 2 Zones as they reflect the outlook space standards of the MDRS. However, the RVA considers 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 RESZ-S6A.3 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S6A.3 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: RESZ-S6.3 Outlook Space (per unit) (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) a. ... i. For retirement units, clauses a – h 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.	Accept in part Amend the standard to only apply at the external boundaries of the site where a rest home is proposed. Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1615	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	78			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S6A.4 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the MDRS. The RVA also considers that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units, as well as residential units, that face the street.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S6A.4 as follows: RESZ-S6.4 Windows to street (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) a. 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. b. Front doors may be solid. Garage doors do not contribute towards the 20% glazing. c. For the purpose of this rule, any area of roof space that is fully enclosed by a gable shall not be included in the area of the front façade...	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1616	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	79			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(5)	Oppose	The RVA opposes RESZ-S6A.5. A maximum building length standard for land use activities is not included in the MDRS.	The RVA seek for RESZ-S6A.5 to be deleted in full.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1617	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	80			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports RESZ-S6A.6 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the landscaped area standard of the MDRS, however it opposes the additional front yard landscaped area standard (RESZ-S6A.6.c) as the MDRS provisions of the Enabling Housing Act do not include this standard. The RVA also considers that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units also.	The RVA seeks to amend RESZ-S6A.6 as follows to provide for retirement units and to delete the additional front yard landscaped area standard that is not included in the MDRS. RESZ-S6A.6 Landscaped area (Residential 1 and 2 Zones) a. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them; b. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or <u>retirement unit</u> ; ~~c. At least 50% of the area of the front yard must comprise landscaped area.~~	Accept in part Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1618	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	81			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(7)	Oppose	The RVA opposes RESZ-S6A.7 as fencing standards for land use activities are not included in the MDRS.	<i>The RVA seek for RESZ-S6A.7 to be deleted in full.</i>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1619	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	82			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	RESZ-MDB	Oppose	The RVA opposes RESZ-MDB in its entirety, as it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS, and noting that the RESZ-MDB has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.	<i>Exclude retirement villages from RESZ-MDB and provide retirement village-specific matters of discretion as set out above.</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1620	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	83			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Introduction to City Centre Zones	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the enabling of inner city living in all city centre zones, but suggests that clarification is necessary to ensure residential activities are enabled in the Zone. The RVA considers that residential accommodation / activities should not be limited to being located above ground floor level within the City Centre 2 Zone. The RVA also seeks to clarify that ‘accommodation’ relates to permanent residential activities (and not temporary living accommodation, hotels etc.) and considers the term ‘accommodation’ should be replaced with ‘residential activities’ to provide clarity and to ensure consistency throughout the City Centre Zones chapter.	The RVA seeks that the City Centre Zones introduction is amended to provide for residential activities at the ground level within the City Centre 2 Zone where appropriate (including retirement villages). The RVA also seeks to replace the term ‘accommodation’ with ‘residential activities’.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1621	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	84			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	CCZ-P5	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports in part CCZ-P5 which encourages the provision of residential units within the city centre, but opposes the reference to ‘high amenity’ as this term is not defined in the Plan, which will lead to interpretation issues when the Plan is applied.	Amend CCZ-P5 as follows: Encourage the provision of ~~high-amenity~~ high-quality residential units. This will be achieved by ensuring residential units provide good access to sunlight from living rooms, good quality outdoor living spaces, outlook spaces, storage spaces, appropriate noise insulation, and are of a size and shape that will enable for the functional use of the units.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1622	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	85			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	Other	Support	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the City Centre Zone is required as well as policy direction relating to larger sites and the role of density standards (as also set out in the submission above at paragraphs [90-92] and [106-108]).	The RVA seeks the following policies are included in the City Centre Zones as follows: CCZ-Px Provision of housing for an ageing population <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 High Density Residential Areas, 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 a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> CCZ-Px Larger sites <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all city centre zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> CCZ-Px Role of density standards <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1623	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	86			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones. The RVA considers that the City Centre Zones should specifically provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. Furthermore, the RVA considers a specific / focused set of retirement village matters of discretion should apply 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. The RVA considers that this rule should sit within the ‘Residential’ rules (CCZ-R15-17). The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from public or limited notification to align with Rule CCZ-R3	The RVA seeks that a new rule is inserted into the City Centre Zone (within the Residential Rules CCZ-R15-17) that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity and the construction of retirement village buildings (including additions and alterations) as a restricted discretionary activity (refer to full submission for text).	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1624	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	87			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	Other	Seek amendment / support in part	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones. The RVA therefore considers that the City Centre 3 Zone should specifically provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. Furthermore, the RVA considers a specific / focused set of retirement village matters of discretion should apply (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. The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from public or limited notification to align with the City Centre 1 and 2 Zone rule.	The RVA seeks that a new rule is inserted into the City Centre Zone that provides for the construction of retirement village buildings (including additions and alterations) in the City Centre 3 Zone, which includes 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 (refer to full submission for text).	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1625	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	88			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S1	Support	The RVA supports CCZ-S1 as it enables greater building heights than the MDRS (with the exception to developments adjoining historic heritage buildings listed in the schedule for Historical and Cultural Values) and provides no height in relation to boundary / building envelope requirements.	Retain CCZ-S1 as notified.	Noted.
1626	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	89			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S2	Oppose in part	The RVA support CCZ-S2 and the yard requirements for the City Centre 1, 2 and 3 Zones.	Retain CCZ-S2 as notified.	Noted.
1627	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	90			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA opposes the minimum size of residential units standard noting there is no equivalent standard in the MDRS. The RVA supports CCZ-S4.2 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle as they are less restrictive than the outdoor living space standards 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 CCZ-S4.2 that enable private indoor living spaces in communal areas of retirement villages to count towards some of the required outdoor living space.	The RVA seek to delete CCZ-S4.1 and amend CCZ-S4.2 as follows to enable the private indoor living spaces in communal areas of retirement villages to count towards some of the required outdoor living space. CCZ-S4 Residential unit design ... 2. Outdoor living space (per unit) a. Residential units must have an outdoor living space: i. Minimum area: 6m2 ii. Minimum dimension of 1.5m. iii. May be grouped cumulatively in 1 communally accessible location or located directly adjacent to the unit. b. Except that an outdoor living space is not required where the net internal floor area for a dwelling is at least 40m2 for a studio and 50m2 for a dwelling with one or more bedrooms. c. For retirement units, clauses a and b apply with the following modifications: i. 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 ii. 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.	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1628	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	91			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-S4(5)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports CCZ-S4.5 and the outlook space provisions as they reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however the RVA considers 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 CCZ-S4.5 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	The RVA seeks to amend CCZ-S4.5 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: CCZ-S4 Residential unit design ... 5. Outlook space a. ... i. For retirement units, clauses a – h 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.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1629	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	92			Transport	Standards	CCZ-S5	Oppose in part	CCZ-S5 refers to Appendix 1 – Parking and Turning Standards. The RVA supports the “zero” parking performance standard that applies to residential units, as it is consistent with the NPSUD. However, it considers that standard should explicitly refer to retirement villages. The RVA opposes the information requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment to be provided for the development of more than 100 residential units per site. The RVA considers any requirements applying to retirement villages should reflect their lower transport demand compared to other residential development.	Amend Appendix 1, Table 1 to clarify that no parking performance standard applies to retirement villages. Amend Appendix 1, 4.a so that an Integrated Transport Assessment is not required for retirement villages.	Reject. Retain the requirement for an ITA and, if rest homes are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in response to other submissions, clarify that ITA requirement applies to rest homes. It is not considered necessary to make any clarifications to the disabled parking requirements. There is no specific requirement for rest homes stated and it is clear that residential has a zero requirement.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1630	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	93			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	CCZ-MDA	Oppose	The RVA opposes RESZ-MDA in its entirety, as it will restrict development and not enable intensification as required by Policy 3 NPSUD. The RVA also notes that the RESZ-MDA has been developed for standard residential/commercial developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.	<i>Exclude retirement villages from CCZ-MDA and provide retirement village-specific matters of discretion as set out above.</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1631	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	94			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Introduction	Introduction	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the enabling of accommodation in the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones (including the provision for all forms of residential activities, including high density residential, within Commercial 4 Zone). However, the RVA consider that accommodation / residential activities should not be limited to being located above ground floor level within the Commercial 1, 2, 3 and 6 Zones. Some of the zone descriptions use the term ‘accommodation’ and some use the term ‘residential’. The RVA seek to replace the term ‘accommodation’ with ‘residential activities’ for clarity.	<i>The RVA seeks to amend the descriptions of the various commercial zones in the Commercial Zones introduction to provide for residential activities at the ground level within the Commercial 1, 2, 3 and 6 Zones where appropriate (including retirement villages). The RVA also seek to replace the term ‘accommodation’ with ‘residential activities’.</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1632	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	95			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I1	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports the provision for living opportunities within centres and the acknowledgement that this supports a greater range of housing choices in Rotorua. The RVA consider however that this should not be limited to above ground level in identified locations.	<i>The RVA seeks that COMZ-I1 is amended to provide for residential activities at the ground level within the Commercial Zones where appropriate.</i>	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1633	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	96			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Issues	COMZ-I2	Support	The RVA supports the enabling of high density environment with a mix of residential and accommodation activities (including the provision of residential activities at ground floor level).	Retain COMZ-I2 as notified.	Noted.
