

Summary of pre-consultation feedback and responses. Plan Changes 38-43 Taupo District Plan

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
1.1.	Ronald Penn	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Except for Residential (See Below)	Accept
1.2.	Ronald Penn	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
1.3.	Ronald Penn	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
1.4.	Ronald Penn	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
1.5.	Ronald Penn	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
1.6.	Ronald Penn	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
1.7.	Ronald Penn	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Taupo is not a High Rise Town, and would absolutely Ruin our Town Low Level Environment	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
1.8.	Ronald Penn	4-Residential Chapter		We need to eliminate Plot Ratio Rule and have 1 - 40% Rule. 30% Rule was introduced it was a assuming based on Big Sites of which most in Taupo at time were around the 1000sq.m. We now have a housing shortage and still have very large land area's that could be developed further, so feel the 35% is still a problem, also the front yard set back of 5m restricts this land being used properly. If this was reduced to 4m (Front Yard) only for Residential and Garage Access from front yard still set at 5m this would enable an extra Residential dwelling added as most land in Taupo Area is twice as long as wide which does not make use proportionately.	Accept in part - all residential provisions will be reviewed as part of the full Residential Chapter review.
1.9.	Ronald Penn	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
2.1.	Chy Taylor	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
2.2.	Chy Taylor	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I think the proposed changes are necessary for the fast changing demand for housing and lifestyle.	Accept
2.3.	Chy Taylor	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	I think the proposed changes are necessary for the fast changing demand for housing and lifestyle.	Accept
2.4.	Chy Taylor	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	I think the proposed changes are necessary for the fast changing demand for housing and lifestyle.	
3.1.	Sharon Drinnan	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
3.2.	Sharon Drinnan	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		We support this change as we can keep the property that we have planted orchards, built tunnel houses, and developed into our family home, as well as housing our business for the last 14 years.	Accept
3.3.	Sharon Drinnan	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
3.4.	Sharon Drinnan	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
3.5.	Sharon Drinnan	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
3.6.	Sharon Drinnan	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given
3.7.	Sharon Drinnan	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
3.8.	Sharon Drinnan	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
4.1.	Trudi Neill	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	I am a current landowner who falls within the area where you wish to make changes and rezone my land to Rural Lifestyle. I currently own 12 acres but would like the opportunity to subdivide off 2 acres for a family member to put a small dwelling on. This would leave a 10 acre block to me. Under your current plan, the minimum I could subdivide to would be approx. 2 hectares (5 acres). I would like to have flexibility to subdivide off a smaller piece of land rather than nearly half.	Reject
4.2.	Trudi Neill	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Its progress that needs to happen.	Accept
4.3.	Trudi Neill	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
4.4.	Trudi Neill	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
4.5.	Trudi Neill	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
4.6.	Trudi Neill	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
4.7.	Trudi Neill	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
4.8.	Trudi Neill	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
4.9.	Trudi Neill	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
5.1.	LYNDA MAIR	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We are interested in subdividing our lifestyle block on Forest Road, Taupo.	Accept
6.1.	Clive Oakes	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	We agree with the view that the 'Rural Lifestyle Environment' in this area can support growth through subdivision of 4hr blocks to 2hr blocks or even 1hr blocks and welcome the changes.	Accept
6.2.	Clive Oakes	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	More people want to live in a rural setting and that type of growth could bring great benefits to this area.	Accept
6.3.	Clive Oakes	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Progress is change and its too restrictive at the moment.	Accept
6.4.	Clive Oakes	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	Progress for Maori owned land is just as important	Accept
6.5.	Clive Oakes	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	Do not fully comprehend the impact of this.	N/A
6.6.	Clive Oakes	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes	All part of the improvements for the town.	Accept
6.7.	Clive Oakes	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	We think that this will modernise and improve the town.	Accept
6.8.	Clive Oakes	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	Agree with the view to increase house size for the benefit of the families	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
6.9.	Clive Oakes	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	This will be necessary to accommodate the expansion of all of the above.	Accept
6.10.	Clive Oakes	6-General		Why not reduce the proposed land size from 2htr to 1htr as this would still benefit those wanting to live in a rural environment and still give them plenty of land.	Reject - inefficient infrastructure provision. This is provided for in the low density residential environment.
7.1.	Cam Blick	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
7.2.	Cam Blick	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		I do not support as proposed with the inclusion of a requirement for the secondary dwelling to be within 20m of the main dwelling. As with many lifestylers the option for a secondary dwelling would be appealing for either rental income, holiday let, or most likely additional accommodation for family and/or friends, however on lifestyle blocks over 2ha (typically closer to 4ha) I cannot understand why there should be a constraint of having to be within 20m of the primary dwelling. I would support the draft changes with this provision excluded	Accept
7.3.	Cam Blick	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
7.4.	Cam Blick	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
8.1.	Amanda Wilson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
8.2.	Amanda Wilson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
8.3.	Amanda Wilson	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
8.4.	Amanda Wilson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
8.5.	Amanda Wilson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	No		No reasons given
8.6.	Amanda Wilson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
8.7.	Amanda Wilson	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
8.8.	Amanda Wilson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
9.1.	peter breakwell	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	As the owner of a property at 81 Whakaroa Rd I would support the proposed new Rural Lifestyle Environment changes. To enable possible subdivision down to 2 Hectares and the possible addition of a smaller dwelling.	Accept
10.1.	Mark McCormack	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	theres alot of smaller sites in taupo with very old and small dwellings on which makes it impractical to design a new home on the new 35% rule would help achieve a slightly bigger home which would enhance the areas and also accommodate families a lot better	Accept
10.2.	Mark McCormack	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
10.3.	Mark McCormack	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
10.4.	Mark McCormack	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
10.5.	Mark McCormack	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
10.6.	Mark McCormack	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
10.7.	Mark McCormack	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given
10.8.	Mark McCormack	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
10.9.	Mark McCormack	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
11.1.	Paul Winter	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	The key element missing is to enhance the linkages between the town centre and the lake especially the lake front towards the boat harbour. The current changes to traffic flow is a good start but not sufficient for Taupo to become as successful as Queenstown and Wanaka in optimising the attractions of its lakeside location.	Accept
11.2.	Paul Winter	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	Endorse the proposed change allowing the region's farmers to have a second house per 10 hectares. Qualified support for rural lifestyle blocks having the ability to have smaller (2 hectare) lot sizes. This process should be secondary to protecting the amount of high quality arable land for export competitive horticulture and agriculture.	Accept
11.3.	Paul Winter	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	See above	Accept
11.4.	Paul Winter	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	Local Government in Taupo should facilitate in a culturally appropriate way the development of successful Papakainga dwellings from an environmental, cultural and economic perspective.	Accept in part - Council is facilitating papakainga through their RM responsibilities under the RMA. Essentially this is led by whanau to determine the form of development which best suits them. Council may be able to provide support through its wider function but these are outside of the plan process.
11.5.	Paul Winter	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	While other areas closer to the Taupo urban centre may be seen by developers as more attractive than the Mapara Valley, it shouldn't be necessary to alter the future status of the Mapara Valley from a development perspective. The farm owners in the Mapara Valley who want to remain in the horticulture and primary sectors should still be governed by the same framework that is now being <u>proposed for all other Taupo rural regions.</u>	The proposal does ensure the Mapara Valley is consistent with the rest of Taupo rural areas.
11.6.	Paul Winter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes	We want to continue to be a vibrant town that makes it attractive to attract events and other activities.	Accept
11.7.	Paul Winter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Building developments should be tiered upwards in height from the current three floor height restrictions for properties adjacent to the lakefront. Behind these buildings, the next cluster of buildings should be allowed to have good lake views for their top level or fourth floor. Similarly the buildings further away from the lake that will allowed to be greater than four floors should be allowed good lake views from the 5th level to the maximum height for the Taupo CBD, say 6 floors.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
11.8.	Paul Winter	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	Agree coverage should be allowed up to 35% of the site possibly 40% given the direction Central Government is taking on this issue.	Accept
11.9.	Paul Winter	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	This assists the attraction of enterprises to Taupo or encourages more start up enterprises for the economic well being of the District.	Accept
12.1.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Because the original conditions are too constraining.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
12.2.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Again the existing conditions are too constraining in fact totally unpractical.	Accept
12.3.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	As above.	Accept
12.4.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No	All for one and one for all.	Not accept - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation.
12.5.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	As above	Accept
12.6.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
12.7.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
12.8.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	Existing conditions are too rigid and not practical.	Accept
12.9.	Sharen Whale for Ron and Bruce Whale Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	No	There's enough already for a town of our size and a lot of it is still unused.	
13.1.	Lyn Sayers	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	We have long since viewed the subdivision of Rural dwelling blocks as too restrictive	Accept
13.2.	Lyn Sayers	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	It just makes sense.	Accept
13.3.	Lyn Sayers	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	It is important to leave productive land out of the building zone.	Accept
13.4.	Lyn Sayers	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	It is important for Maori to be able to have an increasing say over their property.	Accept
13.5.	Lyn Sayers	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	Not of great importance to us.	Accept
13.6.	Lyn Sayers	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
13.7.	Lyn Sayers	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Current height restrictions are too onerous and has a negative impact on land cost relative to planned improvements.	Accept
13.8.	Lyn Sayers	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
13.9.	Lyn Sayers	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
13.10.	Lyn Sayers	6-General		I confess to being somewhat concerned with traffic flow following recent "improvements". I see little purpose in the reduced speed limit and the reduction from two lanes to one, traveling North from Control Gate bridge. The modifications to Tongariro Street has made the access way too congested and more dangerous for pedestrians.	Reject - out of scope
14.1.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
14.2.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
14.3.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
14.4.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
14.5.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
14.6.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
14.7.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given
14.8.	Nathan Stirling for ANS Construction Ltd	4-Residential Chapter	No	Changing Building Coverage without also looking at Plot Ratio and Earthworks is a waste of time. So many people are put off building because of the Resource Consents, why not look at the entire problem instead of just fixing part of it!	Accept in part - all residential provisions will be reviewed as part of the full Residential Chapter review.
15.1.	Kelvin Martin	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	I want to see a town that grows and expands in a fashion that does not detract from what we already have. In particular I do not want to see the centre of town die like I have seen in other towns!	Accept - Support a coherent and planned response to urban development
15.2.	Kelvin Martin	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		I whole heartedly support the opportunity to subdivide to 2ha. I live on 5ha not because I want 5ha but because I want to live in a rural environment. The 5ha is just a pain to maintain. Please lets allow smaller sections so we can have more people looking after the same amount of land. I also support the ability to have a minor dwelling on a lifestyle block. I support this for the reasons mention in the proposed plan changes around family or tourist accommodation. However, I feel the requirement to <u>have the minor dwelling within 20 metres of the main house problematic.</u>	Accept in part
15.3.	Kelvin Martin	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	I am not sure if I have understood this proposed plan correctly. It reads to me that a 10ha title will be allowed one main home, one larger workers home and a minor dwelling. This makes 3 dwellings on 10ha which is too many and not in keeping with your statement to keep large spaces of land available for productive use.	N/A - this has been misunderstood. It is 1 main, 1 minor dwelling per 10 Ha.
15.4.	Kelvin Martin	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
15.5.	Kelvin Martin	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	The Taupo Town is growing fast. I have no issue with it spreading its wings into the Mapara Valley.	Reject
15.6.	Kelvin Martin	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	These events are now part of what define our town and we need to accommodate the temporary structures that come with the events	Accept
15.7.	Kelvin Martin	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Currently lots of buildings through the centre of town have great views of the lake and mountains. It is part of what makes it so neat to work in some of these upstairs offices. 18m high buildings in the areas you propose will obstruct lots of these views. So, while I do support allowing an increase in the maximum height in general I do not support the areas you have identified.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
15.8.	Kelvin Martin	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	In fact I would support a larger maximum building coverage in large areas of the town.	Accept
16.1.	David and Katrina Gage	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
16.2.	David and Katrina Gage	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We previously submitted to the council to subdivide back in early 2000, however we were declined as the council was moving us from lifestyle to rural. We would be interested in subdividing down to maybe three sections, perhaps four, depending on our situation. We would be interested in more information as to what the council's requirements would be.	Accept
16.3.	David and Katrina Gage	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
16.4.	David and Katrina Gage	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
16.5.	David and Katrina Gage	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
16.6.	David and Katrina Gage	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given
17.1.	Richard Hoadley	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
17.2.	Richard Hoadley	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
17.3.	Richard Hoadley	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
17.4.	Richard Hoadley	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
17.5.	Richard Hoadley	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
17.6.	Richard Hoadley	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Maybe	depends on the activity and the location. This could be achieved by consultation with the public and other concerned and affected persons.	Accept in part
17.7.	Richard Hoadley	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights		The current height limit can be exceeded by applicants, as was the case for the hotel. That needs to be stooped, not made easier. There were strong cases to retain the existing heights during the hotel consent hearings and those views have not changed.	The philosophy under the RMA is that anyone can apply for almost anything. It is very difficult to prohibit activities under the RMA.
17.8.	Richard Hoadley	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	as in the example, it is time and money that can be saved if there is some common-sense applied 35% plus or minus say a further 8% would allow other factors to help ensure a good result. Such as permitted yards, open space, vehicle movement and screening from neighbours	Accepted in part
17.9.	Richard Hoadley	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	The existing zoned space for industry is being developed in a manageable rate but is not being replaced with new subdivisions for future use. New land is required for new business opportunities, to be zoned to suit both large and mid sized business operations. With good access to SH1 and other services.	Accept
17.10.	Richard Hoadley	6-General		Council needs to have the ability to accept the consent information provided by the applicants professional advisers, without the need for additional information from a third professional employed by Council for the purpose of checking the applicant is correct.	Reject - out of scope

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
18.1.	Shay Clark	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		We would like our address to be considered for inclusion in the Rural Lifestyle Environment, specifically under the 4b.5.2. ;Rural Lifestyle Environment that adjoins the General Rural Environment with proposed subdividing of a second section, in size of 4 or more hectares, controlled activity. In regards to access via State highway; the proposed new section within our property would be accessed via the existing driveway as per the attached photo and not a new entrance/driveway off of the highway.	Reject. Contrary to the RPS re ribbon development on State Highways.
19.1.	Mat Staples for eHaus Taupo Limited	6-General		Could you please consider the following merits for 50 King rd to be zoned — Rural Lifestyle & bull;The property backs directly onto six other properties that will be zoned rural lifestyle & bull;The property is under 30 hectares. & bull;We purchased the property under the Mapara Valley plan in place, with the understanding this land will be developed in the future.	Reject - it is not surrounded by existing rural lifestyle.
20.1.	Tony Clough	2.2-General rural environment		I object to the proposed changes regarding subdivision size and additional dwellings on rural properties. I live on Oruanui Road. Allowing subdivision to smaller sections and allowing additional dwellings on properties will inevitably lead to a population increase on the road. That will mean more activity and more noise in the area which will detract from the quiet peaceful lifestyle we have come to enjoy.	Reject. It is expected that there will be a reasonable level of noise and activity in the rural environment.
21.1.	James Darge	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	more efficient development	Accept
22.1.	Kelvin Eagleton	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
22.2.	Kelvin Eagleton	4-Residential Chapter		Increasing building size on sections reduces land area that can soak up water (rain). With climate change, more rain is falling, more often, and more heavily. Drainage may not be able to contain this. There is already a problem that TDC doesn't insist on Permeable Concrete Paving. Having permeable concrete paving allows water to flow through the paving into the soil below. I suggest you make of bylaw that permeable concrete paving must only be used. Not having enough natural soil absorption may cause excess water to flow into the lake or elsewhere.	Accept in part. The total coverage provision currently allows significant impermeable coverage. Increasing building coverage will not change this. Total coverage and impermeable surfaces will be looked at as part of the full Residential Chapter review.
23.1.	kit Gainsford	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Land created for lifestyle purposes	Accept
23.2.	kit Gainsford	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Increase land use for lifestyle & small diversification	Accept
23.3.	kit Gainsford	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
23.4.	kit Gainsford	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
23.5.	kit Gainsford	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
23.6.	kit Gainsford	6-General		Would like to see the council water supply scheme extended through the rest of Tukairangi Road to Poihipi Road end.	Reject - out of scope
24.1.	Chris Dawson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
24.2.	Chris Dawson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I strongly agree with the direction. I agree that people do want to live in a rural lifestyle situation where area sizes can range from 1ha to 10ha (within existing lifestyle areas as raised by this document — until saturated, then to investigate new appropriate site in the future) to give them an option to enjoy the outdoors with some ability to se self sustaining, to a level where they can almost be fully sustained, and also setup and run a business and be give flexibility on size.	Accept
24.3.	Chris Dawson	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
24.4.	Chris Dawson	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
24.5.	Chris Dawson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
24.6.	Chris Dawson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
24.7.	Chris Dawson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes	I think the heart of a city and town are people. Specially now where we are all struggling to see an affordable future higher density in the city (with apartments and hotels) as a way of maintaining a heart after dark is a great way to take a sleepy town to a vibrant one.	Accept
24.8.	Chris Dawson	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
24.9.	Chris Dawson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
25.1.	James Moore	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
25.2.	James Moore	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
25.3.	James Moore	6-General		We support most of the suggestions. I am a builder and increasing the plot coverage of a section from 30 to 35 percent is long overdue especially with section sizes getting smaller and smaller. We also support reducing the rural block size and increasing to six storeys (and more) for the town center. You cant stop progress and this would encourage bigger players to town. As a side note we don't support any movements like three waters or any co—governance.	Accept
26.1.	Nesta Adams	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I would like to subdivide my property	Accept
27.1.	Clint Green	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
27.2.	Clint Green	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
27.3.	Clint Green	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
27.4.	Clint Green	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
27.5.	Clint Green	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
27.6.	Clint Green	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
27.7.	Clint Green	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
27.8.	Clint Green	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
27.9.	Clint Green	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
27.10.	Clint Green	6-General		the only way to enhance the Turangi Town Centre is to purchase and demolish the old post office.	Reject - out of scope

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
28.1.	Bruce Macdonald	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	As owners who would be in the new proposed Rural Lifestyle area, we are supportive of the proposed District Plan changes subject to the comments below. We suggest that Council has some flexibility as to area of each title so that it allows for a subdivision. For example our land area is 3.9928 ha.	Accept
29.1.	Paul Taylor for Classic Builders Lakes District	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We are fully supportive of the creation of the two new Rural environments and the proposed rules for each distinct Environment.	Accept
29.2.	Paul Taylor for Classic Builders Lakes District	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	We are also in full support of being able to build minor dwellings in both the new proposed General Rural Environment and the Rural Lifestyle Environment. The proposed rules are consistent with many councils around New Zealand and will enable intergenerational families to be able to live closer together in more affordable accommodation.	Accept
29.3.	Paul Taylor for Classic Builders Lakes District	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	We are in full support of increasing the building coverage from 30% to 35% in the Residential Environmental and Nukuhau General Residential zones. We believe this will enable better design outcomes for our clients on their sites.	Accept
30.1.	Paul Rollin	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
30.2.	Paul Rollin	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	While I support the overall change, in regard to the minor dwelling I feel that 20m is too close to the main dwelling when considering all the uses that a minor dwelling maybe used for — in particular when used for accommodation services (e.g. AirBnB or other types of holiday rental). When using such a building for accommodation services a greater distance from the main house would be preferred. I believe a limit of up to 50 or 75m would be better than the proposed 20m.	Reject. The objective is to manage scale and location to maintain rural openness and protect productive potential.
30.3.	Paul Rollin	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
30.4.	Paul Rollin	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	I feel that iwi should have a greater ability to develop their land as they need to support their people.	Accept - The Papakainga provisions are developed to support whanau occupying ancestral lands.
30.5.	Paul Rollin	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
30.6.	Paul Rollin	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
30.7.	Paul Rollin	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
30.8.	Paul Rollin	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
31.1.	Lauren Strange	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	Your policies on water quality and climate change are not strong enough. "activities that unduly accelerate..... will be discouraged". Discouraged how? Grow a backbone.	Not accept - Wording is limited by the stat role of council and high level planning documents.
31.2.	Lauren Strange	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
31.3.	Lauren Strange	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
31.4.	Lauren Strange	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
31.5.	Lauren Strange	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
31.6.	Lauren Strange	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe	14 days to set up/pack up is almost 3 times greater than the current 5 days. It seems excessive in length and will place an undue strain on the town, both in terms of traffic/noise, but also on the environment where the activity is taking place.	Not all events would need this extra time for set up and pack up. Just a few that require the extra time for complex set ups.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
31.7.	Lauren Strange	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	I do not support the plan to increase the maximum building height above 3 storeys, especially in the CBD and on the front roads next to the lake. It will block the view of the lake, cast a significant shadow over the pedestrian area and be an eyesore in the town. These taller buildings will create even more of a traffic issue than there currently is.	Seeking further advice on shading.
31.8.	Lauren Strange	4-Residential Chapter	No	I am concerned about the loss of green areas, especially if the property is not going to be inhabited by more people.	Reject
31.9.	Lauren Strange	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
31.10.	Lauren Strange	6-General		Parking on Tongariro Street is poorly designed and it is very difficult for people to exit the parks. The change in priority on the Tamamutu Street and Titiraupenga Street causes a lot of backing up traffic and will only get worse if you redirect traffic from Lake Terrace and make it a pedestrian area (horrible idea). The bumps outside of Animates by the crossing are unpleasant and unmarked.	Reject - out of scope
32.1.	Brad Davidson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
32.2.	Brad Davidson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
32.3.	Brad Davidson	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
32.4.	Brad Davidson	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
32.5.	Brad Davidson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
32.6.	Brad Davidson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
32.7.	Brad Davidson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	I feel like as a town this is something that we should support and embrace to further advance and improve Taupo. It will allow for better resources in particular towards hospitality and tourism and bring more spending to town. The adjustment doesn't allow for massive buildings still but the change will bring better building opportunities.	Accept
32.8.	Brad Davidson	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
33.1.	Warren Day	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No		No reason given.
33.2.	Warren Day	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No		N/A
33.3.	Warren Day	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
33.4.	Warren Day	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
33.5.	Warren Day	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
33.6.	Warren Day	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
33.7.	Warren Day	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
33.8.	Warren Day	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
33.9.	Warren Day	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
34.1.	Meghan Grant	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
34.2.	Meghan Grant	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	Some of the proposed ideas could affect a large majority of people and could impact their way of life.	Reject
34.3.	Meghan Grant	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
34.4.	Meghan Grant	2.3-Papakāinga provisions	Yes		Accept
34.5.	Meghan Grant	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	I'm just not completely sure what the impact revoking mapara valley environment zoning will have for those in the area	N/A
34.6.	Meghan Grant	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe	depends on the activities.	Accept
34.7.	Meghan Grant	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	this is because it could affect the environment that surrounds the area as well as the people who dwell in it. If the height of buildings was to increase sunlight accessibility would decrease creating a more hazardous environment.	Further advice on shading being sought.
34.8.	Meghan Grant	4-Residential Chapter	No		Accept
34.9.	Meghan Grant	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
35.1.	Samantha McCaskie	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
35.2.	Samantha McCaskie	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
35.3.	Samantha McCaskie	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
35.4.	Samantha McCaskie	2.3-Papakāinga provisions	Yes		Accept
35.5.	Samantha McCaskie	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
35.6.	Samantha McCaskie	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
35.7.	Samantha McCaskie	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
35.8.	Samantha McCaskie	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
35.9.	Samantha McCaskie	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
36.1.	Graham Aitken	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	it will completely alter the character of the town and waterfront, and views across the lake looking towards the town centre will be dominated by building rather than by the landscape.	Reject. A change in character is not necessarily a reason for a change under the RMA not to proceed. In this case the change in building scale is considered to be outweighed by the economic, town centre viability and efficiency of land use benefits.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
37.1.	Lisa Hall	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No		No reason given.
37.2.	Lisa Hall	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
37.3.	Lisa Hall	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
37.4.	Lisa Hall	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
37.5.	Lisa Hall	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
37.6.	Lisa Hall	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	increasing the building height will cast shadows. creating a cold dark centre of town. locals already have the changes to the parking and are starting to avoid coming into the centre of town. increasing the building height will make locals stay away more. it feels like the council is only thinking about the \$ and tourism and not about its people. we are losing the spirit of Taupō.	Further advice on shading being sought.
38.1.	Nachelle Griffiths	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	It is not my intention to respond to this question. I have attempted to remove the selection but the form does not allow you to do so.	N/A
38.2.	Nachelle Griffiths	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	It is not my intention to respond to this question. I have attempted to remove the selection but the form does not allow you to do so.	N/A
38.3.	Nachelle Griffiths	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	It is not my intention to respond to this question. I have attempted to remove the selection but the form does not allow you to do so.	N/A
38.4.	Nachelle Griffiths	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	I agree with the proposal as it relates to the 'rural chapter'. I do however believe this should also be provided for in the residential setting also, for all Whenua Maori within the residential zones also.	Accept in part - papakainga in a residential setting will form part of the review of the residential chapter of the Plan
38.5.	Nachelle Griffiths	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
38.6.	Nachelle Griffiths	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights		The change in height restrictions as proposed will result in additional shading to the public space at Roberts Street. Any change in height restriction should step up as they move away from the lake to enable the view of the lake to be a visual amenity enjoyed by more of the community, lots/properties, as the town centre moves back/away from the lake. Therefore making the most of the iconic setting and allowing greater development within the town centre moving forward whilst not encroaching on the character of the Lake frontage. I also note that a past consent application regarding a proposed taller building did not garner wider community support, which should also be taken into account.	Further advice on shading being sought.
38.7.	Nachelle Griffiths	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	I would prefer a lift to 45% rather than 35% to help alleviate the housing shortages for whanau. I would also prefer to see a % rise in low—density and high—density residential areas also. I would also like to see the additional provision for Papakainga within the 'residential chapter' for Whenua Maori to allow the development of small whanau papakainga allowing 80—90% building coverage. Whether for: a) larger multi—generational and multi—family house designs; and b) multiple minor dwellings on the property/lot for multi—generational and multi—family houses.	Accept in part. Papakainga will be addressed as part of the full Residential chapter review.
38.8.	Nachelle Griffiths	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe	It is not my intention to respond to this question. I have attempted to remove the selection but the form does not allow you to do so.	N/A
39.1.	Rosemary Peek and John Harpham Rosemary Peek and John Harpham	6-General		See attached	NA

