

CONTENTS

Residential	4	4.27	Residential Rules: General (Classification of Permitted Activities that fail Conditions).....	21	
4.1	Amalgamation of Residential Medium and High Zones.....	4	4.28	Residential Rules: RE3.1 Rule Statement	22
4.2	National Park - Density.....	5	4.29	Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Visitor Accommodation	22
4.3	Rezoning of Land at Ward Street	7	4.30	Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Residential Care Activity and Associated Definition	23
4.4	Owhango - Density.....	7	4.31	Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Fire Stations.....	24
4.5	Rangataua - Density.....	9	4.32	Residential Rules: RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Affected Parties and Notification)	25
4.6	Ohakune - Density.....	11	4.33	Residential Rules: RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities.....	26
4.7	Land between Snowmass and Rochfort Park	11	4.34	Residential Rules: RE3.3.2 Density	27
4.8	Residential Policy: General	12	4.35	Residential Rules: RE3.3.1 Site Coverage	27
4.9	Residential Policy: RE2.1 Introduction	12	4.36	Residential Rules: RE3.3.2 Residential Density	28
4.10	Residential Policy: RE2.2 Quality of the Environment.....	12	4.37	Residential Rules: RE3.3.3 Height.....	28
4.11	Residential Policy: RE2.2.1 Outcome	13	4.38	Residential Rules: RE3.3.4 Fence and Wall Height for National Park	29
4.12	Residential Policy: RE2.2.2 Objective	13	4.39	Residential Rules: RE3.3.5 Yards	30
4.13	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3 Policy	14	4.40	Residential Rules: RE3.3.6 Open Space	32
4.14	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(e) Views of Tongariro National Park	14	4.41	Residential Rules: RE3.3.7 Noise.....	33
4.15	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3 (f) Energy	14	4.43	Residential Rules: RE3.3.9 Lighting and Glare.....	33
4.16	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(h) Area Specific Policies	15	4.44	Residential Rules: RE3.3.12 Windows in Dwellings	33
4.17	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(i) and (j) Safety.....	15	4.45	Residential Rules: RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street	34
4.18	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(k) Comprehensive Residential Development	16	4.46	Residential Rules: RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation	37
4.19	General: Landscaping Policy (National Park).....	17	4.47	Residential Rules: RE3.4.3 Healthcare Services	39
4.20	Residential Policy: Air Quality	17	4.48	Residential Rules: RE3.4.6 Earthworks Activities.....	39
4.21	Residential Policy: RE2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies.....	18			
4.22	Residential Policy: RE2.3 Impact on Infrastructure	18			
4.23	Residential Policy: RE2.4 Consolidation of Residential Areas	19			
4.24	Residential Policy: RE2.5 Non-Residential Uses	20			
4.25	Subdivision Policy - SU2.4.3 General Submissions	20			
4.26	Subdivision Policy - SU2.4.3(f) Solar Gain	20			





4.49 Residential Rules: RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development 40

4.50 Residential Rules: RE3.5.1 Assessment Criteria 43

4.51 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1, SU3.3.1.1 and SU3.3.1.2 44

4.52 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.2 Discretionary Activities 44

4.53 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.3 Non-Complying Activities 44

4.54 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.3(d) Non-Complying Activities 45

4.55 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.2 Transportation 45

4.56 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.3 Electricity and Telecommunications 45

4.57 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.3 Stormwater 46

4.58 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria 47

4.59 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria 47

4.60 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria 47

4.61 Definitions: Boundary Adjustments 49

4.62 Definitions: Height 49

4.63 Definitions: Notional Boundary 50

4.64 Definitions: Residential Activity 50

4.65 Definitions: Site Coverage 50

4.66 Definitions: Visitor Accommodation 51

4.67 Definitions: Yards 52

4.68 Unit Titles 52

4.69 Definitions General 54

4.70 Definitions General 55

4.71 Information Requirements 55

4.72 Information Requirements 55

RESIDENTIAL LOW TO RURAL ZONE..... 57

4.1 Rezoning of Residential Low to Rural Zone 57

RELOCATED BUILDINGS 58

4.1 Entire Chapters 58

4.2 Definitions: Relocated Building 58

4.3 Relocation within a site, removal and demolition 59

4.4 Policy RB2.3.3 (a) Rural Buildings 60

4.5 Policy RB2.3.3(b) Orientation of Buildings 60

4.6 General Comments 60

4.7 Rules: Insulation Requirements 60

4.8 Rules: Amenity Values 61

4.9 Rules: Connections to Foundations 63

4.10 RB3.2.1 Written Approvals 63

4.11 RB3.2.1 Activity Status 64

4.12 Status: Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary 64

4.13 Restrictive Covenants 65

Administrative Changes 65

URBAN SETTLEMENT..... 67

4.1 Objectives and Policies – General 67

4.2 Fire Stations 67

4.3 Subdivision: Urban Settlement Zone (SU3.6.2.2) 69

FUTURE URBAN 70

4.1 Future Urban Area: General 70

4.2 Future Urban Area: RU3.3.9 Rural Rules regarding Future Urban 70

4.3 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5 71

4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5 72

4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5 78

Introduction

This document outlines the Commissioners recommended changes to the Proposed Changes to the Ruapehu District Plan (notified June 2010). It also contains the key reasons for these recommended amendments.

This document addresses the following chapters:

- Residential Low – Rural
- Relocated
- Urban Settlement
- Future Urban

Complete Wording of Provisions is provided in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*

Please note, recommended changes may be addressed in a number of different sections of this and the accompanying documents. To see a complete version of any individual changes see the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*.

Principle Document

Every effort has been taken to ensure that the amendments to the plan change text are identical in both this document and the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*. However, should there be any inconsistencies between the two documents, the wording in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)* will be taken as the correct wording.

Numbering Inconsistencies

Due to changes in numbering as a result of submissions we have tended to use the original numbers given to provisions when the Plan Change was notified in this document (however there are examples where the amended reference numbers have been used). However, amended numbers are used in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*.





