

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO01.1	Patricia Cardinelli-Wayne	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend to include disabled access to homes so that houses are also affordable and accessible to the disabled community.	Because I cannot see anything for disabled people to be able to live in some of these houses. If you break your ankle how will you be able to climb up three stairs for the 3+ months it takes to heal? Our blind community, our wheelchair community, our invisible disabilities community and a lot of other disabilities are not covered by this plan. Being able bodied is only a temporary state. Have the Blind Low Vision NZ, Enabling Good Lives, Crohns and Colitis NZ and other disability groups/associations been consulted in how to make homes/this plan to include our disabled whānua?
SO02.1	Carolyn Bashford	Entire Plan Change	Support	11 meters is ok in most locations.	The more housing available to families is good
SO03.1	Collette Martin	Zone extent	Oppose	Remove Featherston Street from the MRZ	Featherston St is already an extremely busy street, with multiple schools, businesses and residential homes.
SO04.1	Karwa Dyer	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend to have neighbours consent prior to building	It's affecting home owners and could potentially devalue their property
SO05.1	Jaskaran Singh	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO06.1	John Mullinger	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I disagree with allowing extra height and more than one dwellings per site	PNCC is removing on street parking at an alarming rate. Each dwelling will have 1-2 cars that will need to be parked somewhere. The removal of the requirement for off street parking means that there is nowhere for these cars.
SO07.1	Robert Goddard	Zone extent	Amend	Focus zone on areas very close to The Square	Not stated
SO08.1	Ruichen Li	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Palmerston North is still very small. It's much better to expand outwards from the city prior to densify it. The entire city only takes a 10 minute drive to get from one side to the other. There's no need to make the city more dense.
SO09.1	Aya Al-Ibousi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	I don't agree with the medium density housing. I don't think palmy is a city that should expand upwards. I think we can expand outwards. We moved from Auckland to palmy seeking the big yards and big houses. We don't want to see this happen here.
SO10.1	Holly Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Too restricted
SO11.1	Michael Mccavana	Zone extent	Oppose	Exclude Whiskey Creek liquefaction floodplain from the MRZ.	Building on a floodplain will never be ok.. it will get hit sooner or later.
SO12.1	Goodwin Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Just because there's duplexes down our street, in which u will raise rates for who knows what project I don't believe u have sent any communications until today, unless you're having secret meetings and not all of us get the opportunity to have a say
SO13.1	Aous Al-Ibousi	Zone extent	Oppose	Re-evaluate and potentially exclude the midpoint of Fairs Road (from 27 to 85) due to the recent changes in public transport routes.	The lack of public transport
SO14.1	Kate Vandemeer	MRZ-S7	Amend	Set a percentage of units to have greater minimum outdoor space	I would like council to consider implementing some allowances and incentives to build 2-3 bedroom homes that have sufficient outdoor space to allow for owning pets, because I feel this is an area of need in our communities.
SO15.1	Bruce and Margaret Belgrave	Standards	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO16.1	Kathryn Stowell	Standards	Amend	Amend the height suggestion of three stories. Two stories should be the absolute maximum in specific areas like Manapouri crescent and Elmira avenue to retain the original intention to have this area as a garden suburb.	Height controls are set too high for some special areas. See comment above.
SO16.2	Kathryn Stowell	Rules	Oppose	Resource consent should be required for any building or alteration in specific areas like Elmira and Manapouri.	These are special heritage areas designated garden suburbs. Unregulated building could completely destroy the original intentions set down in 1929 as well as decrease the aesthetic appeal of the area.
SO16.3	Kathryn Stowell	Zone extent	Oppose	Delete areas like Manapouri and Elmira Crescents	Manapouri and Elmira are designated as a garden suburb. So putting duplexes and/or multi units would most probably lead to fewer gardens and fewer garages and more cars parked on the street. This would be against the intended aesthetic attractiveness of the area. It would also devalue properties.
SO16.4	Kathryn Stowell	Zone extent	Support	Keep the medium density housing to areas close to public transport	No buses go down Victoria Ave. the only bus that goes down Albert Street is one of the Massey buses. I don't think this should change. This will keep Elmira and Manapouri more private, quieter streets and encourage property owners to maintain gardens as was the original intention of the city plan in 1929. There are other areas on busy bus routes more suitable for medium density housing.
SO16.5	Kathryn Stowell	Standards	Oppose	Section sizes in specific areas should not be smaller than already existing. Eg Elmira and Manapouri.	Smaller sections means no lawns or gardens as has occurred in other areas of the city. Garden suburbs need gardens. Gardens need a reasonable sized section.
SO17.1	David Brooks	Zone extent	Amend	Revise the standards by which a suburb is selected for inclusion.	You will create massive traffic snarl ups if this is not given proper attention. And don't say everyone will walk or bike because that is simply not true.
SO18.1	Shane Telfer	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO19.1	Rob Belchamber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO20.1	Ruth Jackson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	I think our cities will be more efficient and enable more affordable housing if urban density is matched to transport and shopping/community facilities. A note however, living in Panako Place I have noticed it often floods during periods of heavy rain. Maybe stormwater systems need upgrading and flood mitigation measures need to be included in any new builds.
SO21.1	Edwin Hoeksema	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Amend	11 metre height will take away all privacy to the residents on Summerhays Street
SO22.1	Nate Sextus	Zone extent	Support	Extend Hokowhitu boundary to include Anderson St	Anderson St is street that is close to the bus stop. Many of the properties are either rented (a lot to students) or own by KO. It would make sense to include this so there is an option to put more housing in, particularly for social and student flats.
SO23.1	Graeme Fenemor	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	We need more housing, and it needs to be within the current city envelope as currently we are spreading and creating more traffic and commuting issues, this proposal will reduce the spread of infrastructure needs, and help with maintenance of the existing infrastructure and future infrastructure needs within the current city boundary envelope.
SO24.1	Susan Swan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Too many cars will be parked on streets as sections too small for parking; not enough green land on sections to absorb rain, will end up causing flooding and stormwater will not cope; who is going to pay for the extra infrastructure, don't want it to be a burden on taxpayers.
SO25.1	Tayte Cozens	Entire Plan Change	Support	Identify which properties are heritage properties.	I own a home in the area which could potentially have 3 units, but would like to know which homes? Should there be a register?
SO26.1	Adrian Morgan	Zone extent	Oppose	Remove Kelvin Grove area	The Kelvin Grove area included in this proposal are all relatively new homes close to the outer city limits. Your plan has left out areas closer to the centre of town which have older homes which would better be demolished and replaced with healthier homes.
SO27.1	Carole Hill	Zone extent	Amend	Exclude area on Featherston Street near Russell Street	Currently on Featherston St near Russell St, there is very little on road parking. Increasing the numbers of dwellings near the intersection which is frequented by school children, could be dangerous as well as frustrating for those that live there. The current difficulty to get in and out of the properties will only be made worse if there are more dwellings/driveways potential vehicles.
SO28.1	Kell and Antonio Wood	Zone extent	Oppose	Exclude parts of Kelvin Grove	We moved from Tyne street after living in my husband's family home due to all the new hnz houses that were put in down the street as it used to be a peaceful street but after these homes were built it got bad. Couldn't sleep due to noises, party's. Fighting. My children didn't even want to play out on the street anymore due to it. So am worried now as that was the main reason we moved away and gave up our home and moved the kelvin grove thinking we wouldn't have to put up with homes like that. So very disappointed to see that we are now in the zone
SO29.1	Lisa Greer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO30.1	Jean Tipping	Zone extent	Oppose	Address stormwater problems in Margaret Steet first before intensifying.	We already have significant storm water problems at the. Bottom of the hill in Margaret Street, mainly house numbers 10, 12, 11 and 9 and 9A. The storm water floods the street on both sides of the road in heavy rain events. Twice the fire brigade has been called out to pump out water surrounding the house at 9A. The storm water does not drain away in time in these events and causes significant stress and possible damage to the properties.
SO31.1	Gavin Casey	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Leave it at a maximum 9m height of the building	Some owners that own the original buildings will be at a disadvantage in the reduction of sunlight and some circumstance, their privacy. A resource consent needs to be implemented with height of buildings in urban areas that are already developed. Developing areas are better equipped in establishing higher buildings.
SO31.2	Gavin Casey	MRZ-R7	Amend	Some circumstances, 3 units/ houses will be too much. Especially in cul-de-sacs. Numbers of development needs to be lower in certain established areas.	More street parking. Streets become crowded. Increase risk of anti-social behavior. Increase in noise pollution.
SO32.1	Philip Watkinson	MRZ-S1	Amend	In addition to existing provisions, if a height to this proposed building has existing rooftop solar electricity generation then alter the new build to make sure the existing build is not shaded significantly more by this proposed build during the months of least solar power of May, June and July.	Significant increase in the Neighbours rooftop shading during the months of least solar power of May, June and July with significantly economically disadvantage the Neighbour by significantly reducing the rooftop solar electricity generation of the Neighbour.
SO33.1	Paul J Moughan	MRZ-S2	Support	Retain as notified	Height limit in relation to boundary means people in this area won't be affected by shading from tall buildings.
SO33.2	Paul J Moughan	MRZ-R7	Support	Retain as notified	Overall I strongly support the proposed change: Increased housing supply and choice. It makes better use of valuable city infrastructure and will help to revitalise the CBD.
SO33.3	Paul J Moughan	Zone extent	Support	Reduce the zone extent	Perhaps, initially, the scheme should apply to areas contiguous with the Square.
SO34.1	Daniel Hamid	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Not allowing very tall housing to be built where it will block sunlight or reduce privacy for existing houses.	I am concerned about tall developments reducing the quality of life for existing residents where tall buildings block sun and/or remove existing privacy by allowing line of sight into existing houses.
SO35.1	Hayden Giles	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	I object to everything. Build new suburbs. Don't stuff up the neighborhoods and people's lives.
SO36.1	Mark and Zeld Anderson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Concerns about noise, anti-social behaviour, negative impacts on right to enjoy properties in peace and resale values.
SO37.1	Roman Konopka	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO38.1	Lilian Obonyo	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO39.1	Steve Billington	Zone extent	Oppose	* Reassess the areas proposed for medium-density development to ensure they align with community expectations and environmental considerations. * Prioritise infrastructure upgrades before increasing housing density. * Explore alternative solutions.	Concerns about impact on neighbourhood character, infrastructure capacity, traffic and parking and environmental impact
SO40.1	Amardeep Singh	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO41.1	Bev McKay	Zone extent	Oppose	Remove Kelvin Grove area from the MRZ	Concerns about decrease in property values, loss of privacy, impacts on amenity and character.
SO42.1	Ikap Holdings Limited	Zone extent	Oppose	Remove Sections at Bodell Street, and adjacent houses along Featherston Street from this proposal. Specifically the area encompassed by Ruahine Street, Featherston Streets and Heretaunga Streets.	Frequent stormwater and sewage overflow from the infrastructure under heavy rain has caused flooding in the past. Adding significantly more housing to this particular area poses significant repetition of these events. Bodell Street aged care area should be available for Hospital expansion in the future, increased housing or other development in this area will inhibit future possibilities
SO43.1	David White	Reserves rezoning	Oppose	Stop the process to rezone these reserves to housing	The rezoning of reserve land should not take place. There is more need for public reserves if you are going to increase housing density. In fill housing and multi-level units do not allow for recreation space on private land. While it may be argued there is other reserve land near these 2 blocks this will not always be the case. The reserve were set up by our city founders to ensure there is green space. We should respect that.
SO44.1	Angela Oliver	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Not in favour of increased density housing, even though I understand there is a requirement for more housing.
SO45.1	Eru Henare-Findlay	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Please use this as an opportunity to make Palmerston north less car centric
SO46.1	William Glassey	Standards	Support	No off-street parking for most units.	Traffic is a real problem for exiting residents, especially cyclists and pedestrians. We now have a very good bus service in this street, which should be encouraged and used. A lot/most of it is quite walkable to the square or terrace end.
SO47.1	Tania Wilson	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Delete this standard	The new height of 11m will impact neighbouring houses of normal height, by reducing their privacy and sunlight. The new proposed buildings only being 1.5m from boundary and 11m tall is an imposition and an eyesore for the city.
SO48.1	Samuel Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Require a resource consent for all development	It sets a worrying precedent.
SO48.2	Samuel Hill	General	Amend	Amend comprehensively	The process for vegetation clearance (particularly taonga, native vegetation species) and soil disturbance on a would-be new development area needs to be a lot more stringently policed. Property developers should have to submit a full plan of their ecological strategies to offset the ecological damage, carbon footprint of the development and also their climate change mitigation plans and policies, before a single sod of earth is moved.
SO48.3	Samuel Hill	General	Amend	Require planting of trees and other vegetation, and wetland construction, as part of new development	The current proposals do not sufficiently mitigate the effects of climate-change events such as flooding and the urban island heat effect.
SO49.1	Melissa Viviers	Zone extent	Amend	Remove Kelvin Grove area from the MRZ	Concerns about loss of privacy and Amenity, infrastructure strain, environmental impact, loss of neighbourhood character, increased traffic and parking, decreased property values and safety.
SO50.1	Con Fraser	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO51.1	Kathleen and Rick Field	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Add a clause where the maximum height allowed in subsequent medium density developments must take into account already existing neighbouring solar panels.	Concern is that my recently installed solar panels may be overshadowed by a subsequent duplex or apartment building to my north side.
SO52.1	Hayley Steele	Zone extent	Oppose	Do not enable construction of three story duplexes down Bryant Street	Concerns about loss of character homes and lack of maintenance of new dwellings.
SO53.1	Kim Mckelvey	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Houses should be no more than single storey	Concerns about loss of privacy and impact on other homeowners/residents.
SO54.1	Mark Patchett	MRZ-S1	Amend	Decrease the height allowance by 2-3 metres	These height controls are set too high as they would potentially restrict access to sunlight and increase visual intrusion. Any number of suburban two-story houses/apartments is fine, even cheek-by-jowl development, but 11 metres is too high.
SO55.1	Duplicate of SO51				
SO56.1	Gerard Tapp	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Remove the ability to develop multi builds on single sections without consulting neighbors	If you want to build bulk housing areas, why not purchase land and develop it there, rather than ruining peoples out looks and what they have worked hard for, to cram a few extra dwellings in.
SO57.1	Philip Robins	Zone extent	Oppose	Remove Elmira from the MRZ	Emila is a special heritage avenue and dates back to 1929. It is one of the first examples of a garden suburb.
SO58.1	Sarah Harris	Zone extent	Oppose	Reduce the area covered by medium density zone	Allowing buildings of this height will shade other people's homes and damage the character of the area. The zone should be reduced to tighter boundaries around town so the suburbs remain suburbs.
SO59.1	Donna Cummerfield	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Concerns about loss of privacy, sunlight access, street character, increased traffic and congestion and loss of property value.
SO60.1	Dhaval Sevak	Zone extent	Support	Include Drake Street in the MRZ.	The low height restricts development potential.
SO61.1	Paul and Michelle Martin	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Reduce the proposed maximum building height of 11 metres to no more than 8 metres.	The proposed maximum building height of 11 metres is too high and will adversely impact the privacy of existing neighbours. It would also have a detrimental effect on the street appeal with large 11 metre structures looking out of place amongst standard housing.
SO62.1	Jo-Anne Siegel	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Reduce the permitted height of buildings	Because of impacts on privacy in back yards

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO63.1	Allan Anderson	Zone extent	Oppose	Exclude "location sensitive" sites like Moerangi Street or amend the plan to ensure strict requirements for off-street parking and storm water reticulation.	My concern is mainly around provision for adequate stormwater and off-street parking. I refer specifically to Moerangi Street which is a cul de sac. Already, as a result of previous in-fill under the Council's residential planning, there is a significant off street parking issue with people parking on footpaths, in driveways and on both sides of the street with very limited space for through traffic. Additionally, storm water reticulation in the street has been a significant problem for a number of years, which even with regular Council staff intervention, has notified the problems.
SO64.1	Yen Cher Koh	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	To improve the outlook of the city to make it more attractive as the building are aging.
SO65.1	Malcolm Prince	Stormwater Overlay	Amend	Include Keeling Street, Hendon Place and Ngaio in the area with added stormwater requirements.	The area of Keeling St where I live floods from footpath to footpath (sometimes over the footpath) in periods of sustained heavy rain. Flooding occurs between 65 and 71. The water does not drain away through the stormwater grates (outside 67 and 70 Keeling St) until well after rain has eased. If this area is not included in the area of added stormwater requirements I believe it should be exempt from the Medium Density Residential Zone.
SO66.1	Jan Schmid	Zone extent	Amend	Allow medium density housing throughout the city	No rationale is given, or apparent, why medium density housing should be restricted to places "within walkable distance to parks, shops, and public transport". Developers will build such housing only in places where they can expect that people will want to live in them. Thus why not leave it to market forces to determine where medium density housing will be built, rather than basing zones on some preconceptions on this matter, or the preferences of influential NIMBYs?
SO67.1	Audrey Aird	Stormwater Overlay	Amend	Place stormwater overlay on properties between 92 and 102 Russell Street inclusive where stormwater drains to gutter and land is below street level.	Increasing density/site coverage in this area without attention to cumulative effects of stormwater ponding due to the existing disposal issue of stormwater into the gutter from land below road level will lead to localised surface flooding
SO67.2	Audrey Aird	Standards	Amend	Require a parking space for each unit or if this is not acceptable require a percentage of the properties to have a parking space. (say 2/3).	Parking in the Hospital area residential streets is already an issue and commuter parking at the Grey Street end of Russell Street is also a known issue. Increasing the number of residential units without on-site parking will result in more parking issues for the neighbourhood.
SO68.1	Finn Barnett	MRZ-P7	Amend	Remove the requirement for all developments to have a stormwater management plan for all development within the stormwater overlay. Amend this to the effect of "developments must not have adverse stormwater runoff or impacts...attenuation tanks must be used with the capacity based on additional water collection and addition to stormwater system."	This is an untenable position for the council to take - requiring all developments in the VAST majority of the total area to have stormwater plans. This creates unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape, that is totally not needed. It is an example of the council not thinking realistically and in an appropriate way to address the potential risks. The addition of a 200m2 coverage single story house has the same roof size and therefore water collection as a 3 story 200m2 coverage house. Any additional non-permeable land should be factored in, just as it should be now. Regardless of medium density rules.
SO69.1	Paola Rojas	MRZ-S1	Support	Amend or add condition. Not to build higher than 2 story houses next to 1 story units, and have at least 2mts distance from the shares boundaries on back and side.	This submission due to the potential block of light and loss of privacy for neighbours living in 1 storey units.
SO70.1	Anita Sciascia	MRZ-S1	Oppose	More than one story disadvantages anyone with mobility issues. Allowing taller buildings impinges on existing houses and will block natural light.	More than one story disadvantages anyone with mobility issues, use of mobility aids like wheelchairs. Plus more than one story will impinge on existing houses and their right to natural light. Especially if houses are so close together on a smaller allowed section.
SO71.1	Julie Griffiths	MRZ-S1	Amend	Ensure height control is lowered to increase safety.	High rise buildings run the risk of even more people getting into danger when a major disaster or weather event occurs. More stand-alone buildings possibly with greater length or width would be better than greater height
SO72.1	Julie Keall	MRZ-S1	Amend	Single story houses for less impact on neighbours living, privacy and sun/light impacts.	Height controls are too high. They will impact on people's privacy in their home and back yard. The sun will be blocked at certain times of the day, which will impact on outdoor living.
SO73.1	Kathriona Benvie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose height should be no more than one storey in established one storey neighbourhoods. Oppose overbuilding on sections especially with limited green space to allow for rainwater runoff	Concerns about loss of sunlight, decreased outdoor space for new residents, reduced green areas for soakage, reduced privacy and increased shadowing.
SO74.1	Karen Wilton	MRZ-R5	Amend	lighting requirements should apply; also should be requirements around hours of operation -needs to be proper consultation and consent if open outside of standard office hours.	Give neighbours and affected parties opportunity to influence development and operation.