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
40.1.	Glenis Moody	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	I do not trust the TDC to actually stick to any plans or changes the tell the ratepayers about.	N/A
40.2.	Glenis Moody	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Allowing for lifestyle blocks to be taken down to 2 hectares will absolutely destroy the rural landscape. The current 4 hectares is small enough to allow for people to have a community without neighbours peering in our windows. Leave it alone, it is functioning well as it is. Also, the roads - they are country roads, no footpaths, plenty of cyclists and horses, if you bring in more dwellings, the road traffic will increase and become more dangerous.	Reject
40.3.	Glenis Moody	2.2-General rural environment	No		No reason given
40.4.	Glenis Moody	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
40.5.	Glenis Moody	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
40.6.	Glenis Moody	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	We do not need multi story buildings, if this is what you want go live in Queenstown.	No reason given
40.7.	Glenis Moody	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
40.8.	Glenis Moody	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
41.1.	Rod Jamieson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	have not read the whole strategic directions	N/A
41.2.	Rod Jamieson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	It delivers areas that are targeted to the development of lifestyle blocks where the council wants development to happen . instead of the scatter gun approach that we have had in the past .	Accept
41.3.	Rod Jamieson	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
41.4.	Rod Jamieson	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
41.5.	Rod Jamieson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
41.6.	Rod Jamieson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
41.7.	Rod Jamieson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
41.8.	Rod Jamieson	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
41.9.	Rod Jamieson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
42.1.	Lyn Coubrough	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		We currently own a 4 ha property which it seems may be granted the right to subdivide down to 2 ha, or, the right to be able to put another small house beside the current house on the property. I then read about Papakainga and if I read it correctly, the rules for the New Zealanders of the district will be different for those of Maori descent.Maori will be able to have multiple residences on their property in comparison to the other New Zealanders of the district. Is this correct? I do NOT understand why this is imperative, and how this is NOT reverse racism....?	NA - Papakāinga provisions are enabling Māori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA.
42.2.	Lyn Coubrough	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	see above to start with.....	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
42.3.	Lyn Coubrough	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
42.4.	Lyn Coubrough	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No	Why should the Maori people live under different rules to other New Zealanders of the District? This has to be a nonsense.....	Not Accept -Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation.
42.5.	Lyn Coubrough	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	This doesn't affect me and I don't have an understanding of it.	N/A
42.6.	Lyn Coubrough	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	No	The paragraphs here do not make sense to me - what are 14 non operational days? Are they equivalent to the current 5 days to set up and pack up? If so, this is almost 3 times the amount of time for only 1 day more operational time. This seems extreme. I would think it could change to 4 operational; 7or8 to set up and pack up.....	Not all events would need this extra time for set up and pack up. Just a few that require the extra time for complex set ups.
42.7.	Lyn Coubrough	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights		I think that the lake front area and the current town centre should remain as it is. If there are changes to height restrictions do this up town away from the lake front where crowds spend their time. Height restrictions will result in shading of the area and general building encroachment on what is currently a really pleasant environment to spend time in.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
42.8.	Lyn Coubrough	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	From your diagram and information this makes sense to me. However, I think it is important to have outdoor area around a home so I wouldn't like to see the coverage altered any further. Is drainage and water run off considered? i.e. Environmental impact.....	Accept
42.9.	Lyn Coubrough	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	No	Why would you consider setting up an industrial site off Poihipi Road? Might be a consideration if there was a new bridge built allowing ease of access to Taupo Town for workers and public generally.	Accept
42.10.	Lyn Coubrough	6-General		i guess it is too late to make comment on the ridiculous road speeds in the pipeline. I believe there will be worse problems with your stated restrictions. It is great to be able to have a say here. I hope someone reads my comments. Probably they won't be agreed with, but it would be good to receive answers to my questions. Particularly Papakainga.	Reject - out of scope
43.1.	Sidney and Paula Dewes	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	We are strongly opposed to any proposed industrial use of the land identified as Rangatira E and we are strongly opposed to the change in maximum town centre heights. See comments below.	Accept
43.2.	Sidney and Paula Dewes	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights		We STRONGLY OPPOSE these changes to the maximum town centre heights. The TDC has said that they want to make Roberts Street even more attractive to locals and tourists; however, allowing the building heights to be increased will only end up blocking the sun on the existing restaurants and cafes on Roberts Street. And the main reason for raising the building height on Tūwharetoa Street is to allow the hotel to be built, which we again are strongly opposed to, as the traffic congestion in town is already ridiculous, due to the illogical planning of the TDC up to now! Navigating through Taupo has become problematic and we feel more and more people will choose to bypass Taupo as a result of the changes in the town design.	It is incorrect that this process is being put in place to allow the Hotel to be built. The Hotel already has approval to be built.
43.3.	Sidney and Paula Dewes	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		We are strongly opposed to any proposed industrial use of the land identified as Rangatira E. We would expect that the area adjacent to Rangatira E will, in due course, become medium to high density residential property. There are other areas that already exist that would be far more suitable. Furthermore, the increased movement of heavy trucks over the bridge and safety concerns as the intersection of Poihipi Rd and Wairakei Drive, are further reasons against considering that area as a possible area to be zoned for industrial use.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
44.1.	John Crowley on behalf of John and Rhonda Crowley	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	We are submitting on the rural residential proposals specifically.	N/A
44.2.	John Crowley on behalf of John and Rhonda Crowley	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		The proposal to allow a second dwelling on a rural block and the ability to subdivide to a small size seems to us to be eminently sensible. It is our observation that many of the existing small blocks are not being farmed efficiently. On the question of a second dwelling, this provides an opportunity for intergenerational communities. It seems fashionable to now consider this only important to Māori, yet most cultures lived this way for 99.9% of human history. In our families this was the case within our lifetimes. This is an option we would be likely to take up.	Accept
44.3.	John and Rhonda Crowley	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
44.4.	John and Rhonda Crowley	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
44.5.	John and Rhonda Crowley	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
44.6.	John and Rhonda Crowley	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
44.7.	John and Rhonda Crowley	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
44.8.	John and Rhonda Crowley	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
44.9.	John and Rhonda Crowley	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
45.1.	Henry Carson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No		No reason given.
45.2.	Henry Carson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
45.3.	Henry Carson	2.2-General rural environment	No		No reason given
45.4.	Henry Carson	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No		
45.5.	Henry Carson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
45.6.	Henry Carson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
45.7.	Henry Carson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Tall buildings have no place in town centre. It will ruin the natural beauty of the lake and vibe of the town by obstructing sunlight. On top of that tall buildings are an eye sore. I don't support this in any way shape or form.	Further advice on shading being sought.
45.8.	Henry Carson	4-Residential Chapter	No		No reason given
45.9.	Henry Carson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe	Keep destruction of natural resources to a minimum	Accept



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
46.1.	Maree Cordell	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		I strongly agree with the being able to build a minor unit should the conditions/criteria be met. I disagree with the rule that the that the location of the minor unit is restricted to being within 20 meters of the primary house. Providing all other rules are met including access, 1:1, size and building consent requirements are met then I believe the location rule is superfluous.	Accept in part
46.2.	Maree Cordell	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
46.3.	Maree Cordell	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
46.4.	Maree Cordell	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
46.5.	Maree Cordell	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	We should be looking to the future and moving the residential building coverage rate straight to 40%, rather than taking a small incremental step to 35%.	Accept
47.1.	Gary Cordell	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Being able to build a minor unit should the conditions/criteria be met is welcomed. I am not disagree with the rule that the that the location of the minor unit is restricted to being within 20 meters of the primary house. As an example I can build a 100sqm shed anywhere on my property providing it meets boundary rules etc. so why restrict a minor unit be within 20m of the main house? Providing all other rules are met including access, 1:1, size and building consent requirements are met then I believe the location rule is superfluous.	Reject
47.2.	Gary Cordell	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	coverage should go straight to 40% rather than the 35%.	Accept
48.1.	Michael and Philip Fitzgerald	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
48.2.	Michael and Philip Fitzgerald	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
48.3.	Michael and Philip Fitzgerald	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
48.4.	Michael and Philip Fitzgerald	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
48.5.	Michael and Philip Fitzgerald	2.4-Mapara Valley environment		We are in support of the proposed rezoning of farmland to rural and rural lifestyle zones and the removal of the Mapara Valley Structure Plan. Reasons for this support are: Location of properties within the Lake Taupo catchment restricts the ability to farm this land profitability given council land use restrictions. 2Ha (5 Acres) still maintains a rural atmosphere as seen in many parts of New Zealand such as the Waipa District and Waikato Districts. The Mapara Valley is naturally suited to an increased rural population due to the availability of scheme water and multiple road access back to Taupo, as well a proximity to employment in Taupo. As discussed, there are a limited number of lifestyle blocks available around Taupo. The proposed 2Ha minimum subdivision allows landowners to determine how to best extract economic value out of their land.	Accept
49.1.	Martin Frohke	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		The proposed western area to the north of Nukuhau has residential lots on its southern boundary. It will also be bounded to the east residential buildings, as determined by Plan Change 37. Eventually there will be over 300 residential lots within a 500m circle around the subject site. Industrial land makes for a bad neighbour to residential land. Noise, odours, heavy truck traffic, unsightly industrial buildings and so on, are an inherent part of industrial uses. These are acceptable in the rural area or adjacent to other industrial land, but are not acceptable near a residential area.  A better longer term use for that western land could be a change to residential, and this would be possible from a rural use. but not from an industrial use.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
50.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants Limited on behalf of CGR Trustees Service Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		CGR Trustee Services Limited submit that it is necessary that Council revise the zoning for this site as soon as possible, and if not in this current plan change, in the next being the residential zone. We welcome further discussion on this matter as soon as Council is able.	Reject - further conversations to occur as part of the residential chapter review.
51.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants Limited on behalf of Daniel Deere	2.2-General rural environment		3/504 Mapara Rd, being a property already serviced with water, in a location with adequate roading and in close proximity to Taupō urban area, the new Rural Lifestyle zone is appropriate and well considered in this area. This zone change and associated minor dwellings rules are supported on this <u>property and adjoining properties, being similar in size, nature and servicing.</u>	Accept
52.1.	Morag Mccaughan	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	I am emailing in the support of being able to subdivide rural lifestyle blocks into smaller areas. I am not sure what information I need to provide to support this, so please feel free to email me back if you require further information as to where I live etc. I am in the Oruanui Area up a private road on <u>16 acres and would like to subdivide off 5 acres to sell.</u>	Accept
53.1.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Limited on behalf of Mega Foods Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		We specifically support the re-zoning of 63 Broadlands Road to industrial. We request that the industrial zone definition to continue to include ;storage and distribution of goods and for food outlets to continue to be a permitted activity in the industrial zone. There are no current plans to connect the site to council infrastructure at this stage as it can be developed with onsite servicing. We would like to see background reports relating to this site in relation to advantages and <u>disadvantages of including this site in the re-zoning.</u>	Accept in part. The site will continue to be assessed for suitability to be rezoned. The definition is outside the scope of this review and will not change. Expert assessments of the site will be made available.
54.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants Limited on behalf of Mocketenui Station Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Section 1 Blk. V Puketi Survey District, Pt Waihi Kahakahoroa 2 Block&it; Pt Waihi Kahakahoroa 3A Block. Under the draft Plan Change to the Rural Environment, these three parcels are shown as part of the General Rural Zone. In regard to the General Rural Zone, the provisions providing for additional primary housing per 10ha and associated minor dwellings are welcomed. However the constraint on vehicle movements under policy 3b.2.9 appears unnecessary provided adequate and safe <u>intersections are constructed when necessary.</u>	Accept - EVMs adjusted
54.2.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants Limited on behalf of Mocketenui Station Limited	2.2-General rural environment		A clear definition of 'Rural Industry' is required to differentiate industrial activities associated with the rural activities verses industrial activities that should are not associated with rural uses and thus should be located in an Industrial Zone.	Accept
55.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of Lake Taupo Holiday Resort	2.2-General rural environment	No	Under the draft Plan Change to the Rural Environment, Lake Taupō Holiday Resort is shown as part of the General Rural Zone. As long discussed with Taupō District Council, this zoning is not fit for purpose for this site. The historical rural zoning is a result of the philosophy of the plan when established in early 2000s. The zoning for this site was subsequently not revised in the rural plan changes of 2008/09. Therefore it is necessary that Council revise the zoning for this site as soon as possible, and if not in this current plan change, in the next. It is considered that at the current level of consents, a residential zone or a tourist accommodation zone is the most appropriate for this site.	Reject. Out of scope. Further conversations to occur as part of subsequent residential review.
56.1.	Peter Jarvis	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	I wish to record my support for the draft changes to the rural lifestyle rules applying to properties in the Mapara Valley.	Accept
57.1.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Yes as its all positive to look after the area and environment	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
57.2.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We feel it is a very positive move for TDC We think it is far more realistic to be able to have smaller blocks of 2ha so close to the city and more affordable and manageable for lifestyle living, We also agree to be able to have separate dwelling on the 2ha ( 5 acre blocks) as sperate titles this is more affordable. We are also for being able to have a second dwelling for family relatives on the 2 ha blocks.	Accept
57.3.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	I think further our of town it is still reasonable to own 10 ha lots but people need to be able to own smaller blocks that are close to town for kids and lifestyle living and 10ha is quite often to big for the average family that want farm country lifestyle living	Accept
57.4.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	We think this is a great idea but feel it would need to have strong guidelines and direction and oversight	Accept - It should be noted that this in addition to the wider restrictions on the development of maori land under other acts. The proposed provisions provide for an appropriate form of development that reflects the important considerations under Part 2 of the Act.
57.5.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Sorry being new to the area we are not fully familiar with this but if it opens opportunities for work and residency and for the area to grow then this is all great for Taupo	Accept
57.6.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	It brings business to the area and the organizers and everyone involved would stay longer and others would to	Accept
57.7.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	We love the fact that Taupo doesn't feel all closed in and have big high rise building, it is a special town with a great unique feel, it would be a shame to loss this and have concerns if there were high building all around town it would close it in, but if it is necessary to keep up with the growth of the city then we would not be opposed to it.	Accept
57.8.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	Sorry this isn't an area I would have much involvement with so looking at the percentages now it looks like there is a need to do this	Accept
57.9.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Business growth is important as long as it is not taking over farm land and encroaching to much in residential area	Accept
57.10.	Craig Philip & Karen Horan	6-General		As new owners and new to the district we are pleased TDC are looking at the Rural Lifestyle changes.	Accept
58.1.	Steven Painter	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
58.2.	Steven Painter	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
58.3.	Steven Painter	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
58.4.	Steven Painter	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
58.5.	Steven Painter	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
58.6.	Steven Painter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
58.7.	Steven Painter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
58.8.	Steven Painter	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
58.9.	Steven Painter	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
58.10.	Steven Painter	6-General		As an option I think it would also be good to allow some medium density into Kinloch. Its one thing for locals to want to see the village stay small but at the same time there is a huge opportunity for a motel of sort or medium density living in the right area. Not having these is causing an accommodation issue in an amazing location.	Reject - out of scope
59.1.	Philip Poppe	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	It makes sense to split up smaller blocks since there is a shortage of land suitable for development.	Accept
59.2.	Philip Poppe	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
59.3.	Philip Poppe	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	We are the owners of the property at 308 Mapara Road. Currently you are showing us as being given the general rural classification but it does not make sense to give us this classification since we are only 24 Ha so the property is barely economic as a productive farm. We would be better to have the rural lifestyle classification. We are bounded on two sides by rural lifestyle blocks to the north and east of us	Reject for now. This land requires further assessment in relation to low density residential requirements.
60.1.	Phillip Greaves	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	we live on a10 acre block in centennial drive ,and feel that the lifestyle environment around us has changed .Being very close to town, and our land is now not productive as agricultural anymore. The land would be more useful as smaller lifestyle blocks, most of the neighbouring land has already has been divided. We now also have town water supply available.	Accept
61.1.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	The strategic directions have noble and desirable aims, but sadly without restricting population growth and insatiable consumerism they wont happen.	Accept in part - Matters raised are beyond the scope of the plan however recognition of TD2050 reflect population growth projections
61.2.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	It could create reverse sensitivity problems with smaller lot owners expecting a more residential type living. Existing land use farming forestry create noise and smells that some find objectionable. It can also create problems for existing rural land use such as wandering domestic pets worrying stock, increased traffic on rural roads and residential expectations such as street lighting, footpaths, improved water supply etc that puts rates up for productive rural land owners/users.	Reject
61.3.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	I would like to know what happens to the balance lots of the two landowners that took advantage of the Mapara Structure Plan, where smaller lots were averaged with a larger lot? That is they should remain the General Rural Environment.	Accept. The one balance lot that has been identified has been removed.
61.4.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	Seem like a good idea , and maybe similar changes could be made to Pakeha owned land that will not ever be sold or subdivided eg some covenanting provision	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
61.5.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	On the condition that the As mentioned two areas that took up option the larger balance lots should be maintained at the current size not allowed to take up the rural lifestyle option.	Accept. One has not been included within the RLE. The other has been removed.
61.6.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe	There has to be a balance between disruption to locals and the requirements of the event. Maybe if Event organisers can show the event is Carbon Neutral as expressed in desires of Strategic Directions they could stay longer.	Accept
61.7.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	The Council did not listen to the community in the previous debacle where maximum height was exceeded and allowed in a consent . It destroys the intrinsic feel of Taupo as a small lakeside settlement.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
61.8.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	4-Residential Chapter	No		No reason given
61.9.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe	Don't understand some of those suggested, the land tenure of the suggested areas should be listed on the map	Accept in Part. Will add land tenure to proposed sites in the future
61.10.	Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust	6-General		NZ requires a national population policy that allows Councils to restrict population increase . Population density is negativley impacting globally . No one wants to talk about it, but as the saying goes think globally act locally	Reject - out of scope
62.1.	Julie McLeod on behalf of Towncentre Taupo	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Town centre Taupo agree with the proposed changes to the maximum height but believe they should be extended to the whole of the town centre. Our CBD could use the vibrancy and support created by urban—type dwellers. Landowners may also be encouraged to upgrade their buildings if they can increase the height and put in third story apartments. As an example, apartment housing on the river side of Spa Road could have amazing views of the river, town and lake as well as add vibrancy to the area, but this area has been excluded from the proposed changes. Taupo's housing shortage and increase in petrol prices also point to CBD living.	Accept
63.1.	DAVID GRAY	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
63.2.	DAVID GRAY	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Because in the future I would like subdivide my property	Accept
64.1.	Bruce Bartley	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		Noise, odours, heavy truck traffic, unsightly industrial buildings and so on, are an inherent part of industrial uses. These are acceptable in the rural area or adjacent to other industrial land, but are not acceptable near a residential area. The proposed western area to the north of Nukuhau has residential lots on its southern boundary. It will also be bounded to the east residential buildings, as determined by Plan Change 37. There seems to be little to recommend the western land use as industrial land, and there are strong reasons why that use should be avoided.	Accept
65.1.	Angela London on behalf of Garth & Angela London	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	We need to be mindful of the principles of Kaitiakitanga; protection of water, land, air and visual impacts for future generations.Supporting climate change initiatives, reduction in urban sprawl.Council needs to ask itself how changes to the current height restrictions will negatively impact the very special character of our town. One of the attractions of Taupo is its low—rise look and feel. Notwithstanding this, we are not opposed to appropriate and sympathetic development.The question the council should be asking itself is how development will be reflected in the long term and what framework should exist now to achieve positive outcomes in this regard.	Accept in part - Matters raised will be addressed in Section 32 documentation
65.2.	Garth & Angela London	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Rural lifestyle properties that are at least 2ha in size will retain the natural character of the Mapara Valley that we value so much whilst allowing sympathetic development of land that is currently locked up in 4ha or greater lots. Equitable allocation of the costs to provide shared infrastructure facilities (eg driveways, water bores etc.) is required and would need to be considered as a condition of consent. This is particularly relevant where infrastructure is privately owned and this cost should not be expected to be borne by existing owners who may choose/or not be able to subdivide. How does TDC reconcile consent for access to water that may be managed by Waikato Regional Council? Where there is the potential for more than 12 allotments (4b.5.9) how will council manage this, given that it is a discretionary activity? For example, will it be on a first come, first served basis? We would suggest that, if this is the case, council will create some problems for itself.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
65.3.	Garth & Angela London	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
65.4.	Garth & Angela London	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Subject to the proposed protections being in place.	Accept
65.5.	Garth & Angela London	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	We think the existing height limits are not a barrier to appropriate development. Development needs to be sympathetic to the existing environment. We don't believe that high-rise buildings of 6 stories, in the centre of Taupo, fits with that. Shadow lines will negatively impact a lot of public & retail spaces around these proposed areas. Increasing existing height limits will have a huge negative impact on the look and feel of our town.	Reject. Further advice being sought on shading.
65.6.	Garth & Angela London	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
66.1.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	NZAAA interest relates to agricultural aviation activities	N/A
66.2.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	NZAAA interest relates to agricultural aviation activities	N/A
66.3.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	NZAAA interest relates to agricultural aviation activities	N/A
66.4.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	n/a	Accept
66.5.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	NZAAA's interest relates to agricultural aviation activities	N/A
66.6.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Maybe	n/a to NZAAA	N/A
66.7.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	n/a to NZAAA	N/A
66.8.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	n/a to NZAAA	No reason given

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
66.9.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe	n/a to NZAAA	N/A
66.10.	Tony Michelle for New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association (NZAAA)	6-General		This submission from NZAAA is preemptive for Council consideration relating to agricultural aircraft activities from airstrips and remote load sites	NA
67.1.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Some of the idea are ok but some of the environmental and Economics haven't been looked at. For example a 30 plus ha block is classed as economic but this isn't really the case. A block within the lake Taupo catchment is much less economic than a block outside the catchment. People may need other options to make these viable Water and septic tanks in the smaller blocks within the lake Taupo catchment has this been modelled for environmental impacts?	Accept in part - Matters raised will be addressed in Section 32 documentation
67.2.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	In some areas this is a great idea I think the water and sewage just needs to be addressed. to ensure it is sustainable and economic.	Accept
67.3.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	I have a few issues with traffic movements. 100 movements isn't enough for some larger farms. If 1 truck equals 10 cars technically I cant move my cows to winter grazing on one day which I have to do for animal health and financial reason. I think this should be 200 movements per day	Accept - EVMs adjusted
67.4.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	great idea to get affordable houses. just what it to be the same for other people if they want to do something on there block of land. Does everyone have this option. as the Papakainga projects are a great way to get people and families into houses. Taupo needs more affordable house. Free up land and make the Developers carry the risk. Why would the council want to stop sections been freed up?? more rates to build bridges etc	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
67.5.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	Yes the general rural needs more Flexibility to enable them to remain viable. With the lake Taupo catchment a 30— ha block is much less viable than a 30— ha block outside the catchment. more traffic movements is required. It makes no sense if a 2 ha block can have 100 movements and 30— ha has the same. should be at least doubled or averaged over the year. People need to be able to run there businesses with the council trying to stop them in very direction.	Accept - EVMs adjusted.
67.6.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	need to make it easy for people and big some fun to the area.	Accept
67.7.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	will take away the feel of the town centre and have more shading and block views	Further advice on shading being sought.
67.8.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	as long as drainage is thought about get into it. Dumb rules just slow people down and cost money.	Accept
67.9.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Might need more land to the west.	
67.10.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	6-General		I think for the general rural & rural lifestyle just look at the farms located within the rural lifestyle areas palmer mill road mapara, tukarangi, town end of Poihipi and the likes. It will be very hard to farm if the blocks get cut up further more complains from people that don't understand farming. we need to remain viable with options other types of businesses that can run from these larger blocks and the set backs are a major issue as more and more houses that appear on the boundary.	Note the additional controls for subdivision and housing density next to General rural.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
67.11.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.2-General rural environment		300 meter set backs for buildings that house / management animals isn't practical. This makes most of my farm unless as some of my flat land is close to the boundary and the other areas are hilly and can't be built on and is a long distance from power and road access. It should be 300m from any current house. once the structure is built and someone builds closer to 300m from the structure that is there problem. not the farmer who has to be viable. My farm is surrounded by rural lifestyle sections and I will be able to do next to nothing and will end up going broke.	Accept - Setback adjusted
67.12.	Patrick hart for Coolbreene Trust	2.2-General rural environment		I think signage should be allowed to be bigger 2m2 isn't very big. The council should be supporting people to be successful not making it hard for them.	Reject
68.1.	Gabi Dawson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
68.2.	Gabi Dawson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I think the Rural Lifestyle Environment is a good and positive change, and makes use of existing land and allows it to become denser, while still giving a rural setting and feel. I would say a little more flexibility is distance apart of main dwelling (proposed at 20m), could be increased a bit more 30m to allow for more 'private' setting, but still being is quite close proximity to the main dwelling. I would also like to see 100m2 plus 'carport', though accept that a small 2 bedroom house with small garage can be 100m2.I like the idea of 2ha subdivision for 4 to 10ha lifestyle blocks, and support this.	Accept
68.3.	Gabi Dawson	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
68.4.	Gabi Dawson	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
68.5.	Gabi Dawson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
68.6.	Gabi Dawson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
68.7.	Gabi Dawson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
68.8.	Gabi Dawson	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
68.9.	Gabi Dawson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
69.1.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	6-General		see attached	NA
69.2.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Definitions. Resource management responses to intensive primary production activity are changing to provide more clarity for plan interpretation and administration, and to manage associated environmental effects. There is now greater understanding that there is a difference in activity and effect from intensive indoor and outdoor pig farming activity and that it is helpful in plans to define and provide provision for both. The submitter has provided a diagram of the structure developing in planning frameworks for definitions.	Have defined rural industry. Do not think it is necessary to also define primary production.
69.3.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Concerned with the lack of clear strategic direction and inclusion of Strategic Objectives and Policies for Rural Area. Concerned with the lack of a clear policy direction on the relationship of urban form and development and the rural environment and activities when the introduction in the rural environment chapter identifies that this environment makes up most of the land within the district and is an important part of New Zealand's food production and related food security system.	Accept in part - reference to TD2050 as well as other matters refer to provides strategic direction on these key issues at a district level. This includes use of the rural environment.