Residential

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Amalgamation of Residential Medium and High Zones			
<p>No changes recommended</p>	<p>Reasons for Recommendation The amalgamation of Residential High and Medium Zones will result in better planning outcomes for the community, and over the longer term will result in a simplified planning framework.</p>	<p>David Holland (9.1/9.7) accepted Peter Parkinson (13.1) rejected Stephen Taylor (14.1) rejected VJ & TH Holgar (16.1) rejected Darryl Coombs (30.1) accepted Turoa Village Residents Association (31.1) accepted in part Earl Rutherford and Brenda Solon (41.1) accepted Ian & Christine Boniface (87.1) accepted Tauranga Ski Club (95.1) rejected Cheal Consultants 171.7) accepted Peter Daily (198.1) accepted Winstone Pulp International (222.1) accepted Ken Detman (229.1) rejected CC & NM Gebbie Ltd (235.1) rejected Ruapehu Propertyies.com Ltd (236.1) rejected AJ Learmouth (237.5) rejected CH & MC Scott Property Trust (266.1) accepted A&T Therklson (319.1) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence & Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.23&40) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (FS1078.23&40) accepted Allan Bonnici& Sandre McInnes (FS1079.23&40) accepted Robert & Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.23&40)</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Amalgamation of Residential Medium and High Zones			
		accepted Traey Haszard & Phil Sargeant (FS1081.23&40) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 National Park - Density			
No changes recommended	<p>The proposed density for National Park will enable continued growth within the township, while protecting residential character and amenity. Experience with development to date has resulted in community concerns over amenity outcomes in part because of the shape of sites combined with street layout.</p> <p>National Park has a very high water table. 600m2 enables storm water issues to be addressed on site. The comprehensive residential development assessment criteria specifically allow for the mitigation for the storm water issue.</p> <p>Within National Park many of the sites are long and narrow. Amalgamation of these sites for comprehensive residential development is likely to provide for development in keeping with the character of the village.</p>	<p>Graham & Lynne Silvester (3.1) rejected David Burke (33.1) rejected DN Scott (37.1) accepted Earl Rutherford and Brenda Solon (41.2) rejected Lucy Abel (43.1) rejected EC Forch & DL Cunningham (44.2) rejected Kyla Joy Nitschke (45.1) rejected NPVPAI (46.1) accepted Laurence Abel (48.1) rejected Julie Forsyth (49.1) rejected Peter Boomen & Fiona MacDonald (51.1) rejected Mark Nothin & Brett Merrick (68.1) rejected Trevor & Susan Butler (81.1) rejected GA&AC List (82.1) rejected Tauranga Ski Club (95.6) rejected Teina Taylor (103.1&2) rejected Brian Taylor (104.1&2) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (106.18) accepted Robert & Nicolette Brodnax (107.18) accepted Terrence & Moyrene Patterson (108.18) accepted Kent Forsyth (110.1) rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.2 National Park - Density</p>		<p>Dave & Dale Webb (123.1) rejected Traey Haszard & Phil Sargeant (125.18) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandre McInnes (130.18) accepted Joshua J Briscoe (135.1) rejected ME Peggy Shelbourne (139.12) accepted Soloman Briscoe (146.1) rejected Nina Manning (153.1) rejected Graham & Lynne Silvester (163.1) rejected Rhys & Deanna Forsyth (164.1) rejected Cheal Consultants Ltd (171.20) rejected Chris Gebbie (235.2) accepted Ruapehu Propyies.com Ltd (236.2) accepted Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (257.1) CR&LB Baker (272.1) rejected Plateau Surveyors (315.1) rejected Robert & Shona Forbes (275.1) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS1048.10 re: 46.1& FS1048.14 re: 315.1) rejected Terrence & Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.23, .40 & .42 re: 275.2) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (FS1078.23, 40, .42 re: 275.2) accepted Allan Bonnici& Sandre McInnes (FS1079.23, 40 & .42 re: 275.2) accepted Robert & Nicolette Brodnax (FS1078.23, 40, .42 re: 275.2) accepted Tracey Haszard & Phil Sargeant (FS1078.23, .40 &.42 re: 275.2) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 National Park - Density			
		Pukenui Lodge & Ruapehu Prop Ltd (FS 1064.10 re: 139.12) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.3 Rezoning of Land at Ward Street			
No changes recommended	The submission is in support of the proposed rezoning of this land, and it represents an easy, logical extension to the urban and residential areas.	A J Learmouth (237.4) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Owhango - Density			
Amend the Residential Subdivision Rules as follows: <u>SU3.3.1.1 Controlled Activities</u> (d) Any subdivision within National Park, Raetihi, and Owhango resulting in a minimum lot size of 600m ² (net site area) provided the site complies with the General Conditions outlined in section SU3.3.2. <u>SU3.3.1.2 Discretionary Activities</u> (a) Any subdivision within Owhango resulting in a minimum lot size of 600m ² (net site area).	The amendments will clarify the subdivision rules for Owhango, recognising the infrastructural constraints; and will ensure that the density conditions align with the subdivision rules.	David Watts (No. 114.1) accepted in part Horizons Regional Council (280.17) accepted in part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Owhango - Density			
<p>Relevant Objectives and Policies: <u>SU2.4, RE2.2, RE2.3</u> Amend the Residential Rules as follows:</p> <p>RE3.3.2 Residential Density</p> <p>In National Park, <u>and</u> Raetihi, <u>and</u> Owhango:</p> <p>(a) The maximum density on any one site shall be one dwelling or the equivalent per 600m² of net site area.</p> <p><u>In Owhango</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The maximum number of dwellings per site shall be one.</u></p> <p><u>Except:</u></p> <p>(b) <u>One dwelling may be erected on any site existing on (date of Council decision on Proposed Plan) that is less than 600m² in net site area.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>In this context “existing sites” includes sites approved under Section 11 of the Act where the Council’s subdivision consent has not lapsed.</u></p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RE3.5.1(a) (ii), (iii), and (v) and (xviii).</p> <p>RE3.5.1(a) (xviii) <u>In Owhango, whether sufficient open space has</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Owhango - Density			
<u>been provided as part of the development in order to provide adequately for on-site domestic wastewater disposal.</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.5 Rangataua - Density			
<p><i>Amend as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.3.2 Residential Density</p> <p>In Taumarunui, Ohakune, Rangataua, and Waiouru:</p> <p>(a) The maximum density on any one site shall be one dwelling or the equivalent per 450m² of net site area.</p> <p>In National Park, Raetihi, <u>Rangataua</u>, and Owhango:</p> <p>(b) The maximum density on any one site shall be one dwelling or the equivalent per 600m² of net site area.</p> <p>SU 3.3.1.3 Non- Complying Activities</p> <p>(b) Any subdivision within any other Residential Zone within Taumarunui, Ohakune, Rangataua or Waiouru that cannot comply with the minimum lot size requirement of 450m² (net site area)</p> <p>(c) Any subdivision within any other</p>	<p>The proposed amendment to the density provisions for Rangataua will avoid additional pressure being placed on infrastructure within Rangataua, while protecting the existing character and amenity.</p> <p>As a consequential change, it is recommended that the Servicing Condition (SU3.3.2.3) is amended to delete the reference to provision of water. As currently worded this Condition would make all subdivision in Rangataua a Discretionary Activity as there is no public water supply (the change would not affect any other Residential Areas). The provision of potable water to a dwelling can be adequately addressed through a condition of consent, and as such, there is no need to alter the consent category to address.</p>	<p>ERJ Pridham (2.1) rejected Ann Stuckley (12.1) accepted J & M Breen (55.1) accepted in part Richard Hoadley (66.13) accepted Ewen Patience (286.1) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.5 Rangataua - Density</p>			
<p>Residential Zone within National Park, Raetihi, <u>Rangataua</u> and Owahano that cannot comply with the minimum lot size of 600m² (net site area)</p> <p><i>Insert the following policy under RE2.2.3(i)(v)</i></p> <p><u>'To retain the low density, 'bachy' character of Rangataua, and to recognise the infrastructural constraints'.</u></p> <p><i>Amend the explanation to the RE2.2.3.1 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Rangataua</u> <u>Rangataua is a small settlement to the east of Ohakune, originally developed around the railways. Much of the housing within Rangataua is used as holiday homes, and the character of the township reflects this.</u></p> <p><i>And delete all references to Rangataua in the description relating to Ohakune.</i></p> <p>Amend SU3.3.1.1 Controlled Activities as follows:</p> <p>(c) Any subdivision within Taumarunui, Ohakune, <u>Rangataua</u>, and Waiouru resulting in a minimum lot size of 450m² (net site area) provided the site complies with the General Conditions outlined in section SU3.3.2.</p> <p>(d) Any subdivision within National Park, Raetihi, and <u>Rangataua</u> resulting in a minimum lot size of 600m² (net site area) provided the site</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.5 Rangataua - Density			
<p>complies with the General Conditions outlined in section SU3.3.2.</p> <p>SU3.3.2.3 <u>Servicing</u> (a) All sites shall have a reticulated water, sewerage and stormwater system contiguous, or passing through the site, that can be connected with to provide water, sewerage and stormwater services to the site.</p> <p><i>(Note: other changes are proposed to these provisions, e.g. under section 4.4. above)</i></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.6 Ohakune - Density			
No changes recommended	The 450m2 minimum lot size enables the subdivision of larger traditional allotments i.e. 1012m2 sites. Reducing this down to 400m2 would enable the subdivision of smaller sites, where residential amenity would have a greater potential to be compromised.	Vivien Pohl (219.3) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.7 Land between Snowmass and Rochfort Park			
No changes recommended	The rezoning of this site to Residential will provide a greenfields site in close proximity to central Ohakune, with good access to infrastructure, roading and open space.	David Holland (9.9) accepted Turoa Village Residents Association (31.3) accepted in part. Richard Hoadley (66.10) rejected. JC Simpson (194.2) rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.8 Residential Policy: General			
No changes recommended	The submitter supports the proposed Residential Zone Objectives and Policies.	David Holland (9.10) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.9 Residential Policy: RE2.1 Introduction			
No changes recommended	The submitters support the proposed Introduction to the Residential Policies.	Mighty River Power (75.11) accepted NZTA (208.3) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.10 Residential Policy: RE2.2 Quality of the Environment			
Add the following to RE2.2.3(i)(vi) <u>To recognise the character and function of Turoa Village as a small residential scale ski village made up of predominantly holiday homes and ski lodges, surrounded by substantial open space.</u>	The proposed policy is intended to recognise the character and function of Turoa Village.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.3) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.3) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.3) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.3) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.3) accepted in part Ngauruhoe Ski Club Inc (134.1) accepted in part Turoa Village Residents Association (1089.9) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.11 Residential Policy: RE2.2.1 Outcome			
<p><i>Add the following to RE2.2.2 Objective:</i></p> <p><u>'A residential environment that is consistent with the character of the surrounding residential and natural environment and provides amenity that enhances the social and cultural wellbeing of the community.'</u></p>	<p>The proposed Objective links the character of the surrounding urban and broader natural environment, and also places emphasis on social and cultural wellbeing. This goal is supported.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.4) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.4) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.4) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.4) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.4) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS 1048.1) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.12 Residential Policy: RE2.2.2 Objective			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>The proposed objective implies a greater level of control over development than Council is proposing to adopt.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.5) rejected Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.5) rejected Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.5) rejected Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.5) rejected Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.5) rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.13 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3 Policy			
<p><i>Amend RE2.2.3(c) as follows:</i></p> <p>To avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of unreasonable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Noise (ii) Dust; (iii) Odour; and (iv) Glare; and (v) <u>Traffic and Parking</u> 	<p>The recommended amendment recognises the potential for traffic and parking to have adverse effects on residential amenity.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.6) accepted</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.6) accepted</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.6) accepted</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.6) accepted</p> <p>Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.6) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>Teina Taylor (FS 1048.2) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.14 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(e) Views of Tongariro National Park			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>The plan change provides some protection where trees are planted, for example, as a shelterbelt in a Residential Area. However, the plan change provides no protection from individual trees blocking views.</p>	<p>Graeme Wheadon (96.1) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.15 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3 (f) Energy			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>The submitters support the proposed policy.</p>	<p>Mighty River Power (75.12) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (FS. 1046.27) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.16 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(h) Area Specific Policies			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	<p>The proposed density for National Park will enable continued growth within the township, while protecting residential character and amenity. Experience with development to date has resulted in community concerns over amenity outcomes in part because of the shape of the sites combined with the street layout.</p> <p>National Park has a very high water table. 600m² enables storm water issues to be addressed on site. The comprehensive residential development assessment criteria specifically allow for the mitigation for the storm water issue.</p> <p>Within National Park many of the sites are long and narrow. Amalgamation of these sites for comprehensive residential development is likely to provide for development more in keeping with the character of the village.</p>	<p>Tauranga Ski Club (95.2) rejected</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.24) accepted</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (FS1081.24) accepted</p> <p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.24) accepted</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.24) accepted</p> <p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (FS1078.24) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.17 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(i) and (j) Safety			
<p><i>Add the following to Transport Chapter – Policy RT2.2.3(e)</i></p> <p><u>To ensure the impact of any proposal on the transportation network and adverse environmental effects, including safety are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></p> <p><i>Add the following to RE2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies (last paragraph):</i></p>	<p>The Road Transport Chapter provides a general policy to address the concerns raised by the submitters.</p> <p>The additional text relating to the CPTED principles has been proposed as an administrative change simply to provide additional information to plan users.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.6) accepted in part</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.6) accepted in part</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.6) accepted in part</p> <p>Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.6) accepted in part</p> <p>Cheal Consultants (171.5) accepted</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.17 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(i) and (j) Safety			
<p><u>Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Policies (i) and (j) relate to the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Principles (CPTED). These principles are based on the concept that the proper design and effective use of the built environment can reduce crime, reduce the fear of crime, and improve the quality of life. The three most common built environment strategies are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Strategic oversight, for example, designing streets to increase pedestrian and bicycle traffic; placing windows to overlook footpaths and parking lots; use of low fencing, and ensuring appropriate lighting.</u> • <u>Natural access control, for example, planting thorny bushes beneath ground level windows</u> • <u>Open invitations to public use, for example, putting public seating in public areas and encouraging the use of public spaces.</u> 		<p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.6) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS. 1048.3) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(k) Comprehensive Residential Development			
<p>Amend Policy RE2.2.3 as follows:</p> <p>(k) To encourage and provide for higher density development on larger allotments, to allow for the efficient use of land and infrastructure, and provide for greater choice of housing, if the development is designed to:</p> <p>(i) Integrate with, or enhance, the character of the area;</p> <p>(ii) Ensure the amenity of the surrounding area is maintained, <u>including the overlooking of adjoining properties is minimised;</u></p>	<p>Comprehensive Residential Development is likely to result in a higher density of development thereby having a greater potential to affect adjoining properties through overlooking. The proposed amendments to the policy will provide specific guidance to ensure this issue is considered as part of the consent process.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.9) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.9) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.9) accepted in part Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.9) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.9) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3(k) Comprehensive Residential Development			
<i>An identical change is also recommended to the same policy in the Subdivision Chapter.</i>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.19 General: Landscaping Policy (National Park)			
No changes recommended	It is considered the existing provisions adequately address landscaping.	Chris Gebbie (235.20) rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.20 Residential Policy: Air Quality			
<p><i>Amend RE2.2.3 as follows:</i></p> <p><u>(g)To encourage improvements in air quality within Taumarunui through non-regulatory measures, including the use of home insulation and heating appliances that do not cause air pollution.</u></p> <p><i>And to add the following to RE 2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies:</i></p> <p><u>Air Quality</u> <u>Monitoring of air quality in 2001 and 2003 by Horizons identified air quality as an issue within Taumarunui. The primary cause of this issue appears to be from home heating appliances, especially wood burners. Providing information about the air quality issue, and appropriate household solutions such as insulation, may support change over the life of the Plan.</u></p>	<p>The proposed policy and associated text, is considered to be appropriate given the information available on air quality, and having regard to the relevant provisions of the One Plan.</p>	<p>Horizons Regional Council (280.3) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.21 Residential Policy: RE2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	The submitters support the proposed Explanation of Policies.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.10) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.10) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.10) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.10) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.10) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.22 Residential Policy: RE2.3 Impact on Infrastructure			
<p><i>Amend RE2.3.3 as follows:</i></p> <p>(a) To ensure that all development is capable of being adequately serviced with respect to sewage, water and stormwater, <u>and parking</u>.</p>	<p>Car parking (or lack of on-site car parking) can affect roading infrastructure and it is therefore recommended that Policy RE2.3(a) is amended to reflect this.</p> <p>More information has been sought in relation to the flooding risk. It is clear from the information provided that there are flooding issues associated with future development around Miro Street.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended (see section 4.45) that a specific policy be retained (with amendments) to address stormwater issues associated with future subdivision. However, existing sites in this area will have already been assessed in relation to stormwater, and in some cases development contributions paid towards stormwater. Given this, no policies or rules are</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.11) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.11) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.11) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.11) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.11) accepted Horizons Regional Council (280.4) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS 1048.4) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.22 Residential Policy: RE2.3 Impact on Infrastructure			
	proposed in relation to the development of these sites, and as such, it is recommended that the Residential Zone Policy is deleted.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.23 Residential Policy: RE2.4 Consolidation of Residential Areas			
<p><i>Amend RE2.4.3.1 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE2.4.3.1 Explanation of Policies</p> <p>This policy seeks to promote the full utilisation of opportunities for residential development within existing residential areas, <u>while ensuring that the quality of individual towns is retained. Policy guidance on character and density is provided in Section RE2.2.</u></p>	<p>The recommended amendment is intended to clarify that policy stream RE2.4 does not relate to intensification of development.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.12) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.12) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.12) accepted in part Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.12) accepted in part NZTA (208.4) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.12) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS 1048.5)re: 106.12 accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.24 Residential Policy: RE2.5 Non-Residential Uses			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The submissions are in support of the proposed provisions.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.13) accepted Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.13) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.13) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.13) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.13) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.25 Subdivision Policy - SU2.4.3 General Submissions			