SO74.2	Karen Wilton	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Retain current requirement	Current requirement ensures proper consideration and community input - other proposed relaxations are sufficient streamlining without removing this requirement.
SO74.3	Karen Wilton	Consequential amendments	Support	Retain as notified	Fair balance - good to have clear guidance.
SO74.4	Karen Wilton	Zone extent	Amend	Review areas earmarked for med density	Intensive housing development (with good requirements as proposed in this change) are fine for the central city 800m zone. I support this. Medium density development as per proposed changes would be appropriate for PN in new subdivision areas at Aokautere, Cloverlea or towards Ashhurst if sections and neighbourhoods are designed and constructed purposefully such that they have appropriate amenities and environment -retrofitting into 1950 and 1970 suburbs does not work well for community building (e.g. properly catering for disabled elderly, people with mental health or providing space for kids to play).

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO75.1	Chris Robertson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	The predicted growth will not occur in Palmerston North and so in-fill construction of new homes is not required. The Council should focus on current and readily identifiable issues such as a new bridge across the Manawatu River to relieve traffic congestion.
SO76.1	Geneva Housing Ltd	Zone extent	Amend	Remove 353 and 355 Albert Street from the MRZ.	<p>The sites are both adjacent to and directly opposite the local centre of Hokowhitu. Geneva Housing has long signaled its interest with Council officers in the redevelopment of this land to for commercial or retail activities that will contribute to and strengthen the local centre.</p> <p>The justification for this is not only that the land is contiguous with the centre and is the best location for growth of the centre but also that increased densities of residential development from this Plan Change will increase the land area needed for local services which can be met by this submission.</p>
SO77.1	Rachel O'Dea	Zone extent	Oppose	Fix stormwater problems in the Hobson Street, Takaro, area before allowing more housing.	The current stormwater system is unable to cope with rain and water runs through the submitter's property when the stormwater system is overloaded.
SO78.1	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-P2	Support in part	Amend MRZ-P2 as follows: Provide for residential activities and buildings, including papakāinga*, that do not meet the permitted activity standards, where they are well-designed and compatible with the planned built form of the zone and avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities on adjoining sites.	The Fuel Companies generally support MRZ-P2 but are concerned that the policy only deals with the compatibility of the built form within the zone and does not extend to adjoining sites. As such, the Fuel Companies request that the policy also addresses reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities on adjoining sites. Adding words to this effect would ensure that where a proposal does not comply with the MRZ standards, reverse sensitivity effects are adequately considered in the policy framework.
SO78.2	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-R7	Support in part	Retain R7.2(3) as notified subject to the changes requested in relation to MRZ-P2	The Fuel Companies support the restricted discretionary activity status and the matters of discretion under MRZ-R7.2(3) provided that the changes requested to MRZ-P2 are accepted so that reverse sensitivity effects are adequately addressed.
SO78.3	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-R8	Support in part	Retain as notified subject to the changes requested in relation to MRZ-P2 above.	The Fuel Companies support the restricted discretionary activity status and the matters of discretion under MRZ-R8, provided that the changes requested to MRZ-P2 are accepted so that reverse sensitivity effects are adequately addressed.
SO78.4	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-R17	Support	Retain as notified	The Fuel Companies support the Discretionary activity status of MRZ-R17. The activity status is supported as it will allow consideration of objectives and policies, particularly MRZ-P2 and reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining non-residential sites.
SO78.5	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-S3	Support in part	Amend MRZ-S3 as follows: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed: 1. Shading effects on adjoining sites; 2. Loss of privacy effects on adjoining residential sites; 3. Dominance effects on adjoining residential sites. And 4. Safety effects on the land transport network and pedestrians. 5. Reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining non-residential sites.	The Fuel Companies generally support standard MRZ-S3. However, due to the reduced setbacks enabled in the MRZ, the Fuel Companies consider that the policy could be strengthened by including reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion where the standard is infringed. This would ensure that adverse reverse sensitivity effects are adequately considered and mitigated, where necessary.
SO78.6	BP, Mobil and Z Energy (The Fuel Companies)	MRZ-S4	Support in part	Amend MRZ-S4 as follows: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed: 1. The effects of increased building coverage on stormwater discharges from the site and flows; 2. Shading effects on adjoining sites; 3. Loss of privacy effects on adjoining residential sites; and 4. Dominance effects on adjoining residential sites. 5. Reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining non-residential sites.	The Fuel Companies generally support standard MRZ-S4. However, due to the high building coverage enabled in the MRZ, the Fuel Companies consider that the policy could be strengthened by including reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion where the standard is infringed. This would ensure that adverse reverse sensitivity effects are adequately considered and mitigated, where building coverage is exceeded.
SO79.1	Stephen Haslett	MRZ-O2(i)	Amend	Not stated	Not stated
SO79.2	Stephen Haslett	MRZ-O4	Amend	Not stated	Not stated
SO79.3	Stephen Haslett	MRZ-P6	Amend	Not stated	Not stated
SO79.4	Stephen Haslett	Zone extent	Amend	Sections adjacent to the river with access from Dittmer Drive and Buick Crescent should be excluded from the zone unless an existing erosion risk is addressed.	No explicit mention of floods in the plan change. Surprised that an area in Awapuni between Whikiriwhi Crescent and Buick Crescent and adjacent to the Manawatu River has been included as this area is flood prone. Water reticulation and sewage disposal may be problematic in areas that were established as lower density housing and this is exacerbated during floods. Will developers meet this cost or will it be added to rates?
SO80.1	Martin Diprose	Zone extent	Amend	Remove 158-170A Victoria Avenue from the MDRZ.	Because they are not within 800m of a shopping centre.
SO81.1	Jenifer Mark	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Increase proposed distance from boundary for 2 & 3-storey dwellings.	At proposed 1.5m from boundary for 6.5m high dwelling (& similarly, distance for 9m high) is too close in terms of effects of reduced sun & sunlight as well as privacy for neighbours on sections with small distances from their dwelling to their boundaries (eg. in my case, I could have a 6.5m dwelling 4m on NE side 4m from my property wall).
SO82.1	Lance Keall	MRZ-S1	Amend	Reduce height control to single storey buildings	People's privacy in their own home and surroundings.
SO83.1	Taine Leader	Zone extent	Support	Retain inclusion of Roslyn in the zone extent	Improving medium density capability will have significant positive benefits for our community.
SO84.1	Grant Baldwin	MRZ-S2	Amend	Add provisions for buildings not blocking sun, i.e. lower limits on the south side of plots	So a three storey building doesn't block a neighbouring property's sun.
SO85.1	Stuart N Lange	MRZ-S2	Amend	Housing on existing residential boundaries to be single level to retain existing occupant's privacy and environment.	Three-storey housing will impact on privacy and our environment.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO86.1	Richard Sheehan	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Minimal height increase especially near boundaries.	Because of the impact on neighbouring properties.
SO87.1	Sharyn Noldan	MRZ-S2	Amend	Lower height in relation to boundary or increase setback from boundary to more than 1m	An 11m structure built to the minimum 1m boundary would seriously encroach our property and privacy. It would cause disruption to the tenants if such structures were allowed on neighbouring properties.
SO88.1	Pam Marks	MRZ-S1	Amend	Reduce the height.	11m buildings dwarfs existing houses, impacting privacy, noise and sunlight.
SO88.2	Pam Marks	MRZ-S2	Amend	Increase distance from boundaries - sunlight reduction and daylight are important in creating liveable houses.	A 1m setback from the boundary impacts privacy, noise and sunlight for existing houses.
SO88.3	Pam Marks	MRZ-R7	Amend	Three houses on a site need proper planning and design that factors in what the houses are like to live in and the impact on neighbours above short term housing solutions and profit	No specific reason.
SO89.1	Mai Wiki-Holland	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Everything is bad, the 1m spacing is terrible and the fact a developer can build a three story house next to a single story house is terrible, not to mention south street is a packed street with schooling and a rather well off street, this is only going to devalue the street, the home owners will all sell up and this street is going to go downhill.
SO90.1	Neil Stirling	Zone Extent	Amend	Reassessment of the designated map areas to exclude any street that does not have the facility to expand on-street parking facilities for new developments, while not impacting the existing residents amenity	The zone extent does not take into account: - existing street amenity - existing street width, for example South St and Campbell St are narrower than surrounding streets - increased demand for on-street parking, which means children not about to see behind stacked cars parked on the verge and over the road and blocking fire-trucks, and there will be a criminal element introduced.
SO91.1	Wendy Stewart	MRZ-S3	Oppose	Delete	Houses should be further than 1 metre from the boundary line
SO91.2	Wendy Stewart	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Delete	Houses should have height control.
SO92.1	Raymond Robinson	MRZ-S1	Amend	Decrease house heights to single storey	Homes up to 3 storey or 11 metres will have a major impact to neighbouring properties, particularly in relation to sun cover. This will also impact on personal privacy,
SO93.1	Grant Binns	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Limit 11m to high density areas only. Otherwise only single storey, with a resource consent required for two-storey in certain areas.	Three storey development should be reserved for high density areas only, as 11m high buildings in established local neighbourhoods will destroy the ambience of that community and they wouldn't meet the Council's Urban Design rules for streetscape impact. There will be a loss of privacy for existing homeowners, and a negative impact on indoor and outdoor living space for existing properties. This has a negative impact on property value. The Council rules do not control the invasion of privacy.
SO93.2	Grant Binns	MRZ-P4	Oppose	Multi-unit developments must have off street parking	Many of the streets in the proposed MDZ are not wide enough to handle additional car parking from intensification and this will have a major impact on the established local community. More cars in narrow streets will create access problems for larger or longer vehicles such as a fire engine or ambulance, or an existing resident towing a trailer or caravan. More cars in the street will also create visibility issues for people cross the road (especially children) and additional hazards for people on bikes. If there's no off-street parking required, how will electric cars being charged?
SO93.3	Grant Binns	Stormwater Overlay	Oppose	Require that 35% of the city is protected by detention systems	Existing stormwater detention systems are design to overflow in high rainfall events, which will cause more flooding. The systems are hard to maintain. Council needs to increase network capacity by building in significant detention capacity to create a more reliable means of controlling stormwater.
SO93.4	Grant Binns	SUB-MRZ-R1	Amend	A sewer capacity plan should be required for development	There needs to be more capacity in both the wastewater network and in the processing and disposal facilities, to handle additional waste from intensification.
SO93.5	Grant Binns	Entire Plan Change	Support	Focus new development on greenfield areas such as Kikiwhenua and Kakatangiata.	Council should borrow against development contributions and future rates to provide the budget for network services in the proposed greenfield areas. This would be more beneficial to ratepayers than having a 3 storey building dumped next door that they have no say about.
SO94.1	Ronald Raghwan	Entire Plan Change	Support	Remove the heritage height control	Set too low and does not support sustainable house and resource management. It is out of touch with similar cities around the world.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO95.1	Sandra Powell	Zone extent	Amend	Include 29 Parata Street in the MRZ.	29 Parata Street is a corner site of 721 sqm and lends itself well to a medium density residential zone. The property sits just outside of the proposed plan change. Properties have been identified for inclusion in the new zone based on their walkable distance to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bus stops (within 500m). 29 Parata Street is around 300m from the nearest bus stop • parks or reserves (within 400m). 29 Parata Street is around 400m to Caccia Birch House, and around 650m to Jickell St tennis courts and sports ground. Caccia Birch house is open to the public, dogs are allowed and it sits on 3 acres of established grounds and gardens. • schools (within 800m). 29 Parata Street is around 650m to the rear entry of College Street Normal School (off Karaka Street). We used this entry for our 10 years of attendance. • a shopping centre (within 800m). 29 Parata Street is around 800m to the shopping centre at Hokowhitu Village (to nearest shop: KNEAD Bakery) . The village encompasses a Four Square, cafe, bakery, restaurants, pharmacy and medical practice which in recent years has become very popular and widely used. A diary and takeaways is located 190m away on the intersection of Park Road and Marne St.
SO96.1	Michael Andrews	MRZ-S1	Amend	Restrict height to avoid privacy or nuisance issues when overlooking other property backyards and consider general risk.	For example where a 2 or 3 story build - upper levels view into a backyard area with a pool or spa. Privacy could be affected plus potential shadow or light reflection. Could also be a dominant build if other surrounding properties are single story. Consider potential future impact of whether medium density housing will create future slum areas and is there a climate risk hazard of placing housing closer together (e.g. fire risk).
SO96.2	Michael Andrews	MRZ-S2	Amend	Restrict height to avoid privacy or nuisance issues when overlooking other property backyards and consider general risk.	For example where a 2 or 3 story build - upper levels view into a backyard area with a pool or spa. Privacy could be affected plus potential shadow or light reflection. Could also be a dominant build if other surrounding properties are single story. Consider potential future impact of whether medium density housing will create future slum areas and is there a climate risk hazard of placing housing closer together (e.g. fire risk).
SO97.1	Rajwinder Harike	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Increased supply of housing.
SO98.1	Richard Prasad	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO99.1	Gladys Vining	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Better information from Council to enable a submission.	The maps are insufficient.
SO100.1	Olesia Apostolova	Zone extent	Support	Include 22 Haydon Street in the MRZ	Unclear why properties directly across the road from the zone weren't included, i.e. at 22 Hayden Street.
SO101.1	Miranda Sage	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Concerned views will be impacted as height controls are too low.
SO102.1	David Bunckenburg	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Re-write so the plan change can be understood by code and AI.	To supercharge the regulatory process.
SO103.1	Doug Strachan	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Take into consideration the effect on traffic congestion	Denser housing, including at nearby 17 Summerhays rezoning is going to result in more cars on the road, where it is sometimes difficult to exit Worsfold Lane. Does the roading network support more houses in the area?
SO104.1	Hern Teo-Sherrell	Entire Plan Change	Amend	a) New buildings must not encroach on the privacy of neighbouring properties b) No on-street parking overnight c) Fewer car parks as amenities are close by d) Multi-storeys should have minimal impact on street character e) Multi-storeys should be no more than 2 storeys and total height less than 11m f) Mix of one-bedroom and larger units/houses g) Mix of social and private housing	Any new building should not encroach on the privacy of neighbouring properties, or lead to congestion of the street, e.g. no on-street parking overnight and do not provide carparks as amenities and facilities would be close by. Multi-storey units should have minimal impact on street character and no more than two storeys to prevent shading on other properties. Buildings should have a variety of bedroom numbers incorporated into the design as opposed to box-like buildings or terrace housing as they can be an eyesore. A mix of private and social housing should also be provided to ensure inclusivity.
SO104.2	Hern Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S3	Amend	Garages should be set back further than 5.5m	So that vehicles parked outside the garage do not block footpaths.
SO104.3	Hern Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S20	Amend	Minimum fence heights and type of fence should allow residents to interact, and to reduce burglaries. Low well-maintained hedges could be an alternative.	Not stated
SO104.4	Hern Teo-Sherrell	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Immediate neighbours should be notified of construction of new buildings.	Sometimes, immediate neighbours know more about stormwater easements and potential shade cast on their properties than developers or the council as there may not be adequate consultation or reliable records kept on existing properties.
SO104.5	Hern Teo-Sherrell	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Rules have to be changed with regard to the playing of music, the number and type of pets allowed, vehicle noise, and any noise that might impact on neighbours. Also, any street with a higher density of residents should have their street blocked off with a cul-de-sac to enable neighbours to meet and have street activities.	As streets get more built up, and the number of people increase within a small area, noise control regulation needs to be revised to ensure there is minimal impact on residents' right to enjoy peace and quietness in their own homes. Cul-de-sacs would help engage neighbours to get to know one another in order to reduce crime and care for one another. Alternatively, an area should be set aside for such street events to take place, e.g. a small community park.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO104.6	Hern Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S9	Amend	Provision of more permeable surfaces for rainwater absorption and green space instead of concrete pathways.	Stormwater may flow into blocked drains or overwhelm the discharge and treatment systems due to the density of the new buildings. This may affect properties located on land lower than the others, and cause flooding. The importance of having some land around buildings not covered by concrete is essential for any run-off to be absorbed into the soil. On-site green space would also encourage residents to have vegetable gardens or fruit trees.
SO105.1	Murray Kidd	MRZ-S1	Amend	No height increase.	The proposed height may affect adjacent units light values and this needs to be considered with layout.
SO105.2	Murray Kidd	Stormwater Overlay	Amend	The storm water distribution, or the opening of the flood gates needs to be reevaluated to open earlier.	Water lying under the floor space leads to rot and dampness.
SO105.3	Murray Kidd	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	Parking- this needs to be valued for occupancy to ensure access for residents and Emergency services is readily available.
SO106.1	David Jochem Investments Ltd	Zone extent	Amend	Include 525 Ruahine Street in the MRZ	This property is immediately adjacent to the MRZ. Inclusion would result in a more harmonious integration between different housing types.
SO107.1	Powerco Limited	MRZ-O5	Support	Retain MRZ-O5	Powerco supports mitigating reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision, use and development which is located adjacent to infrastructure.
SO107.2	Powerco Limited	MRZ-P11	Support	Retain as notified	Powerco supports appropriate setbacks and design controls to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure, and supports all future buildings, earthworks and construction activities maintaining safe electrical clearance distances in compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for electrical safe distances (NZECP 34:2001).
SO107.3	Powerco Limited	MRZ-R8	Amend	Add an additional matter of discretion: 2. Whether there is a need to provide space on the development site for the provision of essential services	To address issues of an increase in demand for essential services, Powerco considers that consideration should be given to the provision of essential services when four or more units are proposed on a site – to determine whether space needs to be set aside on the development site for any required essential services.
SO107.4	Powerco Limited	MRZ-R19	Amend	Permitted activity status needs to be re-numbered to 1. 2.1. Activity status: Permitted	Powerco notes a minor formatting amendment is required to the rule.
SO107.5	Powerco Limited	Section 5.4(d)	Support	Retain the following text within 5.4(d): Powerco Limited (where the application involves works within the safe clearance requirements in the NZCEP34:2001)	Any building works that are to occur within the vicinity of overhead electricity distribution lines needs to be discussed with Powerco.
SO108.1	Janet Shepherd	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Retain current 9m height maximum.	Three storey residential building in Ashurst will spoil the rural character of the village.
SO108.2	Janet Shepherd	MRZ-R7	Amend	Require sufficient room on a site for car parking for properties in Ashurst.	Residents cannot rely on public transport to get into the city as the bus service is not frequent enough.
SO109.1	Richard Houston	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Keep maximum height the same as in the Residential Zone	Concerned that extra height will cause loss of sunlight/natural light and dominance of a high building.
SO109.2	Richard Houston	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Keep the height recession planes the same as in the Residential Zone	Concerned that extra height will cause loss of sunlight/natural light and dominance of a high building.
SO109.3	Richard Houston	MRZ-S3	Oppose	Keep the setback requirements the same as in the Residential Zone	Concerned about effects of building close to boundaries
SO110.1	Craig Mitchell	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Maximum height should be restricted to two-storeys	We have land around the boundaries of our small city use that Land we don't need the social problems of jamming people into smaller areas.
SO111.1	Brent Norrish	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Reduce the height allowance	Building 11 metres high, and with increasing intensity, will turn our beautiful city into a concrete jungle. The peace and serenity our views create will be gone, and detract from the mental health benefits of a beautiful city with refreshing views.
SO111.2	Brent Norrish	MRZ-S3	Oppose	Do not allow building houses closer together with smaller sections sizes.	Building houses closer together with small section sizes has many disadvantages that are not being seriously considered, such as increase conflict and lack of space for exercise, play and gardening.
SO111.3	Brent Norrish	Stormwater Overlay	Oppose	Improve stormwater facilities on other areas too.	The section of Linton Street that runs from Ferguson St to College St frequently floods. The storm water system is unable to cope, and cars have been flooded above there floors and carpets and engines ruined on a regular basis. Increasing the density in the area will only make matters worse.
SO112.1	David Hillary	Zone Extent	Oppose	Remove Spilman Place from MRZ	as a narrow cul-de-sac, it is not appropriate to allow new construction without adequate on-site parking. Medium density housing with corresponding cars parked on both sides of the narrow street will block access for emergency vehicles.