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
69.4.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		3b.1 Introduction. Support the introduction and approach whereby a General Rural Environment and Rural Lifestyle Environment are described.	Accept
69.5.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Support the intent of Objective 3b.2.1	Accept
69.6.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Support the intent of Objective 3b.2.5 but this should be extended to permitted and existing lawfully established activities (by consent or existing use)	Reject. This is already provided for under s10 of the RMA.
69.7.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Support in part the intent of Policy 3b.2.8 while noting the environment is also characterised by smells associated with rural production.	Reject. Odour dealt with by Regional Plan.
69.8.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Policy 3b.2.11. Oppose the provision of a minor residential unit with 100m2 limitation and requirements that the minor residential unit is no more than 20m from the principal residential unit do not support a viable farm workers accommodation. NZ Pork seeks the inclusion of a definition, <u>policy support and specific rule structure for works accommodation.</u>	Reject. In the vast majority of cases workers houses will be on lots greater than 10Ha.
69.9.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Replace 3b.2.12 as follows: Avoid activities that are incompatible with rile, function and predominant character of the General Rural Environment and/or activities that will result in: 1. reverse sensitivity effects and/or conflict with permitted or lawfully established activities in the zone; or 2. adverse effects, which cannot be avoided, or appropriately remedied or mitigated, on: a) rural character and amenity values b) <u>the productive potential of highly productive soils and the rural environment.</u>	Reject
69.10.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.1.1 Support a permitted activity pathway for activities in the general rural environment able to comply with relevant performance standards and district wide standards rather than extensive activity lists.	Accept
69.11.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.1 Vehicle Movements. Oppose the limitation of 100 vehicle movements (5 truck movements) per day for the allotment. The exception should be extended to primary production activity where herd changes, feed, bedding and other activity requiring vehicle movements would typically exceed the daily limitation.	Accept - EVMs adjusted
69.12.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Support in part a maximum building coverage of 10% of the net allotment area nothing this would provide capacity for typical intensive indoor primary production activity. An exception should be <u>provided to align with that of 4b.2.6 for small scale buildings.</u>	Reject
69.13.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.3. Support the maximum building size of 5000m2 gross floor area for a single building noting that this would provide capacity for typical intensive indoor primary production activity	Accept
69.14.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.5 Support maximum building height of 15m	Accept
69.15.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.6 Support a minimum building setback of 300m for buildings for the management of farmed animals from all boundaries. Support an exception for small scale buildings but do not support a limitation to one small building per allotments and the 6m2 gross floor area. Mobile shelters are a necessary part of outdoor pig farming activity and occur in a variety of sizes. Typically small mobile shelters are spread around the site which could breach the maximum building coverage rule in combination with other building on site plus onerous setbacks when the effects of these extensive farming activities can be managed. Recommended exception is restricted to shelters that are up to 10m2 in area and less than 2m in height as this would limit the exception to small-scale buildings <u>required for animal health and wellbeing.</u>	Accept in part - setback adjusted.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
69.16.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.7 - support the provision of minor residential units in the General Rural Environment, however the 100m2 limitation and requirement that the minor residential unit is no more than 20m from the principal residential unit does not support s viable farm workers accommodation. Farming pigs is very different from farming other livestock. Stockpersons are farm more intimately involved with the care of pigs than other livestock. pigs have a greater need for shelter and their social and dietary requirements are more complex than sheep and cattle. Animal care is a daily responsibility, as pigs are not like ruminants which derive their nutrition from grass.: pigs are monogastric like humans, and require a balanced diet fed daily. As such, providing accommodation on site for workers is an important component of many commercial pig farming operation which often require the onsite provision of farm workers accommodation to provide onsite assistance, animal husbandry and security	Reject - larger farms can have a workers house as of right per 10Ha.
69.17.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Amend 4b.5.1 as follows: Subdivision — General Rural Environment I. Subdivision resulting in lots that are 10 hectares or larger is a controlled restricted discretionary activity.	Reject. This is a significant change from the current operative plan.
69.18.	Penny Cairns for NZPork	2.2-General rural environment		Add new matter of discretion: Location and sensitivity to primary production activities and whether they conflict, reverse sensitivity effects and/or increased risk to people, property and the environment arise.	Reject - the lot size allows for management of RS.
70.1.	Christine Hill	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	I believe that Taupo is growing very fast, I believe that it is time for change to keep the lifestyle, the character of the town, the infrastructure that will need to take place as Taupo develops. Taupo is very beautiful and I would support most of the strategic directions as long as the community have a say and are involved in what is happening to the town, land, water and environment to keep what we have. We seem to have many visitors to our town and I envisage more in the future which will also need to be catered for.	Accept - Plan changes are open for full community submission. The approaches taken reflect those conversations had with the community as a result of the plan review and also through other processes such as the LTP.
70.2.	Christine Hill	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	On a positive note as I have said before, Taupo needs to move forwards however we live on a lifestyle block and would like to add another dwelling for family. I think it is great that you would be able to sub divide on a smaller lifestyle and that there can only be one dwelling as I realise somebody with a larger plot say 20 acres could potentially subdivide and put four dwellings. So having restrictions to one dwelling is great to keep the rural lifestyle.	Accept
70.3.	Christine Hill	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
70.4.	Christine Hill	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
70.5.	Christine Hill	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No	I have only answered no as we have lived in the district only seven years this year, So had no idea about Mapara Valley.	N/A
70.6.	Christine Hill	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
70.7.	Christine Hill	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
70.8.	Christine Hill	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Taupo needs more industrial space for businesses, absolutely as it is growing so fast.	Accept
70.9.	Christine Hill	6-General		Thankyou for including me in the strategic district plan survey. I think overall Taupo needs to move forward with a lot of things now rather than later, when we have grown so much that it will be too late. Looking forward to hearing the outcomes.	NA

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
71.1.	Terry Palmer	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	I agree we need a structured strategic direction going forward. Population growth is not going backwards anytime soon worldwide and if we can identify and plan for the growth and stick to the rules then it has to be great for the area. Support Freshwater, Urban Form and Development, Papakainga and Infrastructure Development.	Accept - SD's refer to district wide planning processes including TD2050 which is conscious of population growth etc.
71.2.	Terry Palmer	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Yes it makes sense that with population growth there will be increased demand for lifestyle living. I agree that it's better to keep good farm land producing something like food than just sporadic housing. However with increased density there would need to be rules and standards that would be similar to residential zoning so that land holders within the new rural lifestyle environment cannot go ahead with an activity that would be more suited in an alternative environment.	Accept
71.3.	Terry Palmer	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Yes, as above, productive land needs to remain productive, so the less carving up the better.	Accept
71.4.	Terry Palmer	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
71.5.	Terry Palmer	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	Yes, it has probably served its purpose and hasn't really taken off after all these years. So long as the 'cluster' notion is retained under the new rules and undesirable activities are not permitted within these clusters then its probably time for it to be revoked.	Reject - cluster rules proposed to be removed. However rural lifestyle proposed for some areas.
71.6.	Terry Palmer	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Maybe	As I discussed above, the increase in temporary activity days for the new Rural Lifestyle Environment is totally inappropriate. There really is no need to have the ability to have this many days because the clusters or environments you are proposing are simply not big enough to have temporary activities, and, they are private properties. The new Rural Lifestyle Environment is more like a less dense town rather than a more dense rural area. However, for the town centre environment I can see the benefits of having temporary activities. It is already a public area and there is really not a greater impact on private peoples lives by increasing the number of days of temporary activities. For the Rural Lifestyle Environment above — there should not be the increase to 8 days...if anything the limit should be reduced or even none at all.	Reject. Temporary activities are not anticipated to be a significant issue in RLE.
71.7.	Terry Palmer	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	I haven't really delved into the draft in detail, but yes due to the inherent fact that land is finite, but population increase is only going to create development, then going upwards makes sense. In a town centre or residential environment it make sense to utilise a footprint to its maximum. Productive land needs to be preserved.	Accept
71.8.	Terry Palmer	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	It just makes sense if there are already lots of applications being processed to go over the current rule.	Accept
71.9.	Terry Palmer	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Yes, plan for it not to avoid reactive, sporadic planning. Makes sense to push out Centennial Drive way. Not too sure about any industrial development along Poihipi Road...there is some beautiful land in here with nice views for residential in the future, why would you want to ruin this environment for future generations.	Accept
71.10.	Terry Palmer	6-General		Thank you again for reading my submission. If you require any clarification please email me and I will respond straight away.	NA
72.1.	Angela Bell	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept - Matters raised are beyond the scope of the plan however recognition of TD2050 reflect population growth projections

Sub.Point No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
72.2.	Angela Bell	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	I strongly oppose Tuhingamata Road being identified as part of the Rural Lifestyle Environment. Tuhingamata Road is very rural in character and many of the lots are used for primary production. There are several rural contracting businesses located along the road, with heavy machinery operating through out the day and night. Reverse sensitivity and existing use rights will cause tension if the proposal goes ahead as rural activities are likely to continue along this road given that it services a number of farms. The road is a narrow local road with several blind corners, which already has an issue with safety, particularly with school children and horse riders. Increasing the traffic load of 24 movements per 2ha lot will significantly increase the traffic safety risk along Tuhingamata Road.	Seeking further advice on traffic safety.
72.3.	Angela Bell	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
73.1.	jim rauch	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	I agree with and oppose aspects of the SCD	Accept in part - Matters raised are beyond the scope of the plan however recognition of TD2050 reflect population growth projections
73.2.	jim rauch	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Freeing up rural lifestyle land is a very welcomes idea. I believe there is great benefit in utilising the aspects of rural lifestyle while being close to our town centre.	Accept
73.3.	jim rauch	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	More support should be available for our farmers to combat the globalist eradication of what happens to be our strongest export and back bone of the country.	Accept
73.4.	jim rauch	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	As long as the provision were cast in a light that doesn't give an unfair bias to Maori base on race.	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
73.5.	jim rauch	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Yes, as the expected influx was not meet, a rural lifestyle zoning is appropriate.	Accept
73.6.	jim rauch	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
73.7.	jim rauch	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	I believe this will negatively affect the shape and feel of our town centre	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
73.8.	jim rauch	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	While I disagree with packing out sections I do think being inline with other councils (35%) is useful.	Accept
73.9.	jim rauch	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
74.1.	John & Nicola McClune	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept - Matters raised are beyond the scope of the plan however recognition of TD2050 reflect population growth projections
74.2.	John & Nicola McClune	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
74.3.	John & Nicola McClune	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
74.4.	John & Nicola McClune	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
74.5.	John & Nicola McClune	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	What minimum hectare size must you need to be to subdivide down to 2 hectares i.e.. 4 hectares. If you have a 4 hectare plus Lifestyle block, must it be subdivided into two equal 2—hectare blocks or i.e. a 3 hectare and a 1—hectare block or thereabouts?	2ha is the minimum lot size as a controlled activity.
74.6.	John & Nicola McClune	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
74.7.	John & Nicola McClune	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
74.8.	John & Nicola McClune	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
74.9.	John & Nicola McClune	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
75.1.	David James Davies	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	it is heading in the right direction, most things are pretty well defined and planned well...just a little concerned with the lack of detail in papakainga planning.	Accept - Note comments re Papakāinga - planning is up to the landowners to forward, we have developed a framework for the RMA aspect relative to the wider plan
75.2.	David James Davies	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
75.3.	David James Davies	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
75.4.	David James Davies	2.3-Papakāinga provisions	Maybe	there needs to be more detail and greater scope...this is written as if it is trying to appease the natives.....believe me us natives are not appeased that easily. I have heaps of suggestions for a more inclusive papakainga development policy. I intend running for one of the maori ward councillors...watch this space.	Accept in part - Provisions were developed in a collaborative manner with iwi. We contacted Mr Davies to get the benefit of his suggestions however he declined to share his thoughts.
75.5.	David James Davies	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
75.6.	David James Davies	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
75.7.	David James Davies	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
75.8.	David James Davies	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	increasing the building foot print on any section from 30% to 35% is a given...it should happen, modern homes extend past the 3 bedrooms, one bathroom, pokey kitchen small dining room and lounge....modern family homes have outgrown the 30% footprint, let us catch up with the rest of NZ	Accept
76.1.	David Briscoe	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
76.2.	David Briscoe	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
76.3.	David Briscoe	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	I assume the council will have the best interest in the Taupo development not to make an error in the rural area. Smaller blocks should not change Taupo's feel. Don't develop the settlement above mine bay as which boaty wants to see big houses painted white sitting above this iconic bay so close to Taupo	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
76.4.	David Briscoe	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No	Some developments are on septic tanks and on tank water and don't have formed roads into the houses. As long as the standard of these dwellings meets the current building codes. There should be one building code for all new structures. The council needs to be careful that certain areas of Taupo are not developed into sub standard housing, right on the lake shore.	Accept - All dwellings and built development will need to meet building standards and also the Waikato Regional Plan for waste water discharge
76.5.	David Briscoe	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
76.6.	David Briscoe	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
76.7.	David Briscoe	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	I would support the 18m height area (in green on your illustration) be reduced back to be 12m. I am happy for the new 12m area. I am not supporting the 18m height area (green area) as I don't want another Queenstown on our lake.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
76.8.	David Briscoe	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
77.1.	Christine Poole on behalf of Gunnadoo Holdings Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
77.2.	Christine Poole on behalf of Gunnadoo Holdings Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
78.1.	Debra Grimwood	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
78.2.	Debra Grimwood	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
78.3.	Debra Grimwood	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
78.4.	Debra Grimwood	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
78.5.	Debra Grimwood	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
79.1.	Chad Keir on behalf of Plateau Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	I support the intent of the proposed lifestyle zone. However, I think the parking, loading and access section also needs considering along side this. There are many rural properties on right of ways that could get a new zoning, but could be hamstrung by neighbours, given the council's more recent stance on access right of ways. I would recommend, including: Include Mokai village - north and south side of Forest road from Tirohanga road to 1,200m east of Tirohanga road, Include Southern end of Otake road, from intersection with Whangamata to 2,000m north of Whangamata road, Oruanui Road - Oruanui No 9 and 10 blocks (Oruanui lands trust). Include Otutira drive, Include 1324-1384 Poihipi Road (already consented for 4ha blocks and adjacent to a proposed lifestyle area), Include northern end of TeToke road from Ohaaki road to 3000m south of Ohaaki road (on river side).	Mokai - accept in part - further discussion with landowners. Otake, Otutira Dr - reject. Contrary to distance criteria. 1324-1384 Poihipi - accept. Clarify Te Toke Rd location.
79.2.	Chad Keir on behalf of Plateau Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	The 300m setback for farm buildings would appear onerous, and not practical in many situations.	Accept - 300m setback adjusted
79.3.	Chad Keir on behalf of Plateau Consultants Ltd	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
79.4.	Chad Keir on behalf of Plateau Consultants Ltd	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	The current MV rules are unworkable. The King road, Ross rise area needs to be given low—density residential rules. Buffer areas adjacent to this need to also be given a higher density status. e.g. 86 Ross rise and 50 King road, to reflect development potential of the previous forest cluster.	Reject
80.1.	Chris Tamarua	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	We hope that the District Plan and Resource Management Act will allow for properties to subdivide off less than 10 acres in Oruanui. Our farm is 4.782 hectares (12 acres) and we hope to be allowed to subdivide off the steep hill paddocks that are not suitable for grazing, along with the bottom paddock which currently has an old unused shearing shed.	Accept - site has been identified.
80.2.	Chris Tamarua	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We would support the proposal to create new rural lifestyle environments due to the large number of people wanting a small block to live on rather than being crowded in town and there is a large shortage of these smaller blocks	Accept
80.3.	Chris Tamarua	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	We understand the general rural environment is to protect the large farming properties which are used to farm livestock, etc... should be kept as functional farms and not to be chopped into smaller blocks. However, lifestyle blocks that are around 10 acres, are not considered to be productive farms.	Accept
80.4.	Chris Tamarua	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	We have no idea what this is sorry	
80.5.	Chris Tamarua	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No	Every property should be considered on its own, rather than grouped into standard boxes.	Reject
80.6.	Chris Tamarua	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe	Again, it depends on what temporary activity and how appealing it is to the public	Accept
80.7.	Chris Tamarua	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
80.8.	Chris Tamarua	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	This should be considered on an individual basis for new developments	Reject
80.9.	Chris Tamarua	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Taupo is an expanding town and therefore will need to expand on the industrial areas as time progresses	Accept
81.1.	Bruce Campbell	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	All of the directions are valid. Water quality, infrastructure and SNA's are a must.	Accept
81.2.	Bruce Campbell	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I have no issue with smaller blocks, BUT do have concerns about impacts on the roading system. Whangamata Road from Poihipi Road to Oakdale Drive has around 46 property/auxiliary road entrances, some of which are multiple use. Many of these accesses are close to bends and many are obscured by vegetation making exiting vehicles difficult to spot.	Accept
81.3.	Bruce Campbell	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
81.4.	Bruce Campbell	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
81.5.	Bruce Campbell	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
81.6.	Bruce Campbell	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	Events are important to the Taupo economy.	Accept
81.7.	Bruce Campbell	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Taupo is unique in that it does not have high rise in the town centre and views around the town and especially from the lake are unencumbered by visual pollution of the landscape. Surely preservation of our unique landscape values far outweigh the commercial advantages for developers. Do we really want to be as ugly as Queenstown?	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
81.8.	Bruce Campbell	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
81.9.	Bruce Campbell	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
82.1.	Moira Peters	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
82.2.	Moira Peters	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	At Bonshaw Park there are already established small blocks successfully engaged in various types of land use. Demand for a small block of land that can sustain a few animals and an area for private recreational use has risen notably in the last few years. Taupo township and its facilities has expanded to a degree that has provoked the need for more liveable land and I believe that allowing for these small blocks will provide the perfect solution for a growing need.	Accept
82.3.	Moira Peters	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
82.4.	Moira Peters	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
83.1.	Murray Hird	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
83.2.	Murray Hird	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
83.3.	Murray Hird	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
83.4.	Murray Hird	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
83.5.	Murray Hird	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
83.6.	Murray Hird	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
83.7.	Murray Hird	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
83.8.	Murray Hird	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	Given that most RMA applications are between 31 — 36% site coverage indicates that these applications are perceived by the applicant as being generally approved anyway. Therefore increasing the standard to 35% makes sense. However any applications to go above this should be strongly discouraged and the assessment criteria much more stringent. There has been no mention of the site ratio rule being reviewed at the same time as reviewing the site coverage. The Site Ratio requirement should be removed completely. Taupo is one of the very few Councils to still have this archaic rule.	Accepted in part
83.9.	Murray Hird	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
83.10.	Murray Hird	6-General		Earthworks rule could be overhauled subject to what changes the RMA review brings about.	NA
84.1.	Sarona Rameka	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
84.2.	Sarona Rameka	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	We support RURAL LIFESTYLE ENVIRONMENT	Accept