See Future Urban Area Overlay assessment criteria.	Additional explanation within SU2.4.3.1 is unnecessary as the policies within SU2.4.3 adequately address the requirements in relation to the Consent Authorities expectations in relation to good urban design. However urban design assessment criteria are to be applied in relation to the Future Urban Area Overlay.	Richard Hoadley (66.2) accepted in part PowerCo. Ltd (289.3) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.26 Subdivision Policy - SU2.4.3(f) Solar Gain			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The proposed policy will help to ensure that subdivisions and subsequently the homes placed on them, can maximise solar gain, and minimise energy usage. This approach reflects both good design, and efficient use of energy in line with section 7 of the Act.	Tauranga Ski Club Incorporated (95.3) rejected Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.25) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.25) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.26 Subdivision Policy - SU2.4.3(f) Solar Gain			
		Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.25) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.25) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.25) accepted Kiwicoast Developments Ltd (No. 1102.1) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.27 Residential Rules: General (Classification of Permitted Activities that fail Conditions)			
<p><i>Amend RE3.2.2 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>(a) Any activity that is provided for as a Permitted Activity by Rule RE3.2.1 but fails to meet one <u>or two more</u> of the General Conditions outlined in section RE3.3 or the Specific Conditions outlined in section RE3.4, but specifically excluding:</p> <p><i>Amend RE3.2.3 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.2.3 Discretionary Activities</p> <p>The following activities are Discretionary Activities.</p> <p>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to, the relevant Assessment Criteria outlined in section RE3.5 below.</p>	<p>An activity which fails three or more of the conditions has the potential to have wider effects on the surrounding environment, and as such, the Discretionary Activity status is considered more appropriate.</p>	<p>Cheal Consultants (171.8) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.28) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.28) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.28) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.28) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.28) accepted</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.27 Residential Rules: General (Classification of Permitted Activities that fail Conditions)			
<p>(a) <u>Any activity that is provided for as a Permitted Activity by Rule RE3.2.1 but fails to meet three or more of the General Conditions outlined in section RE3.3 or the Specific Conditions outlined in section RE3.4, but specifically excluding:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Any activity which does not comply with Condition RE3.3.2 Density. Such applications are classed as Non-Complying Activities.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.28 Residential Rules: RE3.1 Rule Statement			
No changes recommended.	The Reporting Officers Recommendation on the Financial Contributions Chapter was that the Financial Contributions Rules Chapter should remain. As such, the reference to the Financial Contributions Rules at the beginning of the Residential Rules Chapter is appropriate.	David Holland (9.11) rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.29 Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Visitor Accommodation			
<p><i>Amend RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows:</i></p> <p>(a) Any activity that is provided for as a Permitted Activity by Rule RE3.2.1 ...</p> <p>.....</p> <p>(ii) <u>Any activity which does not comply with:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Condition RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation.</u> 	The effects of larger scale visitor accommodation on the character and amenity of a residential area are more appropriately dealt with through a full Discretionary Activity consent.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.15) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.15) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.15) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.15) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.29 Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Visitor Accommodation			
<p><u>Such applications are classed as Discretionary Activities.</u></p> <p><i>Amend RE3.2.3 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.2.3 Discretionary Activities</p> <p>The following activities are Discretionary Activities.</p> <p>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to, the relevant Assessment Criteria outlined in section RE3.5 below.</p> <p><u>(b) Visitor Accommodation Activity not classed as a Permitted Activity</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies RE2.2, RE2.3, and RE2.5</u></p>		Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.15) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.30 Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Residential Care Activity and Associated Definition			
<p><i>Amend the definition of Residential Care Activity as follows:</i></p> <p><u>Buildings and facilities used for accommodation and care, which have a residential character.</u></p> <p>This specifically includes</p>	<p>The environmental effects of a youth detention centre are not dissimilar to those of other residential care facilities in terms of vehicle movements, noise, amenity etc. As such, it is considered appropriate for these activities to be treated in the same manner.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.1, .16) accepted in part</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.1, .16) accepted in part</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (1025.1, .16) accepted in part</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.1, .16) accepted in part</p> <p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.1, .16) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.31 Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Fire Stations</p>			
<p><i>Add the following to Policy RE2.5.3:</i></p> <p><u>(c) To recognise the critical importance of fire stations to the safety of local communities, while balancing this against the potential effects on neighbouring properties, and the identified need for the fire station to locate in the Residential Zone as opposed to the Commercial or Industrial Zone.</u></p> <p><i>Add the following to RE3.2.3:</i></p> <p>RE3.2.3 Discretionary Activities</p> <p><u>(f) Fire Stations</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RE2.2 & RE2.5</u></p> <p><i>Amend RE3.3.7 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.3.7 Noise</p> <p>(a) The Leq noise level and maximum noise level (Lmax) arising from any activity, <u>with the exception of fire stations, ...</u></p> <p><u>(b) The Leq noise level and maximum noise level (Lmax) arising from fire stations measured at the boundary of any site shall not exceed the following limits:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Monday to Saturday 7.00am to 10.00pm inclusive - 50dBLAeq (15 min);</u></p>	<p>The recommended amendments will mean that within the Residential Zone, new Fire Stations will require consent as a Discretionary Activity, but with a policy recognising their importance to the community. It is considered that this rule framework will provide an appropriate balance between the need of communities for fire stations, while still protecting the amenity values of neighbouring properties. Therefore the recommended changes are considered appropriate in terms of sections 5 and 7 of the RMA.</p>	<p>NZ Fire Service Commission (207.8) accepted in part</p> <p>Sue Slegers (140.21) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>NZ Fire Service Commission (FS1095.1) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.31 Residential Rules: RE3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities – Fire Stations			
<p><u>(ii) All other times and on public holidays - 45 dBLAeq (15 min);</u></p> <p><u>(iii) 10.00pm to 7.00am and on public holidays: maximum noise 65dBLAFmax</u></p> <p><u>(c) Fire appliance sirens and call-out sirens for volunteer brigades shall not be subject to the noise limits outlined above, subject to the best practicable option always being adopted to minimise noise levels.</u></p> <p>RE3.5 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</p> <p>RE3.5.1 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</p> <p>(viii) Whether the activity or development will generate noise levels to an unreasonable degree that is inconsistent with the character of the existing environment. <u>Alongside this, consideration will also be given to whether the noise is essential (for example, fire sirens), and whether the noise is temporary in nature, or consistent.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.32 Residential Rules: RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Affected Parties and Notification)			
<p><i>Amend RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows:</i></p>	<p>The decision on whether affected parties consent is necessary and whether an application should be notified lies with Council when it is assessing</p>	<p>Tauranga Ski Club (95.4) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.17) accepted</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.32 Residential Rules: RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (Affected Parties and Notification)			
<p>The following activities are Restricted Discretionary Activities. Such activities may be considered without the need to obtain written approvals from affected parties and without the need for notification.</p> <p>(as per the Recommendation of the Miscellaneous Chapters Report)</p>	<p>an application. The text in question has the potential to cause confusion around this process. It is therefore recommended that this text is deleted.</p> <p>The section on notification policy in the District Plan clarifies Council’s notification processes.</p>	<p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.17) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.17) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1030.17) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (1025.17) accepted Cheal Consultants (171.9) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.33 Residential Rules: RE3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities			
<p><i>Add the following to RE3.5.1:</i></p> <p><u>(xix) Whether character or amenity values of properties within the wider environment will be affected by buildings built in excess of the height limit.</u></p>	<p>Within National Park, some residents are keen to develop an alpine character. Part of this character may be the incorporation of steeper roof pitches. In situations where a minor encroachment is proposed, for example due to roof pitch, it is not considered appropriate that the application would then need to be assessed as a Non-Complying Activity.</p> <p>However, the inclusion of a specific assessment criteria which takes into account the impact of height on properties within the wider environment, combined with the changes proposed in terms of notification (assessed on a case by case basis – see section 4.32) should ensure that appropriate consideration can be given to height encroachments.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.14) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.14) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1030.14) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (1025.14) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.14) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.34 Residential Rules: RE3.3.2 Density			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	The Non-Complying Activity status will make it clear to applicants, should they wish to apply for infill development, that any application will need to be well designed, in relation to the visual impact, and also in relation to the impact on amenity, if consent is to be granted.	Tauranga Ski Club (95.5) rejected Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.22) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.22) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.22) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.22) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.22) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.35 Residential Rules: RE3.3.1 Site Coverage			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	The deletion of the 150m2 maximum site coverage requirement requested by the submitter would have effects on smaller properties not anticipated in the submission.	Peter Daly (198.2) rejected Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.35 re: 98.2) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.35 re: 98.2) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.35 re: 98.2) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.35 re 98.2) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.35 re 98.2) accepted	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.36 Residential Rules: RE3.3.2 Residential Density			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>The exception to Condition RE3.3.2 has been proposed as the current Residential High Zone Rules enabled sites to be subdivided down to 250m² as a Controlled Activity. The new exception will ensure that where subdivision consent has been granted, a house can still be constructed with rules very similar to the Operative Residential High provisions.</p>	<p>Tauranga Ski Club (95.7) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.13) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.13) rejected Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.13) rejected Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.13) rejected Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.13) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.37 Residential Rules: RE3.3.3 Height			
<p><i>Amend as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.3.3 Height</p> <p>(a) The maximum height of any building or part of a building shall be 7.5 metres or 2.0 metres plus the horizontal distance from the nearest site boundary, whichever is less.</p> <p><u>Advice Note:</u> A pitched roof, particularly for a 1.5 or 2 storey building with a pitch of over 30 degrees would support maintaining</p>	<p>Having heard evidence on the potential effects of taller buildings in terms of bulk, and the potential effect on character, including outlook; and taking into account the existing built environment in the District's residential areas, it is considered that a 7.5m maximum height is an appropriate height limit.</p> <p>Where buildings are proposed of a greater height than this, it is considered that the resource consent process is the appropriate mechanism for assessing such applications.</p>	<p>Kiwicoast Developments Ltd (8.2) rejected David Holland (9.12) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.19) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.19) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.19) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.19) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.19) accepted Ruapehu Properties.com Ltd (235.4) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.37 Residential Rules: RE3.3.3 Height			
<p><u>existing amenity values.</u></p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RE3.5.1(a) (i), (ii), (v) and (x), (xv) and (xixi).</p>	<p>In relation to the requests to amend the height in relation to boundary rule adjoining public roads and Rights of Way etc, the amendments requested would enable a significant increase in the bulk of buildings, especially when viewed from the street. This has the potential to change the character of existing Residential Areas, and/or result in new development in existing areas which would be out-of-keeping with the housing in the surrounding area. As such, no changes are recommended in relation to these requests. Consideration can be given to different height restrictions on Greenfield sites as part of the subdivision process.</p>	<p>Robert & Shona Forbes (275.2) rejected Pukenui Lodge (236.4) rejected</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.2, .42) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.2, .42) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.2, .42) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.2, .42) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.2, .42) accepted Turoa Village (FS1089.3 re: 9.12) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.38 Residential Rules: RE3.3.4 Fence and Wall Height for National Park			
<p><i>Amend RE3.3.4 as follows:</i></p> <p>(a) The maximum height of any:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • front boundary fence or wall; and • any side boundary fence or wall located in front of the dwelling <p>on front sections shall not exceed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2m in height, <u>or</u> • 1.6m in height where any fencing above 1.2m in height is visually permeable (that being 50% of the area is not obscured by fencing materials). 	<p>The above amendment will ensure that amenity values are maintained, while providing greater flexibility for land owners.</p>	<p>National Park Village Residents Association (46.3) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.20) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.20) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.20) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.20) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1030.20) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.38 Residential Rules: RE3.3.4 Fence and Wall Height for National Park			
		<p>ME (Peggy) Shelbourne (139.13) accepted in part Cheal Consultants (171.11) accepted in part Ruapehu Properties.com Ltd (235.4) accepted in part Pukenui Lodge (236.4) accepted in part AJ Learmouth (237.8) accepted in part Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (257.5) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.22, .31 re: 235) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.22, .31 re: 235) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.22, .31 re: 235) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.22, .31 re: 235) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.22, .31 re: 235) accepted in part Pukenui Lodge (FS1064.14 re: 139.13) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.39 Residential Rules: RE3.3.5 Yards			
<p><i>Amend RE3.3.5 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.3.5 Yards</p> <p>(a) The minimum yards provided on any site shall be:</p>	<p>The amendments to the yard provisions will provide some additional flexibility in relation to accessory buildings and carports than what was notified. While limitations on the size of the structures, combined with the height in relation to</p>	<p>Kiwicoast Developments Ltd (8.3) accepted in part David Holland (9.13) accepted in part Tauranga Ski Club (95.8 - .10) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.39 Residential Rules: RE3.3.5 Yards</p> <p>(i) Front: 3.0 metres (ii) Side: 1.5 metres (iii) Rear: 3.0 metres</p> <p><u>Except:</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>One accessory building:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Side: 1.0 metres</u> • <u>Rear: 1.5 metres</u> <p><u>Where the accessory building is less than 10m², and has a maximum dimension (width or length) of 4.0m.</u></p> <p>(v) On any site existing on (date of Council decision on the Proposed Plan) that is less than 450-500m² in net site area, <u>which was previously within the Residential High Zone of the Ruapehu District Plan made operative 8 May 2000</u>, the following conditions apply to yards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front: The front yard requirement shall be determined by joining a line from a point 9.0metres along the street boundary to a point 9.0 metres along the respective side boundary where no building will be permitted (see Figure 1 below). • Side: One side yard of 1.0 metres • Rear: 0 metres <p>In this context “existing sites” includes sites approved under Section 11 of the Act where the Council’s subdivision consent has not lapsed.</p>	<p>boundary provisions should ensure that effects on neighbouring properties will not be significant.</p>	<p>(106.21) accepted in part Peter Daly (198.3 & .4) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.21) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (1025.21) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1030.21) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.21) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.3 re: 9.13; .14 re: 95.8; .15 re: 95.9; .36 re: 198.3) (1077.4 re: 95.8)(1077.15 re: 95.9) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.3 re: 9.13, .14 re: 95.8, .15 re 95.9, .36 re: 198.3)(1077.4 re: 95.8)(1077.15 re: 95.9) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.3 re: 9.13, .14 re: 95.8, .15 re 95.9, .36 re: 198.3) (1077.4 re: 95.8)(1077.15 re: 95.9) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.3 re: 9.13, .14 re: 95.8, .15 re 95.9, .36 re: 198.3) (1077.4 re: 95.8)(1077.15 re: 95.9) accepted in part Turoa Village Residents Assoc (FS1089.4 re: 9.13) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.3 re: 9.13, .14 re: 95.8, .15 re 95.9, .36 re: 198.3) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.40 Residential Rules: RE3.3.6 Open Space</p>			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed Open Space requirements are appropriate in terms of ensuring adequate outdoor amenity areas are provided on new allotments.</p> <p>In relation to open space and provision of car parking, the car parking provisions are based on average demand. There will be situations where there is demand in excess of the car parking provided on site. Although this may be problematic for surrounding residents. It is very difficult to control, and is likely to be of a short term nature.</p>	<p>Tauranga Ski Club (95.11) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.22) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.22) Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.22) accepted in part Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (257.3) rejected Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.22) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.22) accepted in part Teina Taylor (FS1048.7) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.26) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.26) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.26) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.26) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.26) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.41 Residential Rules: RE3.3.7 Noise			
See <i>Tidy Up Report</i> .	These submissions are addressed in the ' <i>Tidy Up Report</i> '.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.24) Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.24) Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.24) Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.24) Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.24)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.43 Residential Rules: RE3.3.9 Lighting and Glare			
No changes recommended.	No submissions have been received in opposition to this standard. It is therefore recommended that the submissions are accepted.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.25) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.25) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1030.25) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (1025.25) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.25) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.44 Residential Rules: RE3.3.12 Windows in Dwellings			
Amend RE3.3.12 as follows: All dwellings on sections facing sites adjoining the street shall have....	The proposed condition will help to maintain residential character and amenity and safety. The amendments will ensure that the provisions do not relate to rear sites which are unlikely to have an effect on amenity or character values.	Ruapehu District Council (268.12) accepted Cheal (171.12) rejected Richard Hoadley (66.16) rejected Further Submissions Kiwicoast Developments Ltd (FS1098.1 re: 66.16) rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.45 Residential Rules: RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street			