SO113.1	Rory Blatchford	MRZ-S1	Amend	Increased height should be confined to 'new' areas, not including existing housing areas.	The proposed increase in height will intensify negative urban living issues by screening sunlight from existing dwellings, gardens, patios, etc. In addition, increased residential noise, street traffic, parked vehicle congestion, etc. will occur.
SO114.1	Susanne Aldrich	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Not stated	This will intrude on the privacy of the neighbouring properties.
SO114.2	Susanne Aldrich	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Protect more old homes. At present there are only 45 homes that have some protection in the city. Protect streets that have a style of architecture that adds beauty and value to the city. For instance, Mere Mere Avenue, Langston Avenue...	It is up to the Council to show respect and value for heritage and history within the city, and to protect this for future generations to enjoy.
SO114.3	Susanne Aldrich	Standards	Oppose	Provision for garaging or off-street parking should be mandatory for each new dwelling.	A site with three dwellings could have residents with at least 3 cars which would create congestion in the street and cause ongoing problems for others who live in the street.
SO115.1	Sarah Ruawai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	We have friends who are in the police force who have made us aware of the criminal trouble that occurs in these housing situations and we DO NOT want this in behind us or around us.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO115.2	Sarah Ruawai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	We have a beautiful house that will be devalued by the building of this housing complex.
SO115.3	Sarah Ruawai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	This type of housing would be devalue the area.
SO116.1	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P1	Oppose	Restrict areas where more noisy type activities likely Require maximum permissible area of total site. Increase separation between buildings and facilities from boundary with adjacent residential properties	Wording too vague and too large a part of city affected. Needs to clarify around "compatible with built form" Likely to be noisy and disturbed with many people coming and going- not compatible with quiet enjoyment
SO116.2	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P2	Oppose	Delete	No residential activities or buildings that do not meet "permitted activity standards" should be permitted. The wording is too vague and too large a part of city is affected for such a gross relaxation of reasonable standards to be permitted.
SO116.3	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P3	Oppose	Noise and safety protection for surrounding properties	Criteria do not address whether if a more communal development number of vehicles coming and going and people density
SO116.4	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P4	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.5	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P5	Support	Note the earlier MRZ-P2 is blurring residential and non-residential. This blurring should be avoided	Not stated
SO116.6	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P6	Support	But add: 5. That sites lying in or adjacent to existing ponding areas where building was previously prohibited be subject to rigorous flooding risk assessment and mitigation thereof. 6 Add that preventive measures may not be subsequently impaired	People change things over time and cover areas increasingly with paving impermeable drives etc.
SO116.7	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P7	Oppose	But add: 5. That sites lying in or adjacent to existing ponding areas where building was previously prohibited be subject to rigorous flooding risk assessment and mitigation thereof. 6 Add that preventive measures may not be subsequently impaired	Council is already approving developments which were not allowed in the past- these sites are actually often very wet with ponding at times and considerable risk- also prevent run off from existing properties
SO116.8	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-P13	Amend	A marae, being a centre for large numbers of attendees and functions lasting up to several days would need attention paid to: Distance from residential areas. Air noise control Appropriate road access reducing likelihood of interfering with general traffic flow. Adequate on-site parking Regarding papakainga, see response to MRZ P2	Not stated
SO116.9	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R1	Oppose	Needs to be more definition around this	Not stated
SO116.10	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R2	Amend	Add requirement for adequate on-site parking	Not stated
SO116.11	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R3	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.12	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R4	Amend	Limit on numbers of residents and cars	Unclear if 3 employees is number on-site at any one time or total employed.
SO116.13	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R5	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.14	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R6	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.15	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R7	Amend	For some dwelling such as papakāinga, there may need to be a specified limit on number of residents, and enhanced fire alarm and sprinkler systems.	Increased probability of disturbance, personal safety and risk to adjacent properties.
SO116.16	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R8	Oppose	For some dwelling such as papakāinga, there may need to be a specified limit on number of residents, and enhanced fire alarm and sprinkler systems.	Increased probability of disturbance, personal safety and risk to adjacent properties. Could be multiple businesses run from homes.
SO116.17	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R9	Oppose	Should not be allowed automatically	To address concerns about unauthorised changes
SO116.18	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R10	Oppose	Mitigation is not sufficient to address demands on stormwater management.	There is increased risk to properties from flooding.
SO116.19	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R11	Amend	Include compliance with MRZ-S9 and MRZ-S10 and define whether an accessory building is a granny flat, sleepout or garden shed.	Not stated
SO116.20	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R12	Amend	Add indication of number to be educated in relation to land area and adequacy of facilities for the number	To avoid inappropriate density, noise, traffic disturbance in neighbourhood.
SO116.21	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R13	Oppose	Restrict the areas where community houses can be built, and increase separation between buildings and facilities and adjacent residential properties.	Wording unclear about numbers of residents to be accommodated and/or numbers of employees. Too large a part of city potentially affected. Likely to be noisy and disturbed with many people coming and going- not compatible with quiet enjoyment

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO116.22	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R14	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.23	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R15	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.24	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R16	Oppose	Should be limited to parts of the city. If approved, need to pay attention to: Distance from residential areas. Air noise control Appropriate road access reducing likelihood of interfering with general traffic flow. Adequate on-site parking	Wording too vague and too large a part of city affected. Likely to be noisy and disturbed with many people coming and going- not compatible with quiet enjoyment
SO116.25	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R17	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.26	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R18	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.27	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R19	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.28	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R20	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.29	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R21	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.30	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R23	Oppose	Exempt good quality zinc cladding	In Palmerston North the distance from the sea and the absence of heavy industry producing acidic effluents result in very low loss of zinc coating of unpainted cladding.
SO116.31	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-R24	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.32	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S1	Amend	Should not shade adjacent building's sun in winter between 9 am and 4pm	It is not clear that there will not be excessive shading of adjacent buildings.
SO116.33	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S2	Amend	Should not shade adjacent building's sun in winter between 9 am and 4pm	It is not clear that there will not be excessive shading of adjacent buildings.
SO116.34	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S3	Amend	Accessory buildings higher than 2 metres should be included.	Shade, privacy, appearance
SO116.35	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S4	Amend	Include all impermeable structures, covered or uncovered in the 50% maximum building requirement.	Uncovered impermeable decking and other impermeable structures reduce stormwater absorption by soil.
SO116.36	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S5	Amend	Delete the requirement for growth to 4 metre height within 5 years. Express preference for deciduous trees or large shrubs (less shade in Winter) Require avoidance of trees well known for entering water drainage systems or having large sub-surface roots.	In New Zealand many trees capable of growing to 4 metres within 5 years will become problematic in the long term.
SO116.37	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S14	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.38	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S15	Oppose	Delete sections a and b	It is possible to have a garage and front parking area designed such that all manoeuvring is easily done on-site such that vehicles can enter and leave the property forwards.
SO116.39	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S18	Support	But why just 1 bike?	A family may have several bikes.
SO116.40	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S19	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO116.41	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S20	Amend	Strongly support clause 3	Exiting vehicles need to be able to see pedestrians and vice versa - actually for last 2.5m of fence before footpath fence should have visibility through it or be no higher than 800mm of the side and any adjacent perpendicular fence
SO116.42	Kevin and Ngaire Smidt	MRZ-S21	Support	Not stated	Not stated
SO117.1	Ash Garstang	Zone Extent	Amend	Amend the zone extent so it doesn't cut through the middle of residential blocks	Back to back neighbours are impacted where one can increase density and get the commercial benefit and the other can't and suffers the effects.
SO118.1	Nigel Hughes	Zone Extent	Amend	Include property at corner of Tutaki and Kelvin Grove Roads in the zone.	The site is not impacted by air noise, the soil is poor quality and the site is in proximity amenities and the proposed rail hub. There are existing water and sewage services.
SO119.1	Sam Irvine	MRZ-R7	Amend	The number of units should be a least 4, and preferably 6.	I fully support this move to allowing medium density zoning, and favour the 6 unit limit that was previously proposed. As a compromise, allowing at least 4 units allows two double-story units per site.
SO120.1	Lizi Guest	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Buildings to 11m high in a heritage area are imposing.	Taller buildings in heritage areas should be set back further from properties boundaries to maintain privacy and retain the heritage feel of a street.
SO121.1	Kevin Kelliher	MRZ-R7	Amend	The number of units should be based on the site area, with a 35% building coverage and minimum 70m2 floor area for each unit. Alternatively allow more intensive site coverage within 1.5m of The Square and lower site coverage between 1.5-3.0km from The Square.	To allow the best usage for absolute inner city developments within 1.5 kilometres of The Square without requiring resource consent.
SO122.1	Chris Price	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	There is insufficient on-street parking to support intensification in Hendon Place.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO123.1	Nicola Wardlaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	The extra parking on street and extra comings and goings of potentially quite a few new residents in the general area would change the feel of the neighbourhood
SO124.1	Karina Hapeta	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	There is not enough parking and I don't like the idea of two storey units as it would make the street too busy.
SO125.1	Shari Scanlon	Entire Plan Change	Support	Do not let families live in these structures as living in close proximity to others can sometimes pose certain anti-social behaviors	Allow these new homes to be for those who work in frontline jobs and middle class families this may be discriminatory but it will save a lot of headache later on.
SO126.1	Kevin Guan	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated
SO127.1	Rachelle Tangi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	The height restriction is too high and is set to block neighbours views and sunlight. There is no capacity in existing health care facilities.
SO128.1	Jordan Neall	Entire Plan Change	Support	There should be a requirement for garages.	So there is space for visitors.
SO129.1	Roanne Hautapu	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Developers should be required to advise neighbours before a project starts	Because of the potential for disruption to neighbours.
SO129.2	Roanne Hautapu	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Three units on a site should only be built in greenfield areas or besides existing 2 or 3 storey units.	Loss of privacy and peace.
SO129.3	Roanne Hautapu	MRZ-S20	Amend	Clarify fence heights	Unclear what the heights are for fencing.
SO129.4	Roanne Hautapu	Chapter 10A - Introduction	Amend	Build walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure before intensifying	People already have the choice to walk/bus/bike.
SO129.5	Roanne Hautapu	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consideration of school capacity	Impacts on school capacity, especially primary.
SO129.6	Roanne Hautapu	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Require that a percentage of multi-storey homes are genuinely accessible	Accessibility in housing is either not considered or done badly.
SO130.1	Fraser Abernethy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Medium density proposal will significantly detract from people's quality of life in central Palmerston North the height of the buildings will impact people's privacy and the increased density of house will create more flooding risk and congestion on roads and parking in a number areas of the city
SO131.1	Kathryn Hughes	MRZ-S2	Amend	Decrease to no more than two storeys.	These height allowances are too high for neighboring properties. Potentially blocking sunlight or views.
SO131.2	Kathryn Hughes	MRZ-R7	Amend	Decrease number of dwellings allowed on property from three to two.	Since the property size is smaller, then number of dwellings allowable should be less. Families with children do need some outside space. Not just one metre allowance around dwelling!
SO132.1	Janet Stirling	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Some thought has been given to setting these height restrictions by experts
SO133.1	Keegan Leask	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Denser housing is good for the city.
SO134.1	Wisanu Srichantra	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Retain as notified	Not stated
SO135.1	Alan Kirk	MRZ-S16	Oppose	Only one access allowed per site.	Less land used or wasted by driveways, less risk to pedestrians and cyclists and more on-street parking.
SO135.2	Alan Kirk	MRZ-S14	Oppose	Amend frontal width requirement	This is quite restrictive and may not be possible to manage.
SO136.1	Bella Deacon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO137.1	Rangitāne o Manawatū	Chapter 10A - Introduction	Support	Retain following text as drafted: "The Medium Density Zone supports the physical and spiritual health of our Māori whānau, enabling them to practice their culture and provide for their tikanga*. This includes providing safe access* to the landscapes and urban waterways valued by their tīpuna, enabling the development* of papakāinga* and recognising and celebrating our cultural connections with te taiao and Rangitāne whakapapa through urban design. "	This text reflects Rangitāne feedback via the Clause 3b process.
SO137.2	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the objective to enable papakāinga developments within the Medium Density Zone.
SO137.3	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O2	Support in part	Amend the objective so that it refers to supporting a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, as well as energy efficiency.	Rangitāne consider this objective should be broadened to specifically reference development that supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, to give effect to RPS policy UFD-O5 and the NZ Emission Reductions Plan.
SO137.4	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O3	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the objective as this articulates our aspiration to improve the mauri of the Manawatū Awa and its lagoons and tributaries
SO137.5	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O4	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support this objective as it is important that risks to people, property, infrastructure and the environment are avoided, unless they can be appropriately mitigated.
SO137.6	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O5	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne consider effects on infrastructure are an important matter that should be addressed through an objective.
SO137.7	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-O6	Support in part	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support this objective as it reflects our aspirations to manage our land in a way that is consistent with our values and aspirations.
SO137.8	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the reference to papakāinga being an enabled activity in the zone.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO137.9	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P2	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne supports this policy, as it provides direction for assessment of residential proposals which do not meet the permitted activity standards.
SO137.10	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P3	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support site layouts that respond to the site and context, including adjacent waterways. Developments should not 'turn their backs' on urban waterways.
SO137.11	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P4	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the reference to a requirement for on-site bicycle parking and storage to support mode shift.
SO137.12	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P5	Support	Retain as notified	Non-residential activities should be enabled where they support the needs of local communities and are of a compatible scale and intensity of use.
SO137.13	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P6	Support in part	Amend so the policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - directs that the impacts of climate change are accounted for when designing on-site mitigation measures. - promotes nature-based solutions in preference over hard engineering solutions. - refers to requiring on-going maintenance and repair of stormwater treatment and mitigation devices - requires that current levels of risk, as identified in the Stormwater Servicing Assessment Report, are reduced to a level of risk that has been deemed acceptable to the community prior to, or at the time of, development. 	<p>Maintaining peak flows at pre development levels (i.e. hydraulic neutrality) may be inadequate in areas which are already subjected to significant stormwater ponding, and in order to future proof our urban environments. The areas at greatest risk are concentrated on the western side of the city where our Māori/Pacifica communities live. Rangitāne requests that current levels of risk, as identified in the Stormwater Servicing Assessment Report, are reduced. Additional capacity should be built into the system, to achieve climate change resilience.</p> <p>Nature-based solutions should be adopted in preference over hard engineering solutions, and this should be signaled in the policies. This approach is consistent with best practice, the NPS-IB, NAP and NPS FW, and the Proposed National Policy Statement for Natural Hazard Decision-Making.</p> <p>Assessments of risk should be informed by an understanding of the communities' tolerance for that risk. This should be informed by the Council's strategic work on natural hazards (including consultation with the community), to implement national guidance/direction.</p>
SO137.14	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P7	Support in part	Amend the policy to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reference to the need to consider the impacts of climate change and future resilience when designing mitigation measures. - Include a direction that nature-based solutions should be adopted in preference over hard engineering solutions where practicable, when recommending mitigation measures. - direction that for those areas where modelling predicts down-stream adverse effects from development of a site, the mitigation measures may need to include reducing post-development flows so that they are only a percentage of the pre-development flows, to address the constraints on the existing network and existing downstream flood risk. - direction that the recommended mitigation measures in the stormwater management plan be implemented and maintained on an ongoing basis and that this may be secured through consent notices where appropriate. 	<p>The Stormwater Servicing Assessment for PCI identifies at section 4.3.2 that some areas of the proposed MDZ are predicted to have a negative downstream effect on other areas if re-development and intensification occurs in those areas, and that this will require a site specific stormwater management plan to be prepared, including a that mitigation may include requiring post-development flows to match a percentage (e.g. 80%) of pre development flows, due to the constraints on the existing network and existing downstream flood risk. The explanation is that this is because development will increase the volume of runoff, not just peak flow rates.</p> <p>Rangitāne appreciate that there may be future works to improve stormwater capacity in these areas. However this is important technical direction that should be identified and clearly signalled via the policy, so that it provides strong direction to future applicants, and to Council staff processing consent applications. There is a risk that without this direction in the policy, proposed mitigation measures may not address these risks.</p> <p>Consistent with national guidance in the NPS-IB, NAP and NPS-FW, nature-based solutions should be preferred over hard engineering solutions where this is practicable, and this should be signaled in the policy. Simply preparing a stormwater management plan is not sufficient, the mitigation measures it recommends must be implemented and the policy should indicate this. It is important that mitigation measures are implemented as designed and maintained in good working order. This should be secured through consent notices.</p>

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO137.15	Rangitāne o Manawatū	New policy	Support	<p>Insert a new policy that states that:</p> <p>Within 12 months of the plan change becoming operative the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - develop and implement a programme for requiring as built plans of stormwater management measures to be submitted, installation compliance checks and regular monitoring and maintenance for all on-site stormwater attenuation measures; and -prepare and publish information and guidance for homeowners on how to install, maintain and repair permeable paving, and the importance of not increasing impermeable areas within their properties without appropriate accompanying stormwater attenuation measures. <p>To support this management approach, Rangitāne suggests that the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develops, resources and funds a monitoring and compliance programme, building on any existing monitoring programme; -Amends the Stormwater Bylaw, including in relation to charges and levies, to enable and implement the monitoring and compliance programme, and to integrate with the stormwater management approach in the District Plan. 	Rangitāne are concerned that, as currently drafted, the plan change does not adequately address the need for on-going maintenance and performance of the stormwater attenuation devices that will be relied on to manage stormwater. This matter should be signalled through a policy and/or stated method in the Plan, and then developed through the LTP. Successful stormwater management over time will rely on the individual private and public components of the system being operated, maintained and upgraded in an efficiently and integrated way. Reductions in the effectiveness of private stormwater components over time will jeopardise the effectiveness of the system as a whole. While Rangitāne support a mixed centralised and decentralised stormwater approach, it must be supported by a comprehensive management system that is established at the outset. Such a programme should operate as a user pays system to ensure it can be sustained over time, given the anticipated reliance on on-site measures to address stormwater constraints for an unknown period of time into the future.
SO137.16	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P8	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the requirement to address both water quality and quantity through the use of water sensitive design.
SO137.17	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P9	Support in part	Amend the policy so that it signals that such materials should be avoided in the first instance, or else mitigated.	Rangitāne support the requirement to address the potential water quality issues from building materials at source, rather than requiring downstream treatment. However the policy does not clearly signal this and should be more directive about avoiding these materials in the first instance, rather than just mitigating their use.
SO137.18	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P10	Support in part	Broaden the scope of the policy so that it directs urban design, building form and site layouts which minimise as far as practicable the contribution to climate change of the development and its future use, and increase resilience, including, but not only, through energy efficiency. Reference should be made to water efficiency and waste minimisation, facilitating the use of public and active transport.	As currently worded, the policy is non-aspirational and does not go far enough to give effect to recently adopted regional direction in the RPS, including policy UFD-P8 of the RPS, or the NZ Emission Reductions Plan.
SO137.19	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P11	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne consider reverse sensitivity effects are an important matter that should be addressed through policy.
SO137.20	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P12	Support in part	Amend the policy so that it refers to retaining and integrating existing vegetation and using replacement planting to contribute to sustaining ecosystem services, including stormwater retention, air and soil quality, shade and shelter, cooling and habitats	The policy doesn't sufficiently recognise or seek to retain the Rangitāne's preference is that replacement planting ideally uses indigenous species that would be expected to have been in that place, and that replacement planting is chosen on the basis of its ability to assist with reducing soil erosion, maintaining soil fertility, providing habitat/corridors for native species and contribution to increasing indigenous vegetation cover in the city. The policy doesn't sufficient recognise or seek to retain the multiple ecoservices of vegetation in an urban context.
SO137.21	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-P13	Support in part	<p>Broaden the scope of the policy to ensure that where new development includes public or community spaces, the design of those spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -enables whānau to safely and readily interact with the natural environment, in particular providing safe access to, and along urban waterways; -Uses natural and recycled materials that support connections with te taiao; -Integrates Māori design and mahi toi - Integrates te reo Māori into signage and any new naming - Ensures access for disabled and elderly (a whānau ora approach where all members of the community can participate) 	Rangitāne request that the scope of this policy is broadened, including a reference to enabling our people to safely and readily interact with the natural environment, within urban areas, use natural materials, integrate mahi toi and te reo, and ensure access for all whānau – thereby allowing us to express our cultural traditions and connections.