1634	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	97			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Objectives	COMZ-O3A	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes COMZ-O3A in part. It is not clear how a ‘healthy, safe and quality living environment’, which is not defined under the Plan, differs from a ‘well-functioning urban environment’ which is defined under the NPSUD. This will lead to interpretation issues when the Plan is applied. The RVA seeks amendments to COMZ-O3A to align with the NPSUD.	Amend COMZ-O3A: Residential development provides a <u>well-functioning urban environment</u> ~~healthy, safe, and quality living environments~~ for residents.	Accept in Part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1635	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	98			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P1	Support	The RVA supports COMZ-P1 which seeks to enable an increase in the density and scale of development in commercial areas, as this recognises that the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act require councils to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones.	Retain COMZ-P1 as notified.	Noted.
1636	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	99			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P2	Support	The RVA supports COMZ-P2 and the enabling of a range of activities in the Ngongotahā Village commercial centre (which is anticipated to include residential activities).	Retain COMZ-P2 as notified.	Noted.
1637	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	100			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P3	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes COMZ-P3 in part as it does not recognise that residential activities are anticipated in commercial centres consistent with Objective COMZ-O3A.	Amend COMZ-P3 to enable residential activities.	Accept in part. COMZ-O2 and COMZ-O3 have been amended consequentially to recognise that residential activities are anticipated in commercial centres.
1638	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	102			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P4	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes COMZ-P4 in part as it does not recognise that residential activities are anticipated in neighbourhood centres consistent with Objective COMZ-O3A.	Amend COMZ-P4 to enable residential activities.	Accept in part. COMZ-O2 and COMZ-O3 have been amended consequentially to recognise that residential activities are anticipated in commercial centres.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1639	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	103			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P5	Support	The RVA supports COMZ-P5 and the enabling of high density residential activities, as this recognises 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.	Retain COMZ-P5 as notified.	Noted.
1640	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	104			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P7	Support	The RVA supports COMZ-P7 and the enabling of a range of activities in the Southern Edge commercial centre (which is anticipated to include residential activities).	Retain COMZ-P7 as notified.	Noted.
1641	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	105			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P8	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports COMZ-P8 in so far as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS, but suggests that a requirement to ‘positively’ contribute is unclear, and not required by Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Amend COMZ-P8 as follows: Enable and encourage high quality development that ~~positively~~ contributes to the safety and attractiveness of streets and public open spaces.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1642	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	106			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P10	Support	The RVA supports COMZ-P10 and the enabling of an increase in the density, diversity and quality of housing in “identified” zones. However, it is unclear what zones are “identified” for the purposes of this policy as this term is not defined or described.	Amend COMZ-P10 to replace “identified zones” with “commercial zones”.	Noted.
1643	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	107			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P11	Oppose in part	The RVA is concerned this policy sets a very high threshold of “not adversely affecting” adjoining residential properties. This does not reflect Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend COMZ-P11 as follows: Manage the effects and design of activities to ensure ~~appropriate~~ that the amenity of adjoining residential properties is ~~not adversely affected~~ .	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1644	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	108			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P12	Oppose in part	The RVA considers a requirement to contribute ‘positively’ is unclear and is not required by Policy 3 of the MDRS. The RVA does not oppose the requirements under (a) in principle, but seeks that such requirements are determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to individual site needs and characteristics. It may not be appropriate for some residential activities such as retirement homes to maximise street activation or pedestrian amenity.	Amend COMZ-P12 as follows: a) ~~Require~~ Encourage the design of all buildings to ~~positively~~ contribute to the safety and attractiveness of the street, <u>while recognising the individual needs and characteristics of development</u> , by: i) Within commercial centres, require development to maximise street activation, building continuity along the street, pedestrian amenity and safety; ii) Within other commercial areas, require buildings to orientate to front the street, locate active uses on the street edge, including building entrances, lobbies, and commercial activities where proposed.	Reject The design of buildings are considered to be relevant to the development of rest homes and rest home units. The recommended matters of discretion/assessment criteria for rest homes recognise the functional requirements of rest homes and will provide a clear framework to asses proposal for rest homes.
1645	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	109			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	COMZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA opposes the application of on-site amenity requirements to retirement villages beyond that addressed in MDRS Policy 4. 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 also notes that a requirement for “private” open space does not recognise the communal spaces provided by retirement villages and a requirement for pedestrian access to residential units from the street does not recognise the security and layout requirements of retirement villages.	Delete COMZ-P13 or exclude retirement villages from its application.	Reject On-site amenity outcomes are considered to be relevant to the development rest homes and rest home units. The recommended matters of discretion/assessment criteria for rest homes recognise the functional requirements of rest homes and will provide a clear framework to asses proposal for rest homes.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1646	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	110			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Policies	Other	Support	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zones is required as well as policy direction relating to larger sites and the role of density standards (as also set out in the submission above at paragraphs [90-92] and [106-108]).	The RVA seeks the following policies are included in the Commercial Zones as follows: COMZ-Px Provision of housing for an ageing population <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 High Density Residential Areas, 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 a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>COMZ-Px Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within commercial zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>COMZ-Px Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones of the Section 42A Report.