<p>Delete the following text:</p> <p>RE2.3.3 POLICY</p> <p>(e) — To ensure that new housing and other significant developments within the Miro Street catchment (please see Planning Maps for details of the extent of the catchment) do not exacerbate the risk of flooding.</p> <p>RE3.2.2.1 Explanation of Policies</p> <p>It is worth noting that the Regional Council is in the process of modelling flood risks for Taumarunui and Ohakune. This information will subsequently be incorporated in the District Plan through a plan change, which is likely to address both flood mitigation measures, for example, minimum floor levels for new dwellings, and other measures to minimise the amount of stormwater flowing off sites.</p> <p>In the interim, the policy approach is to require that new development in the Miro Street catchment is designed to ensure it does not exacerbate flooding risks, and to generally encourage developers to minimise stormwater run off. This has advantages in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not exacerbating flood risks in a heavy rainfall event; • avoiding or reducing the need to upgrade the capacity of stormwater pipes (thereby minimising infrastructure costs); and also • reducing the impact of stormwater, which can often carry contaminants, on water quality in streams and 	<p>As notified, the provisions for Miro Street included rules for land use, which required stormwater run off from dwellings and other impervious surfaces to be retained on site for two hours; and required onsite detention of water associated with roads and other accesses over and above that which would have run off the undeveloped site.</p> <p>Submitters have raised a number of valid concerns about the practicalities of this approach, and also whether owners of already subdivided land should be affected by these rules. Clarification has been sought relating to flooding risks and this has confirmed that significant development in the Miro Street catchment 'would increase the flow in the Miro Street Drain to a level that would not pass down the drain without flooding the surrounding properties'.</p> <p>Given this, it is considered important to ensure that there are specific provisions in the Plan to ensure that future subdivisions do not exacerbate this risk. However, we agree with submitters that requiring already subdivided sites to comply with a stormwater rule would be unreasonable.</p> <p>As such, the above policy has been recommended as a stop gap measure until Council undertakes a comprehensive plan change to address flooding and stormwater issues.</p> <p>The policy enables developers to design a</p>	<p>Horizons Regional Council (280.4 and 280.18) accepted in part Stu Ridley (299.1) accepted in part Cheal Consultants (171.22) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.45 Residential Rules: RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street			
<p>rivers-</p> <p>RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street Catchment (see Planning Maps for the extent of the Miro Street Catchment)</p> <p>(a) Every application for a building consent (including dwellings) within the Miro Street catchment in Ohakune (as indicated on the planning maps) shall provide confirmation that on-site detention systems will be constructed, maintained, and operated to ensure that the volume of run-off from the site (including roofs and other impervious areas on the site such as paved outdoor living areas and driveways) subject of the building consent that exceeds that of the equivalent area of undeveloped land shall be retained on-site for at least 2 hours prior to any discharge to the Council stormwater network.</p> <p>SU3.3.2.4 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street Catchment</p> <p>(a) Every application for a subdivision consent within the Miro Street catchment in Ohakune (as indicated on the planning maps) shall provide confirmation that on-site detention systems will be constructed, maintained, and operated to ensure that the volume of run-off from subdivisional roads or other accesses subject of the subdivision consent that exceeds that of the equivalent area of undeveloped land shall be retained on-site for 2 hours prior to any discharge to the Council stormwater</p>	<p>stormwater solution most appropriate for the site/s. This may consist of detention tanks, road run off detention areas, ground soakage, or other alternative measures. This approach provides greater flexibility and should address some of the concerns raised by Cheal Consultants.</p> <p>Finally, the policy specifies that the stormwater management system must be designed to meet the 1:200 year event. The 1:200 year event is consistent with the flooding provisions of the One Plan.</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.45 Residential Rules: RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street			
<p>network.</p> <p><i>Add the following policy and explanation:</i></p> <p>SU2.4.3 (h)</p> <p><u>To ensure that subdivisions in the Miro Street catchment in Ohakune (see Planning Maps) are designed, and subsequent development built, to ensure that the development, including buildings, roading, and other impermeable surfaces, do not exacerbate the risk of downstream flooding in a 1:200 year event.</u></p> <p>Explanation of Policies</p> <p>....</p> <p><u>In relation to Policy (h), Council has recently received information from Horizons Regional Council on flooding risks for both Taumarunui and Ohakune. This information will subsequently be incorporated in the District Plan through a plan change, which is likely to address both flood mitigation measures, for example, minimum floor levels for new dwellings, and other measures to minimise the amount of stormwater flowing off sites.</u></p> <p><u>In the interim, the policy approach is to require that new subdivisions in the Miro Street catchment are designed to ensure they do not exacerbate flooding risks to downstream properties over and above what would have occurred prior to development. A specific policy is proposed for Miro Street as this is an area of identified risk, and also where there is potential for significant growth. Developers will need to assess the potential</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.45 Residential Rules: RE3.3.13 Stormwater Requirements for Miro Street			
<u>additional stormwater created by new roading, housing and other impermeable surfaces.</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.46 Residential Rules: RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation			
<p><i>Amend the definition of Visitor Accommodation as follows:</i></p> <p>Visitor Accommodation Activity: <u>Means land or buildings used for transient accommodation and includes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>o motels,</u> <u>o holiday houses and flats including short term residential accomodation offered at a tariff,</u> <u>o club lodges (not located in the Protected Area Zone) (see definition below), and</u> <u>o camping facilities and backpackers</u> <p><u>Club Lodges (not located in the Protected Area Zone) means buildings that incorporate dormitory sleeping, and communal cooking, eating and bathroom facilities, and managed by a recreational club, providing overnight accommodation to club members. but do not include bar or café/restaurant facilities that are open to the public.</u></p> <p><i>Add the following to Policy RE2.5.3</i></p> <p><u>(a) To provide for Club Lodges within Turoa Village where the open, alpine character of Turoa Village is maintained; large areas of hard surfacing are avoided or mitigated; and amenity values of the surrounding area are not adversely affected.</u></p>	<p>A variety of changes have been recommended to the provisions surrounding Tourist Accommodation.</p> <p>We agree with submitters that Club Lodges will have quite different effects on the environment, especially the character of an area, than a number of the other forms of Visitor Accommodation, and as such, changes are recommended to both the definition of Visitor Accommodation and the associated policies, to provide support for Club Lodges at Turoa Village. These policies also aim to recognise that other forms of Visitor Accommodation, especially those with a more commercial nature, are not in character with Turoa Village.</p> <p>However, it is considered that Club Lodges do have the potential to adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area, and as such, it is recommended that changes are made to the Permitted Activity Conditions in relation to guest numbers from what was notified to allow for 20 guests in Turoa Village as a Permitted Activity. Changes are also</p>	<p>David Holland (9.14) accepted in part Tauranga Ski Club (95.12) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (106.26) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.26) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.26) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.26) accepted in part Ohakune 2000 Inc (244.4) accepted in part Ngauruhoe Ski Club (N134.2) accepted in part Ruapehu Properties.com Ltd (235.5) rejected Pukenui Lodge (236.5) rejected Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (130.26) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Enterprising Taumarunui Inc (FS1019.1) accepted in part Teina Taylor (FS1048.8) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.4 & .16) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (FS1078.4 & .16) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.46 Residential Rules: RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation</p>			
<p><i>Amend the third sentence of the Explanatory Text as follows:</i> In addition, Policy (bc) clarifies</p> <p><i>Add the following Assessment Criteria to RE3.5.1:</i> (xx) <u>The proximity of any lodge or dwelling in Turoa Village to permanent open space, and the extent to which the open space mitigates the site coverage encroachment.</u> (xxi) <u>The proximity of any lodge in Turoa Village to the Turoa Village’s boundaries with any other site.</u></p> <p>Amend RE3.4.2 as follows: RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation Activities (a) Scale</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Accommodation shall not be provided for more than 10 guests at any one time.</p> <p>Advice Note: Any Visitor Accommodation may also need to comply with Fire Safety Regulations. Please contact the Fire Safety Officer at Council for more information. <u>Advice Note: Visitor Accommodation Activities must also comply with the requirements of the Building Code and the Fire Service Amendment Act. Council’s Building Control Team can provide information on the Building Code Requirements, and the New Zealand Fire Service can provide information on the requirements of the Fire Service Amendment Act.</u></p> <p>(b) Coverage</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Maximum building coverage shall not exceed</p>	<p>recommended in relation to the site coverage conditions to align with those for other residential activities, on the basis of retaining the residential character except with relation to Club lodges within Turoa Village.</p> <p>Additional Assessment Criteria are also proposed which recognises that the open space around Turoa Village will help to compensate where the density and site coverage requirements are exceeded.</p>	<p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.4 & .16) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.4 & .16) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (FS1081.4 & .16) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.46 Residential Rules: RE3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation			
<p>3550% of the net site area.</p> <p>Except <u>In relation to (a) Scale and (b) Coverage:</u> <u>Club Lodges located within Turoa Alpine Village (being the sites and roads off Turoa Drive, Ohakune) shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>provide for no more than 20 guests at any one time:</u> <u>and</u> • <u>have a maximum building coverage not exceeding 50% of the net site area.</u> 			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.47 Residential Rules: RE3.4.3 Healthcare Services			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	The proposed provisions relating to Healthcare Services are considered to provide an appropriate balance between enabling small scale Healthcare Services to establish, while ensuring that with slightly larger scale activities, Council can assess the effect on the surrounding residential character, and amenity values.	EC Forch & DL Cunningham (44.3) rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.48 Residential Rules: RE3.4.6 Earthworks Activities			
<p><i>Amend RE3.4.6 as follows:</i></p> <p>(d) Volume</p> <p>(i) No more than 50-100m³ of material measured in its non-compacted form, within one certificate of title, shall</p>	The recommended amendments will help to ensure that earthworks sites are re-vegetated in a timely manner.	David Holland (9.15) accepted in part DOC (191.32) accepted in part Cheal Consultants (171.13) accepted in part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.48 Residential Rules: RE3.4.6 Earthworks Activities			
<p>be removed from the site or shall be relocated on the site, in any calendar year unless the earthworks are identified in and provided for through and approved subdivision or land use consent.</p> <p>(e) <u>Height of Cut or Fill</u></p> <p>(i) <u>No earthworks shall exceed a cut or fill height of 1.5m; and</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>No earthworks within a yard setback shall exceed a cut or fill height of 0.5m.</u></p> <p>(f) <u>Vegetation Removal</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Where vegetation clearance occurs in association with earthworks, and exposed areas shall be re-vegetated within 6 12 months of the earthworks being completed/undertaken.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.49 Residential Rules: RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development			
<p><i>Amend RE3.4 as follows:</i></p> <p>RE3.4 SPECIFIC CONDITIONS</p> <p>The following Specific Conditions shall apply to the Permitted and Discretionary Activities specified below. Where these Specific Conditions differ from the requirements of the General Conditions in section RE3.3 above, the Specific Condition shall be applicable. <u>For</u></p>	<p>Overall, the provisions relating to CRD are intended to provide an alternative and consolidated form of development while ensuring that character and amenity values are maintained.</p> <p>Amendments have been recommended in relation to the orientation of the outdoor living space to ensure that they are orientated to receive good sunlight.</p>	<p>David Holland (No. 9.16) accepted in part Lambertus Te Strake (No. 34.1) accept National Park Village Progressive Association (NPVPAI) (No. 46.2, accepted & 13 accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.27) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.27) accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.49 Residential Rules: RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development			
<p><u>purposes of clarification, the General Conditions do not apply to RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development in terms of determining Activity Status.</u></p> <p>RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development</p> <p>Within Taumarunui, National Park, Raetihi, Ohakune, Rangataua or Waiouru development shall comply with the following Conditions:</p> <p>(a)</p> <p>(e) Each dwelling within a Comprehensive Residential Development shall be provided with an outdoor living space of a minimum of 40m² being able to accommodate a 4.0 metre diameter circle situated adjacent to one of the main living areas of the dwelling <u>on the northern, eastern, or western side of the property</u>.</p> <p>(f) Any open space provided must be established exclusive of any access space.</p> <p>(g) A Communal Outdoor Living Area Open Space shall be provided with a minimum area equal to the required area of Communal Outdoor Living Area Open Space as follows: (e.g. 4 x 540m² = 20160m²) ...</p> <p>(h) Each residential unit shall have a minimum of 5.0m² of open space per dwelling that is able to accommodate a 2.0 metre diameter circle for storage and service purposes.</p>	<p>Amendments are also proposed to the Communal Open Space provisions to reflect that these areas may be used for BBQs etc, but may also be more general landscaped areas associated with a development.</p> <p>Finally, a consequential change has also been made to the fence height condition, which reflects the changes recommended to the general fence height rule (see Section 4.38).</p>	<p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.27) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.27) accepted in part Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.27) accepted in part Sue Slegers (No. 140.20) rejected Cheal Consultants (No. 171.14) rejected DOC (No. 191.31) accepted Chris Gebbie (No. 235.3) accepted in part Ruapehu Properties.com Ltd (No. 236.3) accepted in part AJ Learmonth (No. 237.7) rejected Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (No. 257.2) accepted in part Plateau Surveyors (No. 307.1) rejected Robert and Shona Forbes (No. 275.4) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Teina Taylor (FS 1048.9 re: 106.27) accepted Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.27) accepted in part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.27) accepted in part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.27) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.27) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.27) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.49 Residential Rules: RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum fence height to the front of dwellings shall be <u>either</u>: • 1.2m, <u>or</u> • 1.6m in height where <u>any fencing above 1.2m in height is visually permeable (that being 50% of the area is not obscured by fencing materials)</u> <p>Note: Comprehensive Residential Development is not provided for in Owhango.</p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RE3.5.1(b). (i) - (iii).</p> <p><i>Amend Assessment Criteria RE3.5.1(b).</i></p> <p>The Council will have regard to these matters in considering any proposal:</p> <p>1. the General Conditions for permitted activities specified in Rule 3.3.1, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, and 3.3.9.</p> <p><u>1. the General Conditions for permitted activities specified in Condition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>RE3.3.3 Height</u> <p><u>3. the compatibility between surrounding residences and the proposed development, considering possible difference in:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>bulk of buildings;</u> • <u>overall site coverage; and</u> • <u>intensities of use;</u> <p>5. provision of landscaping, <u>fencing</u> and screening</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.49 Residential Rules: RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development			
<p>(ii) The applicant shall submit site plans of buildings, roading, drainage and stormwater reticulation, and landscaping and reports and other supplementary information as may be necessary to show clearly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the proposed use of land and buildings; 2. the bulk and location of buildings, <u>taking into consideration the impact on adjoining neighbours and the surrounding environment</u> 3. the orientation of roads and buildings (including main living rooms) especially in relation to ensuring good sunlight to the dwellings <u>and outdoor living spaces</u>; and maximising opportunities for passive heating; <p><i>Note additional changes to these provisions are also made below.</i></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.50 Residential Rules: RE3.5.1 Assessment Criteria			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>There are currently cross references to the other relevant chapters at the beginning of each rule section</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.28) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.28) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.28) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.28) accepted in part Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.28) accepted in part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.51 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1, SU3.3.1.1 and SU3.3.1.2			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	<p>As per Section 4.2 above.</p> <p>Subdivision of Network Utilities PowerCo. supports the proposed Rule. No submissions have been received in opposition. It is therefore recommended that the rule is retained as notified.</p>	<p>Tauranga Ski Club Incorporated (No 95.14) rejected PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) accepted Sue Slegers (No. 140.26) accepted</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.18) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.18) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.18) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.18) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.18) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.52 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.2 Discretionary Activities			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The format is based on that of other Council's who have used the provisions successfully.	Kiwicoast Developments Limited (No. 9.27) rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.53 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.3 Non-Complying Activities			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	On balance, the Non-Complying Activity Status will provide a clear signal to applicants that where infill development is proposed serious consideration will be given to the impact of the additional density on character and amenity	<p>Tauranga Ski Club Incorporated (No 95.15) rejected</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.53 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.3 Non-Complying Activities			
	values.	1077.19) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.19) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.19) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.19) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.19) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.54 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.1.3(d) Non-Complying Activities			
<i>Amend SU3.3.1.3 as follows:</i> (d) Any <u>subdivision incorporating</u> a Comprehensive Residential Development that cannot comply with all of the specific standards contained within section RE3.4.7.	The amendments clarify that the rule is referring to subdivisions of land falling under the format of Comprehensive Residential Development.	Kiwicoast Developments Limited (No 9.28) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.55 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.2 Transportation			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The submission supports the proposed provisions.	New Zealand Transport Agency (No 208.25) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.56 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.3 Electricity and Telecommunications			
<i>Amend SU3.3.2.3 as follows:</i> (b) <u>All sites shall be provided with an underground</u>	The proposed changes will ensure that electricity is provided to newly created allotments, but provides more flexibility in relation to	David Holland (No 9.29) accepted in part PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) accepted in part Kiwi Coast Developments Ltd (FS1103.1)	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.56 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.3 Electricity and Telecommunications			
<p><u>electricity supply to the boundary of the site.</u></p> <p>(b) — All sites shall be provided with underground reticulated telecommunications to the boundary of the site.</p> <p><i>Amend SU3.3.3.1 Controlled Activity Assessment Criteria as follows:</i></p> <p><u>(d) Whether underground reticulated telecommunications have been provided to the boundary of the site.</u></p>	<p>telecommunications in recognition of the potential for wireless technology to address telecommunication provision.</p>	<p>accepted in part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.57 Subdivision Rules – SU3.3.2.3 Stormwater			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>Where a site is unable to connect to the reticulated network, and requires on site disposal, it is important that Council is able to assess the specific of the site (permeability etc), to ensure that subsequent development will not result in stormwater issues for adjoining properties.</p>	<p>Cheal Consultants (No 171.21) rejected</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.33) accepted</p> <p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.33) accepted</p> <p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.33) accepted</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.33) accepted</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.33) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