SO137.22	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R1	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support this permitted activity rule for papakāinga.
SO137.23	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R7	Support	Amend MRZ-R7-2.3 to include a reference to Policy MRZ-P8, which relates to water sensitive design. This policy is a relevant consideration for considering compliance with the performance standards that address permeable surfaces and stormwater attenuation devices, and is not only applicable in the Stormwater Overlay areas. Amend MRZ-R7-2.3 to include a reference to Policy RMZ-P10 Energy Efficiency.	Rangitāne support this rule, including that the activity status becomes restricted discretionary where there is non-compliance with one or more of the standards of MRZ-R7-1, subject to the relief we have sought on the performance standards MRZ-S9 and MRZ-S10 (see below). Policy MRZ-P8 and P10 are also relevant considerations for decision making under the restricted discretionary rule, and should be referenced.
SO137.24	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R8	Support in part	Amend MRZ-R8 to include a reference to Policy MRZ-P8, which relates to water sensitive design and Policy RMZ-P10 Energy Efficiency. These policies are relevant considerations for development proposals.	Policy MRZ-P8 and P10 are relevant considerations for decision-making under the restricted-discretionary rule, and should be referenced.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO137.25	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R9	Support in part	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support this rule, which requires additions or alterations to buildings to be subject to the permeable surfaces, stormwater attenuation device, and minimum floor levels performance standards.
SO137.26	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R10	Support in part	Amend the matters of discretion: -Amend matter 3 to read: "The extent to which on-site mitigation measures will support and align with the city-wide Stormwater Strategy, or any catchment or sub-catchment plan to implement the city-side Stormwater Strategy".-Insert a new matter that gives the Council scope to require amendments to ensure neighbouring stormwater attenuation devices are not compromised by new development (e.g. overland flow from a new development being directed across a boundary and overloading the capacity of neighbouring systems). Insert in the Advice Note, a statement that the requirement for ongoing maintenance may be secured through a consent notice or another legal mechanism.	Rangitāne support the requirement to achieve alignment of any on-site mitigation measures with the city wide Stormwater Strategy that is currently being prepared. As it will take some time for individual catchment plans to be prepared to implement the strategy, it is important that alignment with the Stormwater Strategy itself is also achieved (as this will provide direction for future catchment plans). Rangitāne are concerned about the on-going maintenance of stormwater mitigation measures, including who will take responsibility for maintenance, inspections and repairs. Rangitāne consider that if this will be responsibility of the homeowner, this may need to be secured through a consent notice or other legal mechanism.
SO137.27	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R16	Support	Retain as notified	This rule is consistent with Rangitāne standing as mana whenua of Te Papaoiea.
SO137.28	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-R24	Support in part	Insert an Advice Note, that the requirement for ongoing maintenance may be secured through a consent notice or other legal mechanism.	Rangitāne are concerned about the on-going maintenance of stormwater treatment devices including who will take responsibility for maintenance, inspections and repairs. Rangitāne consider that if this will be responsibility of the homeowner, this may need to be secured through a consent notice or other legal mechanism.
SO137.29	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S5	Amend	Amend the matters of discretion to include reference to the positive effects of landscaping – to improve retention of stormwater, retain soil quality, create shade/shelter and cooling and provide habitat.	Rangitāne consider these are relevant matters for consideration if the standard is infringed.
SO137.30	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S6	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support a requirement for outdoor shaded space being included as a performance standard.
SO137.31	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S9	Support in part	Amend the standard so that there is explicit direction to require maintenance of the permeability of the permeable surface on an ongoing basis. Prepare additional guidance on maintenance and repair of permeable paving, and avoiding additional impermeable areas once residential units are occupied and include it in Volume 2 of the District Plan, with a link in the Advice Note.	Rangitāne is concerned the current drafting will not be adequate to address these effects in the longer term, as there is no requirement for maintenance of the permeability of these surfaces. In addition, while the reference in the Advice Note to the permeable pavement construction guide from Auckland Council is helpful and should be retained, that guidance does not address how to maintain and repair such surfaces. Additional guidance is needed on these matters and to educate people on the reasons why permeable surfaces are required, and why additional impermeable surfaces should not be installed on sites once occupied.
SO137.32	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S10	Support in part	Amend the standard to require that the attenuation tank is not used for rainwater harvesting, and that a separate tank would need to be provided if rainwater harvesting is intended. Amend the standard to require mechanical pumping of underground attenuation tanks where gravity draining cannot be provided, with contingency measures to be available in the event of pump failure. See also the submission point seeking a new policy that will signal that installation and maintenance of stormwater attenuation devices will be subject to Council compliance checks and ongoing monitoring. Rangitāne seek that this new policy is referenced in an advice note on this Standard.	The Stormwater Servicing Assessment states that it is important that rainwater tanks are designed to empty following a rain event and must not be used for rainwater harvesting (at Section 4.3). As currently drafted, the performance standard does not require this. Rangitāne are concerned about the ability to monitor (including the ability to access private property and ongoing funding for compliance) and maintain the efficacy of stormwater attenuation tanks on an on-going basis.
SO137.33	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S11	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the performance standard, including the requirement for access to occupied buildings and structures to be above the 2% AEP flood extent.
SO137.34	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ-S18	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the performance standard as it will facilitate increased uptake of active transport.
SO137.35	Rangitāne o Manawatū	MRZ Notification clauses	Support	That the ability to limited notify applications under these rules is retained.	Limited notification should be retained as there is uncertainty that the provisions will ensure good outcomes. Our submission is that stormwater effects of re-zoning for residential intensification are unlikely to be appropriately mitigated in the long term, and there should be an opportunity for potential effects to be identified and addressed through notification processes. This should include consideration of the need to notify Horizons Regional Council and Rangitāne.
SO137.36	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the matters addressed by this objective, in particular the requirement that land development is serviced by water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure that has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development.
SO137.37	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Amend subpoint 8 so that it refers to retaining and integrating mature vegetation so as to contribute to sustaining ecosystem services, including stormwater retention, air and soil quality, shade and shelter, cooling and habitats.	Rangitāne consider mature vegetation is important for the multiple benefits it provides for shade, shelter, cooling, air quality, habitat, mental health etc. Rangitāne' preference is that replacement planting ideally uses indigenous species that would be expected to have been in that place, and that replacement planting is chosen on the basis of its ability to assist with reducing soil erosion, maintaining soil fertility, providing habitat/corridors for native species and contribution to increasing indigenous vegetation cover in the city. The policy does not sufficiently recognise or seek to retain the multiple ecoservices of vegetation in an urban context.
SO137.38	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ-P3	Support	Retain as notified	The policy appropriately addresses the need to ensure future development is not adversely affected by natural hazards.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO137.39	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ-P4	Support in part	Rangitāne seek the following amendments to the policy: Include a reference to the need to consider the impacts of climate change and future resilience when designing mitigation measures. Include a direction that nature-based solutions should be adopted in preference over hard engineering solutions where practicable, when recommending mitigation measures. Include policy direction that for those areas where modelling predicts downstream adverse effects from development of a site, the mitigation measures may need to include reducing post-development flows so that they are only a percentage of the pre-development flows, due to the constraints on the existing network and existing downstream flood risk. Include policy direction that the recommended mitigation measures in the stormwater management plan be implemented and maintained on an ongoing basis and that this may be secured through consent notices.	The Stormwater Servicing Assessment for PCI identifies at section 4.3.2 that some areas of the proposed MDZ are predicted to have a negative downstream effect on other areas if re-development and intensification occurs in those areas, and that this will require a site specific stormwater management plan to be prepared, including a mitigation strategy, to address this. The Assessment identifies that part of that mitigation may include requiring post-development flows to match a fraction (e.g. 80%) of predevelopment flows, due to the constraints on the existing network and existing downstream flood risk. The explanation is that this is because development will increase the volume of runoff, not just peak flow rates. Rangitāne appreciate that there may be future works to improve stormwater capacity in these areas. However this is important technical direction that should be identified and clearly signalled via the policy, so that it provides strong direction to future applicants, and to Council staff processing consent applications. There is a risk that without this direction in the policy, proposed mitigation measures may not address these risks. It is important that mitigation measures are implemented as designed and maintained in good working order. This should be secured through consent notices. Consistent with national guidance in the NPS-IB, NAP and NPS-FW, nature-based solutions should be preferred over hard engineering solutions where this is practicable, and this should be signaled in the policy. Simply preparing a stormwater management plan is not sufficient, the mitigation measures it recommends must be implemented through any development proposal, and the policy should indicate this.
SO137.40	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ-R1	Support in part	Rangitāne seek an amendment to the matter of discretion to state: The extent to which on-site mitigation measures will support and align with the city-wide Stormwater Strategy, or any catchment or sub catchment plan to implement the city-side Stormwater Strategy. Amend the matters of discretion to: -Include a new matter that addresses when and how on-site mitigation measures will be installed and how they are proposed to be maintained, including by whom;-Make it certain that the Council will have scope to require amendments to ensure neighbouring stormwater attenuation devices are not compromised by new development (e.g. overland flow from a new development being directed across a boundary and overloading the capacity of neighbouring systems). Amend the advice note to include a reference to the use of consent notices in relation to installation and maintenance of any on-site stormwater mitigation devices.	Rangitāne support the requirement to achieve alignment of any on-site mitigation measures with the city wide Stormwater Strategy that is currently being prepared. As it will take some time for individual catchment plans to be prepared to implement the strategy, it is important that alignment with the Stormwater Strategy itself is also achieved (as this will provide direction for future catchment plans). It is important that any mitigation measures required as part of a subdivision proposal are implemented as designed and maintained in good working order. This should be secured through consent notices. The first matter of discretion refers to the effects of earthworks on on-site and off-site flooding and overland flow paths, but is not as specific as providing discretion to consider the potential effects of on-site stormwater mitigation measures, on adjacent areas (i.e. off-site).
SO137.41	Rangitāne o Manawatū	SUB-MRZ Notification clauses	Support	That the ability to limited notify applications under these rules, including Horizons Regional Council and Rangitāne, is retained.	Rangitāne are not convinced that the proposed provisions in PCI are sufficiently certain or directive such that, following redevelopment for housing, effective stormwater management within the plan change area can be guaranteed. Limited notification should be retained as there is uncertainty that the provisions will ensure good outcomes. Rangitāne submission is that stormwater effects of re-zoning for residential intensification are unlikely to be appropriately mitigated in the long term, and there should be an opportunity for potential effects to be identified and addressed through notification processes. This should include consideration of the need to notify Horizons Regional Council and Rangitāne.
SO137.42	Rangitāne o Manawatū	Definition - Ancestral Land	Support	As proposed this definition will only apply in the Medium Density Zone, but this definition forms part of the proposed amendments to the definition of papakāinga, which will apply across all zones in the plan. Rangitāne seek a consequential amendment to introduce this definition into section 4 as well as section 4A.	Rangitāne support the definition, but the definition should apply across all zones in the district, not just in the Medium Density Residential Zone.
SO137.43	Rangitāne o Manawatū	Definition - Papakāinga	Support	Retain as notified	Rangitāne support the proposed amendment to the wording of this operative definition, as it will enable such developments on Māori and whānau land that is not in multiple ownership.
SO138.1	Christine Rynhart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Concerned about the suitability of soil conditions in Dittmar Drive for building intensification.
SO139.1	Ian Craig Stevens	Zone Extent	Oppose	Delete Lakemba Park subdivision from the zone extent.	Lakemba Park subdivision was formed to provide single house dwellings on single sections. There is a covenant on all the sections that states "the purchaser shall not do, permit or suffer any of the following, that the land to be further subdivided. Therefore I point out that the councils plans to boost housing in the area goes against this covenant.
SO140.1	Spencer Lilley and Penelope Tucker	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	Provisions will support avoidance and mitigation of negative effects from increased stormwater. The requirement for an on-site specimen tree will help remedy the loss of amenity and biodiversity.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO141.1	Deidre Southee	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Utilise existing buildings in the inner city for housing and/or increase greenfield development	Increasing housing density (especially in the Vogel Street Roslyn area) will result in: - Increased demand for parking and increased risk of potential accidents and injury - Increased crime unless there is more consistent policing and secure buildings - Loss of privacy - Insufficient areas for play - Insufficient infrastructure capacity and concerns about structural stability/durability for buildings
SO142.1	Ben van der Spuy	Zone extent	Oppose	Exclude zones around schools	The areas around schools are already heavily congested, and the increased traffic resulting from the Proposed Plan Change I: Increasing Housing Supply and Choice will only worsen this issue. This added congestion poses a significant safety risk to children and parents, making the school environment more dangerous.
SO143.1	Joanne and Robert Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	Concerns with location, consistency with surrounding buildings, design, lack of outdoor space, loss of privacy, lack of storage, parking, ventilation, accessibility for people with disabilities, older people, mobility impaired etc.
SO143.2	Joanne and Robert Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	The population growth statistics do not reflect the actual population growth in Palmerston North over the last 24 years. Also need to consider migration, immigration and natural attrition along with a declining birth rate.
SO143.3	Joanne and Robert Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Review in light of potential for changed national direction	Pause the plan change whilst wait for the outcome of any review of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development in relation to housing targets.
SO143.4	Joanne and Robert Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Retain requirement for resource consent for new residential units.	Need to have regulations and safe guards in place.
SO144.1	Karen Nistor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Create new greenfield areas or reduce the size of the MRZ.	Concerns with appearance, impacts on property values, loss of light and privacy, reduced air quality, rubbish disposal, energy consumption, poorer health outcomes, traffic congestion and increased crime.
SO145.1	Shraddha Dabholkar	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	No more houses in the city centre	Traffic congestion
SO146.1	David Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Don't like medium density living.
SO147.1	Renee Thurston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO148.1	Emily Doody	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Medium density housing should be located in the new areas of the city first, e.g. Kelvin Grove, Summerhill, Fitzherbert	The older areas of Palmerston North have a great deal of inadequate infrastructure. Every suburb should have equal numbers for fairness sake, but also to ensure that we are not creating more denser pockets of crime.
SO149.1	Steve Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Concerns about increased flooding risk, construction effects, loss of sunlight, privacy and outlook.
SO149.2	Steve Carter	Zone Extent	Oppose	Include areas such as Hunter Street, Catlins Cres, Kaituna and Clearview, as they are within walking distance of schools and bus services.	Building taller buildings in areas that already have them.
SO150.1	Raewyn Greenlees	Zone Extent	Oppose	Exclude Royal Oak Drive and Rosebank Avenue (Lakemba Park)	There are existing restrictive covenants on properties in this subdivision which prevent further subdivision or building more than one dwelling. Also concerns about increased on-street parking.
SO151.1	Oliver Hannaford	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	Increase housing supply
SO152.1	Kimberly Coates	Standards	Amend	Include universal design as a minimum standard.	Accessible universal design even fits so many in society from wheelchair users to elderly or make ease to ensure all new builds have a proportion of accessible dwellings.
SO153.1	Tania Kopytko	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	Concerns about increase in noise and lack of privacy for established households, requirement for on-site parking..
SO154.1	Katreena Collins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Keep medium density to specific areas for example Rangitiki Street and Tremain Avenue where there are already 2-3 storey houses.
SO155.1	Rose Ogrean	Zone Extent	Oppose	Exclude the Hokowhitu area	There is already on-street parking congestion. More housing will mean the school size will need to increase.
SO156.1	Andrew and Julie Phillips	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reinstate the requirement for a resource consent for each home that is more than a single level dwelling.	Concerns about loss of privacy and loss of light (including impacting solar panels).
SO156.2	Andrew and Julie Phillips	MRZ-R7	Oppose	There should be no more than 2 homes per 400m2 of land.	Concerns about increase in noise, pollution, traffic, stormwater and sewerage.
SO157.1	Pamela Bridewell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Concerns about increased traffic impacting existing property access and increasing congestion.
SO157.2	Pamela Bridewell	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Houses should be no more than single storey with a large distance to the boundary.	Concerns about loss of sunlight, privacy and enjoyment of outdoor living space.
SO158.1	Richard Wilde	MRZ-S2	Amend	When adjacent to existing homes, reduce the height from 9m to a more realistic heights on the margins of existing housing.	Concerns about shading, decreased property values, and increased density being out of place with existing houses.
SO159.1	John and Margaret Wood	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Restrict to two storeys in established suburbs	Loss of privacy, increased building height does not fit with existing houses in established suburbs. Too tall with 1m side and rear boundaries.
SO159.2	John and Margaret Wood	Standards	Amend	Amend section size from proposed 350 sq. metre to 450-500 sq. metre	Concerns about lack of space to grow vegetables, fruit trees and flowers, amount of concrete causes heat problems, play outside, dry clothes, for storage, pets. Concern about parked cars over footpaths. Concerns about impacts on well-being.
SO159.3	John and Margaret Wood	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Not stated	Existing infrastructure is already overloaded in some suburbs and retrofitting is cost-prohibitive

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO159.4	John and Margaret Wood	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Require resource consents and neighbour consultation	To sure well designed housing which is in keeping with existing dwellings, and the same requirements for all.
SO160.1	Chris Charleston	MRZ-S1	Amend	Reduce the maximum permitted height	Three storey buildings will be prone to overheating on the top floor. Maintenance will be more difficult as will fire and paramedic access.
SO161.1	Lynnette Thurston-Paris	MRZ-S2	Amend	Reduce the maximum permitted height	Reducing in sunlight will impact ability to grow gardens/food. Reduction in airflow due to increased height and decreased separation may increase dampness.
SO162.1	Peter French	Zone Extent	Oppose	Delete Tyne Street from the MRZ	Tyne Street is on the heritage trail and increased density would change the character of the street. Also concerned with increased traffic, stormwater, and impacts on children playing in the street.
SO163.1	Anthony Grace	Standards	Oppose	Reduce the number of units/1000m2 to no more than 2 and reduce the height to no more than 2 storeys, depending on how close to boundary fences.	Impacts on reasons why people find Palmerston North an attractive place to live and raise families.
SO164.1	David Lane	MRZ-S10	Amend	Support the MRZ approach and consider there should be one set of rules across the city for stormwater attenuation devices	The existing rules for stormwater attenuation devices are unclear and confusing.
SO164.2	David Lane	Zone Extent	Support	Retain the zone extent as notified. Consider including other areas, such as Fitzherbert Avenue.	Not stated
SO164.3	David Lane	MRZ-S19	Oppose	Delete Clause 1	I have no problem with screening of rubbish storage areas on communal properties. I do not support screening for individual residential properties, this seems like over-reach by Council.
SO164.4	David Lane	MRZ-S20	Amend	Amend clause 2(a) to clarify that height is measured from site ground level.	Many sites have a building platform level that is above the level of the footpath, the measure should be taken from the property's perspective, not the footpath perspective.
SO164.5	David Lane	MRZ-S5	Oppose	Delete clause 3 and 4	I don't support mandating of trees on sites in this zone, this should be a matter of personal choice. e concerns about the 20% requirement for landscaping, 80 square metres on a 400 square metre site seems a lot.
SO165.1	Brendon Duncan	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Return the heritage height control to a maximum of two storey.	Concern about loss of privacy, lack of accessibility, appearance, potential for overcrowding, lack of on site parking, lack of outdoor space, loss of character in heritage areas.
SO166.1	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-P3	Amend	Amend MRZ-P3 as follows ... <u>3. Site layouts provide adequate rubbish recycling collection and storage facilities;</u> ...	This matter needs to be addressed when assessing applications for four or more residential units .