1647	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	111			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R3	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA does not oppose COMZ-R3 and the restricted discretionary activity status of new buildings when complying with the relevant performance standards; and the triggering of additional matters of discretion based on non-compliance with the relevant performance standards. However, as noted in response to COMZ-R31 below, the RVA considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity in the commercial zones, and that the construction of a retirement village can be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. The RVA considers that a specific / focused set of retirement village matters of discretion should apply (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The RVA also opposes the current matters of discretion under (1), which include matters that should not form part of an assessment of effects ((d) – financial contributions) and the reference COMZ-MD1, which has been developed for standard commercial developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages. 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. The RVA also seeks that the construction of retirement villages is precluded from public or limited notification to align with Rule COMZ-R3.	The RVA seeks that COMZ-R3 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement village buildings, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities (refer to full submission for text)	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1648	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	112			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Rule Table	COMZ-R31	Oppose	The RVA opposes COMZ-R31 which regulates rest homes as a discretionary or non-complying activity in the Commercial Zones. This rule will not enable a variety of housing to respond to demand as required by the NPSUD. It considers that the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity (as set out above). This approach recognises that retirement villages provide substantial benefits 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. It also aligns with the permitted activity status applying to residential units under COMZ-R32.	The RVA seeks the deletion of COMZ-R31 and a new rule at Rule COMZ-R31 or within the Residential group of rules (COMZ-R32 – R33) that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity in the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1649	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	113			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S1	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports COMZ-S1 and the building height and building envelope provisions which that reflect or otherwise enable greater building heights and more permissive height in relation to boundary provisions than the MDRS. However, the RVA consider that the height in relation to boundary exclusions of the MDRS should be applied, and additional exclusions should be integrated within the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	The RVA seeks to amend COMZ-S1 as follows to include the height in relation to boundary exclusions of the MDRS and to include additional exclusions from the standard (refer to full submission for text)	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1650	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	114			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S2	Oppose in part	The RVA supports COMZ-S2 and the front yard requirements (i.e. no yard is required) for the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones as it is more permissive than the setback standard of the MDRS. However, the RVA opposes the side and rear yard standards where the site adjoins a Residential 1 or 2 Zone (being 3m) and seeks that the side and rear yard standards reflect the setback standard of the MDRS. This recognises 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 (including commercial zones),	The RVA seek that the side and rear yard standards for a site which adjoins Residential 1 and 2 Zones reflect the side and rear yard standards of the MDRS - amend the exception clause for yards from 3m to 1m	Reject The City Centre and Commercial Zones enable greater heights and intensities than the Residential Zones. The proposed yard setback standard is considered to be the most effective and efficient means to give effect to COMZ-O3.
1651	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	115			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA opposes the minimum size of residential units standard noting there is no equivalent standard in the MDRS. The RVA supports COMZ-S5.2 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle as they are less restrictive than the outdoor living space standards 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 COMZ-S5.2 that enable private indoor living spaces in communal areas of retirement villages to count towards some of the required outdoor living space.	The RVA seek to delete COMZ-S5.1 and amend COMZ-S5.2 as follows to enable the private indoor living spaces in communal areas of retirement villages to count towards some of the required outdoor living space (refer to full submission for text).	Accept Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1652	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	116			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(4)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports COMZ-S5.4 and the outlook space provisions as they reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however the RVA considers 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 COMZ-S5.4 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	The RVA seeks to amend COMZ-S5.4 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: COMZ-S5 Residential unit design and landscaping ... 4. Outlook space a. ... <u>i. For retirement units, clauses a – h 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>	Accept Refer to the Residential Section of the Section 42A Report.
1653	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	117			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S5(5)	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports COMZ-S5.5 and the landscaped area provisions for the Commercial 4 Zone in principle as they reflect the landscaped area standard of the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to also provide for retirement units.	The RVA seeks to amend COMZ-S5.5 as follows to provide for retirement units: COMZ-S5.5 Landscaped area (Commercial 4 Zone) a. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them; b. 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> .	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1654	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	118			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S6	Oppose in part	COMZ-S6 refers to Appendix 1 – Parking and Turning Standards. The RVA supports the “zero” parking performance standard that applies to residential units, as it is consistent with the NPSUD. However, it considers that standard should explicitly refer to retirement villages. The RVA opposes the information requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment to be provided for the development of more than 100 residential units per site. The RVA considers any requirements applying to retirement villages should reflect their lower transport demand compared to other residential development.	<i>Amend Appendix 1, Table 1 to clarify that no parking performance standard applies to retirement villages.</i> <i>Amend Appendix 1, 4.a so that an Integrated Transport Assessment is not required for retirement villages.</i>	Reject. Retain the requirement for an ITA and, if rest homes are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in response to other submissions, clarify that ITA requirement applies to rest homes. It is not considered necessary to make any clarifications to the disabled parking requirements. There is no specific requirement for rest homes stated and it is clear that residential has a zero requirement.
1655	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (FS)	88	118	46	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S6		While vehicle use by residents is typically low, retirement villages in the order of 100 units do generate noteworthy traffic associated with visitors and staff. Moreover, the requirement for suitable public and active mode transport infrastructure should be assessed through a TIA. Retirement village proposals of this scale typically also warrant an assessment of the ability of residents to meet their needs locally.	Oppose submission. Retain the provisions of APP1.4B as notified.	

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1656	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	119			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S7	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes COMZ-S7 and the ground floor glazing requirements for the Commercial 1, 2 and 3 Zones (70%, 50% and 50% respectively) as the requirements are significantly higher than the MDRS (20%). The RVA acknowledges the importance of active frontages in commercial zones, however given the requirements of the Enabling Housing Act to provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones (including commercial zones), the RVA consider that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to individual site characteristics and environments.	The RVA seeks to amend COMZ-S7 to provide for a 20% glazing requirement for residential activities.	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1657	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	120			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Standards	COMZ-S9	Seek amendment / support in part	The RVA supports COMZ-S9 and the landscaping requirements for sites that adjoin a residential zone, however as detailed in the response to COMZ-S2, the RVA considers that the side and rear yard standards where the site adjoins a Residential 1 or 2 Zone should reflect the side and rear yard setback standard of the MDRS, and therefore the landscaping requirements form COMZ-S9 should reflect this.	The RVA seeks to amend the landscaping requirements for sites that adjoin Residential 1 and 2 Zones to reflect the side and rear yard standards of the MDRS as follows: COMZ-S9 Landscaping 1. All Commercial Zones a. Where any site boundary adjoins a residential zone <u>(except the Residential 1 and 2 Zones)</u> either: i. The boundary shall be fenced with a 1.8m close-boarded fence; or ii. A two metre strip adjoining the residential boundary shall be planted and maintained with suitable vegetation that has the ability to grow to provide an effective continuous visual screen at least 1.8m in height. <u>b. Where any site boundary adjoins the Residential 1 or 2 Zones either:</u> <u>i. The boundary shall be fenced with a 1.8m close-boarded fence; or</u> <u>ii. A one metre strip adjoining the residential boundary shall be planted and maintained with suitable vegetation that has the ability to grow to provide an effective continuous visual screen at least 1.8m in height.</u>	Reject The City Centre and Commercial Zones enable greater heights and intensities than the Residential Zones. The landscaping standard is considered to be the most effective and efficient means to give effect to COMZ-O3.
1658	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. supported by Ryman Healthcare Limited sub87 and Summerset Group Holdings Limited Sub73	88	121			City & Commercial Centre Zones	Matters of Control/Discretion	COMZ-MD1	Oppose	The RVA opposes COMZ-MD1 in its entirety, as it will restrict development and not enable intensification as required by Policy 3 NPSUD. The RVA also notes that the COMZ-MD1 has been developed for standard residential/commercial developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.	Exclude retirement villages from COMZ-MD1 and provide retirement village-specific matters of discretion as set out above.	Accept in part Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1659	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	88	various	91	32	various	various	various		RDRR states it is the voice for residents and ratepayers. It states that RVA appear to accept the previous Council's decisions to be subject to the MDRS and suggest many nuanced improvements in the interests of citizens in retirement villages. RDRR are broadly supportive. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	If the Council decides to remain subject to the MDRS then give close consideration to the RVA's recommendations.	Refer submission 88.121 above.