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
84.3.	Sarona Rameka	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	We support the proposal to allow rural sections to be subdivided to minimum allotments of 2h and also to allow for minor dwellings. The house prices are too high in Taupo and this is the only way we see us being able to support our elderly parents / children in the future.	Accept
84.4.	Sarona Rameka	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	We absolutely support Papakainga. Housing is unaffordable in Taupo.	Accept
84.5.	Sarona Rameka	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
84.6.	Sarona Rameka	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
84.7.	Sarona Rameka	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	I am opposed to big buildings being built that change the look and feel of the town especially if they are to be owned by big hotel chains owned by overseas investors (OR could be later sold to such investors). I would however support the proposal if the buildings were owned by Tūwharetoa or council entities (not likely to be sold on).	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
84.8.	Sarona Rameka	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
84.9.	Sarona Rameka	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	No	Not on those sites	No reasons given
85.1.	Helen Beever on behalf of Gunnadoo Holdings Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	As outlined in your proposal, there is already a presence of existing clusters of smaller/lifestyle lots in the area. We support the proposal to create a new rural lifestyle environment.	Accept
86.1.	Jen Shieff for The Tongariro Riverside Preservation Group (Inc)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	The Group supports several of the Strategic Directions, noting two points that need clarification. Please refer to our full submission in the online form's additional comments section below.	Accept in part - Note that the submission largely supports the intent of the strategic directions in question. The exception of this is in relation to amenity as the submitter is requesting that amenity is protected. The revised provisions to take revised approach from that of the current plan. Instead of reference to amenity, terminology from the NPSUD is adopted where it relates to planned form, as it is set out in the plan. The intent of this is so that seeking consistency with existing amenity values does not allow change which may be necessary in some cases, i.e. housing supply. Functioning refers to the infrastructure and process etc required for that zone to function for the purpose which it is zoned. those activities which will adversely effect the functioning of that neighbourhood, i.e. industrial activities in residential areas are not appropriate. further direction on such activities will be set out in the lower order provisions. The term nature is not considered appropriate for the reasons re amenity above.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
86.2.	Jen Shieff for The Tongariro Riverside Preservation Group (Inc)	6-General		The Group submits that Taupo District Council Strategic Directions must protect Lake Taupo and the rivers in our District from contaminated and toxic run-off protect the amenity of residential neighbourhoods. In policy 2.3.3 (7)The Group assumes that ;town centre refers to all town centres in the District, not only Taupo Town Centre. This needs to be spelt out in the finalised document. In Policy 2.3.3 (9)the concept of ;functioning needs specificity. The Group is concerned that notions of efficiency and convenience of functioning in any given environment could work against protection of the amenity of residential neighbourhoods. We submit that adding the word ;nature in 9 above would assist at this stage. as in :nature and functioning of the environment.	Reject - out of scope
87.1.	Sandy Hay	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	With our White Road properties so close to town we believe the new draft plan is better suited to our lifestyle environment. it will give us a lot more flexibility around land use particularly the ability to subdivide. We also like the option of having a second dwelling per lot for family/staff accommodation.	Accept
87.2.	Sandy Hay	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
87.3.	Sandy Hay	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
87.4.	Sandy Hay	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
87.5.	Sandy Hay	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
87.6.	Sandy Hay	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
87.7.	Sandy Hay	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
87.8.	Sandy Hay	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
87.9.	Sandy Hay	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
88.1.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	Tangata Whenua:ls nothing more than an asset grab by a few. Our principles around the Treaty of Waitangi and the relationship that Māori have with land, water and significant sites was already being addressed effectively, in fact probably tipping over in favour of Maori - this is racist against New Zealanders who have been here for a long time too. This reeks of the Co-governance asset grab that will see a few holding the power over us and the assets - not conducive to a democratic or unified community. Where was our say on this? Where is the Kotahitanga and Manaakitanga for all tangata whenua.	Not accept - Provisions are consistent with part 2 of the Act and wider planning documents. They look to effectively implement the principles of the treaty of Waitangi and ensure that important cultural views and values are reflected in planning documents and processes.
88.2.	Deborah Morrison	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	Whilst your plan to "allow" land owners of less than 30ha in Rural Lifestyle zoning to subdivide down to 2 ha lots, in theory this sounds wonderful for those owners, in practice there are many reasons why this is not a good idea. Here are some: pasture management, rates and costs of subdivision, urbanisation of productive land, increased traffic, reduction in peacefulness, pressure on infrastructure. TDC should provide more houses elsewhere.	Reject. We are seeking a balance here between supplying some additional RL for the market without impacting on the general rural environment.
88.3.	Deborah Morrison	2.2-General rural environment	No	I support people being able to subdivide their property, however, the areas should be closer to town than the current proposal.	Reject. There are limitations on land ownership and energy encumbrances closer to town.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
88.4.	Deborah Morrison	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	I would not like to see our community becoming a host of marae—type dwellings on each property, unless this was sure to be in keeping with the environment and cognitive of the type of neighbourhood.	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
88.5.	Deborah Morrison	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Seems it is a rural community and should be able to act as such. I would want to if I lived there.	Accept
88.6.	Deborah Morrison	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
88.7.	Deborah Morrison	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Taupo has always been a fantastic place to live with the contour allowing every property a fantastic view from their home. If more than 2 storeys from the highest point of the property was allowed, this would ruin the town. The approval of a commercial building of more than 2 storeys was a big mistake in my view. Move town out, don't make huge shadows and block views, turning us into the problems like Mt Maunganui have now.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
88.8.	Deborah Morrison	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	Yes, but limit the % such as 35 or 40% to allow for good space between properties.	Accept
88.9.	Deborah Morrison	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
88.10.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	As a farmer we are always recognising the importance of water quality in the Taupō District, and do not need to be told what to do and have responsibility for our water taken off us. I would say most farmers are more aware of water quality than any other Kiwis, and have the skills to maintain this high level.	Accept - The provisions are consistent with national direction freshwater quality management and look at opportunities to improve water quality through land development and subdivision. This is wider than the rural environment and applies to all parts of the community.
88.11.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	Many of the recent urban development has occurred with what seems like little fore planning, such as too small roundabouts, changing roading intersections with inadequate notice and expectation of problems, inadequate sewerage systems leading to flow into the lake.	Out of scope - Not relevant to this matter
88.12.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	I have made extensive research into the "idea" of climate change, and have found it is a natural process, indeed not affected by farming as the local and central government, and global leaders, would have us believe. Yet another opportunity to further blame the farmers, and attempt to land grab and restrict our progress. Farmers are the ultimate sustainable environmentalists.	Not Accept
88.13.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	Strategic Infrastructure: See Urban Form above.	Not Accept
88.14.	Deborah Morrison	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	Significant Natural Areas or SNAs - yet another invention to land grab. We are all capable of looking after our own pieces of natural area....indeed we have mostly enhanced them.	Not Accept
89.1.	Sam Gray	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I support the move to split the district's rural environment into General Rural And Rural Lifestyle Environments. However, according to the draft plan change, my property has been zoned in the General Rural Environment. I propose that it be rezoned to Rural Lifestyle Environment instead	Reject. Site too large. Also identified as a high class soil.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
89.2.	Sam Gray	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I support the move to split the district's rural environment into General Rural And Rural Lifestyle Environments. However, according to the draft plan change, my property at 939 Tukairangi Rd, RD5, Taupō has been zoned in the General Rural Environment. I propose that it be rezoned to Rural Lifestyle Environment instead. I have used the Taupō District Councils criteria for selecting properties for the Rural Lifestyle Environment to highlight why 939 Tukairangi Rd should be rezoned.  Has outlined that due to the large 56 Ha block being surrounded by low density residential and smaller rural blocks it should be considered. This property is also unproductive land due to Nitrogen limits.	Reject. Site too large. Also identified as a high class soil.
90.1.	Adam Tyler	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	I think white rd lends itself to 10 acre blocks as it is so close to town and is already cut into smaller blocks	Not relevant to this matter
90.2.	Adam Tyler	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	to help house workers and extended family on larger blocks in the rural areas around Taupo	Accept
90.3.	Adam Tyler	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	as above	Accept
90.4.	Adam Tyler	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No	I don't support division in NZOne law for all we are all New Zealanders and should all be treated equally	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
90.5.	Adam Tyler	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	not my district and don't know why council would change something that is already working?	Reject
90.6.	Adam Tyler	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe	?	Accept
90.7.	Adam Tyler	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	more detail	Accept - further detail will be provided through the process.
90.8.	Adam Tyler	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
90.9.	Adam Tyler	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
91.1.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Request consideration be given to retirement accommodation and care	Accept - Currently considered at a strategic level under objective 2.3.2.1 and 2 as well as policies 2.3.3.1, 2 and 5. It is noted that housing for aged populations was a key consideration of planning for residential land in the Taupō urban areas in TD2050. TD 2050 is a key informing document in the strategic planning process for the District. Specifics will be considered in the upcoming review of the residential chapter.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
91.2.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		The RVA considers that some aspects of the Strategic Directions chapter do not adequately provide for Taupō ageing population, in particular the failure to address the need for retirement and aged care accommodation. Further, some policies could have more restrictive effects than intended. The RVA is concerned the high-level strategy direction in the Draft Plan may not adequately give effect to the NPSUD. In its current form, the policies do not clearly support the provision of a range of housing types, nor intensification to address housing needs.	Not accept - Currently considered at a strategic level under objective 2.3.2.1 and 2 as well as policies 2.3.3.1, 2 and 5. It is noted that housing for aged populations was a key consideration of planning for residential land in the Taupō urban areas in TD2050. TD2050 is a key informing document in the strategic planning process for the District. Specifics will be considered in the upcoming review of the residential chapter. The strategic directions as they apply to the urban environment are considered to be consistent with the NPSUD. An additional objective has been added as a result of submissions to ensure that key direction from that NPS is more clearly articulated in the Plan.
91.3.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Section 2.3 on Urban Form and Development acknowledges the district ;diverse and growing population, which has led to ;increased demand for housing. However, the objectives and policies in this section do not adequately support increasing housing supply, and make no provision for the district ageing population. Objectives/policies need to explicitly provide for the ageing population	Not accept - TD2050 is a key informing document in the strategic planning process for the District. TD2050 identified additional areas to be rezoned to enable the required level of housing to meet supply needs. In addition to the review of residential coverage rules, the residential chapter is due to be reviewed to ensure that the residential environment meets the current and future needs of all of Taupo communities.
91.4.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		The RVA requests the addition of a new objective as follows: ;Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population. Also seeks additional policies to accompany this.	Not accept - TD2050 is a key informing document in the strategic planning process for the District. TD2050 identified additional areas to be rezoned to enable the required level of housing to meet supply needs. In addition to the review of residential coverage rules, the residential chapter is due to be reviewed to ensure that the residential environment meets the current and future needs of all of Taupo communities. No additional and detailed guidance is needed in the strategic directions on specific land uses or developments within the urban environments. Currently considered at a strategic level under objective 2.3.2.1 and 2 as well as policies 2.3.3.1, 2 and 5 and additional Objectives and pols are proposed to be added to better align with the NPS-UD which will consider all communities.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
91.5.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objectives/policies should not constrain necessary residential development. The RVA is concerned that other objectives and policies in section 2.3 could unnecessarily constrain much needed residential development in Taupō. For example, proposed Objective 2.3.2(5) requires that subdivision, use and development will not detract from the wider character and effective functioning of the environment in which it is located. Proposed Policy 2.3.3(9) addresses similar matters and in particular seeks to ;ensure that development will not ;conflict with existing activities on adjoining properties and ;compromise development consistent with the intent of the environment where it is located. The RVA seeks amendments to proposed Objective 3.3.2(5) and Policies 2.3.3(9) to ensure the planned character (not existing character) of a neighbourhood is the key consideration and to enable a range of building typologies to meet the varied needs of the community.	Accept in part - Understand the concerns of the submitter. In considering developments the planned nature of the environment as articulated via objectives and policies etc id what the nature of the character is for that environment. Existing character will be a component of any such decision making but so too will be the planned character as set out in the plan. Amendments have are proposed to Objective 2.3.2.6 and policy 2.3.3.10 to ensure that these matters are considered in a manner consistent with the NPS-UD through reference to planned urban built form .
91.6.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	6-General		36 The RVA seeks the following amendments: 36.1 Objective 2.4.2(1): Subdivision, use and development of land in the Taupō District will considers methods to achieve positive climate change outcomes. 36.2 Policy 2.4.3(4): Urban and built development must be designed in a manner which considers methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with that development and resulting land use.	Reject. The amendments proposed considered too weak given the evidence around climate change.
91.7.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	4-Residential Chapter		Residential building coverage 37 The RVA supports the proposed increase to the maximum building coverage for residential areas from 30% to 35%. While exceedances of this standard will be appropriate for some developments in residential areas, the RVA considers the proposed increase to 35% represents a sensible increase that reflects the NPSUD and need to provide for housing in the district.	Accept
91.8.	John Collyns on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Climate change. The RVA recognises the importance of responding to climate change, including ensuring development is resilient to the effects of climate change. However, the RVA has some concerns about the directive nature of some of the draft objectives and policies in Section 2.4. The RVA notes that climate change is predominately regulated under the Climate Change Response Act 2002, and is important to ensure RMA plans do not result in a double up&rsquo; of regulation.	Accept in part - TDC also has a responsibility to plan for climate change in its District Plan. Climate change has been identified by the Taupō community as an important matter to be reflected in the plan. It is not considered that this is a double up with the climate change response act 2002.
92.1.	Laurie Burdett	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
92.2.	Laurie Burdett	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	A much better plan to identify small block zones rather than them being created willy nilly	Accept
92.3.	Laurie Burdett	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
92.4.	Laurie Burdett	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
92.5.	Laurie Burdett	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
92.6.	Laurie Burdett	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
92.7.	Laurie Burdett	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	I think having the high buildings close to the lake would create a shadow effect and would be unsightly. They would also block the views of those behind.	Further advice on shading being sought.
92.8.	Laurie Burdett	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
92.9.	Laurie Burdett	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
93.1.	Warrick and Penelope Osborne	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	We would prefer the allowance of 3 stories, as it is more than adequate, is kept. Once one building is given consent for over 3 stories i.e.. 6-8, then what is to stop many more being built to that height.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
94.1.	Matthew Brown for Ryman Healthcare Limited on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Limited	6-General		Ryman adopts the RVA's submission on the draft plan changes.	NA
95.1.	Anna Pol	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	One hectare is ample for a lifestyle and will allow enough space for privacy planting on boundaries. Any larger than one hectare becomes a liability. Therefore a provision should be made in the new lifestyle environment to be able to subdivide down to one hectare as of right, rather than having to go to a notified consent application.	Accept
95.2.	Anna Pol	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	No	In regard to new industrial sites, the area indicated on the map North and adjacent to Titan Way development, We oppose. That particular site because of the elevation and close proximity to our rural lifestyle, we will be adversely affected.	Reject in Part. The site will continue to be assessed as part of the industrial land supply exercise with concerns noted.
96.1.	Burke Carlton	6-General		See attached full submission.	NA
96.2.	Burke Carlton	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Wants to use the Forest Cluster plan rather than change the zoning. Wants more environmental considerations ie North Facing homes with solar. Wants to allow for more development.	Reject
97.1.	Wayne and Denise Russell	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Our address is 1069 Poihipi Road and since we have moved here, we love the spot and have downsized in numbers of our animals so would be a perfect opportunity.Would love someone from council to follow though with this as soon as plans are in place	Accept
98.1.	Michael Allen for Wairarapa Moana Incorporation	6-General		There has been no consideration of future strategic zoning for Mangakino, while it is acknowledged that in the last 20 years, growth has been low, however the last 5 to 7 years this has not been the case and demand for permanent and holiday has increased significantly. That being the case it is considered appropriate by Wairarapa Moana that Council now turns its mind to strategic zoning of land for future residential and industrial purposes in Mangakino.	
98.2.	Michael Allen for Wairarapa Moana Incorporation	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		Submitter seeks that Council provide Industrial Zone within Mangakino	Accept in Part. Council will undertake further investigations to better understand the issue.
99.1.	Anna Elwarth	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept - No response required
99.2.	Anna Elwarth	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Yes we support and welcome the rural lifestyle environment with open arms. For future proofing - would you be able to build a tiny dwelling AND subdivide 2ha? Or is it an either / or option, currently this isn't clear.	Accept
99.3.	Anna Elwarth	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
99.4.	Anna Elwarth	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
99.5.	Anna Elwarth	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	I think with housing shortages that for future proofing maybe consider leaving this opportunity open.	We have modelled residential land and have plenty for future projected growth.
99.6.	Anna Elwarth	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	Economically this makes sense	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
99.7.	Anna Elwarth	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	I think for visual impact and natural environment to not allow the town centre to be built upwards	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
99.8.	Anna Elwarth	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	Maybe even go as far as 40%. With housing shortages, the cost of living increasing, post peak fuel and climate change, I feel that inter—generational living is going to become more common.	Accept
99.9.	Anna Elwarth	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
99.10.	Anna Elwarth	6-General		I support that many of these changes are realistic to a post—peak fuel / climate change / growing population future where inter—generational living on the same property will be more common.	NA
100.1.	Lisa Wade	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	with the influx of people wanting to come and live in taupo, subdivisions of these blocks will allow housing development, taking pressure of the already struggling rental situation in town, and supporting growth for our region. Mapara road just seems like a natural extension of the acacia bay area and allows familys to maintain a property with space for animals and kids to run around whilst being close to town.	Not relevant to this matter
100.2.	Lisa Wade	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	as above stated	Accept
100.3.	Lisa Wade	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
100.4.	Lisa Wade	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
100.5.	Lisa Wade	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
100.6.	Lisa Wade	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
100.7.	Lisa Wade	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
100.8.	Lisa Wade	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
101.1.	Brian Elwarth	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	I dont agree with consulting maori on decisions making that affect private land	Not accept - This is a requirement of Part 2 of the RMA and the councils obligations to take into account the principles of the TOW.
101.2.	Brian Elwarth	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Yes we support and welcome the rural lifestyle environment with open arms. We are on Whangamata Rd. Our property was purchased with a cottage as well as the main house, where we already rent out the cottage. We are hoping and proposing that this will not affect our opportunity to subdivide the offered extra 2ha.	Accept
101.3.	Brian Elwarth	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
101.4.	Brian Elwarth	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
101.5.	Brian Elwarth	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
101.6.	Brian Elwarth	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
101.7.	Brian Elwarth	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Town needs more space and the only way is up	Accept



Sub.Point No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
101.8.	Brian Elwarth	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
101.9.	Brian Elwarth	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
102.1.	Brian Robinson	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		
102.2.	Brian Robinson	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	Extra traffic flowing into one bridge to town - is too soon for more development. Speed limits on affected roads need to be assessed. Judging by deviations from previous rules how can we know that factors such as visibility and reverse sensitivity will be strictly taken into account. There is a major flaw is assuming that a self-service water supply is sustainable with increasing use. What work has been done to predict if aquifers can continue to support extra use.	Reject. Second bridge is identified in LTP. Speed limits have recently been assessed. Bore water needs consent from Regional Council.
102.3.	Brian Robinson	2.2-General rural environment	No		No reason given
102.4.	Brian Robinson	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
102.5.	Brian Robinson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
102.6.	Brian Robinson	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No		No reason given
102.7.	Brian Robinson	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
102.8.	Brian Robinson	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	No		No reasons given
103.1.	Kirsteen McDonald for McKenzie and Co on behalf of Setek Limited	2.2-General rural environment	No	Seeks that the property at 822 Rakanui Rd be rezoned to industrial environment. If not then seeks amendment to the obs and pols in the General Rural Environment to better allow for industrial activities next to the industrial environment.	Reject at this stage. Encumbrances and contamination present on this site.
103.2.	Kirsteen McDonald for McKenzie and Co on behalf of Setek Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Seeks the property at 822 Rakanui Rd be rezoned as Industrial land. It is adjacent to existing industrial and has a history of uses associated with industrial activities.	Accept in part. This site will be assessed along with other properties to determine suitability for industrial purposes. If considered appropriate, this site will form part of the formal rezoning process undertaken through Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
104.1.	Kirsteen McDonald for McKenzie and Co on behalf of Unicorn Pacific Trust	6-General			NA
105.1.	Kirsteen McDonald for McKenzie and Co on behalf of Sikka & Aggarwal Investment Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Seeks changes to the draft General Rural provisions to enable the establishment of tourism and visitor accommodation activities on 271 and 281 Spa Road. Alternatively apply a zone to this land that enable the continuation and establishment of tourism activities. A definition for tourism activities may be useful.	Accept in part - tourism and visitor accommodation provisions strengthened.
106.1.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Following amendments to policy 2.5.3(3) are sought "Recognise the functional and operational needs associated with the use and development of significant infrastructure, including those activities which support them such as quarrying."	not accept - The policy includes reference to nationally and regionally significant infrastructure. These are defined terms and there is no identified need to provide examples within the policy.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
106.2.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	The extent of the Rural Lifestyle Environment as currently proposed is unlikely to create any reverse sensitivity issues for Tauhara Quarry since the nearest of these proposed zones is 3km west of the quarry. Mt Tauhara also provides a topographical buffer to areas to the south-west. Removing the rural effects areas radius does create a reverse sensitivity risk based on other activities in the General Rural Environment, since a 50m separation distance for new dwelling would be unlikely to be sufficient for this purpose in relation to the quarry.	Accept
106.3.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	Objective 3b.2.5 and Policy 3b.2.12 relate to reverse sensitivity in the General Rural Environment. Policy 3b.2.12 is useful in clarifying that the focus is on avoiding reverse sensitivity on lawfully established neighbouring activities, when the objective could be narrowly interpreted to only refer to permitted activities in the zone and not those established by resource consent.	Reject
106.4.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	We considered whether the expansion of the Industrial Environment to include Tauhara Quarry would better support the quarrying activities at Tauhara Quarry, but it is unlikely to provide for the full range of activities in operating a quarry, particularly in relation to earthworks performance standards. For this reason it has been discounted as a practical option to be pursued.	Accept
106.5.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	6-General		When considering the draft plan changes in relation to the Tauhara Quarry: Mineral extraction activities, as considered in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, aren't supported with objectives, policies and rules in the draft changes for General Rural Environment Other district plans in the Waikato Region apply a special purpose zone to enable quarrying/mineral extraction such as a "Significant Mineral Extraction Zone" in the Waipa District Plan. Or a buffer area of 300m for new dwellings (South Waikato District Council) from identified quarries.	There is a bigger setback for dwellings from the general rural environment as Quarry's are not the only rural industry. Also see changes around rural industry and definition.
106.6.	Duncan Whyte for 4Sight Consulting Ltd on behalf of Tauhara Quarries Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		A definition should be added to the definition of the District Plan and clarify whether Rural Industry is to include quarrying.	Rural industry now defined.
107.1.	Brett Shepherd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		I wish to strongly oppose your proposal to create a new environment zone and open the White Road area for further development. Allowing the creation of smaller lot sizes will have significant impact to the aesthetics of the area and significant negative impacts on the existing residents and their way of life. I do not see then need to exploit this area when other areas adjoining the Taupo central area may be more suitable for development.	There are limited options for rural lifestyle development adjoining Taupo due to land tenure and encumbrances.
108.1.	Renee des Barres on behalf of Te Kapa o Te Rangiti Marae and Oruanui Lands Trust comprising Oruanui 9 and 10	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
108.2.	Renee des Barres on behalf of Te Kapa o Te Rangiti Marae and Oruanui Lands Trust comprising Oruanui 9 and 10	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	I submit this submission as I consider the exclusion of our lands as extremely detrimental to the future use of our lands for the well being our hapu. I view this exclusion as a limitation on our tino rangatiratanga and our ability to provide for our hapu. It should be noted that Oruanui Lands Trust is the owner of approx 15 hectares of land adjoining the Oruanui 9 block which is in general title. As a Treaty partner, we would expect the same opportunities as afforded our neighbours. Therefore, we seek inclusion in the rural lifestyle areas of Oruanui.	Already proposed rural lifestyle under the draft work.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
108.3.	Renee des Barres on behalf of Te Kapa o Te Rangiiita Marae and Oruanui Lands Trust comprising Oruanui 9 and 10	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
108.4.	Renee des Barres on behalf of Te Kapa o Te Rangiiita Marae and Oruanui Lands Trust comprising Oruanui 9 and 10	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
109.1.	Alex Gifford for Tonkin + Taylor on behalf of New Zealand Defense Force	6-General		Please refer to the full submission attached	NA
109.2.	Alex Gifford for Tonkin + Taylor on behalf of New Zealand Defense Force	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities		NZDF requests that TMTA are provided for as a permitted activity within the Rural Environment and Town Centres Chapters via a TMTA specific rule. The requested rule wording is provided in Appendix C of Attachment A to this letter. Objectives and policies that support the temporary activity rules, including TMTA, should also be included within the Rural Environment and Town Centres chapters.	Reject. The TDP is primarily an effects based plan. If the Defence Force can meet the performance standards for effects then they can carry out their operation. However if they don't meet the effects then it is reasonable that the activity is assessed through a consent process.
110.1.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Our strategic objectives are closely aligned to those of Taupo District Council, in that we wish Taupo district to be the home of competitive, innovative and sustainable business. We believe there are many significant areas of positive impact that will be realised from the implementation of the proposed District Plan Changes. We believe the changes to the District Plan will enable and support growth for the Taupo District and help to reduce barriers for development within the district.	Accept
110.2.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	The Rural Lifestyle Environment provision delivers on the increased demand for rural lifestyle blocks around the district while provisioning for the effective use of infrastructure.	Accept
110.3.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	We support the proposal to split the Taupo District Rural Environment into two sections. We believe the General Rural Environment allowing for additional development for another large property and minor dwelling provides provision for development needs but also maintains large spaces for productive land.	Accept
110.4.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
110.5.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	For simplicity it would be beneficial to have two zones General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Environment.	Accept
110.6.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	We support the draft proposal to increase the amount of time temporary activities can operate in the Taupo district. Events bring significant positive economic growth for the regions and benefit many downstream sectors. This provision will enable better events within the district and reduce barriers and restrictions for established and potential events that are important to the economic and social dynamics of the district.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
110.7.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	We support the proposal to increase the maximum height permitted in the Taupo district to 12—18 meters in some parts of the town centre. We would also encourage the possibility to extend the proposed height restriction zones further onto the other side of Te Heuheu street. To allow for further development and growth within Taupo Town Centre including commercial, office and residential opportunities.	Accept
110.8.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	We support the proposed change to increase the maximum building coverage in residential areas from 30% to 35%. This is in line with comparable districts and will improve compliance efficiency of both cost and time for all parties. It also meets the demand for access to additional building space while mitigating the negative impacts of building size.	Accept
110.9.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	We agree that there is a demand and need for additional industrial land within the Taupo District. It is important for the economic growth and development of the region that a suitable supply of appropriate land is available and support the plan to rezone land to either Taupo or Centennial Industrial Environment. We would encourage more industrial land be made available than just the proposed areas for assessment. This would assist to provide simplicity for development in the future.	Accept
110.10.	Rick Keehan Amplify - Enterprise Great Lake Taupo	6-General		We would like to share a submission to the District Plan in relation to the Taupo districts long term projected population growth rates. Please find our submission attached in the supporting document.	NA
111.1.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
111.2.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	I recommend placing Rural lifestyle zones on rural land that lays beside and contiguous to current lifestyle clusters, as 2 ha blocks will not make profitable use of the rural lifestyle land which is currently mostly 4ha in the district (eg, Mapara, Kinloch and oruanui areas). Rural lifestyle zones are better placed in the lake catchment as nitrogen has been capped and made transferable here and generally speaking the conversion of NDA from farming to extremely low density housing will further reduce the overall Nitrogen discharged, especially if modern dual chamber advanced wastewater sewerage systems are enforced under controlled subdivision conditions.	Accept
111.3.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	There is a presence or existing clusters of smaller/lifestyle lots.135 and 215 Holyoakes rd were omitted by the planning dept erroneously in my opinion. These areas formed parts of a 5 lot subdivision and are contiguous with each other, all being lifestyle blocks on the same water supply, ROW and most on the same powerline.	135 Holyoake's - Accept, 215 Holyoake's - Reject
111.4.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	I don't support disparity and racism being placed between Maori and pakeha. I don't disagree with papakainga developments, but feel this rule should effect all whenua, not just that whenua where maori are kaitiaki, but why should our pakeha hapu not have the same ability to house our tamariki on the whenua we te kaitiaki?	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
111.5.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe	This should be driven by the affected land owners. If it is revoked by council and if they have paid more rates over the years as a result of this council led decision, my belief is that the affected properties must be awarded rates relief	Reject. There is no difference in rates for the Mapara Valley Structure Plan Area.
111.6.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
111.7.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Because intensification is logical. Much of the infrastructure is already there. I would caution that the fault lines should be redefined and building standards made such as to cope with the town being near the epicentre of mass pressure and the fact its on the geothermal field (or right on the edge of the two fields). So when it blows, there should be shelters available and incorporated into the underground of strategic buildings with breathing apparatus a standard feature in basements.	Accept
111.8.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
111.9.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
111.10.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.2-General rural environment		The access provisions 4b.5.9 have not been amended and this is going to be a stumbling block, this rule should be removed in favour of minimum engineering standards based on the number of allotments served by a single access way. Increases in allotments served should satisfy planners that maintenance provisions are consistent with existing maintenance provisions currently on the accessway and that these are not going to unreasonably burden any ROW users in that cluster/community. Vesting of private accessways should be a controlled activity provided the engineering standards are brought up to the applicable austroads design spec for the intended movements per day (4b.4.1).	This rule provides a valuable balance between allowing smaller developments to occur, while requiring a public road for larger developments. There is a process to go through to convert to a public road - it requires everyone's agreement.
111.12.	George Muir on behalf of Muirs Reef Limited	2.2-General rural environment		I think that since TDC is considering removing the effects 50 radius rule, they should make a new rule for buildings which are to be erected on properties which bound afforested land. I propose the effects 50 radius rule should stay on any rural gen and rural lifestyle land contiguous with afforested land and this effect 50 rule should include all buildings and dwellings as well as any mobile dwellings or buildings. Any new overhead Powerlines should also be kept a minimum of two tree lengths (at full maturity) from any afforested areas. I agree with Hilary that all planting and replanting setbacks should be controlled by the NES-PF and I would like to see this agreed to in the proposed draft district plan.	Reject - managed by the NPS -PF
112.1.	Gareth Moran on behalf of Taupo Industrial Estate Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	We encourage additional industrial zoned land	Accept
112.2.	Gareth Moran on behalf of Taupo Industrial Estate Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	As per attachment. We support additional industrial zoned land, however would also like the site located at 189 Napier Road legally described as Lot 2 DP 499406 and comprised in Record of Title 741151, also be rezoned from Rural Environment to Taupo Industrial.	Accept in part. This site will be assessed along with other properties to determine suitability for industrial purposes. If considered appropriate, this site will form part of the formal rezoning process undertaken through Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
113.1.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	6-General		See attached	NA
113.2.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		LWAG intend to comment in more detail on this chapter in the next round of consultation. We note that the inclusion of Climate Change directions is essential. LWAG support Strategic Direction to Support positive climate change outcomes and ensure that land we are developing is resilient to the effects of climate change.	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
113.3.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Wants to prevent the building of houses on SNLA and OLA land. Concerned with adverse effects on the lake, water and climate by creating more small rural sections which may increase the number of people and animals. Do not want subdivision to be a permitted activity, must remain as a 'restricted discretionary'. Dwellings should be controlled status. Nitrogen restrictions in rural residential zone.	SNA and OLA provisions remain in place so controls exist for clearance and development in these area, regardless of RL zoning.
113.4.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights		Taupo has traditionally been a low-rise urban landscape which is appreciated, we believe by both residents and visitors. We are concerned with the adverse amenity effects of 6-story buildings in the urban zone and their visual impact in the newly upgraded lakefront area (Robert St/Lake Tce ). Also the visual amenity from the Lake itself will be adversely affected by unlimited high-rise development. LWAG ask that any multi-story buildings be limited to a zone at least two blocks back from the road/lakefront in the Taupo Town Centre.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
113.5.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	4-Residential Chapter		LWAG see that there are advantages to consolidating subdivision in the residential zone. However, we are concerned by the lack of provisions to prevent the restriction of hard surfaces in the residential zone. Hard surfaces such as paved and concrete areas mean reduced opportunities for capturing rainwater. There is increased potential for pollutant and nutrient pathways to Lake Taupo via stormwater systems. Of specific concern is that the total coverage rule doesn't restrict permeable surfaces. LWAG therefore seek amending wording of the total coverage rule to have a limit on impermeable surfaces.	Accept in part. Total coverage and impermeable surfaces will be looked at as part of the full Residential Chapter review.
113.6.	Jane Penton for Lakes & Waterways Action Group Trust (LWAG)	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		Low-impact design principles require monitoring and enforcing. LWAG ask that the District Plan has provisions that aim to manage stormwater and chemical containment in the industrial zone. We also ask that these are enforceable.	Accept
114.1.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	6-General		Please find the attached document with feedback/submission on the proposed plan changes.	NA
114.2.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Addition: The Taupō District's diverse and growing population has led to increased demand for housing and demand for new commercial and industrial areas. Urban development also generates further demand for infrastructure services, particularly three waters and transportation services. The demand for additional infrastructure, including education facilities, is also increased as a result of growth.	Accept
114.3.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Suggest new provision 2.3.2 Objectives: Subdivision, use and development is supported by sufficient additional infrastructure.	Accept - It is considered that the current wording of Objectives and policies consider both existing and any future infrastructure required. While not specifically stated it is implicit in the current wording. Policy 2.3.3.5 has been revised to make the potentially need to upgrade infrastructure to cater for increased demand more explicit however.
114.4.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Require urban subdivision and land development to connect with the existing infrastructure including additional infrastructure) and transportation network, according to the capacity limitations of that network where available and the potential requirements for upgrading its capacity.	