SO166.2	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-P7	Amend	Amend MRZ-P7 as follows MRZ-P7 - Development* in the Stormwater Overlay Avoid development* in the Stormwater Overlay unless the Council* is satisfied that a site-specific stormwater management plan prepared by a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant (preferably with experience in water sensitive design* concepts and elements) identifies: 1. identifies the location, scale and nature of the development* proposed for the site; 2. identifies the extent of flood and/or overland stormwater flow hazards; 3. identifies the on-site and off-site effects of the proposed development* on people, property and the environment; 4. recommends mitigation measures to remedy or mitigate the on- and off-site effects of the development*; and demonstrates that the on- and off-site adverse effects will be appropriately mitigated.	Clarity of drafting for plan implementation.
SO166.3	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R2	Amend	Amend MRZ-R2.1.c as follows c. No more than 1 /3 of the <u>gross floor area of a residential building, including any accessory building or external storage area, (up to a maximum of 40m2 and including gross floor area and external storage areas but</u> (excluding any car parking areas) <u>must can</u> be used for the home business;	Clarity of drafting for plan implementation.
SO166.4	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R2	Amend	Amend MRZ-R2.2.1 as follows Council's discretion is restricted to: 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R2.1 which has not been met, <u>including any relevant assessment criteria for MRZ-R2.1 (k) (m);</u> and ...	MRZ-R2.1(k-m) references existing rules within the Operative District Plan (ODP) which do not have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.5	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R3	Amend	Amend R3.2.1 Council's* discretion is restricted to: 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R3.1 which has not been met, <u>including any relevant assessment criteria for .M.RZ R3.1 (c) and (d) ;</u> and ...	MRZ-R3.1(c) and (d) references existing rules in the ODP which do not have assessment criteria associated with them.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.6	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R4	Amend	Amend R4.2.1 Council's* discretion is restricted to: 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R4.1 which has not been met, including any relevant assessment criteria for MRZ-R4.1 (b) (e) ; and	MRZ-R4.1(b) – (e) references existing rules in the ODP which do not have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.7	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R5	Amend	Amend R5.2.1 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R5.1 which has not been met, including any relevant assessment criteria for MRZ- R5.1 (c) (b)-(f) ; and	MRZ-R5.1(c) references an existing rule in the ODP which does have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.8	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R6	Amend	Add an advice note that the rule does not apply to heritage buildings.	Provides clarification for plan user
SO166.9	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R7	Amend	Amend R7.2.2 The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R7. 1 [b] which has not been met, including any relevant matters of discretion or assessment criteria ; and	MRZ-R7. 1 [b] references existing rules in the ODP which do not have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.10	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R8	Amend	Amend MRZ-R8 as follows Council's* discretion is restricted to: <u>1.The extent and effects of non-compliance with standards MRZ-S1 – S20; and</u> 2.The relevant matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P6, <u>MRZ-P8</u> and MRZ-P12.	The addition is a relevant matter of discretion. Water sensitive design is a relevant matter of consideration when assessing the construction of four or more dwellings units.
SO166.11	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R9	Amend	Amend MRZ-R9.2.2 as follows The extent and effects of non-compliance with any standard in MRZ-R9.1(b) which has not been met, including the relevant matters of discretion or assessment criteria ; and	MRZ-R9.1(b) references existing rules in the ODP which do not have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.12	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R10	Amend	Delete reference to MRZ-P8	Policy MRZ-P8 is not relevant for this rule.
SO166.13	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R12	Amend	Amend MRZ-R12.2.2 as follows The extent and effects of non-compliance with any requirement in MRZ-R12.1 (e)-(j) which has not been met, including any relevant assessment criteria for MRZ-R 212.1(f)(e)-(i) ; and	MRZ-R12.1(f) references an existing rule in the ODP which does have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.14	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R13	Amend	Amend MRZ-R13.2.2 as follows 2. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any requirement in MRZ-R1 23 .1(b)-(f) which has not been met, including any relevant matters of discretion assessment criteria for MRZ-R13.1(b)-(e) ; and ...	MRZ-R13.1(b)-(f) references existing rules in the ODP which do not have assessment criteria associated with them. Corrects typo in reference to MRZ-R12.
SO166.15	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R14	Amend	Replace reference to MRZ-R14.1(b)-(d) with (c)	MRZ-R14.1(c) references an existing rule in the ODP which do have assessment criteria associated with them.
SO166.16	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R15	Amend	Replace reference in R15.2.2 to MRZ-R14 with MRZ-R15(d)(c)-(g)	MRZ-R15.1(d) references existing rules in the ODP which do have assessment criteria associated with them. Corrects typo in reference to MRZ-R14.
SO166.17	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R18	Amend	Replace reference to MRZ-S6 with MRZ-S20	Corrects typo in reference to MRZ-S6.
SO166.18	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R20	Amend	Add in <u>The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (or its successor) must be given limited notification of an application under this rule unless they have provided written approval.</u>	NZTA are considered an affected party if the permitted standards of MRZ-R20 are not met. This is consistent with the approach taken in Rule 22.2 where KiwiRail Ltd must be given limited notification if the permitted activity standards of MRZ-R22 are not met.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.19	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-R24	Amend	<p>Amend MRZ-R24 as follows</p> <p>MRZ-R24 Stormwater treatment for <u>parking and manoeuvring areas, and access ways four or more carparks (including garages)</u></p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where: <u>The cumulative area of any parking area, manoeuvring area and access ways on a site is less than 100m².</u></p> <p>2. 1.Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>Where: <u>a.MRZ-R24.1(a) is not met</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>Advice Note: <u>The Council prefers the use of bioretention systems for stormwater treatment, for example raingardens, filter strips or swales. Further information is available in Council's Residential Bioretention Design Guide.</u></p>	Having an area as the trigger for compliance is better for administration of the rule.
SO166.20	Palmerston North City Council	New rule	Amend	<p>Insert MRZ-R25 as follows</p> <p><u>MRZ-R25 Any activity or the construction, alteration or addition of buildings or structures not provided for in rules MRZ-R1-R24 is a discretionary activity.</u></p>	In the absence of a 'catch-all' rule, activities/buildings not captured by rules MRZ-R1 – MRZ-R24 would default to being a permitted activity, which would prevent consideration of effects and the application of conditions, if required.
SO166.21	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S1	Amend	<p>Amend MRZ-S1 as follows</p> <p>.Buildings or structures (excluding garages and accessory buildings) may not exceed a maximum height of 11 metres above ground level.</p> <p>Except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as illustrated in MRZ-Figure 1 below. <u>2.Garages or accessory buildings may not exceed a maximum height of 2.8m above ground level.</u> <p>MRZ-S1 does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fences and standalone walls <u>(refer MRZ-S20)</u>; 	A maximum height restriction on accessory buildings is not necessary as they can be controlled via the 11m permitted activity height for all buildings and structures, which includes an accessory building. Having a 2.8m maximum height for accessory buildings will result in many resource consent applications as typical small garages and sheds can be up to 3m at the roof apex. Reference to MRZ-S20 is to provide guidance to the applicable standard.
SO166.22	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Amend MRZ-S2 as follows</p> <p>1.All buildings and structures (excluding garages and accessory buildings) must be contained beneath recession planes, inclined inwards at right angles, of:</p> <p>a.45° measured from a point of 5.0 metres above ground level <u>and perpendicular to the boundary</u>, for the greater distance of either 15 metres, or the first two-thirds of the site, from the boundary with a public road; and</p> <p>b.45° measured from a point of 2.8 metres above ground level <u>and perpendicular to the boundary</u> for the remainder of the site.</p> <p><u>2.Garages and accessory buildings must be contained beneath a 45° measured from a point 2.8 metres above ground level and perpendicular to the boundary.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>2. For rear sites, where the site does not contain any boundaries with a public road other than for an access strip*; all buildings and structures must be contained beneath a line* of 45° measured from a point of 2.8 metres above ground level <u>and perpendicular to the boundary. inclined inwards at right angles</u></p> <p>...</p>	Clarifies drafting to aid with interpretation of the standard. Inclusion of a height in relation to boundary for garages and accessory buildings enables consideration of shading, loss of privacy and dominance effects for larger structures, as would occur with other buildings and structures.
SO166.23	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Replace Figure 2 with updated version</p>	The height in relation to boundary recession plane continues to when a building exceeds the permitted activity height of 11m. The existing figure could be interpreted as suggesting that it doesn't.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.24	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3.1 as follows 1. Any building <u>(including a garage)</u> must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the following Yards table. For a corner site* with frontages to two public roads, the front yard requirement applies to the primary frontage. Clarify the requirements for front yard minimum depths and add requirement for 1 metre rear yard	Clarity for plan users
SO166.25	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S3	Amend	Delete MRZ-S3.2	The application of MRZ-S3.1 to garages as proposed in the submission means that this table is no longer required.
SO166.26	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3 as follows MRZ-S3 does not apply to: • Accessory buildings <u>up to a maximum of 2m in height, which are</u> located in the side or rear yards. • Site boundaries where there is an existing or proposed common wall. • Fences or standalone walls. • Uncovered deck and uncovered structures no more than 1 metre in height above ground level. • Eaves up to 600 mm wide. For eaves wider than 600mm only the additional width beyond 600mm is included in the site coverage calculation.	An accessory building up to 2m in height will have insignificant effects on neighbouring properties given that a fence can be constructed up to 2m on a boundary without building or resource consent.
SO166.27	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S5	Amend	Amend MRZ-5.4 as follows 4. The specimen tree must be located in the outdoor living space required by MRZ-S7(2) where this is <u>provided at the street frontage located in the front yard</u> of a residential unit, papakāinga* or community house*	Clarifies the requirement for locating specimen trees when the outdoor living space is located in the front yard.
SO166.28	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S6	Amend	Delete	The purpose of the standard is to help reduce the heat map of a residential development which is a positive climate change initiative. Other standards such as 30% permeable surfaces, 20% landscaped area will assist to achieve a lower heat map. Standard not considered necessary.
SO166.29	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S8	Amend	Correct figure references	Incorrect reference to S9 and Figure 4
SO166.30	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S11	Amend	Amend MRZ-S11 as follows 1. The minimum floor level (finished floor) and ground level for all residential buildings, accessory buildings and structures must be at least at the required freeboard for the 2% AEP flood extent for the site (including an allowance for climate change). ... Advice Note: The required <u>freeboard minimum floor level</u> will be provided by Palmerston North City Council.	Reference to ground level and accessory buildings and structures is incorrect. Clarity of drafting, to assist with plan implementation.
SO166.31	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S12	Amend	Amend table wording, including introducing requirement for corner sites or a site with two frontages.	Clarity of drafting, to assist with plan implementation. Incorrect references to Figures 3 and 2
SO166.32	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S13	Amend	Add new figure showing front door location	Clarity of drafting, to assist with plan implementation.
SO166.33	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S16	Amend	Add <u>2. The location of any associated new or altered vehicle crossing must not require:</u> <u>i. the removal of any tree planted on any public road, or</u> <u>ii. modification, excavation or construction within the area directly beneath the dripline* of the tree.</u> <u>Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed:</u> <u>1. Health and maturity of the tree;</u> <u>2. Provision of a replacement tree; and</u> <u>3. Feasibility of alternative access* arrangements.</u>	Consistent with the requirements of SUB-MRZ-S4, which protects existing street trees. It is appropriate to include this as a standard when crossings are proposed as part of a development that does not involve subdivision.
SO166.34	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S17	Amend	Amend MRZ-S17 as follows On-site vehicle manoeuvring must comply with MRZ-Figure <u>6 8</u> where there is a side-entry garage or parking space. Add the following note under MRZ Figure 8 <u>Advice Note: This diagram accommodates an 85th percentile single movement swept path as per AS/NZS 2890.1 The Australian/New Zealand Standard Parking Facilities – Part 1- Off-street Car Parking</u>	Correction to figure number. Provides clarification that the diagram is based on a swept path standard.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.35	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S18	Amend	Amend MRZ-S18.1 as follows 1. Bicycle parking must be provided for all residential units at a <u>minimum</u> rate of 1 bicycle park per residential unit;	Allows for more than 1 bike park to be provided.
SO166.36	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S19	Amend	Amend MRZ-S19 as follows <u>2. A communal rubbish storage area must be provided for developments of four or more residential units.</u>	This is an appropriate matter to include in the standard.
SO166.37	Palmerston North City Council	MRZ-S20	Amend	Amend MRZ-20.2 as follows ... 2. On a front boundary with a public road any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, <u>the following applies must not:</u> <u>a. A maximum height of 1.1 metres applies except that solid fencing may be erected to 1.8 metres over not more than 1/3 of the frontage width, and</u> <u>b. No part of a solid fence above 1.1 metres in height shall be located within 1.8 metres of a driveway, except for gate posts relating to a fence of open construction;</u> <u>c. If the fence is of open construction, the fence must not exceed 1.8 metres in height.</u> d. Exceed a maximum height of 1.8 metres above ground level; and e. For any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.1 metres in height, at least 2/3 of the fence must be of open construction. Except that: • Where a fence is erected on the road frontage of a corner site*, the requirements of MRZ-S1620.2 only apply to one road frontage.	The proposed amendment is consistent with Rule 10.6.1.4(d) of the ODP. The reference to MRZ-S16 is a typo.
SO166.38	Palmerston North City Council	Section 7B	Amend	Change "lot/s" to "allotment/s"	"Allotment/s" is defined in the National Planning Standards, which the Council is required to implement.
SO166.39	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-P3	Amend	SUB-MRZ-P3 Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards Take a risk-based approach to the <i>subdivision of land affected by natural hazards</i> so that new or exacerbation of existing <u>natural hazards and/or exacerbation of existing natural hazards is</u> avoided and appropriate mitigation measures are in place prior to <i>development</i> *	Reworded to provide clarity for plan implementation.
SO166.40	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R1	Amend	Remove bylaw year	In rules SUB-MRZ-R1, R1A and R2 references in advice notes are made to specific versions of Bylaws. Removing the Year of the Bylaw avoids tying the plan to specific versions which may be replaced in the future
SO166.41	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R1A	Amend	Remove bylaw year	In rules SUB-MRZ-R1, R1A and R2 references in advice notes are made to specific versions of Bylaws. Removing the Year of the Bylaw avoids tying the plan to specific versions which may be replaced in the future
SO166.42	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R2	Amend	Remove bylaw year	In rules SUB-MRZ-R1, R1A and R2 references in advice notes are made to specific versions of Bylaws. Removing the Year of the Bylaw avoids tying the plan to specific versions which may be replaced in the future
SO166.43	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-P4	Amend	MRZ-SUB-P3 – Subdivision in the Stormwater Overlay Avoid subdivision in the Stormwater Overlay unless the Council* is satisfied that a site-specific stormwater management plan prepared by a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant (preferably with experience in water sensitive design* concepts and elements) <u>identifies:</u> 1. <u>identifies</u> the location, scale and nature of the development* proposed for the site; 2. <u>identifies</u> the extent of flood and/or overland stormwater flow hazards; 3. <u>identifies</u> the on-site and off-site effects of the proposed development* on people, property and the environment; 4. recommend <u>sed</u> mitigation measures to remedy or mitigate the on- and off-site effects of the development*; and 5. demonstrates that the on- and off-site adverse effects will be appropriately mitigated.	Clarity of drafting for plan implementation.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.44	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R1	Amend	Amend SUB-MRZ-R1.1 as follows 1.Activity status: Controlled Where: a.Where the site is not located within the Stormwater Overlay; and a.Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i.Standards MRZ-S1 – MRZ-S20, for <u>allotments lots</u> created with an existing dwelling*; ii.SUB-MRZ-S1 – Access*; iii.SUB-MRZ-S2 – Vehicle crossings; iv.SUB-MRZ-S3 – Essential services*; v.SUB-MRZ-S4 – Street trees; b.Accesses* comply with R20.4.2 i.20.4.2(a)(i)-(v); ii.20.4.2(a)(vi)(b-j); iii.20.4.2(a)(vii)-(viii); and c.Earthworks comply with R6.3.6.1(b). <u>d.MRZ-R24 - Stormwater treatment for parking and manoeuvring areas, and access ways</u>	Clarity of drafting for plan implementation as SUB-MRZ-R1A is proposed. Inclusion of MRZ-R24 is required for any subdivision that proposes to create parking and manoeuvring areas and accessways.
SO166.45	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R1	Amend	Delete SUB-MRZ-R1.2	Deleted as SUB-MRZ-R1A is proposed which will provide clarity when applying for and processing applications within the Stormwater Overlay.
SO166.46	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R1	Amend	Amend SUB-MRZ-R1.3 as follows 23. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a.Compliance with one or more of the standards in SUB-MRZ-R1.1(ab)-(cd) is not achieved. Council's* discretion is restricted to: 1.The matter(s) of discretion for any infringed standard in MRZ-S1-MRZ-S20; 2.The matter(s) control for any infringed standard in SUB-MRZ-R1.1 (ab)(ii iii)-(v) and (b)-(cd);	Not stated
SO166.47	Palmerston North City Council	New rule	Amend	Insert the following new rule <u>SUB-MRZ-R1A Subdivision within the Stormwater Overlay</u> <u>1.Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Council's* discretion is restricted to:</u> <u>a.The effect of earthworks on on-site and off-site flooding and overland flow paths, hazard risk and erosion and sedimentation;</u> <u>b.Setting of minimum floor levels;</u> <u>c.Setting of maximum impervious surface area;</u> <u>d.Subdivision design and layout and the size, shape and arrangement of proposed allotments;</u> <u>e.The extent to which on-site mitigation measures will support and align with any catchment or sub-catchment plan to implement the city-wide Stormwater Strategy</u> <u>f.Whether the subdivision design and layout meet the requirements of the Council's* Engineering Standards for Land Development; and</u> <u>g.The relevant matters in SUB-MRZ-P3 and SUB-MRZ-P4.</u> <u>Advice Note:</u> <u>Service connections to the public stormwater network must comply with the Palmerston North Stormwater Bylaw, service connections to the public wastewater network must comply with the Palmerston North Wastewater Bylaw and service connections to the public water supply network must comply with the Palmerston North Water Supply Bylaw.</u> <u>Notification:</u> <u>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991.</u>	Provides clarity when processing and applying for applications within the Stormwater Overlay

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO166.48	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R2	Amend	Amend SUB-MRZ-R2.1 as follows ... c. Accesses* comply with R20.4.2 i.20.4.2(a)(i)-(v); ii.20.4.2(a)(vi)(b-j); iii.20.4.2(a) (vii)-(viii); and d. Earthworks comply with R6.3.6.1(b). <u>and</u> <u>e. It can be demonstrated that any vacant allotment can comply with MRZ-S1-S5, MRZ-S7-S9 and MRZ-S16-S17.</u> <u>...</u> <u>5. Whether a residential unit can be contained within the allotment which complies with MRZ-S1 – S5, MRZ-S7 - S9, MRZ-S16 – S17. The relevant matters in SUB-MRZ-P2.</u>	(e) is required to trigger the new matter of discretion.
SO166.49	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-R3	Amend	Amend SUB-MRZ-R3(1)(a) There are no new undeveloped separately disposable <u>allotments let</u> , cross leases, company areas or any units created; and	Grammar
SO166.50	Palmerston North City Council	SUB-MRZ-S1.1 & 2	Amend	1. Each allotment must have practical, physical and legal access* to a public road. <u>by way of either</u> 2. <u>Access* to a rear allotment must be</u> by way of either: a. an access leg* at least 3 metres wide forming part of the <u>allotment let</u> ; or b. a shared access* consisting of up to six access strips* lying adjacent to one another and giving access* to no more than five other <u>allotments lets</u> , and in respect of which reciprocal rights-of-way are granted or reserved; or c. an access strip* held in common ownership with the allotment and up to five other allotments; or d. any right-of-way running with and appurtenant to the land in which the allotment is comprised.	Clarity of drafting for plan implementation. The amendment clarifies the requirements for rear allotments and front allotments.
SO166.51	Palmerston North City Council	Definition - Rail Corridor	Amend	Replace DP with District Plan	Removed abbreviation.
SO167.1	Christine Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	That the Council upholds the proposed requirements in the plan change.	Concerned that if the plan provisions are not upheld there will be issues with stormwater, lack of integration with public transport, increased on street car parking and shading from taller buildings.
SO168.1	Ivan Johnstone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Intensification is not for Palmerston North - concerns about height and lack of onsite parking.