1660	Macpherson, L	89	1			Residential 2 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the increased development densities expressing concerns of creating high-rise slums throughout the city. Submitters property is currently affected by high density Kāinga Ora housing, impacting property values, personal safety and increasing crime in the area (for example Fenton Street).	Delete the whole plan it does not benefit Rotorua. Instead encourage more housing to be built outside the city.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1661	Ronayne, T (FS)	89	1	51	21	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high-density area.	Support submission.	Refer submission 89.1 above.
1662	Irwin, W (FS)	89	1	83	23	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high-density area.	Support submission.	Refer submission 89.1 above.
1663	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	89	1	91	33	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		RDRR states that it is sympathetic to the concerns of this submitter but Council should reverse being subject to the MDRS. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Generally support submission. Council reverse decision to be subject to the MDRS, Redevelop the housing policy and plan and restrict high rise consents to the CBD and immediate adjacent areas.	Refer submission 89.1 above.
1664	Ronayne, C (FS)	89	1	164	7	Residential 2 Zone	General	General		The submitter lives in Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme] and is concerned about bad tenants in social housing.	Support submission.	Refer submission 89.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1665	Macpherson, L	89	2			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the increased development densities expressing concerns of creating high-rise slums throughout the city. Submitters property is currently affected by high density Kāinga Ora housing, impacting property values, personal safety and increasing crime in the area (for example Fenton Street).	Delete the whole plan it does not benefit Rotorua. Instead encourage more housing to be built outside the city.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1666	Ward, K (FS)	89	2	106	11	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 2 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 89.2 above.
1667	Morley, J (FS)	89	2	153	4	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. The plan does not take into account that the social issues facing our city of Rotorua, in the extent that has been highlighted by the massive increase in crime and unruly behaviour that Fenton Street and surrounding areas has achieved in the last few years, and simply moving those social issues out to the suburbs. By simply supplying high density housing and putting the same people who are currently living in high density motels on Fenton street, will simply move all these social issues out to the suburbs.	Support submission.	Refer submission 89.2 above.
1668	Lyons-Montgomery, P	90	1			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the Residential 1 Zone in the MDRS. They state that the residential 1 zone is largely an area of privately owned houses and gardens. The submitter brought the home for retirement with the expectation of a quiet and private house and garden and feels that this expectation should continue in the interest of natural justice. MDRS provides for three story homes which would overlook and intrude on neighbours privacy; and the possibility of three homes on a section alters the whole nature of the neighbourhood.	Oppose the inclusion of the residential 1 zone in the MDRS.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1669	Ronayne, T (FS)	90	1	51	22	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high-density area.	Support submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1670	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	90	1	58	6	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and state noise levels will be substantially increased by having multiple homes. Privacy, light, security and quietness enjoyed for many years were factors that attracted the submitter to the area - this should continue in the interests of natural justice.	Support submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1671	Irwin, W (FS)	90	1	83	24	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone [Glenholme]. They support the original submission and state that it aligns with their experience of living in a high-density area.	Support submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1672	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	90	1	91	34	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		RDRR supports the submission. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1673	Ward, K (FS)	90	1	106	12	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns 2 properties in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.		Refer submission 90.1 above.
1674	Gifford, S (FS)	90	1	150	44	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns a property in the Residential 1 Zone and agrees with concerns of adverse effects of 3 storey neighbouring houses.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1675	Marsh, I (FS)	90	1	155	7	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the submission, stating: Noise levels will be substantially increased by having multiple homes. The privacy, light, security and quietness I have enjoyed for many years were the factors that attracted me to this area and the purchase of my home. I feel this should continue in the interest of natural justice.	Support submission.	Refer submission 90.1 above.
1676	Hill, M	91	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to increased density of housing. Reasons discussed include: - Although it will provide more housing stock, the submitter believes it would reinforce poverty because developers and rich people would benefit and the stock would be out of reach to poorer families - It is only more of the same issue - rents continue to be supported by government, only the landowners benefit - It would cause a land grab	That Council take their foot of the accelerator and brake - do nothing and wait to see	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1677	Hill, M	91	2			Natural Environmental Values	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to increased density of housing. Reasons discussed include: - Building on the Caldera's wetlands - impacts on the Caldera, loss of ecology	That Council take their foot of the accelerator and brake - do nothing and wait to see	Reject. The IPI is a required plan change and must incorporate the MDRS, subject to qualifying matters evaluated in accordance with the RMA.
1678	Hill, M	91	3			Infrastructure	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to increased density of housing. Reasons discussed include: - Concern about infrastructure issues - increased effluent	That Council take their foot of the accelerator and brake - do nothing and wait to see	Reject. The Council is subject to legislative requirements to progress PC9

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1679	Bracefield, J	92	1			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter raises concerns about there is a lack of proactive planning and communication to provide schools with the information to best support their learners, whanau and communities to ensure quality outcomes for all stakeholders. Many of the social housing subdivisions that are beginning to appear in the catchment zones for the lower socio-economic schools. Schools that have been identified as at risk within the new equity Index funding scheme recently released by the Ministry for Education. The schools in these areas are already under immense pressure trying to educate children who are entering our schools suffering severe trauma, huge learning deficits and significant emotional damage. Without a strong strategic plan these schools are going to be confronted with unmanageable environments and left to manage the social dysfunction.	The submitter asks that the Rotorua Lakes Council, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Housing, Ministry of Social Development, Iwi, local NGO's and school principals must work together to ensure a strategic plan of quality is constructed to manage this ever-increasing social issue.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.
1680	Bracefield, J	92	2			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter raises concerns that an increase of social housing in specific areas will lead to increased enrolments for specific schools. These students can have higher learning support needs as they have experienced trauma and have large gaps in learning caused by being highly transient in housing.	Submitter asks Council and MOE to inform schools of social housing developments in there areas to ensure that proactive steps can be taken to ensure quality outcomes for students. Would like to work proactively with the various government agencies, iwi and NGO's to also ensure quality outcomes.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.
1681	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	92	2	91	35	Other	Other	Other		RDRR supports the submission but considers it outside the scope of the consultations about PC9. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support in principle.	Refer submission 92.2 above.
1682	Bracefield, J	92	3			Residential	General	General	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter raises concerns about the rules relating to housing intensification allowing multi-level dwellings to be build in residential areas on the same site. This has the potential to create increased disparity in some areas/neighbourhoods as developers could potentially prioritise development in lower socio-economic neighbours. This has the potential to increase the need and demands on these communities and schools to reshape the community as a whole.	The submitter asks that this be a consideration when approving such developments and to inform neighbouring schools.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1683	Bracefield, J	92	4			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	Submitter would like consideration to be given to ensure that there is increased recreational areas provided for the communities that have new and intensified housing to better serve the community. The provision of recreational space allows for social, physical and emotional well-being of residents to be catered for in each development. The submitter believes there is little evidence of this recreational spaces in the Rotorua subdivisions currently under construction. Examples of this can be seen in Christchurch, Hamilton Auckland and Whangarei where it was noted that almost all new subdivisions have large recreational spaces incorporated into their plans and construction. An example in Christchurch provides new schools as well as recreational space which leads the submitter to conclude that key agencies have been included in the planning process.	The submitter would recommend that key agencies are involved in the planning and development of each new subdivision within Rotorua.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.