4.58 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria

<p><i>Amend SU3.3.3.1 as follows:</i></p> <p>Whether the site can be adequately serviced in terms of <u>electricity supply</u>, sewage disposal, potable and fire fighting water supply, and stormwater disposal. NZS 4404:2010 'Land Development and Subdivision Engineering' and SNA PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice shall be used as guides.</p> <p><i>(Note, there are a number of changes to this text outlined elsewhere in the Recommendations. The text above includes these other recommendations, although only the changes relevant to this change are highlighted).</i></p>	<p>Reverse sensitivity effects of rural activities on residential land should have been assessed when the land was rezoned. It is therefore not considered necessary to include additional assessment criteria to address this.</p> <p>Within the Residential Zone assessing electricity provision, along with the other core services is considered to be appropriate. Telecommunications provision is proposed to be assessed under a separate criteria (see section 4.56 above).</p>	<p>Atihau Whanganui Incorporated (No 249.2) Reject PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) Accept in Part</p>	
---	---	--	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

4.59 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria

<p><i>Amend SU3.3.3.2(d) as follows:</i></p> <p>(d) Servicing</p> <p>Advice Notes:</p> <p><u>All servicing will also need to comply with the requirements of Horizons Regional Council One Plan rules.</u></p>	<p>The provisions of the Regional Council's One Plan apply to all zones within the District. For the sake of consistency the advice note provided within the Rural Zone should also be added to the Residential Zone.</p>	<p>Horizons Regional Council (No 280.23) Accept</p>	
--	---	---	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

4.60 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria

<p><i>Amend the Commercial and Industrial Conditions as follows:</i></p>	<p>Ensuring that Electricity is available to newly created sites in the Commercial, Industrial and Urban Settlement Zones is considered to be an</p>	<p>PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) Accept in Part</p>	
--	--	--	--





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.60 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria			
<p>SU3.4.2.2 Servicing</p> <p>(a) All sites <u>shall be appropriately serviced in terms of electricity; and</u> shall have a reticulated water, sewerage and stormwater system contiguous, or passing through the site, that can be connected with to provide water, sewerage and stormwater services to the site.</p> <p>SU3.5.2.2 Servicing</p> <p>(a) All sites <u>shall be appropriately serviced in terms of electricity; and</u> shall have a reticulated water, sewerage and stormwater system contiguous, or passing through the site, that can be connected with to provide water, sewerage and stormwater services to the site.</p> <p><i>Amend the Controlled Activity Commercial, Industrial, Urban Settlement, Protected Areas and Active Reserve Zone Assessment Criteria as follows:</i></p> <p>Whether the site can be adequately serviced in terms of <u>electricity supply</u>, sewage disposal, potable and fire fighting water supply, and stormwater disposal. NZS 4404:2010 'Land Development and Subdivision Engineering' and the SNA PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice shall be used as guides.</p> <p><i>Add the following to the Assessment Criteria for the Commercial, Industrial and Urban Settlement Zones:</i></p> <p><u>Whether underground reticulated telecommunications</u></p>	<p>important consideration. However, as with the Residential Zone, consideration will be given to whether it is necessary to include telecommunication cabling on a case by case basis.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.60 Subdivision Rules: SU3.3.3 Assessment Criteria			
have been provided to the boundary of the site.			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.61 Definitions: Boundary Adjustments			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	Boundary adjustments are a legitimate form of subdivision, that need to be managed to ensure that any effects are addressed.	Richard Hoadley (No. 66.6) Reject Further Submissions Kiwi Coast Developments Ltd (1101.1) Accept in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.62 Definitions: Height			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	No changes are recommended to the definition of height, specifically as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retention of the averaging methodology is important to ensure for development on sloping sites; and there are many situations where certified ground levels would not be necessary. 	David Holland (No. 9.37) Reject Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.10) Reject Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.10) Reject Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.10) Reject Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.10) Reject Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.10) Reject Turoa Village Residents Association (No. 1089.7) Accept	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.63 Definitions: Notional Boundary			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	The definition of Notional Boundary is appropriate given its use in the plan.	David Holland (No. 9.38) Reject Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.11) Reject Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.11) Reject Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.11) Reject Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.11) Reject Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.11) Reject	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.64 Definitions: Residential Activity			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	Without further clarification we are not convinced that the requested amendment would improve the definition.	Richard Hoadley (No. 66.8) Reject	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.65 Definitions: Site Coverage			
<p><i>Amend the definition of Site Coverage as follows:</i></p> <p>Site Coverage: Means the portion of net site area, expressed as a percentage, that is covered by buildings, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decks (<u>over 2m in height</u>) • overhanging balconies; or • other overhanging or cantilevered parts of 	<p>The definition of ‘Building’ excludes structures less than 2m in height. However, clarifying this in the definition of site coverage is considered to be useful.</p> <p>However, decks and cantilevered buildings (greater than 2m in height) have effects in terms of the perceived density of a site that is similar to</p>	<p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.12) Accept in Part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.12) Accept in Part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.12) Accept in Part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.12) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.65 Definitions: Site Coverage			
<p>buildings (including any part of the eaves and/or spouting projecting more than 0.6 metres measured horizontally from the exterior wall).</p> <p>The following shall not be included in building coverage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pergolas; • Underground carparking with landscaping above; • Satellite dishes; • Any swimming pool or tank which is not defined as a building; • Any deck, including decks attached to a building, <u>less than 2m in height.</u> 	<p>other 'buildings', and as such, it is not considered that these structures should be exempt from the site coverage provisions.</p>	<p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.12) Accept in Part Turoa Village Residents Association (No. 1089.8) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.66 Definitions: Visitor Accommodation			
<p><i>Ensure definitions are in alphabetical order</i></p>	<p>Submitters all support the proposed wording (although changes have been recommended elsewhere).</p> <p>Administrative change recommended re: order of definitions.</p>	<p>David Holland (No.9.33) Accept in Part Ruapehu District Council (No. 268.4) Accept</p> <p>Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.6) Accept in Part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.6) Accept in Part Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.6) Accept in Part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.6) Accept in Part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.6) Accept in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.67 Definitions: Yards			
<p><i>Add the following definition under all of the Yard Rules within the respective Zones.</i></p> <p><u>Advice Note: Where a site is classed as a rear site, the rear yard setback is applicable along all boundaries (see definition of Yard for further clarification).</u></p>	<p>The rear setback for all boundaries on a rear site recognises that these sites have a greater potential to affect the amenity of neighbouring properties, especially where infill has occurred. Given that infill is classed as a Controlled Activity in a number of townships it is considered appropriate to maintain the definition as notified.</p> <p>However, an advice note has been proposed for clarification.</p>	<p>David Holland (No. 9.35) Reject</p> <p>Further Submissions</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (No 1077.8) Reject</p> <p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No 1078.8) Reject</p> <p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (No 1079.8) Reject</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (No 1080.8) Reject</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (No 1081.8) Reject</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.68 Unit Titles			
<p>The following changes, are recommended:</p> <p>RE3.4.7 Comprehensive Residential Development</p> <p>Within Taumarunui, National Park, Raetihi, Ohakune, Rangataua or Waiouru development shall comply with the following Conditions:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(e) Each <u>ground floor</u> dwelling within a Comprehensive Residential Development shall be provided with a <u>private</u> outdoor living space of a minimum of 40m² being able to accommodate a 4.0 metre diameter circle situated adjacent to one of the main living areas of the dwelling.</p>	<p>It would not be practical to provide ground floor open space in a manner that is easily accessible from upper storey dwellings. As such the changes to the wording as proposed will take into account situations where there is a multi level development.</p>	<p>Kiwicoast Developments Limited (No 8.4) Accept in Part</p> <p>David Holland (No 9.6, 9.13, 9.16) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.68 Unit Titles</p> <p>(f) <u>Each upper level dwelling within a Comprehensive Residential Development without a living area on the ground floor shall be provided with a private outdoor living space, such as a deck, terrace or balcony of a minimum of 10m² being able to accommodate a 2.5 metre diameter circle situated adjacent to one of the main living areas of the upper level dwelling.</u></p> <p>(g) Any open <u>outdoor living</u> space provided must be established exclusive of any access space.</p> <p>(h) A Communal Outdoor Living Area <u>Any Communal Outdoor Living Area shall be provided in addition to, not in substitution of, the required private outdoor living space for each dwelling.</u></p> <p>(i) Each residential-unit <u>ground floor dwelling</u> shall have a minimum of 5.0m² of open space per dwelling that is able to accommodate a 2.0 metre diameter circle for storage and service purposes.</p> <p>(j) <u>Each upper level dwelling shall have a minimum of 5.0m² of open space per dwelling located on the ground floor that is that is able to accommodate a 2.0 metre diameter circle for storage and service purposes to which outdoor access will be provided.</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.69 Definitions General</p>			
<p><i>Amend the introduction to the Definitions Section as follows:</i></p> <p><u>That the use of definitions included within other legislation is undertaken in the following manner:</u></p> <p><u>All words used in this Plan are defined in the Resource Management Act have the definitions given to them in the Act, as it was on decision date of adoption of the Plan Change. Some of the more common terms from the RMA and other relevant pieces of legislation have been included in the Chapter. These terms have been included for reference only, and are shown as greyed out' text. Readers may wish to check to ensure that the definition remains the same and has not been changed. An online version of the Resource Management Act and other legislation is available at :</u></p> <p>http://www.legislation.govt.nz</p> <p><i>That CA2.2.3 Policies is reworded as follows:</i></p> <p>To avoid telecommunication structures <u>facilities</u> within Ruapehu Road, Egmont Street and Railway Row to protect the heritage values of these areas</p>	<p>The “graying out” of the definitions used within other legislation clearly identifies them for Plan users as those terms taken from other legislation.</p> <p>Providing the definition wording itself within the Plan ensures that Plan users do not have to reference other legislation documents to determine the definition, especially where they may not have the resources to do this.</p> <p>Providing the section reference for the definition in the other legislation will allow those parties who are able to go and find the location of the definition within the other legislation if they wish.</p> <p>The replacement of the word “structures” with the word “facilities” within CA2.2.3(d) will ensure consistency between the policies and the rules, as well as avoid confusion with the relevant legislation, being the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2008.</p>	<p>Telecom New Zealand Limited (No 109.4) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.70 Definitions General			
<i>Highlighting (using italics, bold, underline or similar) of words where the use of the word corresponds with the definition included within the Plan.</i>	That identifying those words used within the text of the Plan that are included within the Definition section using italics, bold, underline or similar will provide connection between the Plan provisions and terminology and aid in the ease of understanding of the plan provisions.	King Country Energy Limited (No 246.1) Accept in Part Horticulture New Zealand (No 281.11) Accept in Part Department of Conservation (No 191.5) Accept in Part Further Submissions: Department of Conservation (No 1050.6 in relation to 281.11) Accept in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.71 Information Requirements			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	Recommended changes to the Information Requirements set out in the 'Chapter Addressing Miscellaneous Requests' are considered to adequately address the issues raised in this part of the PowerCo. submission.	PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.72 Information Requirements			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	Land owners potentially affected by these submissions have had limited opportunity to submit given the generic nature of the submissions. In addition, no assessment of these trees has been undertaken to justify their protection.	Gabrielle Walton (No. 29.1) rejected National Park Village Progressive Association (No. 46.14) rejected Tim Sklenars (No. 64.2) rejected Ruapehu Properties.com Ltd (No. 236.18) accepted CC & NM Gebbie Ltd (No. 235.18) accepted Chris Gebbie (No. 1060.1 re: 29.1, 1062.1)	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.72 Information Requirements		re: 46.14, 1063.1 re: 64.2) accepted Teina Taylor (1048.12) re 46.14 accept in part Pukenui Lodge (1062.2) re 46.14 accept in part	