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
114.5.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.2-General rural environment		The impacts on infrastructure including additional infrastructure) arising from subdivision and development are managed.	Reject
114.6.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.2-General rural environment		Addition to 3b.3.6:The impacts on community and additional infrastructure arising from subdivision and development are managed.	Reject
114.7.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.2-General rural environment		Addition to 3b.2.8:Maintaining the established character Maintain the established General Rural Environment character, as defined by: a) Large open spaces between built structures b) A mix of residential and rural production buildings and buildings containing education facilities. c) Noises related to production activities during the day but low levels of noise at night d) Low levels of light spill. e) Infrequent vehicle movements to and from a site f) Limited signage that directly relates to the activity operating on the site	TDC would prefer to work with MoE through spatial planning exercises and the Designation process.
114.8.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Addition to e of Policy 3b.3.8:e) An environment which includes residential activities, education facilities, rural productive activities and home business activities.	Reject. TDC would prefer to work with MoE through the designation process.
114.9.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.2-General rural environment		New provision in the rural environments: Educational facilities in all rural zones Activity status: Restricted Discretionary	TDC would prefer to work with MoE through spatial planning exercises and the Designation process.
114.10.	Sophie Andrews for Beca Limited on behalf of Ministry of Education	2.2-General rural environment		The Ministry supports the use of the proposed noise performance standards for the management of noise levels in the rural environment zones.	Accept
115.1.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
115.2.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
115.3.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe		Accept
115.4.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
115.5.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
115.6.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
115.7.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
115.8.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
115.9.	Stephanie Muller for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
116.1.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
116.2.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
116.3.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	I agree with preserving the rural character of our land and rather than splitting our land into smaller lots is a great idea especially being allowed to cut 10 ha lots off which will allow other activities to take place within the rural environment this will add character and employment to our rural community if other activities can take place on these lots. However, restricting what activities to just agricultural-related industry could be a negative for the area and new things should be considered that could be based on the farms within buildings that take a smaller area (e.g., data centres, vet clinics, etc) but still maintain the rural character that we are trying to preserve. As we move forward farming is being restricted and so we are needing other sources of income to maintain a living from the land. We are being forced into restricting our productivity from the land by nitrogen discharge and now carbon emissions and so we need the ability to look at other forms of income and diversity.	Reject - vet clinics would likely be able to be established as a rural industry. Data centres are more appropriately located in an urban environment
116.4.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
116.5.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes		Accept
116.6.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
116.7.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
116.8.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
116.9.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
116.10.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	6-General		Thank you for your time. I would also like the opportunity to be heard in person.	Submitter contacted that there is no hearing at this stage in the process. There will be a hearing at the First Schedule process.
116.11.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.2-General rural environment		Also building a new shed on the farm for the housing of animals is too restrictive with the setbacks and once again very impractical in terms of where it would sit geographically on the farm as well as the expense of getting services to that shed because of the distance. How would we get on building a purpose-built vet clinic for horses where they are stabled?	Accept - 300m setback adjusted
116.12.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.2-General rural environment		The car movements per day per property are also too lite they should be at 150 per day plus especially with a commercial industry based on the farm with truck movements.	Accept - EVMs adjusted
116.13.	James Cooper on behalf of Laurieston Enterprises, Lakeman brewing	2.2-General rural environment		Signage of 2meters squared is also too small. Most farm names that are displayed at the gate around the district are more likely 4 square meters in size. These signs also give character to the area and are part of the heritage in our area and people can see it when driving and nowhere to turn in.	Reject
117.1.	John & Carol Hunter	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	As usual there are some aspects of strategic direction one can support and others that create some unease. e.g the national debate with regard to water ownership would be one of unease as to the future intent, direction — and outcome. We regard water as a given right and not ownable. However the quality and environmental management is certainly a collective responsibility both nationally and locally.	Accept
117.2.	John & Carol Hunter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes	We would generally agree with the reasons as described in the Chapter	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
117.3.	John & Carol Hunter	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	1. The current District Plan allows for a 3 story maximum which serves the town centre very well with regard to the natural environment of the wider town area and the greater natural features we enjoy here. Any increase above this will have a major negative impact on the visual and physical environment that has currently evolved within the CBD and further into the wider environment. The current low rise philosophy must be retained to retain the character and amenity that this town is renowned for. We must not allow for any steps down the road to a 'Queenstown' type environment. 2. The 'Elephant in the room' with regard to this intended change is the recent wrong decision to consent a 6 storey building in the CBD. At the Commission hearing for this application (which was for 8 storeys) the likelihood of a precedent being created if consent was obtained was a significant feature of opposition argument. The Commission decision was against the application but the subsequent appeal process resulted in the 6 storey consent being obtained, with TDC support apparent in this process. As was noted the precedent has now been set. We are strongly against this proposal.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
117.4.	John & Carol Hunter	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	We would agree with this being a more efficient use of urban land	Accept
118.1.	George Chang	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
118.2.	George Chang	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
118.3.	George Chang	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
118.4.	George Chang	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes		Accept
118.5.	George Chang	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
118.6.	George Chang	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1- Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
118.7.	George Chang	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes		Accept
118.8.	George Chang	4-Residential Chapter	Yes		Accept
118.9.	George Chang	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes		Accept
119.1.	Bernadette Gallagher	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe		Accept
119.2.	Bernadette Gallagher	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	The proposed rural lifestyle environment should not apply to Bonshaw Park. This subdivision was designed to ensure a mixture of size lots to allow various rural activities to take place. There was to be no further infill subdivision. The proposed subdivision and second dwellings could erode all of the larger blocks. Services such as water are all ready over stretched. Cluster houses will emerge on larger lots and change the natural outlooks and topography of the land. The area of Bonshaw Park. Adjoins a Forestry Block which falls under the general rural environment. The proposed change to the zoning of Bonshaw Park could result in a conflict of interest between the two zones. Bonshaw Park should remain as part of the general rural zone.	Reverse sensitivity has been addressed through stronger rules for blocks that border the GR environment.
119.3.	Bernadette Gallagher	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
119.4.	Bernadette Gallagher	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe		Accept
119.5.	Bernadette Gallagher	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Maybe		Accept
119.6.	Bernadette Gallagher	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
119.7.	Bernadette Gallagher	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Increase in building height detracts from the beautiful natural resource of the Lake and takes away from Taupo unique landscape.	
119.8.	Bernadette Gallagher	4-Residential Chapter	No	a number of social issues arises from lake of green space in residential areas.	Reject - reserves and open space are managed through a separate process.
120.1.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	No	We bought this property because we lived in town for a while and were totally not impressed. 4 hectares is a good size and is small enough. We have good neighbours but they are not too close.	Reject
120.2.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	We like the space we have.	Reject
120.3.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	2.2-General rural environment	No		No reason given
120.4.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	2.3-Papakainga provisions	No		
120.5.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No		Reject - no reason given.
120.6.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Maybe		Accept
120.7.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Maybe		Accept
120.8.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe		Accept
120.9.	Desmond & Kathleen Hinton	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
121.1.	Carolyn McAlley on behalf of Heritage New Zealand (HNZPT)	6-General		See attached full submission.	NA
121.2.	Carolyn McAlley on behalf of Heritage New Zealand (HNZPT)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		New objective 7. The contribution of Historic Heritage to the Taupo district is identified and significant resources recognised and protected in landuse planning and decision making.	Accept in part - Heritage is important to our district however due to the small amount of sites it is not considered to be a significant issue. Policy 2.3.3.12 has been amended to include <u>reference to heritage</u>
121.3.	Carolyn McAlley on behalf of Heritage New Zealand (HNZPT)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		New policy: 12. Support subdivision, use and development of land that protects the values and integrity of scheduled historic heritage"	Accept in part - Heritage is important to our district however due to the small amount of sites it is not considered to be a significant issue. Policy 2.3.3.12 has been amended to include <u>reference to heritage</u>
121.4.	Carolyn McAlley on behalf of Heritage New Zealand (HNZPT)	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amend policy 5: Planning and development of infrastructure will consider the needs and wellbeing of current and future communities, including protecting recognised historic heritage.	Accept in part - Heritage is important to our district however due to the small amount of sites it is not considered to be a significant issue. Policy 2.3.3.12 has been amended to include <u>reference to heritage</u>

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
121.6.	Carolyn McAlley on behalf of Heritage New Zealand (HNZPT)	2.2-General rural environment		New objective and Policy in the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle sections Objective: The impacts on historic heritage from the subdivision, use and development are managed. Policy: Ensure subdivisions, use and development are designed to avoid historic heritage and that any historic heritage is retained within a lot.	Reject but noted addition to SD.
122.1.	Adair Jefferies	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Re: 363 White road, Broadlands Forest. Lot 1 DPS 77468 I would like to submit that I subdivide my 10 acres into 2 x 5 acre lots as per plan attached, showing (already marked) boundaries. Lot 1 will be sold which will free up a 4 brm home. I wish to build a warm, insulated smaller home, on Lot 2. I am now retired and this would suit me immensely.	Accept
123.1.	David King	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept
123.2.	David King	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	For us personally it may give us options to build an extra dwelling where we are currently not allowed because of past zoning issues. It would be good have a little flexibility in the new rules because of the varied and different challenges some sites might present. For example access of main roads or the total squares allowed. Perhaps some discretion allow for all or some cases.	Accept
123.3.	David King	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	They seem logical	Accept
123.4.	David King	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	I fear this may lead to a 2 tier system where slowly over time different sets of rules evolve for different groups. Maybe there is another way to achieve the same or similar outcome for all land owners.	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
123.5.	David King	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Makes sense	Accept
123.6.	David King	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes	If they add value by staying longer.	Accept
123.7.	David King	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Makes sense, go up not out. but beware of damaging the beautiful views that could be blocked.	Accept
123.8.	David King	4-Residential Chapter	Maybe	Maybe but space is important for human growth. Don't put less space over the driver to make more profit for someone.	Reject.
123.9.	David King	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Maybe		Accept
124.1.	Ian Britten	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
124.2.	Ian Britten	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Supports the proposal but wants to add large blocks that have significant portions of land that is sectioned off as conservation areas. 40 Hepina Heights which is 58.9 h.a. but 35.8 h.a. is conservation, leaving 23.1 h.a. usable, ie, and 41 Hepina Heights which is 37.0 h.a. but 26.8 h.a. is conservation, leaving 10.2 h.a usable.	Reject - sites too large.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
125.1.	Ian Britten on behalf of Kinloch Water Limited	6-General		1. We wish to submit on the issue of WATER SUPPLY. a) If additional properties are to rely on new groundwater supply, there is concern that increased use of bores drawing from subterranean sources will have a detrimental effect on existing resource consents. This resource issue needs to be considered, and although it may be primarily a Regional Council responsibility, the significance on existing properties/consents should not be ignored in the District Plan. Water is such an important resource issue. b) We submit that council should be cautious to ensure that there is suitable water supply for any subdivision, without having detrimental effect on other users. Full submission attached	Applicants need to show how servicing will be supplied to new properties through their subdivision consent.
126.1.	Daniela Shepherd	6-General		Full submission attached.	
126.2.	Daniela Shepherd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	Disagrees with White Road being included, argues it does not meet the criteria we have set out.	Reject. Not clear on why White Rd does not meet criteria.
127.1.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rural Lifestyle Zoning locations 12. EnviroWaste acknowledges that the proposed location of the new Rural Lifestyle zone is not in close proximity to the Taupo Landfill. EnviroWaste opposes any re-zoning of property to Rural Lifestyle within a 1.5km radius of the landfill. This is in consideration of the unique characteristics of landfills where reverse sensitivity effects arise from the potential discharge of odour, dust and noise from these facilities. There is an existing large number of vehicle movements with respect to the landfill.	Accept
127.2.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment		Rural Environment Chapter 13. A landfill has no applicable definition in the Taupo District Plan. It therefore falls into a catch—all category as a discretionary activity under the proposed Rural Environment chapter. As discussed at Appendix 1, the infrastructure definition should be amended to include waste management facilities. This will then remove the need to amend many of the provisions listed within Appendix 1. 14. It is noted that the Electricity Generation sites and geothermal steamfields have permitted activity status to any activity involving continued operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing electricity generation core sites, geothermal steamfields and associated structures. EnviroWaste considers that the regional landfill is also a significant land use in the region that requires the same status and recognition. Accordingly, EnviroWaste proposes some changes to the Rural Environment Chapter to ensure its continued operation	Reject but note addition to SD re municipal waste.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
127.3.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		<p>Industrial Land Supply</p> <p>15. EnviroWaste notes that there are three parcels of land, to the north at 63 Broadlands Road Section 14 SO438782), part of 263 Broadlands Road, and to the north—east at 254 Broadlands Road, Taupo (Lot 1—6 DP 445148) that are proposed to be re—zoned to either Taupō or Centennial Industrial Environment.</p> <p>16. The submitter is concerned that certain light industrial activities, commercial/commercial services or tourism activities that could be established on these lots will be sufficiently close to the landfill so that there is more chance that they may be exposed to adverse environmental and amenity effects. It is therefore suggested that these lots are not the first choice for re—zoning due to potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>17. EnviroWaste is not satisfied that these effects could be mitigated through the current wording of the Taupō and Centennial Industrial Environment chapter. Any re—zoning would require additional objectives, policies, rules and setbacks to be added to the chapter to minimise effects on the landfill site. EnviroWaste requests early engagement of any re—zoning proposal to provide for the continued operation of the landfill and transfer station.</p>	Reject in Part. The sites will continue to be assessed as part of the industrial land supply exercise with concerns noted.
127.4.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	<p>Objective 2.3.2.1 — Development is serviced by an appropriate level of infrastructure that effectively meets the demands of that development.</p> <p>As the definition for infrastructure under the RMA excludes waste treatment and disposal facilities, the continuance and expansion of these facilities (where necessary, but particularly recycling) needs to be included in the Strategic Directions chapter and be part of this relevant objective.</p> <p>Relief Sought Addition of ‘.....an appropriate level of infrastructure and waste treatment and disposal facilities that effectively meets...’</p>	Accept in part - The provisions have been widened to include specific reference to national and regional infrastructure. These are to be applied at a district wide level and it is acknowledged that not all of the district relies on waste treatment and disposal facilities. these matters can be considered in the wider plan as appropriate.
127.5.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		<p>New Objective 2.3.2</p> <p>The Taupo landfill and power stations are examples of regionally significant land uses that are difficult or impossible to be established in alternative locations. They therefore must be protected from reverse sensitivity to ensure their ongoing operation.</p> <p>Relief Sought New Objective: Regionally significant land uses are protected from reverse sensitivity effects caused by incompatible subdivision, use and development.</p>	Not accept - It is considered that reverse sensitivity issues are reflected in Policy 2.3.3.10 for urban environments and are addressed in more detail in the specific requirements for each environment.
127.6.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	<p>Addition of the existing infrastructure, waste facilities and transportation network, according to the capacity limitations of that network/infrastructure/waste facilities where available;</p>	Not Accept - Understand the concerns of the submitter however at the strategic level it is not considered necessary to provide more granular detail on specific infrastructure. The matters raised by the submitter in respect to important local infrastructure are currently captured in the existing Objectives and pols in section 2.3 and 2.5 of the draft chapter. A proposed amendment has been made to Objective 3 however to better reflect the need to consider the capacity of that infrastructure.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
127.7.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Policy 2.3.3.8 — This policy needs to encompass that many industrial activities need to be separated from more sensitive activities due to their potential for odour, noise, or safety effects. Restrict the location and development of retail and commercial activities within non—commercial areas of the district to ensure that the town centre continue to be the districts pre—eminent retail and commercial centres. Relief Sought ...and commercial centres and to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing uses	Not Accept - The intent of this policy is to support the ongoing functioning and integrity of the Districts commercial centres. Policy 10 does however capture the matters raised in the submission at a strategic level and will be considered in more detail in the specific requirements for each development.
127.8.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		New Policy under 2.3.3 — 2.3.3x Alternative relief to amendment of Policy 2.3.3.8 above for reasons stated above. [point 127.7] Relief Sought New policy: Enable the efficient use of industrial land for industrial activities and avoid incompatible activities.	Not Accept - The intent of this policy is to support the ongoing functioning and integrity of the Districts commercial centres. Policy 10 does however capture the matters raised in the submission at a strategic level and will be considered in more detail in the specific requirements for each development.
127.9.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Policy 2.3.3.9 — d. give rise to reverse sensitivity effects from existing uses The existing wording of the policy is broad, but it acknowledges that some activities, like the Taupo Landfill, need to be protected from reverse sensitivity and to ensure they can continue to operate and provide an essential service to the community.	Accept - No response required
127.10.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Section 2.4 — Land use activities which will unduly accelerate the effects of climate change will be discouraged. While it is acknowledged that waste minimisation is necessary to meet particular climate change outcomes, refuse transfer stations and waste treatment and disposal facilities will still be required by the community. Interpreting Policy 2.4.3.2 will therefore be key in whether new facilities or the reconstituting of existing facilities will be acceptable when an activity such as a landfill has a complex climatic footprint. How will activities be discouraged? The policy should identify the mechanisms by which this could be achieved.	Accept in part - These matters will be considered on a case by case basis through consenting and more detailed policy and planning for each environment.
127.11.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Section 2.5 — Paragraph 1, 2 and 4 As the definition for infrastructure under the RMA and the current District Plan excludes waste treatment and disposal facilities, the continuance and possible expansion of these facilities needs to be included in this section, or the definition of infrastructure expanded to include waste transfer stations and Class 1 landfills. Altering the definition may be a neater solution rather than the required amendments to Section 2.5. Relief Sought ...and any other network utilities undertaken by network utility operators. Waste management facilities are also critical services. ...However, inappropriately located or designed land use activities can adversely affect the safe and effective functioning of significant and locally important infrastructure, and waste management facilities. ...In addition to nationally important infrastructure, local roads, and other infrastructure and waste facilities are is vital	Accept in part - Understand the concerns of the submitter however at the strategic level it is not considered necessary to provide more granular detail on specific infrastructure. The matters raised by the submitter in respect to important local infrastructure are currently captured in the existing Objectives and pols in section 2.3 and 2.5 of the draft chapter. A proposed amendment has been made to Objective 3 however to better reflect the need to consider the capacity of that infrastructure.
127.12.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Objective 2.5.2.3 — Land use in the District will not reduce the safe and effective functioning of significant and local infrastructure. Relief Sought: Land use in the District will not reduce the safe and effective functioning of significant and local infrastructure, and waste management facilities.	Accept in part

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
127.13.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	Policy 2.5.3.4 — Subdivision, landuse and development will not adversely affect the effective and safe functioning of infrastructure. Relief Sought: Subdivision, landuse and development will not adversely affect the effective and safe functioning of infrastructure and waste management facilities.	Accept in part
127.14.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Section 3b.1 — Paragraph 2 under General Rural Environment Enviro NZ agrees in providing distinct locations for Rural lifestyle however it considers the subdivision rules for Rural Environment need the subdivision lot size to be lifted to achieve this aim. Relief Sought: 'The purpose of separating the General Rural Environment...	Reject
127.15.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	Objective 3b.2.3 — Rural industry is enabled whilst commercial and industrial activities, other than home business, are avoided This objective will not allow necessary industrial activities, such as a composting plant, to establish in the most appropriate location being the rural zone. As the compost provides nutrients, etc to primary production activities, the objective should be amended to allow for food waste from urban areas to be appropriately treated. Relief Sought The character, intensity and scale of rural industries are in keeping with the character of the rural area Rural industry is enabled whilst commercial and industrial activities, unless related to rural production activities and/or other than home business, are avoided	Reject. Composting would likely meet the definition of rural industry.
127.16.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	Objective 3b.2.4 — Māori cultural activities, tourism activities, visitor accommodation and electricity generation activities are enabled in the General Rural Environment. This objective is too generalised and may lead to an erosion of rural character by being too enabling. It also does not consider existing significant regional land uses, such as the existing landfill, which need protection from reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject but note addition to SD re municipal waste.
127.17.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	Objective 3b.2.5 — Māori cultural activities, tourism activities, visitor accommodation and electricity generation activities are enabled in the General Rural Environment. Reverse sensitivity effects on permitted activities within the General Rural Environment, including conflict with activities in neighbouring Environments, are avoided. This objective only provides for permitted activities to be protected from reverse sensitivity effects. Most waste facilities go through extensive consenting hurdles to become established and are never a permitted activity therefore their inclusion is required. We also include infrastructure for completeness. Relief Sought: Reverse sensitivity effects on permitted activities and existing regional infrastructure and waste management facilities within the General Rural Environment	Accept in part
127.18.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	Objective 3b.2.6 — The impacts on infrastructure arising from subdivision and development are managed. If the above proposed amendments are not accepted then infrastructure and waste management facilities need protection not management from effects of encroaching subdivision and development. Relief Sought Infrastructure and waste management facilities are protected from reverse sensitivity effects caused by incompatible subdivision, use and development.	Reject