1684	Forbes, B	93	1			General	General	General	Support	Submitter is in support of the full plan change	Adopt the plan change	Accept in part. With other changes as proposed in the Section 42 Report.
1685	Gifford, S (FS)	93	1	150	45	General	General	General		The submitter lives in the Residential 1 Zone and opposes the submission for reasons given in response to other submissions - the PC9 is rushed, lacks information and is not a solution suitable for Rotorua.	Disallow submission.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1686	Nahu, J	94	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes PC9 and the amendments to the residential 1 and 2 zone provisions. They state they do not want neighbours to have multiple 2 or 3 story buildings constructed.	Delete the plan change	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1687	Gifford, S (FS)	94	1	150	46	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Allow submission	Refer submission 94.1 above.
1688	Tura Ngati Te Ngakau Iwi Hapu Trust & Ngati Whakaue ki Ngongotaha	95	1			Papakāinga	General	General	Support	Support the direction of the Papakāinga changes.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part. Refer to Papakainga section of the section 42A report for further changes recommended.
1689	Kilpatrick, J	96	1			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P31	Support	Support direction of SUB-P31, as this policy encourages subdivision activity appropriate to the enabled development in the zone	Retain	Noted.
1690	Kilpatrick, J	96	2			Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P35A	Seek amendment / support in part	Support direction of SUB-P35A, as this policy encourages subdivision activity adjacent to, and appropriate to the enabled development in the zone. My position is some zone rules need to change, so compliance with such (old rules) will stifle sensible development	Amendment and where there is compliance with District-wide and zone rules.	Accept. Retain proposed policy.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1691	Kilpatrick, J	96	3			Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R1	Support	Support direction of SUB-R1 “RMA notification affected parties” as under current (unchanged) performance standards, there will be several non compliances, and forcing notification unnecessarily extends project timelines and adds cost by professional fees, and potential for NIMBY blockers	Retain	Noted.
1692	Kilpatrick, J	96	4			Subdivision	Rule Table	SUB-R4	Support	Support direction of SUB-R4 “RMA notification affected parties”, for the same reason as above	Retain	Noted.
1693	Kilpatrick, J	96	5			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43(1)(a)(i)	Oppose	Oppose direction of SUB-R43 as there is not adequate mapping of areas “the 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows and/or the 1% AEP lake flood level”. Submitter states that maps are ambiguous and the scale is to large to tell where the boundaries area. Submitter opposes the removal of special map 208 (AEP 2% flood area), and states that council should survey the district and publish a small scale map before doing so - creating a map which can see individual streets and land parcels. Otherwise, subdividers/developers all bear the cost of professional fees to discover if their project falls in the area, which adds cost, stalls and potentially destroys their proposal. Leave it alone, the 2% AEP flood level as shown on Special Map 208 is all the data we have, it is fit for purpose. We shouldn’t have a new provision for a standard where there is no detailed map, and it puts the burden for investigation solely would be developers of land.	Delete - “ ~~the 1% AEP flood level from rivers or overland flows and/or the 1% AEP lake flood level~~ ”	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1694	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	96	5	84	19	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43(1)(a)(i)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter; the 1% AEP is the primary hazard consideration under the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (Appendix L).	Oppose submission.	Accept. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1695	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	96	5	91	36	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43(1)(a)(i)		RDRR supports this original submission. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission. Consideration of PC9 be delayed until flood modelling has been received.	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1696	Kilpatrick, J	96	6			Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43(1)(a)(ii)	Oppose	Oppose direction of SUB-R43.1aii as it hinges on climate change theory, its political and an unnecessary additional provision when present text adequately covers the risk of a 1 in 50 year water event. Adding a “climate change, using RCP8.5 median scenario” provision text to the plan, makes it easy for future justification of national standard (political) sweeping changes, as national standards become more politicised.	Delete	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1697	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	96	6	84	20	Natural Hazards	Rule Table	SUB-R43(1)(a)(ii)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter; Policy IR 2B of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement directs to recognise and provide for the predicted effects of climate change. As our climate changes, rainfall is expected to increase, which will also increase flooding.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Refer to discussion in the Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1698	Kilpatrick, J	96	7			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(a)(i)	Support	Support direction of SUB-S1.1ai 250 sqm net site area, I support this as it will enable developers to subdivide before/after building according to new MDRS rules. If care is made at building design stage performance standards can be met. This enables more individual land titles (with a single residential unit on it), and gives the potential for developers and investors to divest their holdings at some stage and first home buyers and all other owner occupiers can get a chance to buy in, because presently only the wealthy can purchase a single title land with 3 residential units on it. The new MDRS rules will create more residential units, and SUB-S1.1ai will mean more individual land titles are created, assisting more kiwis owning their own house and land.	Retain	Noted.
1699	Gifford, S (FS)	96	7	150	47	Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(a)(i)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the initial submission. This enables greater intensification without the need for 3 storeys and the adverse effects that come from the added height.	Allow submission.	Refer submission 96.7 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1700	Kilpatrick, J	96	8			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1(1)(b)(i)	Support	Support direction of SUB-S1.1ai 250 sqm net site area, I support this as it will enable developers to subdivide before/after building according to new MDRS rules. If care is made at building design stage performance standards can be met. This enables more individual land titles (with a single residential unit on it), and gives the potential for developers and investors to divest their holdings at some stage and first home buyers and all other owner occupiers can get a chance to buy in, because presently only the wealthy can purchase single title land with 3 residential units on it. The new MDRS rules will create more residential units, and SUB-S1.1bi will mean more individual land titles are created, assisting more kiwis owning their own house and land.	Retain	Noted.
1701	Kilpatrick, J	96	9			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1.2(a)(i)(1)	Support	Support intent of this Res Zone 1 provision. Reducing minimum net site area to 250 sqm without reducing site design factor makes no sense to me. I support 120 sqm building platform.	Retain	Noted.
1702	Kilpatrick, J	96	10			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1.2(b)(i)	Support	Support the intent of this Res 2 Zone provision. I support 120sqm building platform.	Retain	Noted.
1703	Kilpatrick, J	96	11			Transport	Standards	SUB-S1(4)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this “near front doors” provision. If we want to develop and build more residential units, and we need turning and parking, whether or not its adjacent to front door isn’t important.	Delete	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
1704	Kilpatrick, J	96	12			Transport	Standards	SUB-S3.3	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this “near front doors” provision. If we want to develop and build more residential units, and we need turning and parking, whether or not its adjacent to front door isn’t important.	Delete	Accept Refer to the Transport Section of the Section 42A Report.
1705	Kilpatrick, J	96	13			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S8.1	Support	I support the intent of this provision, as it is adequately addressed in other performance standards	Retain	Accept. Retain proposed changes.
1706	Kilpatrick, J	96	14			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S8.2(a)(iii)	Support	I support the intent of this provision, as it is adequately addressed in other performance standards	Retain	Accept. Retain proposed changes.
1707	Kilpatrick, J	96	15			Natural Hazards	Standards	SUB-S9(1)(a)(i)	Support	I support the intent of this provision, as it is adequately addressed in other performance standards	Retain	Accept. Retain proposed changes.
1708	Kilpatrick, J	96	16			Transport	Standards	SUB-S9(2)(b)(i)	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision, as it is adequately addressed in other performance standards. Changing name “household” to residential unit seems unnecessary to me, unless its part of political speak to erode family values, in a home vs unit-flat-ghetto situation. In any case – why must we change?	Amend ~~Residential Unit~~	Reject. Terminology is amended for alignment with the National Planning Standards.