RESIDENTIAL LOW TO RURAL ZONE

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Rezoning of Residential Low to Rural Zone			
<p><i>No changes recommended</i></p>	<p>That the inclusion of land zoned as Residential Low within the Operative Plan into the Rural Zone of the Proposed Plan Change does not unduly restrict the development potential of these sites as the requirement to obtain consent already existed and re-subdivision potential was already limited.</p> <p>The servicing of these sites, in an overall perspective, is more consistent with the level of servicing found in the Rural zone, therefore following the amalgamation of the Residential High and Residential Medium zones it is logical to return Residential Low to Rural.</p> <p>The “Future Urban Area” overlay provides a level of development that creates a “rural-residential” interface between the existing urban area of Ohakune and the Rural zone.</p>	<p>David Holland (No 9.8) accepted Allan and Julie Whale (No 98.1) rejected Mark Prater for MP Ventures (No 159.1) rejected Alison Learmonth (No 237.6) rejected Bernice Rhodes (No 1001.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Glen Wilson (No 1002.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Gene McQuarrie (No 1030.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted John McQuarrie (No 1031.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Jocelyn Cranston (No 1096.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Judith Rivlin (No 1037.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Kai Hagener (No 1039.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted Donald Beggs (No 1032.1 in relation to 159.1) accepted</p>	





RELOCATED BUILDINGS

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Entire Chapters			
No changes recommended.	The existing provisions have been designed to ensure the sustainable management of issues around relocatable dwellings.	<p>House Movers Section of the Heavy Haulage Association (Inc) (No. 291.1(a)) rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.30) accepted in part Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.30) accepted in part Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.30) accepted in part Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.30) accepted in part Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.30) accepted in part</p> <p>Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.44) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (FS1078.44) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.44) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (FS1081.44) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.44) accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Definitions: Relocated Building			
No changes recommended.	Under section 86F this definition must be treated	David Holland (9.31, 9.34) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Definitions: Relocated Building			
	as operative.	Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (1077.11) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (1078.1) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1079.1) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (1081.1) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (1080.1) accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.3 Relocation within a site, removal and demolition			
<p><i>Amend RB3.1 as follows:</i></p> <p>RB3.1 Rule Statement</p> <p>The following rules shall apply to relocated buildings across the District. All relocated buildings shall also comply with the other relevant rules and conditions of the District Plan. In particular, the use of the building shall comply with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the requirements for the zone in which it is to be located, as well as the bulk and location conditions,; • any relevant Heritage Rules.; • <u>the District-Wide Rules (especially in relation to the removal of buildings).</u> 	<p>The proposed changes will help to clarify the rules around relocatable buildings, and aid usability of the Plan.</p> <p>The relocation of a building within the same site is classed as a Permitted Activity (subject to compliance with the other relevant rules) and as such no changes are needed to address this submission</p>	<p>Federated Farmers (Nos. 284.35) Accept in Part Federated Farmers (Nos. 284.72) Accept Heavy Haulage Association (No. 291.1(b)) Accept in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Policy RB2.3.3 (a) Rural Buildings			
<p><i>Policy RB2.3.3 is amended as follows:</i></p> <p>(a) To require relocated buildings, <u>which will be used for either habitable accommodation or commercial activities</u>, to be insulated to the same standard as new buildings.</p>	<p>The proposed changes will clarify that the insulation policy relates only to habitable accommodation and commercial activities. It is considered that the requested changes in relation to woolsheds are unnecessary as this is clarified by the Commercial Activities definition.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (No. 137.20) Accept in Part Ashley Cole (No. 137.42) Reject Velma Siemonek (No. 212.12) Accept in Part Federated Farmers (No. 284.36) Accept</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.5 Policy RB2.3.3(b) Orientation of Buildings			
<p><i>Policy RB2.3.2 is amended as follows:</i></p> <p>To require relocated dwellings to ensure habitable rooms have good sunlight <u>be orientated to maximise sunlight availability into habitable rooms.</u></p>	<p>Proposed change will help clarify the intent of the policy.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (No. 137.20) Accept in Part Federated Farmers (284.37) Accept</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.6 General Comments			
<p><i>No changes recommended.</i></p>	<p>The provisions will ensure the sustainable management of relocated buildings and the associated living environments</p>	<p>CC & NM Gebbie Ltd (No. 235.7) Accept Ruapehu Property.com Ltd (No. 236.7) Accept A J Learmonth (237.10) Accept</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.7 Rules: Insulation Requirements			
<p><i>It is recommended that Condition RB3.3.2 is amended as follows:</i></p> <p>(a) <u>Any building which is to be used as habitable accommodation, or for commercial activity, must be insulated to meet the insulation standards of the New</u></p>	<p>The amended insulation provisions will ensure that all new dwellings within the district will be capable of providing housing for residents that is warm and healthy. This is consistent with the sustainable management philosophy of the Act, specifically in relation to enabling people and</p>	<p>Trevor and Susan Butler (No. 81.2) Accept A J Learmonth (No. 237.10) Accept National Park Village Progressive Assoc (46.12) Accept Joshua J Briscoe (135.2) Accept in Part Nina Manning (153.2) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.7 Rules: Insulation Requirements			
<p><u>Zealand Building Code for Climate Zone 3, as set out in Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 1992, specifically Clause H1: Energy Efficiency – Third Edition, (excluding H1.3.4 and H1.3.5 either through compliance with the Acceptable Solution H1/AS1 or through an Alternative Solution which achieves compliance with the Clause H1 of the Building Code 1992.</u></p>	<p>communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety; and in relation to the efficiency of the end use of energy.</p> <p>The recommended alterations will ensure a flexible approach is taken to meeting the insulation requirements, while still achieving the same outcome.</p>	<p>John Hotter (196.1) Accept in Part Peter Daly (198.5(b)) Accept in Part Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (257.10) Accept in Part King Country Glass (267.2) Reject House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc (291.1(c) &3) Reject</p> <p>Further Submissions: Peter Daly (1029.1) Reject Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (1077.43 & 44) Accept Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (1078.43 & 44) Accept Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1079.43 & 44) Accept Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (1080.43 & 44) Accept Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (1081.43 & 44) Accept</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.8 Rules: Amenity Values			
<p><i>Amend as follows:</i></p> <p>RB3.2.1 Controlled Activities</p> <p>(a) Relocated Buildings</p> <p>The Council has reserved control over the following</p>	<p>Council needs to ensure that an equitable approach is taken to controlling relocatable buildings when compared to new dwellings, unless the effects of either activity are different.</p> <p>As Council is not controlling the design of new buildings it is not considered appropriate to impose stricter controls on the design of</p>	<p>DN Scott (No. 37.2) Reject Joshua Briscoe (No. 135.2) Accept Nina Manning (No. 153.2) Reject John Hotter (No. 196.1) Reject Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (No. 257.11) Accept in Part Peter Daly (No. 198.5(a)) Accept in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.8 Rules: Amenity Values			
<p>matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity values of the surrounding environment <p>RB3.4 Assessment Criteria:</p> <p>(a) In particular consideration will be given to the following features:</p> <p>Exterior cladding, <u>including cladding to conceal piles:</u></p>	<p>relocatables beyond the controls already imposed. However, a minor amendment is recommended in relation to the Assessment Criteria relating to cladding around the base of the building.</p>	<p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.32) Reject</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.32) Reject</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.32) Reject</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.32) Reject</p> <p>Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.32) Reject</p> <p>Further Submissions:</p> <p>Peter Daly (1029.2) Accept in Part</p> <p>Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (1077.34) Reject</p> <p>Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (1078.34) Reject</p> <p>Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1079.34) Reject</p> <p>Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (1080.34) Reject</p> <p>Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (1081.34) Reject</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.9 Rules: Connections to Foundations			
<i>It is recommended that General Condition RB3.3.1 is deleted.</i>	The deletion of this condition will ensure an equitable approach is taken to the treatment of relocatable dwellings when compared to new dwellings.	Heavy Haulage Association (No. 291.2) Accept A J Learmouth (No.237.10) Reject Peter Daly (No. 198.5(c)) Accept in Part EC Forch & DL Cunningham (No. 44.4) Accept in Part Ashley Cole (No. 137.41) Reject	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.10 RB3.2.1 Written Approvals			
<i>No changes recommended.</i>	Providing for limited and full notification of applications for relocatables would not achieve an equitable approach when comparing relocatables to in situ built dwellings.	Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.31) Reject Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.31) Reject Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.31) Reject Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.31) Reject Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.31) Reject	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.11 RB3.2.1 Activity Status			
<p><i>No changes recommended.</i></p>	<p>The proposed controlled activity status will enable the specific adverse effects of relocatables to be managed, without widening the scope of considerations beyond that which would be considered for similar type activities.</p>	<p>Bruce Thompson (No. 100.1) Accepted in Part Joshua Briscoe (No. 135.2) Accepted in Part Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Hare (No. 106.31(b)) Reject Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (107.31(b)) Reject Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (108.31(b)) Reject Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargent (125.31(b)) Reject Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (130.31(b)) Reject Heavy Haulage Association (291.1(d), 291.4) Reject</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.12 Status: Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary			
<p><i>Administrative change to RB3.2.2 as follows:</i></p> <p>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to, the Assessment Criteria specified in section RB3.4 below.</p>	<p>To extend the remit of what can be considered by classing the activity as Discretionary would enable Council to consider a broader range of issues. This is not considered to be equitable, as this would enable issues to be considered for uninsulated relocatables (beyond insulation issues) that would not be considered for other relocatables, or other new dwellings.</p> <p>The administrative changes are proposed to ensure that the introductory text is consistent with</p>	<p>David Holland (No. 9.32) Reject</p> <p>Further Submissions: Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (1077.5) Reject Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (1078.5) Reject Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (1079.5) Reject Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (1080.5) Reject</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.12 Status: Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary			
	the requirements of the RMA in relation to Restricted Activities (Section 87A(3)), specifically that Council is restricted in decision-making to those 'matters over which discretion is restricted'.	Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (1081.5) Reject	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.13 Restrictive Covenants			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The imposition of private covenants aimed at enhancing the quality of new subdivisions does not create a planning issue for this district.	House Movers Section of the NZ Heavy Haulage Assoc (Inc) (No. 291.1(e)) Reject	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
Administrative Changes			
<p><i>It is requested that 'RB2.3.3.1 Explanation of Policy' is amended as follows (last sentence of paragraph two):</i></p> <p>'In such instances, applicants will need to demonstrate other measures to ensure the house is adequately insulated (this will be assessed as a <u>Restricted Limited Discretionary Activity</u>)'</p> <p>Grammatical changes are also requested in relation to the two following Objectives:</p> <p>RB2.2.2 OBJECTIVE (a) Amenity values of an area <u>are</u> maintained after a building is relocated on to a site.</p> <p>RB2.3.2 OBJECTIVE (a) All relocated buildings are insulated to an</p>	Administrative changes only	None	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
Administrative Changes			
adequate level to enable residents to: a. Have warm and healthy home environments;			