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
127.19.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment		New Objective — The chapter neglects to include aggregate quarries, cleanfills and managed fills which are an important rural use and necessary for development. Therefore, by appropriately restricting their establishment, their effects can be assessed within a clear set of parameters. Relief Sought Restrict quarries, cleanfills and managed fills so that they should not adversely affect or inhibit the use of surrounding land for productive purposes or for carrying out any permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activity; and their completed state should be in keeping with the appearance, form and location of existing rural character and amenity values.	Reject but note amendments to SDs.
127.20.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	Policy 3b.2.9 Residential units — Avoid the cumulative effects of rural lifestyle development by limiting residential units that: a)Increase the demand for community infrastructure and services b)Result in the inefficient use of land or loss of future flexibility for productive uses c)Erode the general rural character through its density, scale and location. This policy needs to be strengthened to avoid the cumulative effects of eroding of rural character and to maintain a low intensity of residential buildings. At the very least, replacing the word limiting for avoiding will aid in achieving this aim. Otherwise EnviroNZ is concerned that as additional dwellings are only a discretionary activity, reverse sensitivity issues will occur for regional infrastructure and the regional landfill. Relief Sought: Avoid the cumulative effects of rural lifestyle development by limiting avoiding residential units that:	Reject
127.21.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	Policy 3b.2.12 Avoiding reverse sensitivity — Any adverse effects generated by an activity must be managed within the allotment so as to avoid adversely affecting lawfully established neighbouring activities. The change is required to address where multiple lots are owned together. Relief Sought: Any adverse effects generated by an activity must be managed within the landholding allotment.	Reject
127.22.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	Objective 3b.3.2 Avoid reverse sensitivity — Adverse reverse sensitivity effects, including conflict with activities in neighbouring Environments, are avoided The change is required to address where multiple lots are owned together. The objective needs strengthening to appropriately address the issue. Relief Sought Development in the zone avoids reverse sensitivity effects and does not compromise the ability of adjacent zones to be effectively and efficiently used for appropriate activities.	Have strengthened the reverse sensitivity provisions.
127.23.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment		New objective — A specific objective is required so that regionally significant infrastructure and landfills can continue to operate effectively. Relief Sought Subdivision, use and development is compatible with existing infrastructure and waste management facilities and any existing infrastructure and waste management facilities are protected from reverse sensitivity effects	Amendments made to SDs in this regard.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
127.24.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment		New policy — A specific objective is required so that regionally significant infrastructure and landfills can continue to operate effectively. Relief Sought Prevent subdivision, use and development from compromising the safe and efficient operation of existing mineral extraction activities, rural production activities, existing infrastructure, waste management facilities or industry in adjacent zones.	Amendments made to SDs in this regard.
127.25.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	4b.1.1 (ii) Activities in the General Rural Environment — Any activity that is not a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary or a noncomplying activity is a discretionary activity. A dwelling that does not comply with the standards of the zone should be a non—complying activity to avoid erosion of rural character and increasing reverse sensitivity to existing infrastructure and waste management facilities	Reject. There will still be varying circumstances in these cases that can then be assessed through a consent.
127.26.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment		New clause 4b.1.4(ii) — Similar to 4b.1.4(i), the regional landfill at Broadlands Road requires its continued operation secured. The definition of maintenance and minor upgrading for the landfill can be determined on discussion. Relief sought: ii. Any activity involving continued operation, maintenance, and minor upgrading of the existing landfill is a permitted activity	Amendments made to SDs in this regard.
127.27.	Kaaren Rosser for EnviroNZ	2.2-General rural environment	No	4b.5.1 Subdivision – General Rural Environment — Subdivision resulting in lots that are 10 hectares or larger is a controlled activity. Enviro NZ is concerned that the minimum subdivision size for General Rural Environment will not achieve avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects. The minimum lot size should be increased to at least a minimum of 40 hectares.	Reject. This is the current minimum lot size within the operative plan.
128.1.	Catriona Eagles on behalf of Natalie Healet	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		The submitter considers that the site located at 61 Huka Falls Road is generally consistent with the criteria used to form the Rural Lifestyle Zone with the exception of the total site area. Due to topographical constraints the developable part of the site is much smaller than the title size and less than 30ha. The site should not be considered as a productive area for either farming or forestry due to topographical constraints and trees could impact nearby housing.	Reject. However further conversations to occur on this site as part of residential chapter. Submitter should also look at rural papakainga provisions.
128.2.	Catriona Eagles on behalf of Natalie Healet	6-General		The submitter also seeks that residential zoning be considered for this property as would be consistent with adjoining properties which are either residential or low density residential. The site was identified in TD2050 as a future growth area and is able to be serviced with water, good visibility for vehicle access and wastewater disposal either onsite or future connection to reticulation.	Reject - out of scope at this stage. Will discuss when completing residential chapter.
129.1.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
129.2.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Federated Farmers supports the proposed strategic directions, including tangata whenua, freshwater quality, urban form and development, climate change, strategic infrastructure and natural values and landscapes. Given the district has a significant rural presence, we seek further consideration and protection of the values, character and resources of the GRE. As such, we propose that an additional strategic direction is implemented, which could be termed strong rural , or similar.	Accept in part - Agree with the matters raised. Considered that this is done through reference to the TD2050 which sets out a pattern of land use that supports appropriate development within the GRE. More detailed provisions relating to this area are included in the Rural Chapter its self

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
129.3.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		In terms of the proposed subdivision policies and associated rules for the RLE, Federated Farmers is neutral on the proposed allowance to subdivide down to 2 hectares (ha). We note that 2ha is too small for most productive farm uses and would compromise the size of an average lifestyle block. We believe subdivisions of this size would not compromise rural character or amenity, as a general assumption. We note that in most situations Council and the landowner would benefit more from smaller lot subdivision, as it provides additional accommodation and rates whilst not being a substantial loss of productive land which would occur with a 10 hectare or greater allowance.	Accept
129.4.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		In terms of the proposed subdivision policies and associated rules for the GRE, Federated Farmers is neutral on the allowance to subdivide down to 10ha. We note that 10ha is not considered to be large enough for a productive farm, and there is little difference between a 2ha and a 10ha allotment in this respect. We also note that depending on the location and use of the land, there may be a requirement for landowners to acquire land use consents for farming related activities, even at such a small scale. Federated Farmers submits that an alternative approach to subdivision within the GRE could be to allow for a smaller allotment size (for example, 4ha), which still provides distinction between the RLE and GRE, but better reflects the lower productivity anticipated with smaller allotments.	Accept
129.5.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		While not yet adopted, the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) will require local authorities to identify highly productive land through the Land Use Capability system, which considers factors such as soil, erosion, and climate. Land would be categorised from Class 1 (high production) to Class 8 (low production) based on its versatility and ability to sustain productive uses. While it is accepted that the Land Use Classes I to III are considered the most versatile it does not mean that the lower classes are unproductive land but are limited in some way. In fact, the land identified in the lower classes may be more suitable for growing some crops due to the limitations. We also note that LUC classes IV -; VII land types tend to be less suitable for residential dwellings due to being more prone to erosion, land instability and inundation. Further, such land is generally of a lower value and as a result there will be lower demand not only for pastoral farming but also residential and lifestyle lots. We urge Council to consider defining highly productive land for the purposes of the DP. Further, Federated Farmers would appreciate a response as to how the NPS-HPL may be implemented in the future in terms of any potential impacts on rural subdivision.	Reject - will wait for the NPS to be adopted before making changes. Otherwise we risk being inconsistent with the NPS.
129.6.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		We congratulate IDC on its approach to considering reverse sensitivity effects within the RLE and GRE. The inclusion of objective 3b.3.2 (RLE), which detail that adverse reverse sensitivity effects, including conflict with activities in neighbouring environments, are avoided. Further, policy 3b.3.9 (RLE) requiring larger lot sizes and greater building setbacks for allotments joining the GRE to manage reverse sensitivity is another excellent example of an appropriate framework to consider and mitigate reverse sensitivity effects. For the GRE, we also consider the inclusion of objective 3b.2.2. focussing on maintaining the established general rural character and objective 3b.2.5 which specifically addresses the avoidance of reverse sensitivity as appropriate provisions for protecting the rural environment (with correct interpretation and consideration in processes)	Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
129.7.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		In terms of the proposed changes to minor residential unit rules, Federated Farmers appreciates Council listening to communities who live in rural environments, and providing a framework to make it easier for people to build a minor residential unit on their property. The proposed permitted activity conditions for a minor residential unit are practical, and as such are supported. We recommend that the term minor residential unit; is defined in the definitions chapter of the plan when notification of the plan changes occurs later in the year.	Minor unit is essentially defined by the rule. 100m2 dwelling etc.
129.8.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		In terms of the proposed changes to minor residential unit rules, Federated Farmers appreciates Council listening to communities who live in rural environments, and providing a framework to make it easier for people to build a minor residential unit on their property. The proposed permitted activity conditions for a minor residential unit are practical, and as such are supported. We recommend that the term minor residential unit,; is defined in the definitions chapter of the plan when notification of the plan changes occurs later in the year.	Accept
129.9.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		We note that section 4b.2.6 (minimum setbacks -; GRE) will require a minimum setback of 300 metres (m) from all boundaries for buildings for the management of farmed animals from all boundaries (conditions 4b.2.6.iii). We question Council on the issue that is trying to be addressed by the increase in the setback. We note that farmed animals and associated buildings are anticipated in the rural environment, and consequently so are any reasonable and permitted noises, odours and effects on rural amenity. Federated Farmers proposes that instead, a 100m setback is required from any residential units or community facilities (such as churches, schools, halls etc.), is proposed, whether these fall within or outside of a boundary.	Accept - 300m setback adjusted
129.10.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		We note that plan proposes intensive indoor primary production within the RLE as a permitted activity, if it complies with the performance standards. Intensive indoor primary production means activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing produce, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified period of time) or poultry. The performance standards (4b.4.7) require buildings to be located at least 15m or greater from all boundaries, with no separate setback requirement for intensive indoor primary production. While there are limits on the size of the activity (gross floor area or within a building), we note there is some inequity here in the approach between the GRE and RLE. Section 4b.4.7 (minimum setbacks -; RLE) will require all buildings to be located at least 15m from all boundaries, and residential units to be setback a minimum of 50m from the GRE. Federated Farmers supports the 50m setback from the GRE, and seeks clarification that this setback is taken from the boundary of the site to the GRE. The setback should reduce conflict with general rural activities.	Note 4b.4.7 relates to dwellings. Primary production has been limited in terms of size in RLE.
129.11.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		We further propose that a 50m setback be imposed for buildings (and residential units) in both the GRE and RLE from commercial afforested land, i.e., planted in indigenous or exotic forestry. We believe this will reduce the likelihood of rare fire events, which spread rapidly in afforested areas.	Reject - there are provisions relating to setbacks in the NPS - PF.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
129.12.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		<p>We note that Rule 4b.5.8 for the subdivision of bonus lots states that any subdivision that results in the creation of bonus lots over 2ha is a discretionary activity, however then lists requirements that need to be met to be considered a discretionary activity. Section 4b.5.8 in its current format contradicts itself, with requirements such as point 4b.5.8.i.a. stating that each bonus lot must correspond to no less than 4ha of a nominated significant natural area (SNA), and point 4b.5.8.c stating that bonus lot(s) will not be located within a SNA.</p> <p>Federated Farmers requests that point 4b.5.8.c is revised and clarified, given the definition of a bonus lot is associated with the formal protection of part, or all of a nominated SNA. Federated Farmers seeks confirmation from Council that the activity status stated is incorrect. We would appreciate confirmation of the correct activity status and any associated conditions depending on that classification.</p> <p>We further seek clarity on the size allowance of the allotment for this rule. However, we also recommend that Council considers the allowance of bonus lots of any size to recognise the environment gains that can be achieved by any part of a SNA being able to be utilised as a bonus lot.</p>	Accept - amendments made to bonus lot rule
129.13.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	2.2-General rural environment		<p>Under the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation (2011), it states decision makers must have regard to the need to locate the renewable electricity generation activity where the renewable energy resource is available. While electricity generation and transmission are anticipated in the rural environment, we note in particular that some transmission pipelines are an eye sore in the rural environment across the district.</p> <p>Federated Farmers would like to see improved mitigations for extensive electricity operations where <u>practical to better blend with the aesthetics of the rural environment.</u></p>	Accept. New policy added to the SD chapter.
129.14.	Jesse Brennan on behalf of Rotorua/Taupo Federated Farmers of New Zealand.	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		<p>Evidence suggests that the current supply of industrial land in Taupō is reaching capacity and additional land is required to support industrial growth. We note that the proposed areas for assessment as industrial zoning are currently zoned as GRE. Given the proximity of these areas to existing industrial land and the wider Taupō township, Federated Farmers supports the proposed areas for assessment. We further acknowledge that location of industrial activities on the fringes of urban environments provides greater accessibility to rural environments and therefore rural producers.</p>	Accept
130.1.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
130.2.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		The submitter supports some proposed zoning but also seeks amendments to other neighbouring properties.	Accept
130.3.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks that "wood processing" should be included in the description of activities in the general rural environment.	Reject but refer to new definition of rural industry.
130.4.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Suggest removing reference to openness, unless suitable mitigation (eg bunds) are provided. Alternatively if reference to openness is related, we submit that additional wording is included "with the exception of existing lawfully established activities".	Reject.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
130.5.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		3b.2.5 Insert "and lawfully established activities" after permitted activities.	Accept in part. Have added "consented".
130.6.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks the following wording is inserted to Policy 3b.2.8 "except where a lawfully established activity exists"	Reject. Already provided for under s10 of the Act.
130.7.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks the removal of Policy 3b.2.10 Heavy Vehicle Movements.	Accept in part - EVMs adjusted
130.8.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks that vehicle movements should be removed as a proposed performance standard.	Accept in part - EVMs adjusted
130.9.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.12 sought. We submit that the effects of subdivision on lawfully established activities should be provided for within this policy	Our view is that this policy already does this.
130.10.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments sought to Policy 3b.2.13. We submit that lawfully established commercial and industrial activities should be provided with the exception to this policy, not just as an existing use, but for future growth.	Reject
130.11.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Noted the "separation of activities serves to minimise reverse sensitivity issues" in 3b.1. Lifestyle sites adjoining existing lawfully established businesses need to be mindful of existing activities and that sites even over the road should be restricted to the 'adjoining' rules Submitter seeks that sites over the road should be restricted to the 'adjoining' rules	We would rather look at specific geographical locations rather than a generic application across the District.
130.12.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Objective 3b.3.2 seek that clarity is provided in this objective for lawfully established activities ie the following words added "lawfully established activities in this environment and in neighbouring environments"	Accept in part - some amendments made to this affect.
130.13.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Policy 3b.3.9 Support this policy and submit that properties located over the road should also be considered to be "adjoining"	We would prefer to look at the specific properties this effects rather than applying a generic rule.
130.14.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks amendment to Policy 3b.3.11. We submit that properties located over the road from a rural lifestyle site should also be considered to be 'adjoining' the rural site.	We would prefer to look at the specific properties this effects rather than applying a generic rule.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
130.15.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.1.5 Industrial Activities which does not comply with performance standards is a restricted discretionary activity. Submitter disputes that restriction is required at all given the location need for rural industry to be in the rural area. If there is to be a restriction on rural industry then we consider that the Restricted Discretionary activity status is appropriate, with the exception of the assessment criteria relating to daily vehicle movements and hours of operation.	Reject except note amendment to EVM. Also note new definition of rural industry.
130.16.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter recommends the removal of Rule 4b.2.1 Vehicle Movements. If the standard is retained, we recommend the exemption for lawfully established uses (including the expansion of their operation)	Accept in part - EVMs adjusted
130.17.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter seeks amendments to Rule 4b.2.6 which provides an exception standard that water tanks are not required to comply with the setback requirements of this standard.	Reject for now as out of scope. But will relook at this with residential chapter.
130.18.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Submitter considers that Rule 4b.2.8 Home business, commercial and industrial activities is to restrictive for Rural Industry. If this standard is retained, lawfully established buildings and uses should be excluded from this restriction. We also submit that if you do restrict the floor area of the business use, there is not need to also restrict vehicle movements.	Note new definition of rural industry. EVMs adjusted.
130.19.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.2.9 Maximum Noise Limits and 4b.2.11 Max Noise - Construction Noise. Submitter notes that the measurement of this standard (from within the notional boundary) remains the same as measured in the Operative District Plan and would also want the definition of notional boundary to remain the same. The measurement in the lifestyle zone differs and should be made consistent with the measurement of these rules.	Noise limits have been updated according to best practice.
130.20.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment	No	Rule 4b.2.13 Maximum Noise - Other. Submitter notes no change from the ODP for this including rather than excluding sawmilling equipment. Also suggests changes to temporary activities in relation to noise limits.	Reject.
130.21.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.2.15 Signage. PermaPine have consent to exceed signage standards but do not request any changes to the proposed standards	Accept
130.22.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rule 4b.3.2 Minor Residential Units. Submitter notes that minor dwellings can be constructed in association with a primary residence.	Accept
130.23.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rule 4b.3.3 Home Business, commercial and retail activities. Noted that industrial activities are not restricted here and support this wording is retained. It is unclear why industrial activities are not restricted in the Rural Lifestyle zone and are restricted in the General Rural zone.	Industrial defaults to discretionary because it hasn't been mentioned.
130.24.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	Rule 4b.4.1 Vehicle Movements - standard is insufficient for larger holding that might want to run a business from their site. Submit that this standard is removed.	Accept in part

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
130.25.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Seek changes to Rule 4b.4.4 Subdivision Standard - one house per 2ha.	Reject
130.26.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		seek changes to Rule 4b.4.5 Minor Residential units. submit that properties located adjoining (over the road) should also be restricted to one house per 4ha	We would rather look at specific geographical locations rather than a generic application across the District.
130.27.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rule 4b.4.7 Building Setbacks. Seeks that this rule should include accommodation and properties located over the road from the General Rural Environment. Amend to "residential and accommodation units shall be setback a minimum of 50m from the General Rural Environment". Measurement should be taken from the closest general rural environment boundary and may include the road and road reserve between sites that are located over the road or river etc from the General Rural Environment.	Accept in part. Some amendment made to this provision.
130.28.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Submission relates to Rule 4b.4.13 Noise -Limits and seeking methods of measurement are retained and carried forward to the Proposed District Plan. Method for measuring noise should stay as it is in the Operative District Plan ie from within the notional boundary	Noise limits have been updated according to latest best practice.
130.29.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	Submitter is supportive of Rule 4b.5.1 Subdivision where 10ha or larger lots are controlled activity and under 10ha is a non-complying activity.	Accept
130.30.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Submitter seeks changes to Rule 4b.5.2 to include properties located over the road from the general rural environment to be defined as adjoining.	We would rather look at specific geographical locations rather than a generic application across the District.
130.31.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rule 4b.5.3. Submitter would prefer that properties surrounding their operation are not further subdivided, however with the larger standard (10ha and 4ha) required for adjoining general rural we are generally supportive of this. Submitter has outlined that "adjoining" should include properties over the road from a general rural property.	We would rather look at specific geographical locations rather than a generic application across the District.
130.32.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		clarification sought in relation to Rule 4b.5.6 a). should this refer to 4b.5.3 and 4b.5.5 assessment criteria rather than 4b.3.1 and 4b.3.2?	Accept. Amended.
130.33.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Objective 3b.2.3 Rural Industry. Changes sought to definition of industrial activity as rural industry is not defined. Additionally, the objectives and policies should not hinder the future expansion of lawfully established activities.	Rural industry now defined.
130.34.	Helen Brosnan for Cheal Consultants Ltd on behalf of PermaPine Limited	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Permapine would now like to confirm that they would prefer to have 1640 Broadlands road located in the Rural rather than rural lifestyle zone.	Accept



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
131.1.	Patrick Hart on behalf of Taupo East Rural Representative Group (TERG)	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
131.2.	Patrick Hart on behalf of Taupo East Rural Representative Group (TERG)	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		TheTERG support the removal of the Mapara Valley Structure plan and support the creation of the new Lifestyle rural environment, we would like to see that there is greater consistency in the application of the general and rural lifestyle environments. Given the land between Mapara through to Kinloch is largely unproductive (not suitable for economic farming),subject to Lake Taupo Catchment restrictions it is more suited to smaller lifestyle blocks, we would like to see all this area zoned in the new rural lifestyle environment.  TERG also want consideration to be given to a second bridge.	Reject. Trying to strike a balance here between supplying lifestyle blocks but not carving up larger rural blocks. The potential impact on infrastructure of this proposal would be significant.
131.3.	Patrick Hart on behalf of Taupo East Rural Representative Group (TERG)	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Yes	3.0 Papakainga The TERG support the addition of Papakainga developments which enable affordable housing and the strengthening of our maori communities, whilst ensuring any developments are also sustainable and give due consideration to environmental aspects that are also throughout the rural area.	Accept
132.1.	Kirsteen McDonald for McKenzie and Co on behalf of The Proprietors of Hiruharama - Ponui Block	2.2-General rural environment	No	The Hiruharama - Ponui Block is already consented for residential type use and is fully serviced for water and waste water. It is never going to be used for rural production purposes. The existing and ongoing use of the subject land does not align with the current or draft Rural Environment provisions . As such we do not support the zoning of this land as Rural. Further, the rezoning of this land to Residential will support the implementation of Council's community outcomes relating to Strategic Direction 1 - Tangata Whenua.	Reject. Out of scope. Further conversation can occur for Residential Plan Change. Clarification needed on which block.
133.1.	Sean Grace on behalf of Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
133.2.	Sean Grace on behalf of Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Corrections is asking for the strategic directions to align with TD2050 and as such would like to see amendments to the strategic directions.	Accept in part - The proposed directions have been drafted to align with TD2050, amendments to Objective 3 and policy 6 have been made in response to the submission. Additional specificity around activities was not considered appropriate given the strategic nature of the policy. it is considered that if positive those activities will be inherently supported by that policy. The proposed policy is not considered appropriate for the Strategic Directions chapter and is considered to be more relevant for the review of the residential chapter.
133.3.	Sean Grace on behalf of Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Corrections are asking for a special corrections zone to be created around the prison. In there submission they have attached a full set of zoning rules for what a corrections environment would look like.	Out of scope
134.1.	Joe Jordan	6-General		See attached full submission	NA

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
134.2.	Joe Jordan	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		You are proposing to allow lifestyle block owners to subdivide their land down to 2 hectare blocks, but as most lifestyle blocks are of only 4 hectares size, it means cutting them in half, which, in many cases, won't be feasible in a logical, common sense manner, due to land topography or other constraints. It would be far more practical to allow subdivision down to 1 hectare sizes, or even to 1 acre sizes.>And why is it that currently, large landowners such as my neighbour, of 898 Mapara road, are permitted to subdivide their land into numerous 1 acre blocks, whereas small landowners, like lifestyle block owners, are not accorded the same option. What logical rationale does Council apply to justify such unfair discrimination.	Reject
135.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Baillie Lodges being the operator of Huka Lodge	2.2-General rural environment	No	Therefore the submitter considers it is necessary that Council revise the zoning for this site to not be General Rural or Rural Lifestyle as soon as possible, and if not in this current plan change, in the next being the residential environment. It is considered that at the current level of consents, a residential zone or a tourist accommodation zone is the most appropriate for this site.	Reject. Out of scope. Further conversations to occur as part of subsequent residential review.
136.1.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	4-Residential Chapter	Yes	This brings the coverage rule in line with other Councils and reflects, as noted, the scale of residential dwellings the community expects to build within Taupo.	Accept
136.2.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		Submitter notes that several blocks now proposed were not included in CISP when it was undertaken and that further assessment of these blocks is not proposed. We look forward to reading this further assessment, and the demand assessment relating to industrial land as background.	Accept
136.3.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.1. The submitter looks forward to understanding how this strategic direction develops future consultation, mitigation and decision making across all levels and types of consents. Also how this relates to Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki.	Accept in part - These objectives were developed in consultation with mana whenua of Taupō District. They are to be applied through plan development and decision making processes. This will include the review of the wider plan and the assessment and decision making relating to private plan changes and resource consents. It is considered that 2.1 and other directions, i.e. 2.2 will support the council to recognise and provide for Te Kaupapa Kaitiaki.
136.4.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.2. Submitter notes that currently the Taupo District Plan does not clearly identify water bodies to which this policy framework relates and there is a lack of clarity (and inconsistency between Councils) regarding the role of Ephemeral water courses in water quality. Also notes that the focus on water quality does not address any values associated with the water body itself, perhaps leaving this to natural values.	Accept in part - Section 3.5.4 of the NPSFW requires every territorial authority to include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments. There is no requirement for the council to identify specific water bodies, instead the reference to water bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments provides adequate guidance to be applied on a case by case situation dependent on when the objectives are to be applied. Similarly the application of the policy will be the trigger to consider those specific values of relevance. Reference to Mauri, health and wellbeing are included in the objective however.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
136.5.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.3 - notes a lack of discussion in these obj and policies regarding roading/reserves connectivity between developments, connectivity via alternative modes of transport and lack of acknowledgement of how subdivision can facilitate public transport. Policy 11 refers to 'inappropriately' - this is not clear as to is meaning. Additional the policy is best to refer to 'identified natural values'. There are several references to TD2050 however some of the industrial zoning proposed will not be consistent with TD2050 and should be amended.	Accept in part -These are strategic directions and not anticipated to cover off all issues. The matters raised are more appropriate to be covered off in the provisions relating to specific environments. Matters relating to public transport can be considered through these policies and those relating to climate change, however they are not explicitly mentioned. Inappropriately is considered on a case by case basis depending on the values of the area concerned. What is inappropriate is described in the wider plan.
136.6.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.4. Curious as to how this works for industrial activities as it refers to use of land and land use activities which will unduly accelerate climate change will be discouraged. This feels like an expansion into regional council jurisdiction and unclear how it will impact future industrial landuse consent assessment criteria.	Accept in part - Additional guidance has been provided in 2.4.3.1 on how such matters can be achieved. The provisions signal a need for all development to consider matters relating to climate change. Those activities which have the opportunity to better consider climate change but, for what ever reason, do not will be discouraged. These provisions relate to subdivision and development and not discharges and sit within the DC jurisdiction.
136.7.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.6. Interested in the interface between this strategic direction and Obj 2.1 as it relates to future development of Maori land. these two objectives may work in opposition if not carefully crafted.	Accept in part - The matters raised in the submission have been considered in the development of these provisions. They provide high level strategic guidance which will be considered on a case by case basis. The application of the provisions and how they relate to the given situation will need to be balanced in consideration of the specific circumstances of the application.
136.8.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Area X and Y. Centennial Dr and Link properties that are 4 to 6ha are covered by Rules 4b.5.2 and 4b.5.2 with subdivision into 2ha blocks adjoining general rural would be a discretionary activity with no reference to Area X or Contact encumbrance etc as Rule 4b.5.6 iii doesn't apply? However in Area Y there must be a covenant and subdivision detailed in Rule 4b.5.6 iii. This appears either inconsistent or incomplete in the package of rules and requires more consideration.	Accept - rule clarified.
136.9.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Rural production buildings requires definition	Accept
136.10.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Policy 3b.3.8 mentions Rural Production Activities. Rural Productive Activities requires a definition	Accept in part - have modified wording.
136.11.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		New dwelling and minor dwelling provisions are likely to work well. However it is unclear how this relates to accommodation activities/units	Accept in part
136.12.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amend Objective 3b.2.2 and Policy 3b.3.8 to mention lawfully established rural industry and other lawfully established activities.	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
136.13.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Rule 4b.1.2 does not include the location or safety of the access of the need for a shared access however the associated rule in the Rural Lifestyle zone does. The submitter seeks that consistency is applied between provisions.	Accept. Amended.
136.14.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amend Rule 4b.3.2 to include the safety of the access point	Accept
136.15.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.2.2 talks of 10% net allotment area, this is a new term and requires definition. It is also different to the corresponding rule on Rural Lifestyle which states 10% total allotment area. The increase to 10% is more workable for rural activities.	Accept have amended this.
136.16.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Consider rule similar to 4b.2.6. for Rural Lifestyle.	See rule 4b.4.7
136.17.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Provide some assessment criteria to guide the key issues particularly around the need for public roads or public rights of access and the need for connectivity to other public roads.	Accept. Have added a new policy on this to SD 3.
136.18.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.1.5 does not have assessment criteria for the owner living on the site however Rule 4b.3.3 assessment criteria does mention this? Home business therefore requires a definition	Accept. Amended.
136.19.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.1.5 limits home business, commercial or industrial but not retail, however Rule 4b.3.3 limited home business, commercial and retail	This is intentional. Defaults to discretionary as not mentioned.
136.20.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		What is the status of industrial activities in the Rural Lifestyle as Rule 4b.4.9 does not include industrial activities?	Industrial defaults to discretionary because it hasn't been mentioned.
136.21.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		The subdivision assessment criteria need to reflect the proximity to existing lawfully established activities and mitigation to reverse sensitivity.	Reverse sensitivity provisions strengthened.
136.22.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Under Rule 4b.5.2 and 4b.5.3 a 1.95ha lot in the red location would be a non-complying activity however a 1.95ha lot in the green location would be a discretionary activity. Please clarify.	Accept - amendments made.
136.23.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Although tourism activities are outlined as being a part of the Rural Environment, they will be caught in the definition of commercial activity, the vehicle movement rule and the proposed area constraint unless more clearly defined. Appears contrary to proposed Objective 3b.2.4. Consider definition for Tourism activities	Accept see new rule 4b.1.11