1709	Kilpatrick, J	96	17			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(a)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed change.
1710	Kilpatrick, J	96	18			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(b)	Oppose	I do not support "and..."	Delete	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1711	Kilpatrick, J	96	19			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(c)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision, as some non compliances will inevitably be created by the development, and this one part c is a stopper and headwind (requiring more professional fees, investigation, reports and surveys) to good development	Delete	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1712	Kilpatrick, J	96	20			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(d)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1713	Kilpatrick, J	96	21			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(e)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed change.
1714	Kilpatrick, J	96	22			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(2)(f)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed change.
1715	Kilpatrick, J	96	23			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(3)(a)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1716	Kilpatrick, J	96	24			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(3)(b)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1717	Kilpatrick, J	96	25			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(6)(a)	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~or the subdivision shall not increase the degree of non-compliance~~	Reject. Adopt the proposed change. Refer to the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1718	Kilpatrick, J	96	26			Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S14(6)(b)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed change.
1719	Kilpatrick, J	96	27			Subdivision	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MC1(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~Residential~~	Reject. Do not make the proposed amendment.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1720	Kilpatrick, J	96	28			Subdivision	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD1(2)(e)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision. I prefer the word household.	Delete	Reject. The terminology is changed for consistency with the National Planning Standards.
1721	Kilpatrick, J	96	29			Natural Hazards	Matters of Control/Discretion	SUB-MD2	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept in part Retain proposed changes but with further changes as discussed in Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report.
1722	Kilpatrick, J	96	30			Subdivision	Assessment Criteria	SUB- AC1	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend Residential	Accept. Adopt the proposed change.
1723	Kilpatrick, J	96	31			Subdivision	Other	SUB-AER6	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1724	Kilpatrick, J	96	32			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Introduction	Introduction	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1725	Kilpatrick, J	96	33			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I1	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1726	Kilpatrick, J	96	34			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Issues	RESZ-I2	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1727	Kilpatrick, J	96	35			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O1	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1728	Kilpatrick, J	96	36			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O2	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1729	Kilpatrick, J	96	37			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O3	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1730	Kilpatrick, J	96	38			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O4	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1731	Kilpatrick, J	96	39			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O5	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed objective. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1732	Kilpatrick, J	96	40			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O6	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1733	Kilpatrick, J	96	41			Residential 1 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O7	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1734	Kilpatrick, J	96	42			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O8	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1735	Kilpatrick, J	96	43			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O9	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1736	Kilpatrick, J	96	44			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O10	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1737	Kilpatrick, J	96	45			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O11	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1738	Kilpatrick, J	96	46			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O12	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept. Adopt the proposed objective. Refer to Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1739	Kilpatrick, J	96	47			Residential 2 Zone	Objectives	RESZ-O13	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1740	Kilpatrick, J	96	48			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P1	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1741	Kilpatrick, J	96	49			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P2	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~setbacks, low or visually permeable fencing.~~	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1742	Kilpatrick, J	96	50			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P3	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1743	Kilpatrick, J	96	51			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P4	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1744	Kilpatrick, J	96	52			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P5	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street~~	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1745	Kilpatrick, J	96	53			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P6	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries; 2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;~~	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1746	Kilpatrick, J	96	54			Residential 1 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P7	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Accept in part. Make changes to the policy as detailed and discussed in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1747	Kilpatrick, J	96	55			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P11(2)	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~setbacks, low or visually permeable fencing.~~	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1748	Kilpatrick, J	96	56			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P14	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision, I believe safe pedestrian access can always be achieved with a shared vehicle access/leg in, so 4 Is unnecessary.	Amend ~~4. safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street.~~	Reject The relief sought is not necessary for PC9 as it does not relate to the implementation of the MDRS or Policy 5 of the NPS-UD
1749	Kilpatrick, J	96	57			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P15	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision	Amend ~~1. Setting buildings back from side and rear boundaries; 2. Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear boundaries;~~	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1750	Kilpatrick, J	96	58			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P16	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1751	Kilpatrick, J	96	59			Residential 2 Zone	Policies	RESZ-P17	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1752	Kilpatrick, J	96	60			Residential	Policies	RESZ-P19	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision, I prefer the word household.	Delete	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD. This provision is not subject to change under PC9.
1753	Kilpatrick, J	96	61			Residential	Policies	RESZ-P20	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD. This provision is not subject to change under PC9.
1754	Kilpatrick, J	96	62			Residential	Policies	RESZ-P21	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision	Delete	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD. This provision is not subject to change under PC9.
1755	Kilpatrick, J	96	63			Residential	Rule Table	RESZ-R8	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1756	Kilpatrick, J	96	64			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)(b)(i)	Seek amendment / support in part	I support the intent of this provision. In particular, applying the 12m recession plane to the entire legal boundary, and to the furthest boundary across a legal access leg in is very sensible, as one never builds on a legal access leg in.	Amend within 23.5m from the road frontage.	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1757	Kilpatrick, J	96	65			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)(b)(ii)	Oppose	I do not support this provision. Let the 12m recession plane apply to the entire boundary, including that more than 23.5m from the street, let's give the designers some space to come up with something decent	Delete	Reject Refer to the Residential Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1758	Kilpatrick, J	96	66			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)(c)	Support	I support this provision	Retain	Noted.
1759	Kilpatrick, J	96	67			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision. Allow maximum impermeable surfaces to remain 80%	Delete	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Adopt the proposed changes to impermeable (impervious) surfaces.
1760	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	96	67	84	21	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(1)(b)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter because restricting impervious surface area mitigates flooding and water quality effects.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Adopt the proposed changes to impermeable (impervious) surfaces.
1761	Kilpatrick, J	96	68			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision. Allow maximum impermeable surfaces to remain 100% in Res Zone 2.	Delete	Reject. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Adopt the proposed changes to impermeable (impervious) surfaces.
1762	Bay of Plenty Regional Council (FS)	96	68	84	22	Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S3(2)(b)		Oppose relief sought by the submitter because restricting impervious surface area mitigates flooding and water quality effects.	Oppose submission.	Accept. Refer to Natural Hazards - Flooding section of the Section 42A Report. Adopt the proposed changes to impermeable (impervious) surfaces.
1763	Kilpatrick, J	96	69			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6(A)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1764	Kilpatrick, J	96	70			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4)(b)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1765	Kilpatrick, J	96	71			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(4)(c)	Support	I support the intent of this provision	Retain	Noted.
1766	Kilpatrick, J	96	72			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6A(6)(c)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision, its unnecessary to put a % on landscaped space in the front yard, in MDRS the front yards are tiny in any case, so leave it to the designer's discretion	Delete	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.