URBAN SETTLEMENT

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Objectives and Policies – General			
None	The submission supports the proposed provisions, which are considered to be consistent with Part II of the RMA.	Horizons (No. 280.5) accepted in part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Fire Stations			
<p>Amend US2.2.3 POLICIES as follows:</p> <p>(e) <u>To recognise the critical importance of fire stations to the safety of local communities, while balancing this against the potential effects on neighbouring properties.</u></p> <p>US3.2.2 Discretionary Activities</p> <p>(e) <u>Fire Stations</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: US2.2.2 & US2.2.3</u></p> <p>US3.3 GENERAL CONDITIONS</p> <p>US3.3.7 Noise</p> <p>(a) The Leq noise level and maximum noise level (Lmax) arising from any activity, <u>with the exception of fire</u></p>	<p>The recommended amendments will mean that within the Urban Settlement Zone, new Fire Stations will require consent as a Discretionary Activity, but with a policy recognising their importance to the community. It is considered that this rule framework will provide an appropriate balance between the need of communities for fire stations, while still protecting the amenity values of neighbouring properties. Therefore the recommended changes are considered appropriate in terms of sections 5 and 7 of the RMA.</p>	<p>NZ Fire Service Commission (No. 207.9, .13 & .15) accepted in part</p> <p>NZ Fire Service Commission (No. 207.11) rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.2 Fire Stations</p> <p><u>stations, measured at the boundary of any site, other than the site generating the noise shall not exceed the following limits:</u></p> <p>.....</p> <p><u>(b) The Leq noise level and maximum noise level (Lmax) arising from fire stations measured at the boundary of any site shall not exceed the following limits:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Monday to Saturday 7.00am to 10.00pm inclusive - 55dBLAeq (15 min);</u></p> <p><u>(ii) All other times and on public holidays - 45 dBLAeq (15 min);</u></p> <p><u>(iii) 10.00pm to 7.00am and on public holidays: maximum noise 65dBLAFmax”</u></p> <p><u>(c) Fire appliance sirens and call-out sirens for volunteer brigades shall not be subject to the noise limits outlined above, subject to the best practicable option always being adopted to minimise noise levels.</u></p> <p>US3.5 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</p> <p>US3.5.1 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</p> <p>(c) Whether the activity or development will generate noise levels to an unreasonable degree that is inconsistent with the character of the existing environment. <u>Alongside this, consideration will also be given to whether the noise</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Fire Stations			
<u>is essential (for example, fire sirens), and whether the noise is temporary in nature, or consistent.</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.3 Subdivision: Urban Settlement Zone (SU3.6.2.2)			
<i>No changes recommended</i>	The proposed assessment criteria will help to ensure that new sites are designed to enable future dwellings to be orientated to maximise solar gain. This is considered to be appropriate in terms of the sustainable management philosophy of the RMA, especially in relation to section 7.	Tauranga Ski Club (No. 95.16) rejected Further Submissions Terrence and Moyrene Patterson (FS1077.20) accepted Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell and Barry Harre (FS1078.20) accepted Allan Bonnici and Sandra McInnes (FS1079.20) accepted Tracey Haszard and Phil Sargeant (FS1081.20) accepted Robert and Nicolette Brodnax (FS1080.20) accepted	





FUTURE URBAN

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Future Urban Area: General			
<p><i>Change to the map legend to clearly show the “Future Urban Area” as an “overlay” and the corresponding change to the planning maps (such as crosshatching of the overlay area) to allow the underlying rural zone map colour to show through.</i></p>	<p>The Future Urban Area is an “overlay” placed upon the Rural zone, as such all of the Rural objectives, policies and rules apply to this area of land, along with a specific objective some associated policies and rules which apply exclusively to the future urban “overlay”.</p> <p>The “overlay” should remain identified as “Future Urban” not “Future Residential” as this area may be used for activities other than solely residential.</p>	<p>David Holland (No 9.2) accepted Donald Beggs (No 101.1) accepted in part New Zealand Transport Agency (No 208.6) accepted in part Errol Vincent (No 220.3) accepted in part Ngati Rangī Trust (No 255.4) accepted in part Richard Milne (No 306.1) rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Future Urban Area: RU3.3.9 Rural Rules regarding Future Urban			
<p>Amend RU3.3.9 as follows:</p> <p>RU3.3.9 Future Urban Area</p> <p>(a) All activities located within the Future Urban Area <u>Overlay</u> shall be located in a manner that recognises and provides for any identified plan for future development of the area.</p> <p>(b) <u>The minimum yards provided on any one site shall be:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>10m – front, side and rear unless any alternative yard distance would enable efficient urban development while protecting amenity values or has been approved pursuant to a Comprehensive Development Plan.</u></p>	<p>The requested amendments will keep activities that occur within the Future Urban Area more consistent with an urban style of development rather than with rural zone activities. It is appropriate to allow for alternative yard distances to be established through the Comprehensive Development Plan process, which will allow a full consideration of the effect of the yard in conjunction with the size and shape of the parent and adjoining lots.</p>	<p>Ruapehu District Council (No 268.10) Accept in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Future Urban Area: RU3.3.9 Rural Rules regarding Future Urban			
<p>(c) <u>The maximum height of any building shall be 7.5m or 2.0m plus the horizontal distance from the nearest site boundary, whichever is the less.</u></p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RU3.5.1(a)(i), (ii), (iii), (vii) and (ix), and RU2.7</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.3 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>SU3.2.2.5 <u>Re-subdivision Potential</u></p> <p>(a) In the Future Urban Area <u>Overlay</u>, subsequent re-subdivision for urban purposes should will be facilitated with <u>by</u> any subdivision satisfying the following:</p> <p>(i) A configuration which would permit a complying urban subdivision to be carried out in future in an effective manner <u>and which enables efficient use of urban land.</u></p> <p>(ii) Appropriate regard to the constraints created by topography or other natural features on any subsequent urban subdivision.</p> <p>(iii) Provision for feasible, adequate and economic subdivisional access and infrastructure provision, <u>including a well connected street system between the subdivision and the surrounding area.</u></p>	<p>The proposed changes ensure that there is no confusion in relation to the application of the rule, in that it will be applied in relation to re-subdivision for urban purposes within the Future Urban area.</p>	<p>David Holland (No 9.24 and 9.26) Accept in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.3 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>(iv) <u>Staging that recognises the District Plan’s focus of enabling short to medium term development within the existing urban area of Ohakune, given the undeveloped land available there; and avoids flooding the realistically available market.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>All subdivision applications involving land within the Future Urban Area Overlay shall be accompanied by a Comprehensive Structure Plan that includes evidence of consultation with all other landowners whose sites are within the portion of the Future Urban Area in question (ie either north or south of Shannon Street in Ohakune), Ruapehu District Council, relevant nearby landowners where there is potential for creating a more connected street system, and infrastructure providers. The Comprehensive Structure Plan shall address those matters identified within Rule SU3.2.3.2(j) below.</u></p> <p><i>(This text includes subsequent changes made to these provisions elsewhere in the future urban Recommendations)</i></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
Rural Zone - Policy	The proposed changes ensure that there is no confusion in relation to the application of the rule,	Allan and Julie Whale (No 98.3 and 98.5) Accept in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>RU2.7 <u>ISSUE</u></p> <p>Future Urban Area</p> <p>(a) Subdivision and landuse <u>activities</u> compromising the ability to <u>comprehensively</u> develop land to the east of Ohakune for future urban development.</p> <p>RU2.7.1 <u>OBJECTIVE</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Provide for a future urban area that is overlaid on rural zoned land to the east of Ohakune, within which limited interim development can take place and which ensures there are no impediments to efficient, full urban development in the future</u> <u>Provide for a future urban area within which limited interim development can take place until full urban development can occur.</u></p> <p>RU2.7.2 <u>Policies</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Ensure that the activities carried out in the rural zone covered by the future urban area overlay do not generate adverse environmental effects and/or compromise efficient future urban development and use.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Enable the continuation of a range of existing activities providing they avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse environmental effects and do not compromise efficient future urbanisation potential.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Control the subdivision of land and siting of</u></p>	<p>in that it will be applied in relation to re-subdivision for urban purposes within the Future Urban area</p>	<p>John Hotter (No 196.3) Accept in Part Further Submitters Allan Whale (No 1038.6 in relation to 196.3) Accept in Part</p>	



WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>(d) <u>buildings so that the size, arrangement, access and development of lots will not compromise efficient potential urban development.</u> <u>Ensure that any development undertaken in the rural zone within the future urban area overlay does not exacerbate downstream flood risks.</u></p> <p>(e) <u>Enable quality design outcomes which create an overall sense of place with a character that is distinctive but well connected to the existing urban zones of Ohakune Township through the use of Comprehensive Structure Plans for subdivision and development of land within the Future Urban Area Overlay.</u></p> <p>(f) <u>Ensure all Comprehensive Structure Plans consider the surrounding area of which they are a part, and result in outcomes that maintain and enhance the connections between the new and existing urban and surrounding area, where this is also part of the future urban area, and do not undermine the continued development of vacant lots within Ohakune.</u></p> <p>(a) — Ensure that the activities carried out in the future urban area do not generate adverse environmental effects and or compromise future urban use.</p> <p>(b) — Enable the continuation of a range of existing activities providing they avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse environmental effects</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>and do not compromise future urbanisation potential.</p> <p>(e) Control the subdivision of land and siting of buildings so that the size, arrangement, access and development of lots will not compromise potential urban development.</p> <p>(d) Ensure that any development undertaken in the future urban area does not exacerbate downstream flood risks.</p> <p>RU2.7.2.1 <u>Explanation of Policies</u></p> <p><u>Council's approach to development in the short to medium term is to consolidate urban development within the existing ex-Residential Medium and High zoned areas of the District before rezoning any additional land to Residential. Specifically with regard to Ohakune it is recognised that the logical area for the town to extend is to the east, primarily as there are already community facilities (the College and associated facilities e.g. squash courts, tennis courts, gymnasium) within this area and existing patterns of infrastructure lend themselves to accommodating future development.</u></p> <p><u>Interim development within the rural zone covered by the future urban area overlay, including infrastructure provision, has the potential to make further conversion to full urban development difficult if not managed appropriately. While there is current demand for development, particularly smaller lot "rural residential" type opportunities, in this area, sporadic interim development can effectively make further conversion to full urban</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>development uneconomic. This is particularly so if development affects or pre-empts the effective and efficient location of roads and a well connected urban street system, services and other supporting land use activities. The type of infrastructure provided, particularly for rural residential or other forms of interim residential development, can have major impacts on further conversion to urban development in future.</u></p> <p><u>The underlying zone of sites within the Future Urban Area Overlay is Rural, however, they are earmarked for future development. At this time Council considers that only limited development should be provided for within this area. It is envisaged that more intensive development will be triggered by a plan change to re-zone this land, with the appropriate urban zoning to be determined through this process. In the meantime, development will be considered through the resource consent process through the assessment of comprehensive structure plan applications which support future efficient full urban development. For example, in the future urban overlay area bounded by Shannon St, Ruapehu Road, the railway line and the existing urban area it is anticipated that an application would be for the entire area, and would consider the overall future development of the area, including stormwater management and a connected street system. Where existing urban subdivisions have not been implemented and include cul de sacs rather than a connected street system, Council acknowledges that there is some public benefit to enabling a more connected street system, through a co-operative approach with adjacent landowners, and with Council involvement.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p>4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5</p> <p><u>Staged subdivisions may be possible within the bounds of an approved comprehensive structure plan, where the staging recognises the range of urban development and redevelopment opportunities already available and the realistic demand, is consistent with infrastructure provision, and there is sufficient information for certainty about the outcomes to be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>The intention of the rules associated with the Future Urban Area Overlay is to restrict the unplanned sprawl of “rural-residential” type lots over this important future development area. This will in turn allow sufficient time for Council to carefully determine the type, nature, style and location of the development considered appropriate for this area, or for appropriate applications that ensure sound urban outcomes.</u></p> <p>Council’s approach to development in the short term to medium term is to consolidate urban development within the extent of the ex-Residential Medium and High zoned areas of the District before rezoning any additional land to Residential. Specifically with regard to Ohakune it is recognised that the logical area for the town to extend is to the east, primarily as there are already Community facilities (the College and associated facilities e.g. squash courts, tennis courts, gymnasium) within this area and existing patterns of infrastructure lend themselves to accommodating future development.</p> <p>Interim development within this future urban area, including infrastructure provision, has the potential to make further conversion to full urban development difficult if not managed</p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>appropriately. While there is current demand for development, particularly smaller lot “rural residential” type opportunities, in this area, sporadic interim development can effectively make further conversion to full urban development uneconomic. This is particularly so if development affects or pre-empt the effective and efficient location of roads, services and other supporting land use activities. The type of infrastructure provided, particularly for rural residential or other forms of interim residential development, can have major impacts on further conversion to urban development in future.</p> <p><i>(This text includes subsequent changes made to these provisions elsewhere in the future urban Recommendations)</i></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>Rural Zone - Policy</p> <p>RU2.7 ISSUE</p> <p><i>See amendments to RU2.7 outlined in the section above.</i></p> <p>Rural Zone – Rules</p> <p>RU3.3.9 Future Urban Area</p> <p>(a) All activities located within the Future Urban Area <u>Overlay</u> shall be located in a manner that recognises and provides for any identified plan for future development of the area.</p>	<p>Until such time as it necessary and desirable to apply full urban zoning to the area it is reasonable to allow for appropriate interim development of the Future Urban area to the east of Ohakune. If properly and comprehensively designed, such interim development has the potential to generate positive effects through addressing stormwater management, establishing effective future movement corridors, and creating a pattern of development that properly responds to its setting and environmental features. It is necessary however for such interim development to be planned in conjunction with other landowners within the Future Urban area. The amendments to the Plan Change recognise and provide for</p>	<p>Allan and Julie Whale (No 98.3 and 98.5) Accepted in Part</p> <p>John Hotter (No 196.3) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Further Submissions:</p> <p>Allan Whale (No 1038.6 in relation to 196.3) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>(b) <u>The minimum yards provided on any one site shall be:</u> (i) <u>10m – front, side and rear unless any alternative yard distance would enable efficient urban development while protecting amenity values or has been approved pursuant to a Comprehensive Development Plan.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The maximum height of any building shall be 7.5m or 2.0m plus the horizontal distance from the nearest site boundary, whichever is the less.</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RU3.5.1(a)(i), (ii), (iii), (vii) and (ix), and RU2.7</u> Subdivision – Rules</p> <p>SU3.2.1.2 Discretionary Activities The following activities are Discretionary Activities, provided they comply with the General Conditions outlined in section SU3.2.2.</p> <p>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to, the Assessment Criteria noted below the General or Condition(s) with which the activity is unable to comply.</p> <p>(i) <u>Subdivision of up to 10 sites as part of a staged Comprehensive Structure Plan development within the Rural Zone covered by Future Urban Area Overlay to the east of Ohakune</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies – RU2.7, SU2.2 and</u></p>	<p>such opportunities.</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>SU2.3.</u></p> <p>(b) — Any subdivision of a site with a Computer Freehold Register issued prior to X (being the date of a decision by Council on this plan) within the Future Urban Area to the east of Ohakune, where:</p> <p>(i) — No more than one additional lot is created.</p> <p>Relevant Objectives and Policies — RU2.7</p> <p>SU3.2.1.3 Non-Complying Activities The following activities are Non-Complying Activities:</p> <p>(c) Any subdivision with a complying building platform within 500 metres of Tongariro National Park <u>(excluding any site located within the Future Urban Overlay Area in Ohakune):</u></p> <p>SU3.2.2 General Conditions</p> <p>Compliance with the following Conditions is required for all Discretionary Activities as outlined in Rule SU3.2.1.2 above, subject to any amendments required to ensure compliance with Standard SU 3.2.2.5 below.</p> <p>SU3.2.2.5 <u>Re-subdivision Potential</u></p> <p>(c) In the Future Urban Area <u>Overlay</u>, subsequent re-subdivision for urban purposes should will be facilitated with <u>by</u> any subdivision satisfying the following:</p> <p>(i) A configuration which would permit a</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>complying urban subdivision to be carried out in future in an effective manner <u>and which enables efficient use of urban land.</u></p> <p>(ii) Appropriate regard to the constraints created by topography or other natural features on any subsequent urban subdivision.</p> <p>(iii) Provision for feasible, adequate and economic subdivisional access and infrastructure provision, <u>including a well connected street system between the subdivision and the surrounding area.</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Staging that recognises the District Plan's focus of enabling short to medium term development within the existing urban area of Ohakune, given the undeveloped land available there; and avoids flooding the realistically available market.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>All subdivision applications involving land within the Future Urban Area Overlay shall be accompanied by a Comprehensive Structure Plan that includes evidence of consultation with all other landowners whose sites are within the portion of the Future Urban Area in question (ie either north or south of Shannon Street in Ohakune), Ruapehu District Council, relevant nearby landowners where there is potential for creating a more connected street</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>system, and infrastructure providers. The Comprehensive Structure Plan shall address those matters identified within Rule SU3.2.3.2(j) below.</u></p> <p><i>(This text includes subsequent changes made to these provisions elsewhere in the future urban recommendations).</i></p> <p>SU3.2.3.2 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</p> <p>Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities will be assessed against, but not limited to, the assessment criteria below.</p> <p>Reference to relevant assessment criteria in other sections of the District Plan may be required as stated for the General and Conditions above.</p> <p>Where any subdivision includes a Comprehensive Structure Plan the following criteria will apply:</p> <p><u>(j) Subdivision and development within the Future Urban Area Overlay.</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Context</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which the proposal</u> <u>a. provides a context analysis of the site within the context of the town and the social, cultural, economic and other activities within this; the area, including</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>other future urban areas and the rural area; key natural and built elements and places, including landscape context and character; ecological values, including waterways, and stormwater and other requirements; public spaces, including streets; historic heritage and any other matters relevant to a context analysis.</u></p> <p><u>b. takes a long term view in responding positively to the above, and to the factors set out below.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Good connections</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which the proposal provides for:</u></p> <p>a. <u>A safe, attractive and well connected street network that enables choice of routes by those in vehicles, including emergency vehicles, or walking and cycling, and ensures appropriate, car parking, infrastructure services, street tree planting and landscape treatment.</u></p> <p>b. <u>agreed connections to other existing and future urban areas for a connected street system to the north, south, east and west;</u></p> <p>c. <u>the movement and place functions of streets, the opportunities they present for social and cultural interaction, and their role as public spaces;</u></p> <p>d. <u>safe attractive pathways for walking and cycling through green networks, including stormwater and other reserves, and that safely and directly link schools, reserves, and commercial and residential areas, and public and private spaces;</u></p> <p>e. <u>stormwater management features such as rain gardens, swales and permeable paving to be</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>incorporated into roading design, as is space for infrastructure services, street tree planting and landscape treatment:</u></p> <p>f. <u>streets that support the character of the new and surrounding area, with appropriate capacity and that protects the safety of road users, including cyclists and walkers.</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Infrastructure location, capacity and design for stormwater, water and wastewater</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Infrastructure for stormwater, wastewater and water supply are designed to ensure techniques are used to minimise water use and wastewater generation.</u></p> <p>b. <u>The infrastructure provided to serve any new development is of a recognised public standard.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Development retains and enhances riparian margins and provides protection through a range of building setbacks and replanting measures.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Development incorporates on-site storm water mitigation techniques that limit storm water runoff.</u></p> <p>e. <u>An integrated approach to storm water management is adopted for storm water mitigation, with the emphasis being in the first instance on the reduction of storm water generated from sites through reuse of storm water and increased permeable areas, including de-compaction of soils following earthworks.</u></p> <p>f. <u>The lots to be created are of a size and dimension that can meet (at later building and development stage), provision for stormwater mitigation on-site.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>g. <u>The design of development defines the 200 year flood plain, and limits development within that floodplain to infrastructure, including roads, water supply, wastewater, storm water facilities and reserves.</u></p> <p>h. <u>Stormwater retention and treatment facilities are to be designed to retain in stream ecological values and add additional habitat (e.g. wetlands) where possible.</u></p> <p>i. <u>Stormwater is managed to avoid any potential effects of development on downstream properties, including the ability for stormwater flows to be retained on site.</u></p> <p>j. <u>Earthworks and other site works are undertaken in such a way as to avoid adverse effects on watercourse, areas of ecological values and neighbouring properties arising from changes in landform and the generation of sediments.</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Provision for public open space and community facilities while retaining and enhancing natural features, having regard to the integration of any subdivision or development with adjoining land.</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The proposal responds positively to existing characteristics, including the built and natural environment, that make the site, town and area distinctive.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Public open space is designed to provide a sense of order and proportion with specific regard given to the human scale.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Public open space is orientated and designed to provide pedestrians with adequate access to sunlight.</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>In particular, public spaces should be designed to maximise sunlight access between 10am and 2pm on the shortest day.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Seating and landscaping is made available in a pleasant, clearly visible, convenient and safe location. Landscaping should comprise low shrubs and plants or tall open trees and shrubs which do not visually obscure the seating from public viewing.</u></p> <p>e. <u>Adequate provision is made for access and use of the public space by the disabled, including visually impaired.</u></p> <p>f. <u>The proposal addressed the need for reserves; including drainage reserves, and ensuring these (where possible) have street frontages, provide alternative linkages between streets and are overlooked by surrounding activities.</u></p> <p>g. <u>Subdivision and development will enable building frontages with windows, balconies, and doors providing oversight of public open space to contribute to vitality, interest and public safety.</u></p> <p>(v) <u>Bulk, scale, design and location of sites, buildings, car parking and driveways.</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The development requires landscaping and/or screening to reduce the visibility of parking, loading and servicing areas from streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>b. <u>The development's visual appeal will not undermined by the location of intended service areas, and rubbish storage and recycling facilities can be located away</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p>from habitable spaces and screened from public places.</p> <p>c. <u>Vehicle ingress and egress to sites can be designed so that it is primarily considered from the perspective of pedestrians and cyclists, particularly in terms of visibility and the use of paving materials;</u></p> <p>d. <u>Car parking, driveways and circulation can be integrated into the overall site and building design.</u></p> <p>e. <u>The development will provide well lit parking areas and pedestrian linkages, with defined footpaths.</u></p> <p>(vi) <u>Landscape Treatment and Screening</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The proposal ensures that activity and property boundaries are located so as to support sound landscape outcomes.</u></p> <p>b. <u>It is feasible to retain existing vegetation and landforms.</u></p> <p>c. <u>The proposed form of buildings resulting from subdivision lot development can complement the natural rise and fall of the land and existing trees</u></p> <p>d. <u>The subdivision considers building placement or off setting in relation to maintaining amenity across the overall development, and between future buildings.</u></p> <p>(vii) <u>Acoustic and visual amenity between the sites to be developed and existing development on adjoining and adjacent land</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which sites have been designed to minimise conflict between noisy or visually intrusive</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>activities and activities requiring a higher acoustic or visual amenity. This is particularly relevant to the North Island Main Trunk Line and State Highway 49.</u></p> <p>(viii) <u>Protection and enhancement of natural landscape qualities including the protection of sites, features or values (cultural, ecological, historical or amenity related)</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which:</u></p> <p>a. <u>The proposal responds positively to distinctive landforms (including Mount Ruapehu and other mountains), including rivers, streams and other waterbodies, the needs of indigenous plants and animals and protects landscapes and ecological systems.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Any site of cultural, ecological, historical or amenity related value has been identified.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Any identified areas will be protected and enhanced and the methods to achieve this.</u></p> <p>c. <u>The proposal responds positively to the area’s cultural, built and natural heritage, including histories, buildings, places and landscapes and whether these are incorporated and referenced in what is developed.</u></p> <p>(ix) <u>Areas of contamination and the rehabilitation standards required</u></p> <p>a. <u>Identification of any areas of contamination within the site, including but not limited to, contamination</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
<p><u>associated with past rural uses of any site.</u></p> <p>b. <u>The extent to which any identified areas of contamination require remediation and the methods to achieve this.</u></p> <p>(x) <u>Protection, safety and access requirements of existing or future Network Utility infrastructure.</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which adequate provision has been made to enable protection, safety and access for existing or future network utility infrastructure, including the assessment of the potential effects of the development on this infrastructure.</u></p> <p>(xi) <u>Consideration as to whether the proposal has the potential to increase the risk resulting from any natural hazard</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which the development may result in an increased risk from natural hazards, including but not limited to, erosion, subsidence, slippage, or inundation from any source, or liquefaction.</u></p> <p>(xiii) <u>The comprehensive structure plan shall demonstrate how the overall development will be staged, including:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Recognising the District Plan's focus of enabling short to medium term development within the existing urban area of Ohakune, given the undeveloped land available there; and avoiding flooding the realistically available market.</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 Future Urban Area: SU3.2.1.2(b) and SU3.2.2.5			
b. <u>Any retrofitting to connect existing streets with streets to be developed, and how this will be achieved.</u> c. <u>Identification of critical infrastructure and other works that need to be undertaken or installed to serve each stage of the comprehensive structure plan, and the realistic timing of such infrastructure, taking into account a above.</u>			