SO169.1	Jennifer Orange	Zone Extent	Amend	Extend zone boundary to include 68 Fitzroy Street, Terrace End.	This is an island in the current zone extent. It would be illogical, impracticable and limiting if this site was not included.
SO170.1	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S1	Amend	amend the second part of the standard (assume an error as it states 1. as well as follows (delete in its entirety). <u>2. Garages or accessory buildings may not exceed a maximum height of 2.8m above ground level.</u> We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought.	There are situations where a granny flat or studio may be located above e.g a garage (attached or detached) which would be caught by this rule and should be subject to MRZ-S1.1 height. We should be trying to encourage granny flats i.e minor residential units. If it is not the intention that this be captured by MRZ S1.2 then the standard should be updated to make this clearer as I understand the intention may be to manage the impact of taller utilitarian type buildings on the residential character and amenity values. MRZ-S1.1 should be sufficient for mitigating any dominance effects as it applies to the entire dwelling which would be used as the permitted baseline for effects purposes.
SO170.2	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S2	Support	Retain as notified	This standard is supported by the Urban Design Report by McIndoe Urban which provides a more nuanced approach to the MDRS standards for Palmerston North.
SO170.3	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S3	Amend	Please amend the wording as follows: 1. Front - 1.5 metres from a public road where there is no parking in the front yard Front - 5.5 metres for that part of the frontage where a parking space is provided but no garage (internal or standalone) Side <u>and Rear</u> 1 metre We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought	For consistency, the requested amendment to the standard has included the word rear as this is the wording of the MDRS and rear is also included in table two and might have been accidentally left out?
SO170.4	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S4	Support	Retain as notified	It is generally in line with the MDRS standards and will allow greater building coverage for greater housing density needs in Palmerston North whilst still mitigating amenity effects and effects relating to stormwater.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO170.5	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S5	Amend	<p>Retain the proposed wording of this standard except for the changes requested below:</p> <p>3. At least one specimen tree capable of growing to a minimum height of four metres after five <u>ten</u> years must be provided for each ground floor residential unit, papakāinga* or community house*.</p> <p>In addition, the Council should consider providing more guidance to applicants about suitable specimen trees in a non-regulatory urban design and landscape design guideline.</p> <p>We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought</p>	The standard does need to be amended to be in line with the advice given in the Landscape Report as the five years for the specimen tree growth is not supported in the Landscape Report which recommends 10 years.
SO170.6	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S6	Oppose	Delete standard	This standard would be difficult to enforce, show compliance with (i.e costs associated with modelling shading for building consent/resource consent purposes) and will add additional expense for housing.
SO170.7	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S7	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Where the outdoor living space is provided at ground level it must provide:</p> <p>a. a minimum area of 30m² which can accommodate a 4.5 metre diameter circle for a residential unit or community house* with two <u>three</u> or more bedrooms; or</p> <p>b. a minimum area of 20m² which can accommodate a 4 metre diameter circle for a residential unit or community house* with one bedroom <u>up to two bedrooms</u>; and</p> <p>We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought</p>	Support larger outdoor living areas for houses which can accommodate larger households. Granny flats of up to 60 sqm can contain up to two bedrooms and to be enabling of this for infill housing -20sqm outdoor living spaces would be sufficient for these types of minor dwellings.
SO170.8	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S8	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>An outlook space must be provided for every residential units, papakāinga* or community house* which meets the following minimum dimensions (measured from the centre point of the applicable window):</p> <p>a. 6.5 <u>6</u> metres in depth x 4 metres in width outlook space for a main living area; and</p> <p>b. 3 metres in depth x 3 metres in width outlook space for the primary bedroom; and</p> <p>c. 1 metre in depth x 1 metre in width outlook space for all other habitable rooms.</p> <p>We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought</p>	The suggested amendments better align with the MDRS standards. Furthermore, there may be no primary bedroom in a house layout and bedrooms do not generally require the same amount of light and privacy as living spaces as occupants do not spend the same amount occupying these spaces for entertainment/leisure purposes. In addition, bedrooms can benefit from less sunlight and more shade given their primary purpose is for sleeping whereby issues of overheating can be an issue
SO170.9	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S9	Support	Retain as notified	30% permeable surface is a threshold that has been adopted by a number of other Councils.
SO170.10	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S10	Support	Retain as notified	Clear and easy to understand and calculate. Will require a soakpit design report to demonstrate compliance if this is the attenuation method proposed as depends on soakage rate of soils. This information would need to be provide up-front. This could be added as a note.
SO170.11	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S11	Oppose	Delete standard	Stormwater Servicing Assessment report only seem to rely on PNCCs current level of service for FFL as per their PNCC ESLD. The Tonkin and Taylor supporting stormwater report states that This assessment does not specifically consider whether the flood depths within the proposed intensification areas are acceptable or require any mitigation measures or infilling to raise floor levels above the floodplain, in order to be developed."
SO170.12	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S12	Support	Retain as notified	The rule provides a more nuanced approach to the MDRS standard which anecdotally is not flexible enough for different scenarios creating the need for unnecessary resource consents.
SO170.13	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S13	Support	Retain as notified	Contributes to good urban design outcomes.
SO170.14	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S14	Oppose	Delete standard	Some houses are designed so that the garage door occupies the bottom of the building with the living accommodation mostly upstairs. This can also help with managing flood risk for the habitable rooms in the house. When the garage door is integrated into the house design, despite taking up the bottom half of the house façade, it can look aesthetically pleasing.
SO170.15	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S15	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Any on-site carparking within 6 metres of a boundary adjoining a public road:</p> <p>a. must not comprise more than 50% of the width of the residential unit's façade to which it relates</p>	Point a of the standard does not appear to relate to other of the matters of discretion and appears to be an amenity matter. This point a. also seems to discourage parking perpendicular to the road frontage which has benefits such as on-site maneuvering so you can exit the site in a forwards manner
SO170.16	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S16	Support	Retain as notified	Supports safety for pedestrians, reduces the number of vehicle crossings which also remove on-street car parking spaces.
SO170.17	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S17	Support	Retain as notified	With more residential units sharing an access, internal circulation becomes more important for safety reasons.
SO170.18	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S18	Support	Retain as notified	I support the intent of this rule. You will have people just showing that they could wheel their bike into their living room though and lean it up against the wall.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO170.19	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S19	Amend	1. Each residential unit must have access to a screened rubbish storage area which is sized to accommodate one 240l wheelie bin and one recycling crate <u>and is screened if visible from a public place, shared accessway or communal area.</u>	For rear properties which do not front the street or a shared accessway, it would be unnecessary to have to screen the bin storage area as it would not be visible from a public or shared/communal area.
SO170.20	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S20	Amend	2. On a front boundary with a public road any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not: a. Exceed a maximum height of 1.8 metres above ground level; and b. For any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.1 metres in height, at least 2/3 of the fence must be of open construction.	You could re-word this to include a certain amount of the fence has to be 'permeable' but as worded I don't think this would work for people who have dogs in their front yard and need to contain the dogs from escaping.
SO170.21	Leith Consulting	MRZ-S21	Support	Retain as notified	Helps to provide a pleasant living environment without needing to open windows and doors for ventilation when outdoor noise levels are high.
SO170.22	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R1	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.23	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R2	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.24	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R3	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.25	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R4	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.26	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R5	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.27	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R6	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.28	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R7	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.29	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R8	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.30	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R9	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity
SO170.31	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R10	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.32	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R11	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.33	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R12	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.34	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R13	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.35	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R14	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.36	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R15	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.37	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R16	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.38	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R17	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.39	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R18	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.40	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R19	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.41	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R20	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.42	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R21	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.43	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R22	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.44	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R23	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.45	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R24	Support	Retain as notified	Clear wording and intent and manages adverse effects on residential amenity and stormwater effects.
SO170.46	Leith Consulting	MRZ-R24	Amend	MRZ-R24 Stormwater treatment for Provision of four or more carparks (including garages) <u>per site</u>	Could this not be addressed by a well worded permitted activity rule or standard so that people who are providing four on site car parks for residential living do not require a resource consent?
SO170.47	Leith Consulting	MRZ - Activity Status	Support	Retain RDA activity status for rules	I support the use of the restricted discretionary activity status for the new MDRS chapter standards as it provides applicants and plan users with clarity and scope when applying for resource consents. The use of notes in the plan also adds to clarify and interpretation as well as notification clauses.
SO171.1	Anne Allan	Zone Extent	Oppose	The MRZ should be restricted to the inner-city area only.	This would allow the council to assess demand and affordability of such housing without changing the character of the rest of the city by doing high density housing throughout a large part of the city. This area should be bounded approximately by College St, Victoria Ave, Featherston St and Cook street. Some of the housing within this rough boundary is quite rundown and undy and this would provide the opportunity to upgrade these areas. This approximate area fulfils all your zoning criteria schools, shops, transport, green space. The effects on neighbours of increased density are not acceptable.
SO171.2	Anne Allan	Standards	Amend	Include a minimum site size	The number of buildings per site is meaningless without a site size.
SO172.1	Warren Walton	Zone Extent	Oppose	Exclude Royal Oak Drive and Rosebank Avenue from the zone extent.	To be consistent with exclusion of Rodeo Drive.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO173.1	Vanesa Gonzalez Freijo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	I don't think that our city's infrastructure ready to these changes. Is not just water... it's parking, health, schools (all levels), safety, roads, etc. These changes to the density and building heights will impact on neighboring properties privacy, lifestyle and value.
SO174.1	Connie and Kerry Zuppich	Entire Plan Change	Support	Not stated	The neighbours must still be taken into account. Their right to privacy, sunlight, green space must still be taken into account
SO175.1	Deana Garstang	Standards	Oppose	Increase the distance between houses, lower the height control and change the borderlines.	Concerns about houses being too close together, loss of privacy, increased noise, loss of sun, impact on property values.
SO176.1	Kim Mclean	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Keep existing requirement	These new proposed boundry height allowances are too high, blocks out natural sunlight, and invades neighbouring properites privacy
SO177.1	Michelle Herbert	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Keep existing requirement	These new proposed boundry height allowances are too high, blocks out natural sunlight, and invades neighbouring properites privacy
SO178.1	Annette Nixon	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified, noting: 1. Does optimise solar gain include encouragement to invest in solar power? 2. Achieving high quality landscape outcomes should also include engaging shading to mitigate heat effects 3. Public gathering spaces should be with residential development and within the neighbourhood.	Not stated.
SO178.2	Annette Nixon	SUB-MRZ-P2	Support	Retain as notified	In Palmerston North the developments at North St and with Soho using multiple sites, park / reserve / street or commercial boundaries, especially those commercial areas presenting a plain or spacious façade, have the best appearance and blend with their neighbourhoods in terms of height, space for landscaping and outdoor residential activity.
SO178.3	Annette Nixon	Reserves rezoning	Support	Support Summerhays and PNCC Depot site. For Huia Street Please ensure the setback from the Fitzherbert Ave / Park Road corner allows excellent visibility for traffic flow, including pedestrian traffic. This area adjoining the tennis courts and school can be an invitation gateway to the parks. Please develop this access, encouraging recreational activity and links between the existing residential neighbourhood, the new development and the public areas away from the road.	Not stated.
SO178.4	Annette Nixon	Standards	Support	Apart from an attenuation device on site, are their likely to be other S/W controls such as swales (creating a biodiversity area) or rainwater collection for other use?	Not stated.
SO178.5	Annette Nixon	SUB-MRZ-S4	Support	Retain as notified	Essential to maintain or add this amenity and environmental addition for shading and city "greening" along with berm gardens, residential and public food production areas.
SO179.1	Rosemary Watson	Zone Extent	Amend	Consider whether specific areas should be omitted or phased for intensification: - stormwater overlay - areas with narrow streets - special interest/heritage areas	To achieve better outcomes for all
SO179.2	Rosemary Watson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Reconsider what "the need to maintain residential amenity and character" means.	New development should fit with the overall look of the city and be consistent with surrounding buildings.
SO179.3	Rosemary Watson	Standards	Amend	Reconsider effects on nearby/next-door neighbours specific to proposed development site and individual building designs.	As well as basic aesthetics, amenity value for existing residents needs to be considered on an individual basis. Also need to consider accessibility, potential for overcrowding, limited outdoor space and potential for overheating.
SO179.4	Rosemary Watson	Standards	Amend	Reconsider importance of greenspace and access to greenspace.	Private and public greenspace is important. Concern that minimum landscaping and permeable surface requirements are insufficient to plant trees etc to ensure sufficient cooling.
SO180.1	Richard Houlahan	MRZ-S1	Amend	Increase the height of accessory buildings from 2.8m to 3.8m	As an LBP Design 2 Architectural Designer of 22 years my advice is it's impossible to achieve the 2.8m maximum height. Even for a flat membrane roof which still requires 2° roof pitch and roof framing in the form of rafters that could be between 190-290mm thick depending on span. In this case the height calc would be 225+2455+290+200 (roof rise) = 3170mm, An even higher figure than the trussed 3° pitch option.
SO181.1	Steve Allan	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend to align with the actual intention of the RMA. Implement an opportunity for city resident to vote as to whether the implementation of the RMA should be supported in Palmerston North.	Many of the factors identified as reason / justification for increased future population are actually in decline.
SO181.2	Steve Allan	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Help remove development and subdivision cost barriers to traditional infill 2 story maximum housing.	Cost is major impediment for traditional subdivision where aging residents wish to remain in their dwelling but cannot afford to retain or do not require extensive amounts of land. Lower cost would conceivably make more sub dividable property available for development.
SO181.3	Steve Allan	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Amend to a 2 dwelling maximum per property for intensification	Living in a suburban street with infill housing, and in observing others, it is my experience that Palmerston North suburbs have coped with infill housing without significant social upheaval, overloading of council provided infrastructure and services. It is reasonable to expect housing intensification impact will be significantly more and that non council provided services such as electricity will become an issue. The arrival of E vehicles has already challenged the suburban power distribution networks.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO182.1	Vicki Worker	Standards	Amend	Require that off-street parking is supplied.	To ensure streets aren't clogged up with residents cars and also to provide residents with a place where they could potentially "charge" EV's
SO182.2	Vicki Worker	Standards	Amend	More direction required about building materials/maintenance on 3 storey developments	Concerned that in 20-30 years some of these 3 storey apartments will look like ghettos and like some of the old state housing apartment blocks if difficult and expensive to maintain, Unlikely high windows would be washed often (if at all) and 3 storey is very expensive to paint so are blocks/brick a better material and less likely to require major maintenance.
SO183.1	Shivarn Stewart	Zone Extent	Amend	Recommend that all properties on Wharenui Terrace and nearby properties on Rangiora Ave are required to have a case-by-case stormwater review before further housing can be approved to be built, similar to some other areas listed in the city.	Many properties on this street don't have their own stormwater and sewer access, instead, this goes through neighbouring properties. This poses a risk if housing in our area was significantly increased, given that more and more houses would be running through the same shared water systems. Further, the street drainage point in this street get blocked multiple times a year due to (public) trees' leaves and in heavy rain often floods the culdesac entranceway and makes it difficult for pedestrians and cars. As far as we're aware there's no plans to improve or better maintain this drainage, which would add to issues in storming situations.
SO184.1	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain MRZ-O1(a) as notified	There is too little choice in the type and size of housing currently being provided. Many of the dwellings in the city are too big for the small households that are now the norm. Also, need to provide an alternative to the sprawl that is currently occurring.
SO184.2	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O1	Amend	Delete 'and do not compromise the existing hierarchy of business zones within the city' from MRZ-O1(b)	The existing hierarchy of business zones is a highly car centric one. The nature of work and commerce has changed dramatically in recent years. There is now both the ability for many occupations to be undertaken from anywhere and the desire of many people to work from home. Having quiet and clean retail, service and hospitality activities in the MRZ will result in more destinations being within walking distance of people's homes contributing to both local community connectedness and the ability of resident to live car-light lives.
SO184.3	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O2	Support	Retain MRZ-O2(a-c) and (f-j) as notified	All these points will help to make the MRZ successful but they will also need to be accompanied by behavioural rules and enforcement especially concerning noise and vehicle use. These two factors are the major causes of conflict within medium density zones in other cities.
SO184.4	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O2	Amend	Replace 'adaptable' with another word in MRZ-O2 (d).	While 'healthy' is readily understood to mean something like 'conducive to the good health of residents', the meaning of 'adaptable' in this context is not clear.
SO184.5	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O2	Amend	Replace 'reasonable' with another word in MRZ-O2(e)	'Reasonable' is a highly subjective word, meaning different things to different people. S
SO184.6	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O3	Amend	Replace 'Manawatū Awa' with 'Manawatu River (Manawatū Awa)'	Given this is a document overwhelmingly written in English, text should be in English with any Maori language being used parenthetically and defined in Chapter 4 where it isn't a direct translation of the preceding English word.
SO184.7	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O4	Amend	Delete 'residential'. Replace 'the on-site and off-site effects of flooding (including from stormwater) on people, property and the environment as a result of residential intensification are appropriately mitigated.' with 'there is no net increase in stormwater yield or rate from a site compared with prior to intensification'.	Development enabling non residential activities is also permitted (Ref. No. 11 MRZ P1.2) so intensification of that should also be referred to in this provision. Deleting 'residential' achieves this as the sentence then covers both residential and non residential intensification. 'Appropriately' mitigated is too vague and 'mitigated' only means lessened. sites is measured or modelled.
SO184.8	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O5	Amend	Insert the types of infrastructure that is intended to be covered by this unless all public infrastructure is being referred to. If the latter is the case, insert 'any public' before 'infrastructure'.	Infrastructure isn't defined in Chapter 4. Roading and railways and airports, water and gas pipes, communications and energy cables are all infrastructure. Are all of these things meant by the use of this term here?
SO184.9	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O6	Amend	Replace 'Whenua Maori' – 'Tangata whenua' and 'whenua' with the appropriate English words and include the Maori words parenthetically.	Given this is a document overwhelmingly written in English, text should be in English with any Maori language being used parenthetically and defined in Chapter 4 where it isn't a direct translation of the preceding English word. Assuming 'whenua' is referring to 'land' in this instance, is 'whenua Maori' land that is Maori freehold land, Maori customary land or general land owned by one Maori person or a group of Maori people? (Office of the Maori Trustee)
SO184.10	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-O6	Amend	I request that it be made clear how any differences between Maori cultural values and aspirations and the rest of the objectives, policies and rules of this Plan Change will be reconciled.	The way this objective is written could give rise to conflict between residents and undermine the integrity of the zone.
SO184.11	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified	I agree that the zone should enable primarily residential activity and buildings but also certain non-residential activity and buildings. People need somewhere to live and those places will be enriched by enabling some non-residential activity to be mixed in with the residential activity.
SO184.12	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P2	Amend	Amend by adding some words that would more clearly limit the degree of non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The critical words here are 'well designed and compatible'. These are quite subjective and so introduce a degree of uncertainty in the plan. Some limitation should be specified on the degree of non-compliance with the standards that is allowable.
SO184.13	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P3	Amend	Use less subjective words in 1-4 and 6-7	This is good in that it provides greater specificity but it still includes lots of subjective words like 'responds to', 'good level', 'appropriately-sized', 'reasonable level' . Whose opinion will count on what these mean? It would be better if words were used that more clearly state what is meant, e.g. 'a good level of pedestrian access and amenity' could be replaced by '...access and amenity which is easy, comfortable and safe to find and use, and provides visual interest ..'
SO184.14	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P3	Amend	Amend point 5 - 'Development* frontages provide a legible connection to the street' by inserting 'and direct visual' after 'legible'	The suggested insertion is to prevent the use of fences and vegetation inside the site to block view of street from the front facade

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO184.15	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P4	Amend	Insert 'on-site,' after 'safe'	It is unclear where the safe turning and manoeuvring is meant to occur. Other provisions suggest turning and manoeuvring is supposed to be off-street rather than on-street to help maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.
SO184.16	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P5	Support	Retain points 1-5 as notified	Non-residential activities are essential to create a zone in which people want to live and develop community. Without them, the zone will end up as a car dependent sleeper zone which everyone has to leave to meet their daily needs and wants.