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
136.24.	Catriona Eagles for Cheal on behalf of Cheal Consultants Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		The submitters main comments relate to matters of existing lawfully established activities, vehicle movements and commercial/industrial activities. The re-inclusion of vehicle movements will capture any expansion of existing rural industry, even if the definition of rural industry includes these activities i.e pet lodges. Researching Councils long term plan and roading asset management plan there are no rural roads identified as being significantly under pressure. If there is damage to roads occurring this is not evident in current information. This matter is perhaps best addressed through DCs and associated capital works or a change to visibility or driveway access provisions rather than a rule. The associated rule to Policy 3b.2.10 only mentions heavy vehicle movements however the rule captures all vehicle movements. Also noted that the rules introduce a new definition of vehicle movement calculation which is not consistent with the Residential Environment. This new calculation will be difficult to monitor. if concern is amenity rather than damage to roads an alternative provision should be sought.	Accept - EVMs adjusted
137.1.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
137.2.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Minor Additions to 2.5 Strategic Direction 5 - Significant and Local Infrastructure introduction	Accept - Reference to Transmission has been included
137.3.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		New objective in 2.5.2	Accept in part - A new objective relating to electricity transmission is not supported as it is felt that amendments can be made to the existing objectives (i.e. Objectives 2) to suitably recognise the importance of the national electricity transmission network.
137.4.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Minor Amendments to 2.5.3 Policy no 2 and no 4.	Accept in part - The amendment was made to policy 2 to include reference to transmission activities. The suggested amendment to policy 4 was not made as it was considered that the term 'adverse effects' captures compromising activities.
137.5.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b Rural Environment Chapter Introduction	Accept in part
137.6.	Trudi Burney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.2.4	Accept
138.1.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
138.2.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Reword Policy 2.2.2 Water Quality	Accept in part - The objective was revised as per submission however with additional reference to mauri
138.3.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendments to 2.4 Introduction to SD4 - Climate Change	Accept in part - Introduction was amended in line (but not word for word) with the suggestions of the submitter.
138.4.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 1.	Accept - Added as a new objective

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
138.5.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 2	Not accept - The proposed objective was not considered appropriate and the matters covered are generally covered in the wider objectives. This level of specificity was not required.
138.6.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 3	Not accept - It was not considered necessarily to provide specific examples in this instance. It is a strategic objective and that level of detail was not required. Emissions are mentioned in the intro.
138.7.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 5	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested objective are already covered in the wider objectives. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
138.8.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD4 Climate Change 2.4.3 Policy 5	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested policy are already covered in the wider policies. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
138.9.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.2 Objective 1	Accept in part - The changes suggested were included in the objective with a few additional amendments to ensure that the objective read correctly.
138.10.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.2 Objective 2	Not accepted - It was considered that the draft provisions better reflected the act and enabled all situations to be considered on a case by case basis. Increased was not considered appropriate as there may be opportunities for efficiency gains in existing activities which may lead to better outcomes than increasing activities.
138.11.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.3 Policy 4	Accept in part - the proposed policy was revised but using similar wording which will still achieve the outcomes sought by the submitter.
138.12.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD6 Natural Environmental Values 2.5.3 Policy 9	Not accept - Such matters can be considered in the development of more detailed policy at the chapter specific level.
138.13.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD6 Natural Environmental Values 2.5.3 Policy 10	Not accept - Modified environments do not have the same level of significance to the wider district and its communities.
138.14.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b.1 - Introduction to the Rural Chapter	Some amendments made to intro in relation to energy.
138.15.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 3b.1 - Introduction to the Rural Chapter	Some amendments made to this section.
138.16.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b.1 - Introduction to the General Rural Environment	Some amendments made to intro in relation to energy.
138.17.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 3b.1 - Introduction to the Rural Lifestyle Environment	Some amendments made to this section.
138.18.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.2 Maintaining the established General Rural character	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
138.19.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.3 Rural industry	Note new definition of rural industry.
138.20.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.4 Other activities	Reject but note new definition of Rural Industry.
138.21.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Insert new objective: Renewable Electricity Generation Activities and Transmission	Reject but note amendments to SD chapter.
138.22.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.5 Avoidance of reverse sensitivity	Reject but note amendment to this objective.
138.23.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.8 Maintaining the established character	Reject but note amendments to intro and new rural industry definition.
138.24.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.9 Residential units	Reject
138.25.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.10 Heavy Vehicle movements	EVMs adjusted
138.26.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.11 Minor residential unit	Reject
138.27.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.12 Avoiding reverse sensitivity	Reject
138.28.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		New Policy for Renewable Electricity Generation	Reject but note other changes to this section and SDs.
138.29.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Additional note for Policy 3b.2.13 Commercial and industrial activity	Reject but see new definition of rural industry.
138.30.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.14 Allotment size	Reject
138.31.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.2 Avoid reverse sensitivity	Reject.
138.32.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.3 Commercial and industrial activities	Reject
138.33.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.4 Consolidate rural lifestyle activities	Reject
138.34.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.5 Allotment sizes	Reject
138.35.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.6 Impacts on community infrastructure	Reject. This objective is specifically about avoiding the pressure for additional community infrastructure, not on commercial infrastructure.
138.36.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.8 Character of the Rural Lifestyle Environment	Reject. The reference to urban infrastructure is intentional. But have strengthened the concept that energy is part of the rural environment.
138.37.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.9 Setbacks for allotments adjoining the General Rural Environment	Reject
138.38.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Delete Policy 3b.3.11 Larger lot sizes for lots which adjoin the General Rural Environment	Accept
138.39.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.3.12 Minor residential unit	Have strengthened reverse sensitivity provisions.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
138.40.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to 4b.1.1 Activities in the General Rural Environment	Reject
138.41.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to matters of discretion for 4b.1.2 Minor residential units	Reject
138.42.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.4 Electricity Generation Core Sites and Geothermal Steamfields	Reject
138.43.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		New definition: Renewable Electricity Generation Activities means the construction, operation and maintenance of structures, buildings, equipment associated with renewable electricity generation. This includes exploration, geothermal pipelines, solar panels, batteries, storage of energy, powerhouse, hydro dams, separation plants, switchyards, intake, control and diversion structures, wells, pipes, tunnels, cables, small and community-scale distributed renewable generation activities and the system of electricity conveyance required to convey electricity to the distribution network and/or the national grid and electricity storage technologies associated with renewable electricity.	Reject. Not necessary when it is defined by the NPS.
138.44.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		New Definition: Geothermal Drilling means the construction, maintenance and upgrading of wells associated with Geothermal resource exploration or development, including drilling rigs, well pads, well tracks, well heads, well testing, drill cutting ponds, accessory buildings, structures and equipment, temporary ancillary accommodation and fencing.	Reject. As this term is not used within the chapter it is not considered necessary.
138.45.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to NOTE: For the purpose of this rule ;maintenance	Some minor amendments made to this.
138.46.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to the NOTE: For the purpose of this rule ;minor upgrading" means...	Some minor amendments made to this.
138.47.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		New Rule: 4b.1.4X New Renewable Electricity Generation Activities	Reject. Note obs and pols within the SD section. Also note the NPS gives significant weight to Renewable energy.
138.48.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the matters of discretion for 4b.1.5 Home businesses, commercial and industrial activities	Reject
138.49.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to the matters of discretion for 4b.1.6 Papakāinga	Reject, unnecessary.
138.50.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.7 High voltage transmission lines	Reject. Network Utilities definition already includes: Transformation, transmission, or distribution of electricity
138.51.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to the exception for 4b.1.9 Earthworks within Outstanding Landscape Areas	Reject
138.52.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the exception for 4b.2.1 Vehicle movements	Amendments made to EVMs
138.53.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks	At this stage no evidence on distance or a mechanism for implementing.
138.54.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to the matters of discretion for 4b.3.2 Minor residential units	Have strengthened reverse sensitivity provisions.
138.55.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to matters of discretion for 4b.3.3 Home business, commercial, and retail activities	Reject
138.56.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 4b.4.5 Minor residential units	Have amended X and Y rules, and also a land use rule for minor dwellings.



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
138.57.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 4b.4.7 Building setbacks	Reject. Have avoided intensification in areas X and Y. RL more than 1000m from Aratiatia. Not clear what other sites this would apply to.
138.58.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to the matters of discretion For the purpose of Rules 4b.5.1.#	Have strengthened reverse sensitivity provisions.
138.59.	Alice Lin on behalf of Genesis Energy Ltd	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the matters of discretion for 4b.5.5 Subdivision resulting in a new public road, or extension of existing public road	Reject
139.1.	Catriona Eagles on behalf of Breda Investments Limited and EF Deadman Ltd	6-General		That the following parcels of land located at the end of Kaiapo Road be considered for Low Density Residential Environment zoning. Lot 1 DP 410435 Lot 2 DP 337255 Lot 1 DP 337255	Reject - out of scope at this stage. Will discuss when completing residential chapter.
140.1.	Duncan Brown	6-General		See full submission attached	NA
140.2.	Duncan Brown	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Regarding 170 Tukairangi road. The proposed Rural/Lifestyle(R2) zoning in the area stops on our boundary because of residential rule 4e.15.1 which relates to contact energy easements. Our land has been recently subdivided off the property known as Tauke farms and while some of the Contact easements relate to our place, the primary ;above ground easements remain with Tauke. Blocks less than 2h already sit on our southern boundary and we have no issue with current Contact easements relating to our property.. Our submission is that we would like 170 Tukairangi road to be included in the new R2 zone because we have a lot <u>more in common with those characteristics than we do with Rural/Geothermal use</u>	Reject - property impacted by residential rule 4e.15.1.
141.1.	Mark Wynyard	6-General		I do not agree with the 20 metre limitation regarding small dwellings, there should be no restrictions as to distance to main dwelling to give people privacythere would however need to have some minimum distance regarding boundaries.	Reject. There is a balance here between allowing for second dwellings but not compromising the rural productivity, potential productivity and character. Second dwellings apart from the main dwellings are also used as a back door for <u>subdivision.</u>
142.1.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	6-General		WRC is supportive overall. Some concerns have been raised: subdivision provisions, rule framework does not fully consider the possibility of natural hazards making land unsuitable for development, potential effects of future climate change on development, natural wetlands and gully erosion in thematters of control and discretion for the draft controlled and restricted discretionary activities,provisions in the FBPCs directing development away from natural gully systems and management of gully vegetation, proposed industrial areas in proximity to SNAs and SGF.	Note that through section 109 of the RMA natural hazards must be taking into account at subdivision stage.
142.2.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Urban form and environment — WRC suggests including reference to creating ‘well—functioning urban environments’ as per the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).	Accept in part - The provisions have been revised to better reflect the wording of the NPS-UD as suggested by the submitter.
142.3.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		Request consideration be given to natural gully systems in General Rural Environment and proposed Rural Lifestyle Environment. General protection, restricted land use in close proximity, restricted or controlled access, vegetation enhancement and management, erosion control.	Identifying all natural gullies a significant exercise. Note this is for rural development not urban.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
142.4.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	No	WRC does not support the release or development of land protected under a land improvement agreement (LIA). However where development is required for public infrastructure a case by case approval approach can be adopted.	Land under an LIA would not be able to be developed.
142.5.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.3-Papakainga provisions		Provisions should also cater for social services as per Policy 6.4.2 of the WRPS	Accept - The definition of Papakainga includes reference to social activities - it is consistent with WRC policy - have added in additional reference to health based activities.
142.6.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Recommend rural residential development is directed away from high class soil to align with development principles under S6A of the WRPS	Reject. Land identified as rural lifestyle already is rural lifestyle so has minimal production potential.
142.7.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Request consideration be given to natural gully systems in General Rural Environment and proposed Rural Lifestyle Environment. General protection, restricted land use in close proximity, restricted or controlled access, vegetation enhancement and management, erosion control.	Reject. Would be an extensive process to identify gullies, for limited development.
142.8.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		Recommend rural residential development is directed away from high class soil to align with development principles under S6A of the WRPS	Reject in part. The areas that are proposed for rural lifestyle zone are already rural lifestyle so generally already compromised in their ability to be productive.
142.9.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		WRC does not support the release or development of land protected under a land improvement agreement (LIA). However where development is required for public infrastructure a case by case approval approach can be adopted.	Noted and supported.
142.10.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks - WRC considers important to also list setbacks from water bodies, including wetlands.	Majority of water bodies already have a set back.
142.11.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks - WRC considers important to also list setbacks from water bodies, including wetlands.	Reject. Note "development" in this case is farm houses, not urban development. Also significant water bodies already have a setback.
142.12.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		Overall Subdivision - WRC notes that the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land is likely to be gazetted in the near future and may require changes to rural subdivision provisions.	Accept
142.13.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		4b.5.1 Subdivision -; General Rural Environment WRC queries if it would be appropriate to require larger than 10ha lots for subdivision on high class soils. Considering TDC does not have significant areas of high class soils, WRC considers the high-class soils should be better protected.	Reject
142.14.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks WRC considers important to also list setbacks from water bodies, including wetlands.	Majority of water bodies already have a set back.
142.15.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks WRC considers important to also list setbacks from water bodies, including wetlands.	Reject. Note "development" in this case is farm houses, not urban development. Also significant water bodies already have a setback.
142.16.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	Overall Subdivision WRC notes that the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land is likely to be gazetted in the near future and may require changes to rural subdivision provisions.	Noted
142.17.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	Consider appropriateness of larger than 10ha lots to protect any areas of high class soil.	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
142.18.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	Request protection of high class soil on lots not adjoining General Rural - consider a minimum size greater than 4ha for subdivision	Reject. Land identified as rural lifestyle already is rural lifestyle so has minimal production potential.
142.19.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment		WRC considers the subdivision rules do not adequately take account of the possibility that the potential for natural hazards on particular land may render the land entirely unsuitable for residential development, particularly when the potential effects of future climate change are also considered. We submit that: (a) Rules 4b.5.1i, 4b.5.2i, 4b.5.3i and 4b.5.6i should be changed to restricted discretionary activities; and(b) The matters over which the Council retains discretion for each rule <u>should also be modified.</u>	Natural hazards have been identified in the matters of control. Significant hazards are also mapped as an overlay or for Building Act purposes, i.e. fault lines, flooding etc.
142.20.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	Matters of control and discretion WRC considers the matters of control/discretion for the proposed controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules for subdivision should be amended to include reference to gully erosion to enable any such effects to be appropriately managed through conditions. Some recent developments have proposed to use these highly erosive gully systems for stormwater management and infrastructure.	Note the minimum lot size in the GRE is 10 Ha.
142.21.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Maybe	Building Heights - WRC notes that changes relating to the urban environment should be in alignment with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Chapter 6 of the WRPS.	Accept
142.22.	Joao Paulo Silva for Waikato Regional Council	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		WRC recommends TDC considers other areas for industrial development that would not pose a risk for local indigenous biodiversity and geothermal features. We also recommend directing industrial development away from high class soils. WRC has identified that some of the areas proposed for industrial development are within or adjoining Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) and Significant Geothermal Features (SGFs). WRC considers this is a significant issue given the risk of loss of indigenous ecosystems and geothermal features, including geothermal vegetation. In case of industrial development adjoining SNAs and SGFs there is the risk of encroachment into these <u>sensitive environments, which are irreplaceable.</u>	Reject in Part. The sites will continue to be assessed as part of the industrial land supply exercise with concerns noted.
143.1.	Jacqueline McGregor	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
143.2.	Jacqueline McGregor	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	I received the letter in regards to the district plan changes. I would like to note I am in support of the new proposed scheme. For 2 hectare blocks and minor dwellings.	Accept
144.1.	Lynne Best on behalf of Horizon Regional Council	6-General		The submitter acknowledges that the draft plan generally gives effect to the One Plan provisions, however note the following changes in relation to Rule 4b.1.9.	NA
144.2.	Lynne Best on behalf of Horizon Regional Council	6-General		The submitter acknowledges that the draft plan generally gives effect to the One Plan provisions, however notes that there is no explicit recognition in the DPD of the hierarchy of effects management set out in One Plan Policy 6-6. The submitter acknowledges that restricted discretionary rules 4b.1.8 Buildings within Outstanding Landscape Areas and 4b.9 Earthworks within Outstanding landscape Areas retain discretion to consider cumulative visual effects.	Outstanding landscape provisions have remained at status quo. This is because a comprehensive review of outstanding landscapes has not been undertaken at this stage.
144.3.	Lynne Best on behalf of Horizon Regional Council	6-General		Depending on the timing and outcome of any national direction, the submitter welcomes the opportunity to work together to address potential conflict with S75 RMA.	Noted
145.1.	Lawrence Parton	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes		Accept

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
145.2.	Lawrence Parton	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes		Accept
145.3.	Lawrence Parton	2.2-General rural environment	Yes	An arbitrary regulation of a 20m building envelope seems unnecessary as long as setbacks and other compliance matters (existing) are maintained in view of property sizes.	Reject
145.4.	Lawrence Parton	2.3-Papakainga provisions	Maybe	Anything which can free up Maori land for housing is useful as long as rules for subdivision, provision of utilities and infrastructure and rating are identical to non—Maori development.	Accept in part - Papakainga provisions are enabling maori to occupy their ancestral land as per part 2 of the RMA and in recognition of the many constraints both now and historically that impede this occupation. It also reflects the wider legal constraints placed on maori land by wider legislation
145.5.	Lawrence Parton	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	No	Land purchased in this area was valued on the possibility of subdivision. Arbitrary disenfranchisement of this "value" is unfair to existing owners. (I have no commercial interest in this.)	Reject. This is not an arbitrary decision. It is based on future growth projections, and the Mapara Valley is not required.
145.6.	Lawrence Parton	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	Yes		Accept
145.7.	Lawrence Parton	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	1. There is already widespread opposition to this proposal, exacerbated by Council's secretive approval against all advice. Extending this impact exacerbates.2. The tall buildings in this area benefit property owners only. This will create shadow zones and wind tunnels for the entire downtown area.3. Tall buildings in this environment and location will be an eyesore, detracting from the <u>ambience of our rural location.</u>	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
145.8.	Lawrence Parton	4-Residential Chapter	No	Infill housing puts unnecessary strain on existing infrastructure and benefits property owners and Council rating only. Crowded neighbourhoods are not in anybody's interest.	Reject
145.9.	Lawrence Parton	5-Industrial Environment Chapter	Yes	Development of existing peripheral land to support employment is laudable as long as it is in keeping with existing regulations.	Accept
146.1.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Maybe	With some changes to subdivision size of lots	Accept in part
146.2.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe	With changes to possible lot size. Not 2ha. Should be down to 1 acre lots as this will future proof infrastructure otherwise in 15 years time will be a real mess sorting roading and water. People wish to look after 1 acre, 2ha is not a useful unit for anyone to buy or use.	Reject
146.3.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	2.2-General rural environment	Yes		Accept
146.4.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	2.4-Mapara Valley environment	Yes	Was never a good concept from the initial planning process, not in right place and some of the main drivers for it were never possibilities e.g. the school. The WEKA subdivision removed too.	Accept
146.5.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.1-Temporary activities	No		No reasons given
146.6.	Mary Stewart on behalf of Lake View Home Trust	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2-Maximum town centre heights	No	Taupo's charm is in lower sized buildings no need for greater heights, creates sunshine and wind problems.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
147.1.	Sharni Mackintosh	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Although I am in favour of being allowed to subdivide my land situated at 750 tukairangi road, Taupo I do feel strongly that subdividing down to 2ha is of some concern. 2ha is not really enough land to be able to have some horses on and too big for most people to handle. as a real estate agent myself, I see an influx of 2ha blocks becoming available for sale and after the initial influx there will not be a market for these, due to the size being of no use to those wanting to have horses or some Stock for example. I think you should allow blocks of 4ha or more the opportunity to take off a smaller amount. As in 5010 m2 plus , maybe only one at this stage, as this will allow a family member to have a home on the block but retain the 4ha as a valuable lifestyle block going forward	There will still be a range of sizes available. Not everyone will subdivide to 2Ha, nor will everyone want a 2 Ha block.
148.1.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
148.2.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment of Objective 2.2.2 in SD 2 Freshwater quality	Accept in part - The objective was revised as per submission however with additional reference to mauri
148.3.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment of SD 4 Climate Change intro.	Accept in part - Introduction was amended in line (but not word for word) with the suggestions of the submitter.
148.4.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to 2.4.2 Objective 1, SD 4 Climate Change	Accept - Added as a new objective
148.5.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 2	Not accept - The proposed objective was not considered appropriate and the matters covered are generally covered in the wider objectives. This level of specificity was not required.
148.6.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 3	Not accept - It was not considered necessarily to provide specific examples in this instance. It is a strategic objective and that level of detail was not required. Emissions are mentioned in the intro.
148.7.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 4 Climate Change 2.4.2 Objective 5	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested objective are already covered in the wider objectives. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
148.8.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 4 Climate Change 2.4.3 Policy 5	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested policy are already covered in the wider policies. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
148.9.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.2 Objective 1	Accept in part - The changes suggested were included in the objective with a few additional amendments to ensure that the objective read correctly.
148.10.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.2 Objective 2	Not accepted
148.11.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 5 Significant and Local Infrastructure 2.5.3 Policy 4	Accept in part - the proposed policy was revised but using similar wording which will still achieve the outcomes sought by the submitter.
148.12.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 6 Natural Environmental Values 2.6.3 Policy 9	Not accept - Such matters can be considered in the development of more detailed policy at the chapter specific level.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
148.13.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 6 Natural Environmental Values 2.6.3 Policy 10	Not accept - Modified environments do not have the same level of significance to the wider district and its communities.
148.14.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	6-General		A longer longer-term outcome sought is the inclusion of a stand-alone Energy chapter within the Operative Taupo District Plan, which we consider will enhance these joint objectives.	Noted
148.15.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	6-General		Broadly speaking, enabling all existing and new Renewable Electricity Generation activities, including upgrading, will rely on objectives and policies within the drafted Strategic Issues chapter that relate to Climate Change and Energy, as well as enabling rules within the General Rural Environment, which have been set out. There are challenges with this process being only a partial plan change, which leaves some policy solutions out of scope. This includes changes to the industrial zone, geothermal provisions, EGCS overlays, which are all within the operative plan, but need to be workable within the context of the new chapters.	Noted
148.16.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b.1 Introduction	Some amendments made to intro in relation to energy.
148.18.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b.1 - Intro to the General Rural Environment	Some amendments made to intro in relation to energy.
148.20.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.2 Maintaining the established General Rural character	Reject
148.21.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.2.3 Rural industry	Accept in part. Note new definition for rural industry.
148.22.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.4 Other activities	Reject
148.23.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Insert new objective: Renewable Electricity Generation Activities and Transmission	Reject but note amendments to SD chapter.
148.24.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.2.5 Avoidance of reverse sensitivity	Accept in part
148.25.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.8 Maintaining the established character	Reject but note new definition of Rural Industry.
148.26.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.9 Residential units	Reject
148.27.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.10 Heavy Vehicle movements	Reject in part - EVMs adjusted.
148.28.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.11 Minor residential unit	Reject.
148.29.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.12 Avoiding reverse sensitivity	Reject.
148.30.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New Policy for Renewable Electricity Generation, Policy 3b.2.X	Reject.
148.31.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New note for Policy 3b.2.13 Commercial and industrial activity	Reject but note new definition of Rural Industry.
148.32.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.14 Allotment size	Reject
148.33.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.2 Avoid reverse sensitivity	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
148.34.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.3 Commercial and industrial activities	Reject
148.35.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.4 Consolidate rural lifestyle activities	Reject
148.36.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.5 Allotment sizes	Reject
148.37.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.6 Impacts on community infrastructure	Reject
148.38.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.8 Character of the Rural Lifestyle Environment	Reject. The reference to urban infrastructure is intentional. But have strengthened the concept that energy is part of the rural environment.
148.39.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.9 Setbacks for allotments adjoining the General Rural Environment	Reject. There is no need to be specific about energy generation activities.
148.40.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Delete policy 3b.3.11 Larger lot sizes for lots which adjoin the General Rural Environment	Accept
148.41.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.12 Minor residential unit	Accept in part
148.42.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.1 Activities in the General Rural Environment	Reject
148.43.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the matters of discretion for 4b.1.2 Minor residential units	Reject
148.44.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.4 Electricity Generation Core Sites and Geothermal Steamfields	Reject
148.45.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New definition: Renewable Electricity Generation means generation of electricity from renewable energy resources, including solar, wind, hydro-electricity, geothermal, biomass.	Reject - not necessary when already defined by the NPS.
148.46.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New Definition Renewable Electricity Generation Activities means the construction, operation, upgrading and maintenance of structures, buildings, equipment associated with renewable electricity generation. This includes exploration, geothermal pipelines, solar panels, batteries, storage of energy, powerhouse, hydro dams, separation plants, switchyards, intake, control and diversion structures, wells, pipes, tunnels, cables, small and community-scale distributed renewable generation activities and the system of electricity conveyance required to convey electricity to the distribution network and/or the national grid and electricity storage technologies associated with renewable electricity.	Reject - not necessary when already defined by the NPS.
148.47.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New definition: Geothermal Drilling means the construction, maintenance and upgrading of wells associated with Geothermal resource exploration or development, including drilling rigs, well pads, well tracks, well heads, well testing, drill cutting ponds, accessory buildings, structures and equipment, temporary ancillary accommodation and fencing.	Reject
148.48.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments with the Notes associated with 4b.1.4 Electricity Generation Core Sites and Geothermal Steamfields	Accept
148.49.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		New Rule: 4b.1.4X New Renewable Electricity Generation Activities The development and construction of new renewable electricity generation activities and associated structures where not otherwise provided for within the General Rural Environment, is a discretionary activity	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
148.50.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments associated with the matters of discretion for 4b.1.5 Home businesses, commercial and industrial activities	Reject
148.51.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to matters of discretion associated with 4b.1.6 Papakāinga	Reject
148.52.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.7 High voltage transmission lines	Reject - network utilities definition includes electricity generation.
148.53.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the Exceptions associated with 4b.1.8 Buildings within Outstanding Landscape Areas	Reject
148.54.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to the exceptions associated with 4b.1.9 Earthworks within Outstanding Landscape Areas	Reject
148.55.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments associated with Exception to 4b.2.1 Vehicle movements	Reject but note amendments to EVMs
148.56.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments associated with exception to 4b.2.5 Maximum building height	Reject
148.57.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.2.6 Minimum building setbacks	Reject
148.58.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to matters of discretion relating to 4b.3.2 Minor residential units	Have strengthened reverse sensitivity provisions.
148.59.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments relating to matters of discretion for 4b.3.3 Home business, commercial, and retail activities	Have strengthened reverse sensitivity provisions.
148.60.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 4b.4.5 Minor residential units	Have amended X and Y rules, and also a land use rule for minor dwellings.
148.61.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to 4b.4.7 Building setbacks	Reject. Have avoided intensification in areas X and Y. RL more than 1000m from Aratiatia. Not clear what other sites this would apply to.
148.62.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to matters of discretion relating to 4b.5.1.#	Reject
148.63.	Fraser Graafhuis on behalf of Mercury	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to matters of discretion relating to 4b.5.5 Subdivision resulting in a new public road, or extension of existing public road	Reject
149.1.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
149.2.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		The Runanga supports the objectives and policies in the tangata whenua section but suggest that the point 2.1.3.9 is amended and that relevant post-settlement governance entities should also be acknowledged and provided for within the policy section.	Accept in Part - Support is acknowledged and it is anticipated that relevant post settlement entities will be referenced within part 1 of the Plan. This section will most likely contain additional information re engagement etc with iwi
149.3.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Strategic Direction 2. The Runanga support the objective for freshwater quality but suggest that the objective be strengthened by including the need to not only enhance water quality but also protect and restore freshwater wherever possible as these actions will also improve the mauri, health and wellbeing of waterbodies and freshwater ecosystems.	Accept in part - The outcome of the submission is acknowledged however what is requested by the submitter is out of scope of the role of District Councils to achieve. The draft objective has been revised to be more consistent with the NPSUD