1767	Kilpatrick, J	96	73			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S6(A)(7)	Oppose	I do not support the intent of this provision. Let the building designers decide. Kiwis like their fences, let them be. You know they will build non-complying fencing afterwards anyway in spite of the rule.	Delete	Reject Refer to the Residential Zone Section of the Section 42A Report.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1768	Cusumano, V and J	97	1			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3	Oppose	No development should be permitted without going through a rigorous notification and assessment process that takes into consideration the effect that the proposed development will have on not only the adjoining properties, but on the environment as well. All buildings all should require resource consent under the District Plan. Plan Change 9 is an attempt to circumvent the common right of the adjoining owner to have a say on what is built next door or up the road where it affects their property.	There should therefore be a requirement for adjoining owners to be made aware of an application under this plan and they should then have the opportunity to object, should the proposed development under this plan adversely affect their views, sunlight, or privacy. Resource consent should be required on all developments with the exception of Pergolas, carports and shade structures, Unroofed decks, patios and terraces, Garages, sheds and gazebos, Fences and freestanding walls, Refinishing external appearance To ensure all adjoining property owners can assess the impacts of any proposed development all applicants should be required to undertake the following: • Completed Development Consent Form There should be different forms for different categories of development. • Owner’s consent There needs to be a verified consent from all registered owners of the property. • Description of proposed development There must be included a detailed description of what you intend to build, renovate or demolish. • Estimated cost of works. • Plans and sketches • Environmental impact statement, depending on the type of building work the applicant intends to carry out, • Required fees - scaled depending on the type of work the applicant intends to carry out.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1769	Eruini-Bennett, S (FS)	97	1	58	7	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission . The MDRS will enable 2-3 houses to be built along the boundary of existing homes and allows for a rear boundary of only 1m. There are issues of privacy and overshadowing for current homeowners.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.1 above.
1770	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	97	1	91	37	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		RDRR is sympathetic of the submitter's perspective because it is pragmatic (insists on an infrastructure assessment in the public interest), provides natural justice to homeowners seeking to protect their assets and defend their interests and enables reasonable intensification in the CBD and adjacent areas. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.1 above.
1771	Jones, P (FS)	97	1	127	2	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.1 above.
1772	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	1	148	1	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They refer to history of use of motels near their property for accommodation and state that RDC has a duty of care to ratepayers in locations where development will adversely affect their property rights - enjoyment or value.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.1 above.
1773	Gifford, S (FS)	97	1	150	48	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They agree developments should involve those adversely affected and 3 storeys is too high due to adverse effects.	Allow submission, but preference is for PC9 to be deleted.	Refer submission 97.1 above.
1774	Marsh, I (FS)	97	1	155	8	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Rule Table	RESZ-R3		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission. The MDRS will enable 2-3 houses to be built along the boundary of existing homes and allows for a rear boundary of only 1 meter. Again, issues of privacy and overshadowing for current homeowners are now multiplied by 2-3 times.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.1 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1775	Cusumano, V and J	97	2			Residential 1 Zone	General	General	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns about the MDRS, and it allowing up to three 2-3 story residential units as a permitted activity. Submitter states that this is unacceptable as the adjoining owner should have the right to object a proposal should they feel the proposed development will adversely affect their property. Resource consent should still be required if standards such as yards or height to boundary are breached.	There should be a general requirement for neighbours to be informed of development. Those undertaking developments, should have a requirement to keep their neighbours informed in order to maintain relationships with their neighbours, regardless if a resource consent is required. Developers should have a requirement to inform neighbours of their development in order to obtain their approval and assist with obtaining their resource consent. The Council should as a matter of Duty of Care to its residents, ‘notify’ adjoining properties of a resource consent application to allow them to make a formal submission on the proposal. All types of applications should be ‘notified’ regardless of the degree of potential effects assessed by the Council regardless of the Resource Management Act 1991 or rules in the District Plan . An example is an application for up to three residential units in the Residential 1 Zone that does not comply with one of the density performance standards (like height or yards) should be notified once Plan Change 9 is operative. This rule should be included in the District Plan because of the recent changes to the RMA. In metropolitan areas, council should be required to inform neighbours within a 50-metre radius that has been applied for a development. Residents should have at a minimum 14 days to make a submission on the development and these should be assessed before it can be approved.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1776	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	2	148	2	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Adjoining private property owners should have the right to object to a proposal should they feel the proposed development will adversely affect their property rights.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.2 above.
1777	Gifford, S (FS)	97	2	150	49	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They agree developments should involve those adversely affected and 3 storeys is too high due to adverse effects.	Allow submission, but preference is for PC9 to be deleted.	Refer submission 97.2 above.
1778	Hamill, W (FS)	97	2	154	6	Residential 1 Zone	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.2 above.
1779	Cusumano, V and J	97	3			Other	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	To ensure that there is a fair opportunity for adjoining residents to view and make comment on a proposed development, regardless of whether require resource consent is or isn’t required, applications for resource consent should be determined by Council officers under delegated authority. In situations where there are objections from multiple properties about a development, these applications should be decided by independent commissioners.	Resource consent should be determined by Council officers with the delegations. Independent commissioners should decide when there are multiple objections to a development. Under the proposed changes, the District Plan/RMA processes should require the developer to seek and obtain the neighbours approval to assist with an application. If this is not provided, then the approval should be withheld. After the application is notified for submissions, the adjoining owner has the right to make a submission. Every submitter should be given the right to appear at a hearing and have their points heard by an independent commissioner(s). Those that made submissions should have a right to appeal to the Environment Court against the decision of Council on an application for resource consent.	Reject The relief sought does not relate to amendments to the operative District Plan.
1780	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	3	148	3	Other	Other	Other		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission, particularly in regards to independent commissioners.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.3 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1781	Paget, M and J (FS)	97	3	149	3	Papakāinga	Other	Other		The submitters own property adjacent to Maori land in the Rural Zone. They support the submission with respect to ensuring that there is fair opportunity for adjoining residents to view and make comment on proposed developments. They state that development should be planned and not done on the fly to ensure that: - the best opportunities to accommodate Papakāinga while considering the surrounding neighbours and existing rural environment are achieved - surrounding rural property owners (existing and future) have opportunity to submit and some certainty for the future.	Support submission	Accept in part Proposed amendments to permitted density standards for papakāinga development with restricted discretionary activity for those that exceed permitted number of units. Refer to Papakainga section of the Section 42A Report.
1782	Cusumano, V and J	97	4			Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(b)	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The District Plan should restrict loss of views in the Residential 1 Zone. This should apply to the height standards and height to boundary standards that must be complied with for an activity to be permitted under the District Plan. There should not have any 'matters of discretion' for assessing developments that do not comply with these standards. As Rotorua has many spectacular views, and as these were some of the compelling reasons people bought houses and/or property to build a home, no development should be permitted which will in any way remove an established view.	Height in relation to boundary rules should not be able to be breached and associated matters of discretion should be deleted.	Reject Non-compliance with the height in relation to boundary standard is a restricted discretionary activity in accordance with the MDRS.
1783	Gifford, S (FS)	97	4	150	50	Residential 1 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(b)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They agree developments should involve those adversely affected and 3 storeys is too high due to adverse effects.	Allow submission, but preference is for PC9 to be deleted.	Refer submission 97.4 above.
1784	Cusumano, V and J	97	5			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(a)	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	The stricter height rules that are provided to protect Marae from the impacts of adjacent development should apply to all dwellings in the residential zones in the Rotorua area	Apply the 5m height restriction in the marae protection area to residential zones in the Rotorua area.	Reject This provision is required to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone in accordance with section 80F of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1785	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	97	5	64	12	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(a)		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission and state that there shouldn't be different standards that relate simply to ownership. Existing uses should have the same level of protection regardless of who there neighbour is.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.5 above.
1786	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	5	148	4	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	Standards	RESZ-S1(1)(a)		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission and agree that the stricter height rules that apply to marae should also apply to Residential 1 and 2 Zones.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.5 above.
1787	Cusumano, V and J	97	6			Residential 2 Zone	Standards	RESZ-S1(2)	Support	In the Residential 2 Zone (which is proposed to be located close to the city centre of Rotorua) submitter has no objection to an increased maximum height standard of 19.5m proposed unless this development blocks the views of residential dwellings.	Adopt the changes proposed unless it blocks the views of residential dwellings.	Reject The MDRS as set out under Schedule 3A of the RMA. The MDRS cannot be made more restrictive unless a qualifying matter applies.