SO184.17	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P5	Oppose	Delete '6. Do not affect the City's business zone hierarchy.'	The existing hierarchy of business zones is a highly car centric one. The nature of work and commerce has changed dramatically in recent years. There is now both the ability for many occupations to be undertaken from anywhere and the desire of many people to work from home. Having quiet and clean retail, service and hospitality activities in the MRZ will result in more destinations being within walking distance of people's homes contributing to both local community connectedness and the ability of resident to live car-light lives.
SO184.18	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P6	Amend	Replace ' That off-site stormwater peak flows' with 'That peak flows of stormwater leaving a site'	'Off site stormwater peak flows' are those that occur in the street or on other land other than on the site in question. It is too difficult to tie off-site flows with development of single sites because the contribution of any single site to stormwater flows off-site is miniscule but the cumulative effect of many miniscule increases could be catastrophic. So needs to be the peak flow rate of stormwater leaving a site that is maintained at pre-development levels.
SO184.19	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P7	Amend	Insert '6. That peak flows of stormwater leaving a site following intensification of a site are maintained at pre development* levels.'	Should be at least the same as in parts of the MRZ not covered by the Stormwater Overlay
SO184.20	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P8	Support	Retain as notified	This is best practice. The past approach has been good at providing and disposing of water but is less well-suited to protecting freshwater ecosystems, using water efficiently or coping with intense rainfall events so incorporating water sensitive design methods will be an improvement.
SO184.21	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P9	Amend	Insert 'and plastic' after 'zinc'.	Not only copper and zinc are having adverse effects on aquatic life – microplastics are too. These are likely to be produced by degradation of plastic building materials over time.
SO184.22	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P10	Support	Retain as notified	This is sensible both from the perspective of the comfort of residents but also from economic and environmental perspectives. Both enabling enough solar access and preventing excessive solar exposure will be important as the climate changes and more longer periods of intense heat occur.
SO184.23	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P11	Support	Not stated	Infrastructure isn't defined in Chapter 4. Roading and railways and airports, water and gas pipes, communications and energy cables are all infrastructure. Are all of these things meant by the use of this term here?
SO184.24	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P12	Amend	Replace 'b. Use locally sourced species' with 'b. use plants grown from locally-sourced seeds where native species are used.'	The way b. is currently written could be taken to mean that replacement plants must be grown locally or that they must be native species. I do not agree with this. Exotics must still be allowed as they are far more suitable in many cases because of their deciduous nature enabling winter sun access. Very few native species are deciduous. However, where native species should be used if possible to try to help prevent contamination of local gene pools which is important in maintaining biodiversity.
SO184.25	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-P13	Amend	Replace 'Rangitane o Manawatū' with 'the hapu with mana whenua over the land in question'	The proposed wording is more general and helps explain the reason for the provision.
SO184.26	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R1	Support	Retain as notified	This is the main purpose of the zone
SO184.27	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R2	Amend	In R2.1(d) replace "do not create a dust nuisance' with 'must comply with R 10.7.1.5 Home Occupations (c)'	'Dust nuisance' is too vague. R 10.7.1.5 already provides a suitable standard that provides a measurable way to access an activity.
SO184.28	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R2	Amend	In R2.1(f) change 'or motor vehicles' to 'of motor vehicles'. Delete 'excluding the residents' motor vehicles'. Or Insert after 'excluding' the words 'repair or maintenance activities listed in Appendix XX on'	I have a recent experience of neighbours repairing and painting vehicles which appear to be their own, creating noise and odour at all times of day and night. The adverse effects occur irrespective of whether vehicles are the residents' or belong to other people.
SO184.29	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R2	Amend	In R2.1(h) replace 7.00 am to 10.00 pm' with '7.00 am to 7.00 pm'. Replace 'Monday to Saturday' with 'Monday to Friday'.	This would make it the same as for home child care services and more appropriate for a residential area where young children and others may be trying to sleep or people may be wanting to have the quiet enjoyment of their own property after an active day or week away from it. Some provision could be made for hospitality businesses which might especially be wanted by residents at weekends, or perhaps parts of the zone such as along urban connector (arterial and collector) streets could allow longer hours and more days while local streets have tighter restrictions.
SO184.30	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R2	Amend	In R2.1(i) need to decrease the hours in R10.8.1 from 7am to 10pm and 10pm to 7am to 7 am to 7 pm and 7 pm to 7 am for LAeq (15mins) and night-time Lmax . Also need a day-time (7 am to 7 pm) Lmax. These limits should not apply only to fixed mechanical plant but also to non-fixed machines and the activities of people with short-term exclusions allowed for certain activities.	This is in recognition of the higher density of buildings and decreased vegetation providing less attenuation of noise and the increased number of people likely to be using the zone resulting in more noise. Also, a lot of noise is nowadays generated by mobile equipment. R10.8.1 doesn't adequately address the noise of workers, radios etc. Need a day-time (7 am to 7 pm) Lmax also in recognition of all the nightshift workers and others who may need to sleep in the daytime as well as the increasing number of people working from home.
SO184.31	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R3	Amend	At R3.1(d) Need to decrease the hours in R10.8.1 from 7am to 10pm and 10pm to 7am to 7 am to 7 pm and 7 pm to 7 am for LAeq (15mins) and night-time Lmax . Also need a day-time (7 am to 7 pm) Lmax. These limits should not apply only to fixed mechanical plant but also to non-fixed machines and the activities of people with short-term exclusions allowed for certain activities.	R10.8.1 doesn't adequately deal with the noise potentially generated by 4 children.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO184.32	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R4	Amend	At R4.1(c)(i) Insert after 'access*' 'except that residential developments of three or less dwelling units with access onto a Local Road are not exempt from this requirement.'	20.4.2(a)(vi)(h) exempts residential developments of 3 or fewer dwelling units with access onto a Local Road from maintaining a pedestrian visibility splay. This exemption should not exist for community houses or any other development in the MRZ. With a higher density of pedestrians in the MRZ it is even more appropriate that pedestrian visibility splays be required.
SO184.33	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R4	Amend	Add a requirement for the front of any garage or carport facing a public road to be at least 6.5m away from the front boundary.	This is so as to achieve the same result as in R20.4.2.(e) Loading space provision (ii)(b) 'does not adversely affect traffic flow along the street frontage for pedestrians ...'. Not providing this commonly results in impedance and/or endangerment of pedestrians by vehicles protruding over the footpath as people mostly seem to want to walk around the front of their vehicles not the rear.
SO184.34	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R5	Amend	Add a requirement for any parking space between garage /carport and front property boundary adjoining a public road or the accessway to the site to be at least 6.5m long .	This is so as to achieve the same result as in R20.4.2.(e) Loading space provision (ii)(b) 'does not adversely affect traffic flow along the street frontage for pedestrians ...'. Not providing this commonly results in impedance and/or endangerment of pedestrians by vehicles protruding over the footpath as people mostly seem to want to walk around the front of their vehicles not the rear.
SO184.35	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R7	Amend	Insert a further land use rule as follows: 'MRZ-RX Erection of shared parking buildings. Activity status: Permitted where the following standards are complied with ' coupled with the development of a number of suitable standards.	This would provide for separate ownership of parking spaces, encourage mode shift, enable more efficient land use, creation of streets which prioritise place function. Parking buildings could be limited to specific locations and be subject to similar standards as other buildings plus additional specific standards. Currently it is unclear whether such land use would be considered compatible with the residential nature of the zone.
SO184.36	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S1	Amend	Replace '11m' with '10m'. Replace '50%' by '5%' in the exception.	A building's height is a major determinant of not only its dominance effect but also of the amount of shade it creates. Allowing up to 5% of the roof in elevation to exceed 10m still provides for antennae, satellite dishes, architectural features etc without risking creating excessive additional shading on neighbouring sites whereas 50% would cause shading for many hours each day in winter.
SO184.37	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R7	Amend	Replace 'Garages or accessory buildings may not exceed a maximum height of 2.8m above ground level.' with 'Garages attached to a dwelling may not exceed 4m above ground level while detached garages and accessory buildings on sites with a dwelling may not exceed 2.8m above ground level'.	This provides for car stacking, a way of more effectively using the ground area of a site, which will be important in the MRZ.
SO184.38	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S1	Amend	Delete '* Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm;' Delete ' Satellite dishes, antennas*, aerials, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials and spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 2 metres measured vertically.' Insert 'Satellite dishes, antennas*, aerials, flues, chimneys, masts, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials and spires) that protrude above 10m above ground must not exceed 1m in diameter and must not exceed the height by more than 2 metres measured vertically.'	The overall effect of these proposals would be to decrease shading on adjacent properties, probably one of the major concerns of residents, while still providing for a small range of roof angles as well as for solar panels and other structures on the roof.
SO184.39	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S1	Amend	Insert '2. Shading effects on adjoining residential sites.'	Shading of neighbouring sites is likely to be one of the major adverse effects of intensification, especially when the sun elevation is low as it is from April to September so should be a matter that decision makers can consider.
SO184.40	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S2	Amend	Replace the currently-proposed threshold values (i.e. 5m, 45°, 2.8m) with more appropriate ones. The exceptions be consistent with those for building height discussed above under MRZ R7.1(a)(i)	The currently-proposed thresholds will result in massive shading of neighbouring sites although this will depend on the orientation of the boundaries. probably needs different thresholds on the northern and southern boundaries which may also be different from those for the eastern and western ones.
SO184.41	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S3	Amend	a)Meaning of 'primary' needs to be made clear. b)Insert 'from a public road' after '5.5 metres'. c)Replace 'Front - 5.5 metres for that part of the frontage where a parking space is provided but no garage (internal or standalone).' with 'Front – where no garage (internal or standalone) or carport exists, 6.5 metres for that part of the frontage where a parking space is provided perpendicular to the public road and 5.5m where it is provided parallel to the public road.' d)Replace '1 metre' with '1 metre or, if there are no windows or doors in the wall facing the side and the wall is nonflammable, 0 metres.'	For consistency and clarity. For (d) requiring a 1m setback wastes valuable space. It is of virtually no use except for walking along. It also seems to prevent the possibility of attached housing that is common in medium density zones overseas.
SO184.42	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S3	Amend	Replace '5.5 metres' with '6.5 metres' Replace '1 metre' with '1 metre or, if there are no windows or doors in the wall facing the side and the wall is non-flammable, 0 metres.'	This is so as to achieve the same result as in R20.4.2.(e) Loading space provision (ii)(b) 'does not adversely affect traffic flow along the street frontage for pedestrians ...'. Not providing this commonly results in impedance and/or endangerment of pedestrians by vehicles protruding over the footpath as people mostly seem to want to walk around the front of their vehicles not the rear.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO184.43	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S3	Amend	Replace '3. A side entry garage must be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres from a boundary fronting a public road.' with 'Note: Side entry garages and carports are not permitted on sites adjacent to public roads.'	Side entry garages on front parts of sites adversely affect the visual connection between the dwelling building and the street. They also increase the area of hard surface compared with garages and carports located to enable straight entry from the street.
SO184.44	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S4	Amend	Insert between 'coverage' and 'must' the words 'of all buildings combined on the site.' Delete both of the exceptions listed.	This insertion would make it clear that coverage includes all buildings on the site so that garages and accessory buildings whether attached to the main dwelling or not are included in the calculation of coverage.
SO184.45	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S5	Amend	Replace '20%' with '30%'.	The beneficial effects of vegetation on resident health and well-being is well recognised. The more the better. 20% of a 150m2 site is only 30m2, a very small area hence the request to increase this proportion.
SO184.46	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S5	Amend	Replace '30%' with '50%'	The areas between buildings on front sites and the public road is very important for creating the sort of streetscape which will invite people to walk along, and interact on, it. Such pedestrian activity is critical to a well functioning urban area, especially if development is intensified.
SO184.47	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S5	Amend	Add 'No vegetation may be used to interrupt the visual connection between windows and doors in the front facade of the ground floor of a building on a front site with a public road.' and 'Note: This means that there must be a direct line of sight, between 1.0m and 2.5m height, maintained from each window and door in the front facade to the street although short-term obstruction is permissible in the first 5 years after occupation while any trees planted grow above this height.'	In some cases where the front fencing requirements included in this PC have been implemented in recent redevelopments, residents have planted hedges or other vegetation that has effectively blocked the sight of the street from the building closest to the street, largely defeating the purpose of the fencing requirement.
SO184.48	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S6	Amend	Delete 'ground level' from 2. Delete 3.	There seems to be a contradiction between 2 and 3. A ground floor residential unit requires either 10 or 15m2 (under 2) or 2.5 or 4m2 (under 3). The apparent contradiction should be removed. The need for shaded area is the same whether provided at ground level or above ground level so I can't see the rationale for having different requirements according to where the shade is provided.
SO184.49	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S7	Amend	Replace '2. Where the outdoor living space is provided at ground level it must provide' with '2. The outdoor living space must be:' Replace 3 with '3. The minimum areas stated in 2 may be split across one or more storeys.'	The need for outdoor living space is the same whether it is provided at ground level or above ground so if the replacement of 2 obviates the need for the original 3. Further, outdoor living space should be able to be provided at any level or even be split across levels. There may be benefits in doing so in terms of ease of access for residents but also in residents being able to use the area where the temperature, amount of shade or wind is most to their liking. If 3 is retained then the omission of papakainga from 3 (as well as from 2) needs addressing so that the requirements apply to all three categories of dwelling as indicated by MRZ-S7 (1).
SO184.50	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S8	Amend	It is not clear at what distance from the window the observer is assumed to be, yet this determines the width of the outlook space. It is not clear how the part that says 'MRZ-S9 does not apply to: 'Deck balustrades, pergolas, verandas, porches and other building overhangs.' applies to this standard. Has it been misplaced?	Not stated.
SO184.51	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S9	Amend	Replace '30%' with '50%'.	This PC is very likely to lead to an increase in total non permeable surface area because it proposes to increase the permissible building coverage to 50% from the 30-40% currently allowed. Also, the smaller sites (as low as 150m2) envisaged with intensification will result in more land being covered for accessways etc. So a higher percentage than the 30% proposed is needed to help counter the effect of the increase in impermeable area.
SO184.52	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S10	Support	Retain as notified	Such devices whether they are constructed tanks or swales or other things will be essential for helping to achieve no net increase in the peak flow of stormwater from sites.
SO184.53	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S11	Support	Retain as notified	These are sensible given the possibility of flooding cannot be completely removed.
SO184.54	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S12	Support	Retain as notified	Having windows in any facade facing the road is important in creating the visual connection between the street and the site, enabling passive surveillance and the opportunity for interaction between people on site and those on the street. It also helps to decrease the dominance of the buildings, especially if they are close to the street.
SO184.55	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S13	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO184.56	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S14	Amend	Replace 'Any garage door facing a public road or an access way must not occupy more than half the width of the building façade to which it relates.' with 'Any garage door facing a public road must not occupy more than a third of the width of the building façade in which it is located.' and 'Any garage door facing an accessway must not occupy more than half the width of the width of the building façade in which it is located.'	Half is too much for the facade facing the street. It would create a visually dominant effect at eye level. This is less a concern on accessways because those are mostly use by much smaller numbers of people.
SO184.57	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S14	Amend	Replace 'Multiple garages facing a public road or access way must not comprise more than half the width of the frontage for that site.' with 'Multiple garages facing a public road must not comprise more than a third of the width of the frontage for that site.' and 'Multiple garages facing an accessway must not comprise more than a half of the width facade along that side of the site	Half is too much for the facade facing the street. It would create a visually dominant effect at eye level. This is less a concern on accessways because those are mostly use by much smaller numbers of people.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO184.58	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S15	Amend	Replace 'a. must not comprise more than 50% of the width of the residential unit's façade to which it relates;' with 'a. must not comprise more than a third of the width of the residential unit's façade closest to the road'. Replace '5.5m' with '6.5m'. Insert 'd. Parking shall be provided for no more than 2 motor vehicles between the building and the public road'	Allowing 50% of the front area to be used for parking is too much. It should match the maximum proportion of the front facade that can be taken up by a garage door, i.e. 30%
SO184.59	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S16	Amend	Replace '8m' with '15m except where access is required to rear sites in which case 1 additional crossing may be provided per total frontage'.	The existing residential zone rule is 1 crossing per 30m of frontage which means the vast majority of properties can have only 1 vehicle crossing. Vehicle crossings are challenging to pedestrians, including people in wheelchairs, and they can create trip hazards.
SO184.60	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S17	Support	Retain as notified	I strongly support what looks in Fig 8 to be a requirement to enter a site frontwards and to exit a site frontwards because of the increase in visibility of the footpath and the rest of the street attained by doing so and the consequent increase in safety for pedestrians
SO184.61	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S18	Amend	Insert "no less than' between 'of' and '1'. Need to define what is meant by a bicycle park as it seems not to be defined anywhere.	The intention is surely to provide at least this number rather than only exactly that number of bicycle parks. Is a tree or a fence a bicycle park or does a bicycle park have to have some particular form?
SO184.62	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S19	Amend	Replace 'Each residential unit must have access to a screened rubbish storage area which is sized to accommodate one 240l wheelie bin and one recycling crate' with 'Each residential unit must have access to a rubbish storage area which is sized to accommodate one 240l wheelie bin and one recycling crate and which is screened so as not to be visible from a public road.'	This is especially important for the attractiveness of the front dwelling. Many people would regard the sight of rubbish receptacles from the street as undesirable.
SO184.63	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S19	Amend	The whole DP should be updated to reflect the national system.	Although 'Arterial' and 'Collector' match the terms used in DP section 20.6, they do not match the NZ system of road nomenclature, the One Network Framework classification.
SO184.64	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S20	Amend	Delete 'must not' from the lead in sentence for 2. In a. insert 'Must not' before 'exceed'. In b. replace 'For any' with 'Any'. In b. insert '; and' after 'construction'. Add 'c. Any part of a fence or standalone wall within 2.0m of an access way must be no more than 1.1m tall or of open construction.' The reference to MRZ-S16.2 doesn't make sense as there is no MRZ-S16.2. It is not clear what it should be.	The insertion of c. is consistent with R.20.4.2(a)(vi)(h) that requires visibility splays.
SO184.65	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S20	Amend	In point 3, replace 'access leg' with 'access way' Add 4. 'No more than 1 fence or standalone wall or other visual barrier may be erected between the front facade and the front boundary.'	Access legs seem to refer only to access ways to rear sites (Chapter 4 – definitions).
SO184.66	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-S21	Amend	Change 'relive' to a more commonly understood word.	Couldn't find any definition of 'relive' in chapter 4 or online in connection with mechanical ventilation.
SO184.67	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R7	Amend	Delete reference to R20.4.2(a)(vi)(d). Insert in ii) after j) 'except the exemption from providing a pedestrian visibility splay for residential developments of three or less dwelling units with access onto a Local Road in R20.4.2(a)(vi)(h) will not apply in the MRZ.'	R20.4.2(a)(vi)(d) doesn't apply to any streets in the proposed zone as it only includes streets with posted speed limits of 70km/h or greater. The exemption in (h) is highly inappropriate in the MRZ where pedestrian numbers are expected to be greater and the number of times the footpath is crossed by vehicles each day is expected to be higher because of the intensification.
SO184.68	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R8	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.69	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R9	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.70	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R10	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.71	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R11	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.72	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R12	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.73	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R13	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.74	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R14	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.75	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R15	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.76	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R16	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.77	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R17	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO184.78	Chris Teo-Sherrell	MRZ-R18	Amend	Make consistent amendments to the standards applying to this rule.	Not stated.
SO185.1	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.2	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.3	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O3	Support	Retain as notified	Aligns with One Plan & Rangitāne IMP
SO185.4	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O4	Support	Retain as notified	Appropriate, and allows for development where effects can be mitigated.
SO185.5	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O5	Support	Retain as notified	Appropriate to ensure effects are managed near infrastructure.
SO185.6	Phocus Planning	MRZ-O6	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.7	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified	Allows for and enables appropriate activities.