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
149.4.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Strategic Direction 4 - Climate Change. The Runanga appreciates the differentiation between the two types of effects on or from climate change and are pleased that the Council has recognised the level of concerns in the community regarding this issues.	Accept - Accept the premise however consider the suggested wording provided by the submitter unnecessarily restricted the application of the policy.
149.5.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Suggest amending policy 2.6.3.7 to read: "Support opportunities for tangata whenua to exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua and kaitiaki in respect of the features or landscapes when considering economic opportunities to develop their land."	Accept in part
149.6.	Michelle Phillips on behalf of Ngati Tahu-Ngati Whaoa Runanga Trust	2.2-General rural environment		The Runanga supports the changes to the rural environment chapter, especially those proposed for papakainga. The Runanga has been involved with the review of the rules regarding the development of papakainga and look forward to continuing to work with Council staff and contractors to finalise this section in the near future.	Accept
150.1.	Brigid Buckley for Contact Energy on behalf of Contact Energy	6-General		See full attached submission	NA
150.2.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		We consider that a specific objective and policy in section 2.4 is required to enable the on-going use and development of renewable energy resources in the District where they contribute towards the decarbonisation of Aotearoa / New Zealand economy, and more broadly our international commitments. It is also important that there is high-level protection of these assets and operations from potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part - Policy 2.4.3.1 is proposed to be revised to include reference to decarbonisation
150.3.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Contact supports the creation of this specific Rural Lifestyle zone that will be applied to targeted areas - which in many cases already exist. Directing rural lifestyle living to specific locations is an important tool to reduce the potential for land use conflict between incompatible activities (ie industrial land uses and housing), and therefore enabling the District to provide for its on-going economic well-being.	Accept
150.6.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		We have recommended several amendments to the General Rural and Rural Lifestyle Environments chapters which is provided as Attachment A to reflect this point.	Accept
150.7.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Contact requests that the underlying zoning of the generation component of its REG sites is updated. Contact will provide Council with the updated zonings by 30 June 2022.	Will assess when provided.
150.8.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	5-Industrial Environment Chapter		In relation to the areas shown in Figure 2 below: Contact has surface and sub-surface rights over Areas 1 and 2 which provide us with the ability to access and occupy this land; and Areas 3, 4 and 5 are owned by Contact; Contact consent area for Tauhara encompasses Area 6, and this area (in-part) contains geothermal vegetation; and Area 7 is adjacent to the proposed area being consented as part of the Wairakei development. Contact is a significant landowner in the District (refer to Attachment A for an overview of these locations), and whilst some of the identified areas in Figure 2 would not be available, some of our other sites (or parts of) might be. Contact is interested in discussing these opportunities further with Council.	Accept in part. Some of the sites will be removed from the assessment exercise, others will remain and suitably determined through the assessment process with concerns noted.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
150.9.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Proposed amendments to 3b.1 Introduction to outline reverse sensitivity.	Accept in part
150.10.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Additions to the General Rural explanation to emphasize significance of electricity generation.	Accept in part
150.11.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Additions to the introductory text to emphasize the impacts of reverse sensitivity.	Accept in part
150.12.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Additions to Objective 3b.2.2 Rural Character.	Reject
150.13.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.2.3 Rural Industry	Reject
150.14.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.2.4 Other Activities	Reject, however note new definition of Rural Industry.
150.15.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		New Objective 3b.2.X Renewable electricity generation, storage and transmission	Reject, however note amendments to SD section.
150.16.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to objective 3b.2.5 Avoidance of reverse sensitivity	Accept in part
150.17.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.8 Maintaining the established character	Reject
150.18.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.9 Residential Units	Reject
150.19.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.9 Residential Units	Reject
150.20.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.10 Heavy Vehicle Movements	Accept in part. EVMs adjusted.
150.21.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.11 Minor residential unit	Reject
150.22.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.12 Avoiding Reverse sensitivity	Reject
150.23.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.2.13 Commercial and Industrial Activity	Reject

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
150.24.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Comment on Policy 3b.2.14 - in conflict with the policy directing rural lifestyle to the RLE.	Reject. This is the current minimum lot size within the operative plan.
150.25.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments proposed to Objective 3b.3.2 Avoid Reverse Sensitivity	Reject
150.26.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Objective 3b.3.2 - Avoid Reverse sensitivity	Reject
150.27.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.3 Commercial and Industrial activities	This has been clarified through defining rural industry.
150.28.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.2 Consolidate rural lifestyle activities	Reject
150.29.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Objective 3b.3.5 Allotment sizes	Reject
150.30.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.3.8 Character of the Rural Lifestyle Environment	Reject. The reference to urban infrastructure is intentional.
150.31.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendment to Policy 3b.3.9 Setbacks for allotments adjoining the General Rural Environment	Accept in part
150.32.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Delete Policy 3b.3.11	Accept
150.33.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.3.12 Minor residential unit	Reject
150.34.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Ensure new electricity generation is anticipated and considered in the matters of discretion 4b.1.2	Reject
150.35.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Minor amendments to explanatory text for 4b.1.4	Accept
150.36.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Addition to the matters of discretion for 4b.1.5	Reject
150.37.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Contact supports the exemption of 4b.1.8 exempting electricity generation core sites.	Accept
150.38.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Addition to policy 4b.2.1 Vehicle movements	Accept in part - EVMs adjusted

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
150.39.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Contact would like to discuss the Minimum Building Setback in 4b.2.6	Had a discussion on this. At this stage no evidence on distance or a mechanism for implementing.
150.40.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to Performance Standard 4b.2.7	Reject. 100m2 was intentional.
150.41.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Contact would like to discuss the Maximum Noise Limits 4b.2.9	Reject. Based on our expert advice these noise levels are appropriate to maintain well being and also an acceptable level of amenity in the rural environment.
150.42.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.2.11 Maximum Noise - Electricity Generation Core Site	Reject. Based on our expert advice these noise levels are appropriate to maintain well being and also an acceptable level of amenity in the rural environment.
150.43.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to 4b.2.12 Maximum Noise - Well Drilling and Testing	Reject. Based on our expert advice these noise levels are appropriate to maintain well being and also an acceptable level of amenity in the rural environment.
150.44.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.13 - Contact supports the retention of 4b.2.13	Accept
150.45.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		4b.2.15 - Contact supports this exception	Accept
150.46.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Addition proposed for matters of discretion relating to 4b.3.2	Reject
150.47.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.2-General rural environment		Addition proposed for matters of discretion relating to 4b.3.3	Reject
150.48.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments proposed to 4b.4.5 Minor Residential Unit	Reject. Although some merit to this idea, have no evidence for a distance and also well sites are not mapped.
150.49.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Amendments proposed to 4b.4.7 Building Setbacks	Reject. Although some merit to this idea, have no evidence for a distance and also well sites are not mapped.
150.50.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Addition proposed for matters of discretion relating to 4b.5.5	Reject
150.51.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Addition to the matters of discretion for 4b.5.6	Reject but other amendments made to reflect this point.
150.52.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		The Centennial Drive RLE is deleted in its entirety.	Reject but amendments made to area x and y rule re intensification.
150.53.	Brigid Buckley on behalf of Contact Energy	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Request further discussion regarding the extent of the RLE zoning and the associated development controls at Bonshaw Park, Tukairangi Rd and Oruanui Rd.	Accept - further discussions held.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
151.1.	Sue Lake	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Maybe		Accept
151.2.	Sue Lake	2.2-General rural environment	Maybe	There are some changes I agree with but others I don't e.g. subdividing into 2 hectares is NOT something I would like to see happen. I have concerns re water supply and infrastructure for White Road.	Water supply would need to be addressed at subdivision. Seeking further advice on traffic effects.
151.3.	Sue Lake	6-General		See full submission attached	NA
151.4.	Sue Lake	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		There are some changes I agree with but others I don't eg subdividing into 2 hectares is not something I would like to see happen.. I have concerns re water supply and infrastructure for White Rd	Concerns noted. Water will need to be addressed at subdivision. Seeking further advice on traffic.
152.1.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
152.2.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments proposed to 3b.1 Introduction	Reject in part. Some additions to reflect importance of energy.
152.3.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment proposed to the General Rural Environment introduction.	Reject in part. Some additions to reflect importance of energy.
152.4.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment proposed to 3b.2.2 Maintaining the established General Rural Character	Reject in part. Some additions to reflect importance of energy.
152.5.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments proposed to 3b.2.3	Reject. This objective links to subdivision rules for the GRE.
152.6.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments proposed to 3b.2.4 Other Activities	Reject. However note new definition for rural industry.
152.7.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments proposed to 3b.2.5 Avoidance of Reverse Sensitivity	Accept in part
152.8.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.8 Maintaining the established character	Reject but note new definition of Rural Industry.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
152.9.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Policy 3b.2.12 Avoiding Reverse Sensitivity	Reject.
152.10.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 3b.2.13 Commercial and Industrial activity	Reject, however note new definition of Rural Industry.
152.11.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		New policy 3b.2.X	Reject but note changes to SD chapter re renewable electricity generation.
152.12.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendment to 4b.1.1 Activities in the General Rural Environment	Reject. Reference to District wide performance standards important.
152.13.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.4 Electricity Generation Core Sites and Geothermal Steam Fields	Accept
152.14.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		New rule proposed to New Renewable Electricity Generation Activities	Reject.
152.15.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.7 High Voltage Transmission Lines	Reject but note new definition of Rural Industry.
152.16.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments proposed to 4b.1.8 Buildings within Outstanding Landscapes	Reject.
152.17.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.1.9 Earthworks within Outstanding Landscape Areas	Reject
152.18.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to 4b.2.1 Vehicle movements	Accept in part. EVMs adjusted.
152.19.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	2.2-General rural environment		Amendments to Minimum building setbacks 4b.2.6	At this stage no evidence on distance or a mechanism for implementing.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
152.20.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to objective 2.2.2	Accept in part - The objective was revised as per submission however with additional reference to mauri
152.21.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to SD 4 - Climate Change introduction	Accept in part - Introduction was amended in line (but not word for word) with the suggestions of the submitter.
152.22.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Objective 2.4.2 (1)	Accept - Added as a new objective
152.23.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Objective 2.4.2 (2)	Not accept - The proposed objective was not considered appropriate and the matters covered are generally covered in the wider objectives. This level of specificity was not required.
152.24.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to objective 2.4.2 (3)	Not accept - It was not considered necessarily to provide specific examples in this instance. It is a strategic objective and that level of detail was not required. Emissions are mentioned in the intro.
152.25.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to objective 2.4.2 (5)	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested objective are already covered in the wider objectives. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
152.26.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Policy 2.4.3 (5)	Not accept - It is considered that the matters raised in the suggested policy are already covered in the wider policies. The matters are also covered in the infrastructure provisions and do not need to be raised multiple times.
152.27.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Objective 2.5.2 (1)	Accept in part - The changes suggested were included in the objective with a few additional amendments to ensure that the objective read correctly.
152.28.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Objective 2.5.2(2)	Not accepted - It was considered that the draft provisions better reflected the act and enabled all situations to be considered on a case by case basis. Increased was not considered appropriate as there may be opportunities for efficiency gains in existing activities which may lead to better outcomes than increasing activities.
152.29.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendment to Objective 2.5.3 (4)	Accept in part - the proposed policy was revised but using similar wording which will still achieve the outcomes sought by the submitter.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
152.30.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Additional Policy 9 in 2.6.3	Not accept - Such matters can be considered in the development of more detailed policy at the chapter specific level.
152.31.	Shelby Macfarlane-Hill on behalf of Manawa Energy Limited	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Additional Policy 10 in 2.6.3	Not accept - Modified environments do not have the same level of significance to the wider district and its communities.
153.1.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
153.2.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	TLC support Policy 2.3.3 of the released draft chapter as it provides a strong, clear message in relation to the adverse effects of urban fragmentation on critical infrastructure networks. In particular TLC seek that sub-clauses 3 and 4 are retained.	Accept
153.3.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	1-Strategic Directions Chapter	Yes	Sub-clause 9 of draft Policy 2.3.3 is also supported by TLC as it relates to subdivision and development, and the potential adverse effect on reverse sensitivity. Much of TLC's sub-transmission network traverses rural environments and therefore can lend such Regionally Significant Infrastructure to complaints over visual and acoustic effects from the subdivision of rural farm holdings (particularly in to rural/residential allotments).	Accept
153.4.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		TLC seek that Section 2.4 explicitly references the uptake in EV usage (as an example of addressing climate change), and furthermore the section correlates this uptake with the importance of a safe and secure supply of electricity.	Accept - This is more of a detailed method which is better located in the specific chapters of the DP
153.5.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Section 2.5 is a key section to TLC and their core business. TLC is pleased to see the wording contained within the sections preamble:Infrastructure is critical to the social and economic wellbeing of people and communities, including providing for their health and safety. and has national, regional and local benefits. However, inappropriatelylocated or designed land use activities can adverselyaffect the safe and effective functioning of significant and locally important infrastructure. As indicated above, TLCs infrastructure is from not only economic and social wellbeing perspective, but also the role it serves as a Lifeline Utility. TLC contends that the above statement is appropriate to introduce Section 2.5; however, for the sake of consistency with other local-level planning documents - the term Regionally Significant Infrastructure should be included instead of just significant .... infrastructure. Objective 2.5.2 and Policy 2.5.3 also used the words " significant and local infrastructure". Following on from the comments above, TLC consider that the term " Regionally Significant Infrastructure' is included	Accept - revise to include reference to regionally significant infrastructure
153.6.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	2.2-General rural environment		TLC is of the opinion that the Objective 3b.2.5 adequately identifies the importance of managing the actual or potential effects of reverse sensitivity; however TLC consider that the words 'or lawfully established' is included to take into account such physical environmental features such as the districts sub transmission lines which are common place within and across the Districts rural zones.	Accept in part



Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
153.7.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	2.2-General rural environment		Objective 3b.2.6. TLC is generally supportive - in principle - of the intent behind this objective. Whilst, by its very nature, the objective is a high-level statement, the important message being presented is that network capacity, NZECP 34 compliance and even reverse sensitivity adverse effects are managed. TLC considers that the words "... are managed" in isolation are weak as there is no emphasis placed on how, or to what extent such impacts are to be managed. TLC feel that a <u>qualifying word such as "effectively" or "satisfactorily" is included.</u>	Reject.
153.8.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	2.2-General rural environment		TLC seek that terminology (within the definitions section of the final TPDP draft) clearly identifies both the National Grid, as well as TLC's sub—transmission network (the TLC sub transmission network contains both 11kV and 33kV — both of which are 'high voltage' for the purpose of Rule 4b.1.7). The final draft of TPDP will be required to address National Grid 'yard' and 'corridor' setbacks as required under the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission. These comments would <u>also apply to Draft Rule 4b.3.7</u>	Noted.
153.9.	Tim Lester for Edison Consulting Group on behalf of The Lines Company	2.2-General rural environment		Rule 4b.4.15 relates to noise standards that are directly applicable to TLC assets and operations. TLC request this rule be amended to relate to the closest facade to a habitable room of the nearest dwelling. Additionally a minor error is noted in that there is no Rule 4a.4.12 in Chapter 3b of the draft TPDP.	Reject
154.1.	Diane Hamer	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
154.2.	Diane Hamer	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment	Yes	Supports the changes for subdivision from 10ha to 2ha.	Accept
155.1.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	6-General		See attached full submission	NA
155.2.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Amendments sought to Urban form and development. To make sure our urban development occurs in a planned and efficient manner through the promotion of brownfield development. This means it doesn't cost our community more than it needs to when building infrastructure, in particular for drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation.	Not accepted - TD2050 has established the direction for development in the district. This includes both greenfield and brownfield development. As such it is not appropriate to make the change suggested by the submitter.
155.3.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		The important of the Town Centre as a mixed use area, which includes residential activities while also being the primary commercial, retail, recreational, cultural and entertainment centres for Taupo District are recognised in land use planning and decision making.	Accept
155.4.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Objective 2.3.2.5 Kainga Ora considers protective language such as 'detract' to be limiting of new or alternative housing developments and higher densities. Moreover, it does not enable change to take place through requiring the status quo to be maintained.	Accept - update the plan to refer to planned urban built form instead of amenity to ensure that development is guided by the plan and not existing land uses where they differ.
155.5.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Policy 2.3.3.5 Kainga Ora generally supports this policy and recognises the need to provide for the social outcomes of the local community, this includes more affordable housing choice to cater for the growing population of Taupo.	Accept - No response required
155.6.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Policy 2.3.3.6 Kainga Ora generally supports this policy in part. Papakainga should not be restricted to Maori Land only and should be provided as a mechanism for development within urban areas also.	Accept in part - In this situation Papakāinga is restricted to Māori land as a way to ensure that the council is meeting its duties under the act in respect to enabling the occupation of ancestral land by Māori. It is anticipated that this will be extended to urban areas as those sections of the plan are reviewed.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
155.7.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Policy 2.3.3.7 Maintain Strong boundaries to the town centre to consolidate and intensify retail, commercial and office activities within the city centre and protect the amenity of residential neighbourhoods maintain a level of amenity that is reflective of the planned built environment.	Accept - Note that this submission supports the policy and have revised the policy to ensure consistency with the NPSUD as it relates to planned urban form.
155.8.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	1-Strategic Directions Chapter		Policy 2.3.3.8 Restrict the location and development of retail and commercial activities within non—commercial areas of the district to ensure that the town centre continue to be the districts pre—eminent retail, commercial and mixed used centres.	Accept - Note that this submission supports the policy and have revised the policy to ensure consistency with the changes made to the town centre heights to enable residential uses in upper stories.
155.9.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	4-Residential Chapter		4a.1.1. Kainga Ora supports the increase of the maximum residential building coverage from 30% to 35%. However Kainga Ora considers that 40% building coverage will be more appropriate for residential development moving forward, as this will provide for more development potential on a site, further housing typologies and efficient use of land.	Accept
155.10.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights		Review and increase the height limits when the Turangi town centre review is completed in the future. A 12m limit is suggested to be in line with the Taupo Town Centre height limit.	Accept
155.11.	Andrew Hill on behalf of Kainga Ora	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	Yes	Increase all of the Taupo Town Centre height limit to 12m and retain the proposed 18m height limit area.	Accept
156.1.	Pippa Mules	3-Town Centre Chapter > 3.2- Maximum town centre heights	No	I do not want any change to do with size of houses either in height nor on land. Taupo is unique and we do not want to turn into a Hawaii, or any other resort place. This is the New Zealand way and we do not want these wealthy property developers coming in and ruining our wonderful community for their back pockets. It Will become an irreversible disaster. Please, I have lived here since 1979, our views will be destroyed and hatred for council will be enormous.	Reject. The potential benefits associated with the proposed change of height limits over the subject blocks are considered to significantly outweigh any potential costs.
157.1.	Douglas Wallace	2.1-Rural lifestyle environment		Would like property on Tukairangi Rd to not be rural lifestyle due to reverse sensitivity issues with neighbouring properties.	Accept
158.1.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Allow additional lots down to 4 hectares to be created as a controlled activity in the proposed General Rural zone where clusters of smaller lifestyle lots are adjacent to portions of one or more boundaries with George Muirs property	Reject. No rationale is provided here for why this property is any different from other larger properties.
158.2.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Change 4b.2.5 minimum setback - 15 m from all boundaries to 20m. General Rural zones need to protect the associated rural amenity values, one of those being open space.	Reject. It is not anticipated the 5 metres from the boundary will make a material difference.
158.3.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Change the 300 metres for building of farmed animals to 100m. This proposal is impractical and contrary to providing for the practical needs of rural industries related to farming on the larger lots in the General Rural zones.	Accept in part. Have reduced the setback requirement to 200m.
158.4.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Change minor dwelling from 100 m2 to 150m2 including garage. In order to support and enhance the productive potential of rural industries, minor dwellings in the proposed General Rural Area are needed to house staff which may well exceed 1 or 2 people and a house of 100m2 including a garage is totally inadequate for housing more than 2 people especially a married couple with a child or 2. The alternative of having to build a larger house and garage is prohibitively expensive and unnecessary	Reject. For larger farms who require staff they can build a normal house (or a smaller house) at the density of 1 per 10 Ha. They are not restricted to a minor dwelling due to the size of their land.

Sub.Poi nt No	Submitter	Category	Support?	Summary	Response
158.5.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Change minor dwelling from 20 metres from primary residence to 100 m. This is contrary to preserving openness and privacy for owners, managers and staff of large lots in the proposed General Rural zone. Having staff with associated vehicle and people noise living within 20 metres of a homestead or main dwelling becomes unbearable and intrusive for both parties, any farm owner/manager will vouch for that. It is economically prohibitive to expect the landowner to build another main residence to accommodate 2 to 4 staff members and their vehicles in order to have a comfortable distance between them. These arbitrary rules of having staff accommodation very close to the main house are due to Councils mindset that minor dwellings are built in order to pursue subdivision without considering the bad effects of forcing staff and employers/managers into socially unhealthy close confines.	Reject - see above.
158.6.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Do not require minor dwellings to share a driveway with primary residential unit. This isn't practical where the driveway is winding and narrow with visibility issues, especially if council insists on using the 20 metre rule. Some rural driveways are in places where its costly and impractical to attempt widening and or straightening bends. If it can't be included as a permitted activity, then at least make it an activity that doesn't require neighbours consent on unreasonable grounds.	Reject. There is the opportunity to apply for consent if the dwelling is proposed to be further from the primary dwelling.
158.7.	Sue Muir	2.2-General rural environment		Caravans and other structures used for accommodation for more than two consecutive months in a calendar year on the allotment to be exempted from this note or any similar plan changes. It's too restrictive for when farmers and foresters may need to accommodate extra temporary staff including RSE workers in a caravan or another accommodation structure used for more than two months esp. when planting, harvesting or pruning large forestry lots or fencing during the drier seasons, milking cows and calving during milking season, harvesting and husbandry in orchards and nurseries and many other types of temporary work.	Reject. The caravan etc fits under the minor dwelling definition. If this wasn't included then any landowner could put multiple caravans on their property to house workers etc on a permanent basis. Very temporary (less than two months) is excluded so will not be caught by the rule.