1788	Cusumano, V and J	97	8			Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General	Oppose	Submitter objects to the immediate legal effect in some locations of the MDRS. This is unfair unless the adjoining owners are notified and a due process that allows for any objections to be heard and assessed. Regardless of whether the site is in a 'qualifying matter area' these new rules should not have immediate legal effect.	Remove the immediate legal effect of PC9	Reject The MDRS have immediate legal effect in accordance with Section 86BA of the RMA.
1789	McPherson, D (2) (FS)	97	8	64	13	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter is a resident in the Residential 2 Zone. They support the original submission.	Support submission.	Refer submission 97.8 above.
1790	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	8	148	5	Residential 1 & 2 Zones	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. They consider there has been poor planning in the past contributing to the housing dilemma.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.8 above.
1791	Cusumano, V and J	97	9			Other	Other	Other	Support	The qualifying matters area should continue to include areas such as those subject to more significant flood depths and areas subject to height restrictions because of the Airport Height Control Rules.	Retain qualifying matters.	Accept. Existing qualifying matters have been retained as detailed in the Appendix to the Section 42A Report.
1792	Cusumano, V and J	97	10			Financial Contributions	Other	Other	Neither support or oppose / seek clarification / not stated	All development should be subject to contributions that Council must use in the adjoining area to improve infrastructure such as parks, community facilities, local roads, footpaths, stromwater drainage and traffic management.	No relief stated	Accept in part. Make no changes. The Council implements a system of development contributions for three waters infrastructure and financial contributions for reserves.
1793	Cusumano, V and J	97	11			General	General	General	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns about the process undertaken by Council to increase urban density for money. Increased density has shown all around the world to add social problems and a deterioration of living standards. Many people purchased homes or were born and raised in Rotorua because of the openness of the current planning standards.	Reject the plan change unless the aforementioned controls are included.	Reject PC9 is an IPI required under section 80F of the RMA to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone and give effect to the NPS-UD.
1794	Bean, D and D (FS)	97	11	148	6	General	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone and supports the original submission. Increased density might work well in major city centres but is not right for Rotorua - different economy, demographics, social-economic mix, land availability and ownership, economic base (tourism). It will not support or enhance Rotorua but do the reverse.	Allow submission	Refer submission 97.11 above.

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	Submitter Name	Sub ID #	Sub Point #	F Sub ID #	F Sub Point #	Hearing Topic	Provision	Plan Reference	Position	Summary of Submission Point	Relief Sought by Submitter	Recommendation and Reasons
1												
1795	Firstgas Limited	98	1			Infrastructure	General	General	Seek amendment / support in part	Firstgas' transmission pipeline terminates southeast of Tihiotonga, and its distribution lines (including strategic main lines) are located throughout the city residential area, with the strategic distribution lines located predominantly within road corridors (berms). Firstgas, seeks to continue to safely operate, maintain, upgrade, develop, protect, relocate and / or remove its assets and operations in a timely and safe manner. This includes ensuring that an adequate separation is provided between appropriate residential development and Firstgas pipelines and assets, and that inappropriate development does not occur within proximity to transmission pipelines and/or strategic distribution pipelines. The greatest risk to pipelines is through damage by third parties, most commonly occurring through the land disturbance and excavation / boring equipment. Increased residential intensification within proximity to pipelines and assets increases these risks and to the population exposed to risk, should an event occur. Firstgas accepts the need to adopt a pragmatic approach and will look to adopt other means to try to manage the encroachment of sensitive activities within the residual area. The provisions sought are to ensure that it is consulted when works are proposed within proximity to strategic pipelines within the gas transmission network to manage effects on the network and from the network. Firstgas intends that such consultation would ensure that Firstgas are able to provide technical expertise early in residential and land developments to assess whether proposed developments presents a risk to strategic gas pipelines which may threaten the safety of people, property and the pipeline. The submission notes that Firstgas does not intend to prohibit development within the proposed corridors as there may be situations here development is appropriate - but intends the corridor as a trigger to begin discussions to	Firstgas seeks that a 'pipeline corridor' be provided for within the District Plan and planning maps, which requires any increase of residential intensity, change of use to a sensitive activity and/or subdivision of site to consult with Firstgas to ensure that the activity does not result in any adverse effects on pipeline safety, integrity and continued operation of the pipeline. Firstgas seek that this corridor have dimensions of 60 metres (30m either side) of a transmission gas pipeline, and 10 metres (5 m either side) of a strategic distribution pipeline. In order to ensure clarity around this pipeline corridor, Firstgas seeks that the following definitions be included within Part 1 Interpretations of the District Plan: Transmission gas pipeline – Main high-pressure pipelines with a nominal operating pressure 2000kPa and above. Strategic distribution gas pipelines – pipelines with an operating pressure of greater than 420kPa but less than 2000kPa, and where the consequence of a loss of supply and/or the consequence of a gas escape risk is assessed to be serious or greater by Firstgas Distribution Engineer or Distribution Manager.	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1796	Ronayne, T (FS)	98	1	51	23	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and consider the requests reasonable.	Support submission	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1797	Irwin, W (FS)	98	1	83	25	Infrastructure	General	General		The submitter owns property in the Residential 1 Zone. They support the original submission and consider the requests reasonable.	Support submission	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Infrastructure section of the Section 42A Report.
1798	Firstgas Limited	98	2			Other	Definitions	Definitions	Seek amendment / support in part	*note - replaces previous submission point in withdrawn submission 82, which was identical	Firstgas also seek that specific use and reference to the terminology of 'qualifying matters' is enabled within PC9, so as to ensure consistency with NPS-UD and to promote greater awareness of location of gas networks and safety considerations in the enabling of greater residential intensity within the Rotorua Lakes district.	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1799	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (FS)	98	2	80	14	Other	Definitions	Definitions		HNZPT supports the consideration and use and ongoing reference to the terminology around "qualifying matters", particularly as this includes historic heritage.	Accept submission 98.2	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1800	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	98	2	91	38	Infrastructure	General	General		RDRR supports the original submission and consider the requests reasonable. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Support submission	Reject. Refer to discussion in the Other section of the Section 42A Report.
1801	Holster, D	99	1			City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General	Oppose in part	Rotorua is the Queenstown of the North Island. Tourism dollars keeps the town vibrant. Please ensure our CBD and Fenton Street Hotels create a positive vibe and buzz for both our own people being national visitors along with internationals. Please empower the people of Rotorua to build on the hard work and mahi of forefathers to create a jewel of a the North Island. I understand we all need to live somewhere but that somewhere is not right in the heart of the diamond which is Rotorua's CBD. Shame on the Labour government and that really pains me as we are traditionally staunch Labour supporters.	No emergency accommodation on Fenton Street or in Central Rotorua.	Reject Refer to the City Centre and Commercial Centre Zones Section of the Section 42A Report.
1802	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers (FS)	99	1	91	39	City & Commercial Centre Zones	General	General		RDRR is ambivalent about the submission. It agrees that the homeless industry was created to offset the effects of COVID and needs to be dismantled. On the other hand, restoration of the CBD requires in part permitting greater housing intensification in the CBD and adjacent areas, but not in more distant suburbs like Glenholme. H Maguire and M Gordon also support the RDRR submission (FS166 and FS124).	Ambivalent.	Refer submission 99.1 above.