SO185.8	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.9	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P3	Support in part	Amend – 5. Development* frontages provide a legible connection to the street through <u>a combination of</u> orientation, entrance location, fencing, and glazing, and they are not dominated by garages; 6. Developments* integrate <u>a reasonable amount of</u> landscaping with building and access* design; 7. They provide <u>a reasonable amount of</u> visual interest through the modulation and articulation of façades and roof forms.	Amended wording provides greater flexibility for the assessment of developments rather than being 100% prescriptive of what design elements are required. Not all allotment shapes and sizes will be suited to achieve the specified design elements. Affordability of implementing all of these design measures needs to be balanced with being able to provide affordable housing supply.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO185.10	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P4	Support in part	Amend on-site bicycle parking. Wording changed to " encourage on site bicycle parking ", rather than it "is provided".	While we accept that bicycles and active modes of transport should be encouraged and provide a range of benefits, not everyone is able to use other modes of transport, such as bicycles, and it is illogical to require bicycles where this may be the case. It is onerous to require every development to provide on site bicycle parking. Needs to be left to individual choice.
SO185.11	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P5	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.12	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P6	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.13	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P7	Support in part	Amend	Policy needs re-wording. It may be appropriate to not require a stormwater management plan for a small development where it clearly has no adverse effect (i.e. garden shed/ pergola). Otherwise, there is a risk of developments falling foul of this policy. Onerous to by default require all development to be supported by an SMP.
SO185.14	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P8	Support	Amend Add in words "to a scale commensurate with the scale of the subdivision or development"	Policy needs rewording so as to reflect that not all development will require water sensitive design, or that it may not be possible for some very small development (i.e garden shed)
SO185.15	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P9	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.16	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P10	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.17	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P11	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.18	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P12	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.19	Phocus Planning	MRZ-P13	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.20	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R1	Support	Retain as notified	Provides an excellent opportunity for small businesses and working from home to be lawful, provided specific criteria are met.
SO185.21	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.22	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R3	Support	Re R3.1 - Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.23	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R3	Support	Re R3.2 - Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.24	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R4	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.25	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R5	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.26	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R7	Support	Retain as notified	Provides opportunities for housing/multi-unit development where relevant performance standards can be met.
SO185.27	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R8	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.28	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R9	Support in part	Amend wording	Seems overly restrictive to capture all and any type of structure. Approach needs to be rethought for very small structures and buildings. Requiring them to comply with all performance standards will result in an unintended consequence of very minor activities requiring resource consent.
SO185.29	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R10	Oppose	Amend to a permitted activity, with standards around ensuring adequate mitigations are imposed for development in these areas. E.g. FFL or attenuation. RDA pathway where these standards are not met.	Significant percentage of properties within this overlay. This will result in all new homes, alterations and garages (and other buildings) within these areas requiring RC, where effects can be managed via PA conditions.
SO185.30	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R11	Support in part	Only require compliance with height, HRB, Building coverage, permeable surfaces, and stormwater attenuation. Needs to also include yard setbacks.	Could infringe on neighbours having no yard separation.
SO185.31	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R12	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.32	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R13	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.33	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R14	Support in part	Create new rule or amend rule/definition to accommodate smaller air bnb type arrangements. For example: HDC District Plan (REZ GRZ-R4) provides a permitted activity pathway for visitor accommodation for up to 4 people per site, which would allow for those smaller/air bnb type visitor accommodations.	Permitted Activity Standard allows visitor accommodation where it has a frontage and entrance with a major arterial or minor arterial road. Definition captures those renting their properties/homes for short term air bnb type arrangements, which will require RC if they are not located within those areas. Smaller air bnbs type arrangements are likely to have similar effects to those using their property for residential activities.
SO185.34	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R14	Support in part	Remove conflict in R14.2 with MRZ-R17.	Activity is permitted where: a. Visitor accommodation is located on properties with a frontage and the main entrance from a street listed as a Major Arterial or Minor Arterial Road in 20.6.1.1 and 20.6.1.2 in Section 20 of the District Plan. RDA pathway provided where performance standards are not met. In contrast, MRZ-R17 requires a discretionary activity pathway for: 'Visitor Accommodation with frontage to a Major Arterial or Minor Arterial Road as listed in Appendix 20A'. These rules are therefore conflicting.
SO185.35	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R15	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.36	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R16	Support in part	Amend to include the words " unless the written approval to the proposal is provided ".	Avoids the need to limited notify an application if Rangitāne has provided their written approval.
SO185.37	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R17	Amend	Resolve conflict with MRZ-R14.	Rules are conflicting as visitor accommodation on arterial roads is both permitted and discretionary.
SO185.38	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R18	Support in part	Amend to remove performance standard relating to MRZ-S6.	Not clear the link or relationship to MRZ-S6 - Shade.
SO185.39	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R19	Support	Not stated	Rule logically refers to ensuring compliance with NZECP 34:2001.
SO185.40	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R20	Support	Not stated	Reasonable rule ensures adequate internal amenity. Allows buildings to be retrofitted where there is not a significant increase in floor area.
SO185.41	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R21	Support in part	Amend to include as a condition of MRZ-R22.	Logically would be included as a condition of MRZ-R22.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO185.42	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R22	Support	Not stated	Reasonable rule which ensures adequate internal amenity and allows for retrofitting/extensions which do not significantly increase floor area.
SO185.43	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R23	Support in part	Further thought needs to be given and/or clarification around how architects, builders, planners will demonstrate compliance.	How will this be checked as part of a resource consent or building consent application? What information is expected to be provided to Council.
SO185.44	Phocus Planning	MRZ-R24	Oppose	There should be a PA rule	This is overly restrictive and will potentially capture activities that are having no effect and will thereby require consent. Why are garages being included when stormwater will be clean roof water? Stormwater from 4 car parks will have less effect than the roads adjacent. Treatment of stormwater should be the responsibility of the Council under whatever consenting requirements they themselves have. Can see difficulty with the interpretation of what is a car park vs. a driveway vs. an onsite maneuvering area vs. an impervious area.
SO185.45	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S1	Support	Not stated	Logical rule which adequately manages density/bulk effects.
SO185.46	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S2	Support	Not stated	Appropriate boundary rules which adequately manage effects on neighbours.
SO185.47	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S3	Support in part	Amend to include a rear yard requirement consistent with the side yard provisions.	No rear yard could impact neighbouring properties. Building Act requires 1m setback where there is no fire resistance rating (FRR).
SO185.48	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S4	Support	Not stated	Reasonable standard. Other requirements will ensure appropriate density is maintained.
SO185.49	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S5	Support in part	Amend to remove specimen tree requirement.	Support landscaped area requirement and the principle of retaining green areas and space however the requirement to plant a specimen tree is overly restrictive. Clarification also required about location in the outdoor living space.
SO185.50	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S6	Oppose	Remove requirements	Conflicts with current practice, where daylight is also required in these spaces. Overly complex rule to enforce. Overregulation. Shading can be achieved by umbrellas, shade sails, and other means.
SO185.51	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S7	Support	Suggest clarifying what is a ground floor apartment to avoid debate, and conflicting views of what is/ isn't.	Sensible performance standards which ensures on-site amenity.
SO185.52	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S8	Oppose	Remove requirements	Overly complex rule to enforce/demonstrate compliance. Overregulation. Yard separation requirements will assist with achieving onsite amenity and privacy. Not clear how achievable these performance standards would be. Seems these standards will conflict with yard setback allowances.
SO185.53	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S9	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.54	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S10	Oppose in part	Amend to resolve rule conflict	Permitted activity rule for buildings. RDA for buildings within SW overlay, yet attenuation is required. There should be an appropriate PA pathway (as with minimum FFL) to mitigate stormwater overlay risk and make dwellings in these areas permitted. Clarify that these structures do not require side yard encroachment consent to avoid the nonsensical outcome of them being located in the middle of the yard. Thought needs to be given to the situation where a landowner constructs for example a garden path on an existing site. Does that trigger the need for an attenuation device? Risk of unintentionally capturing some very minor activities.
SO185.55	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S11	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.56	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S12	Support in part	Amend wording	Current wording will capture all buildings? Example of small garden shed not having a window potentially triggering consent?
SO185.57	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S13	Oppose	Amend to only apply to apartment terraced style units or Remove requirements.	Requiring a consent for a dwelling that does not have a door facing the street is excessive and over regulation. Creates a situation where a consent could be required for this non-compliance. What does that process look like? This appears as overreach as in many cases it would be difficult to quantify the level of adverse effect of not doing this. Will not always be an appropriate and achievable design
SO185.58	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S14	Support	Not stated.	Not stated.
SO185.59	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S15	Support in part	Requires clarification of what will be captured.	For example, if there is an existing situation where there is non-compliance, would an alteration to the back of the house require this matter to be addressed? It shouldn't, however, there have been historic examples with other standards where this has happened (i.e. lack of onsite maneuvering).
SO185.60	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S16	Support	Not stated.	Reasonable to ensure traffic safety.
SO185.61	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S17	Support in part	Remove this requirement for local roads with 50km/hr speed limit or lower but require vehicle splays as a performance condition to maximize visibility	Question whether this is needed for the lowest order roads. Other district plans do not require this (Such as Napier City Council). Would provide additional area for developments.
SO185.62	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S18	Oppose	Remove requirements	Difficult to determine compliance, particularly where bicycle spaces are parked within residential units. Not always appropriate for the elderly or those with accessibility issues. We do not accept the argument that provision of these facilities will encourage mode shift.
SO185.63	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S19	Oppose in part	Remove requirements around screening.	This is infringing on property rights, whereby the Council is designating where people store rubbish, for aesthetic reasons? Difficult to ensure compliance with long term.
SO185.64	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S20	Support in part	Amend to remove open construction standard for the bulk of the fence along the public frontage.	We support the height reduction next to an access, to ensure pedestrian visibility. However, requiring open construction along the road frontage where a fence is higher than 1.1m infringes on privacy.
SO185.65	Phocus Planning	MRZ-S21	Oppose	Delete standard	Building Act controls ventilation. Difficult to measure compliance.
SO185.66	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-O1	Support in part	Retain wording but clarify that it is appropriate to do non-medium density residential subdivisions in the zone.	Need to make sure that it is clear that not all subdivision in this zone have to be for medium density purposes.
SO185.67	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.68	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-P2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO185.69	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-P3	Support in part	Amend wording to include the following: "...existing natural hazards is avoided or where effective, appropriate mitigation measures are in place..."	Seems reasonable and aligns with Section 106 of the RMA. Mitigation is an acceptable form of managing adverse effects from natural hazards.
SO185.70	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-P4	Support in part	Delete wording (preferably with experience in water sensitive design)	Not all development will require water sensitive design, or that it may not be possible for some very small development infill subdivision.
SO185.71	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-P5	Support	Retain as notified	Reasonable to ensure that all allotments are appropriately serviced.
SO185.72	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R1	Support in part	Provide a controlled activity pathway for allotments in the stormwater overlay. Amend to remove the need to comply with the following performance standards: MRZ-S5.3 & .4 – Specimen Tree requirement MRZ-S6 MRZ-S8 MRZ-S10 MRZ – S11 MRZ-S12 MRZ-S13 MRZ-S14 MRZ-S15 MRZ-S-17 (for local roads with 50km/hr speed restriction or less) MRZ-S18 MRZ-S20	Stormwater overlay covers significant percentage of the rezoned area. Section 106 can still be used where there is natural hazard risk. Include a performance standard requiring provision of Stormwater Management details to demonstrate stormwater can be managed for sites within this area for controlled activity rule. We consider subdivision for infill subdivision to be overly restrictive. Do not need to demonstrate compliance with these matters for an existing dwelling on an allotment. Risk of process looking to use opportunity through this process to address existing, lawfully established non compliances.
SO185.73	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R1.3	Support in part	Remove the following: Requirement to comply with the following performance standards MRZ-S5.3 & .4 – Specimen Tree requirement MRZ-S6 MRZ-S8 MRZ-S10 MRZ – S11 MRZ-S12 MRZ-S13 MRZ-S14 MRZ-S-17 (for local roads with 50km/hr speed restriction or less) MRZ-S18 MRZ-S20	Stormwater overlay covers a significant percentage of the rezoned area. Section 106 can still be used where there is natural hazard risk. Include a performance standard requiring provision of Stormwater Management details to demonstrate stormwater can be managed for sites within this area for controlled activity rule. We consider subdivision for infill subdivision to be overly restrictive.
SO185.74	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.75	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R3	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.76	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R4	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.77	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R5	Support	Retain MRZ-R1.1 as notified	Not stated.
SO185.78	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-R5	Support	Retain MRZ-R5.2 as notified	Not stated.
SO185.79	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-S1	Support in part	Amend wording to: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed	Not stated.
SO185.80	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-S2	Support	Retain as notified	Not stated.
SO185.81	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-S3	Support in part	Amend wording to: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed	Not stated.
SO185.82	Phocus Planning	SUB-MRZ-S4	Support in part	Amend wording to: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed	Not stated.
SO186.1	Sheila Barrass	MRZ-S3	Oppose	Increase side boundary to 3 metres	The effect of reduced light on existing single storey properties when new multi storey houses are built. I think the same considerations should be important for existing home owners as they are to the occupants of the new homes.
SO186.2	Sheila Barrass	MRZ-S4	Amend	Take into consideration the existing building coverage so you build houses in the centre of a section.	If the building coverage is up to 50% of the site why do they need to build so near to an existing side boundary?
SO187.1	Fiona Wilson	Zone Extent	Oppose	Amend area of zone.	I question how the decision was made to include my property on Park Road in this area and yet properties only 150 meters from mine are not included?
SO187.2	Fiona Wilson	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Delete the proposal for three buildings of up to 11 metres high to be allowed	This Linton Street development of three units on a single section is only two stories high but has already encroached on my backyard privacy and more so on my immediate neighbours. Furthermore these properties were not sold despite being on the market for some time so have been rented out resulting in tenants with large and noisy dogs on pocket sized areas.
SO187.3	Fiona Wilson	Reserves rezoning	Oppose	Do not rezone Huia Street Reserve.	Opposed to the reserve being included in the MRZ
SO188.1	Te Pū Harakeke—Community Collective Manawatū	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	We have an urgent housing crisis in Papaioea. Our most vulnerable populations are hit the hardest. Any solution created for the housing issue must keep this in mind to be effective.
SO189.1	Therese McManus	Zone Extent	Amend	Remove area from Featherston Street to Russell Street from the MRZ.	Specifically concern about the area from Featherston Street to Russell Street, because of existing increased traffic from developments such as Mitre 10 and outlet stores and additional traffic from more intensive housing.
SO190.1	Russell Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Higher density housing will come with more on-street parking, loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, overcapacity schools.
SO191.1	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P1	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.2	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P2	Oppose	Delete	Residential activities or buildings that do not meet "permitted activity standards" should not be permitted.
SO191.3	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P3	Oppose	Noise and safety protection for surrounding properties	Criteria do not address what is acceptable in terms of people density and vehicle numbers.
SO191.4	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P4	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.5	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P5	Support	Note the earlier MRZ-P2 is blurring residential and non-residential. This blurring should be a	Not stated.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO191.6	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P6	Support	Add 5.Those sites lying in or adjacent to existing ponding areas where building was previously prohibited be subject to rigorous flooding risk assessment and mitigation thereof. 6 Add that preventive measures may not be subsequently impaired	People make changes over me that increase the risk of flash flooding e.g. by replacing lawns and gardens with impermeable paving etc.
SO191.7	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P7	Oppose	Not stated	Council is already approving developments that were not allowed in the past and increase the risk of flooding.
SO191.8	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-P13	Amend	Delete enablement of papakāinga. For marae, attention to be paid to: Distance from residential areas. Air noise control Appropriate road access reducing likelihood of interfering with general traffic flow. Adequate on-site parking	Not stated.
SO191.9	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R1	Oppose	Requires clearer definition.	Not stated.
SO191.10	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R2	Amend	Add requirement for adequate on-site parking	Not stated.
SO191.11	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R3	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.12	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R4	Amend	Limit on numbers of residents and cars	Unclear if 3 employees is number on site at any one time or total employed.
SO191.13	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R5	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.14	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R6	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.15	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R7	Amend	In addition to compliance with other required standards, for some dwellings such as papakainga there may need to be a specified limit on the number of residents. Also require enhanced fire alarm and sprinkler systems.	Increased probability of disturbance to adjacent residences. Personal safety and also risk to adjacent proper es
SO191.16	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R8	Oppose	In addition to compliance with other required standards, for some dwellings such as papakainga there may need to be a specified limit on the number of residents. Also enhanced fire alarm and sprinkler systems.	Increased probability of disturbance to adjacent residences. Personal safety and also risk to adjacent proper es Also unclear on applicable area of land. Could be multiple businesses run from homes
SO191.17	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R9	Oppose	Should require council consideration and not be permitted automatically	Difficulties already arise where owners have made unauthorised changes and councils appear very reluctant to require correction.
SO191.18	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R10	Oppose	Adjust – Subject to council considerations and only in exceptional circumstances will council permit mitigation which is being sought to add to demands on stormwater management	in this time of climate change and increasing risk to city properties of flooding Particularly with Palmerston North's mainly flat topography and dependence on stop banks and flood overflow areas.
SO191.19	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R11	Amend	Include compliance rules as in MRZ S9 and S10	Not stated.
SO191.20	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R12	Amend	Add indication of number to be educated in relation to land area and adequacy of facilities f	To avoid inappropriate density, noise, traffic disturbance in neighbourhood.
SO191.21	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R13	Oppose	Restrict areas where more noisy activities likely. Increase separation between buildings and facilities from boundary with adjacent residential properties	Wording unclear about numbers of residents to be accommodated and/or numbers of employees. Too large a part of city potentially affected. Not compatible with quiet enjoyment.
SO191.22	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R14	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.23	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R15	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.24	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R16	Oppose	Need limits on to parts of city This is not about accommodating people in homes. Attention to be paid to: Distance from residential areas. Air noise control Appropriate road access reducing likelihood of interfering with general traffic flow. Adequate on-site parking	Marae activities are commonly largely carried out outside as well as inside, may have large numbers of attendees and functions which may last over several days.
SO191.25	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R17	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.26	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R18	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.27	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R19	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.28	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R20	Support	Not stated	Not stated.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO191.29	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R21	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.30	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R23	Oppose	That good quality zinc coated cladding be exempt.	In Palmerston North the distance from the sea and the absence of heavy industry producing acidic effluents result in very low loss of zinc coating of unpainted cladding. Unlikely to result in significant risk.
SO191.31	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-R24	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.32	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S1	Amend	Should not shade adjacent building's sun in winter between 9 am and 4pm	Unclear if proposal prevents excessive shading of adjacent buildings.
SO191.33	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S2	Amend	Should not shade adjacent building's sun in winter between 9 am and 4pm	Unclear if proposal prevents excessive shading of adjacent buildings.
SO191.34	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S3	Amend	Accessory buildings higher than 2 metres should be included	Shade, privacy, appearance.
SO191.35	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S4	Amend	Include all impermeable structures, covered or uncovered in the 50% maximum coverage r	Uncovered impermeable decking and other impermeable structures reduce stormwater absorb on by soil.
SO191.36	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S5	Amend	Delete the requirement for growth to 4 metre height within 5 years. Express preference for deciduous trees or large shrubs (less shade in winter). Require avoidance of trees well known for entering water drainage systems or having large sub-surface roots.	Problems will include: Shade Leaf and flower drop in spouting and drains Damage to above-ground structures Root damage to underground structures including paving and drainage systems
SO191.37	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S14	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.38	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S15	Oppose	Delete sections a and b	It is possible to have a garage and front parking area designed such that all manoeuvring is easily done on-site such that vehicles can enter and leave the property forwards. This can be safer and also provide more off-street parking than requiring a smaller area.
SO191.39	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S18	Support	But why just 1 bike?	A family may well own several bikes.
SO191.40	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S19	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO191.41	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S20	Support	Strongly support clause 3	Improve pedestrian safety through better visibility of exiting vehicles.
SO191.42	Robert and Gill Norris	MRZ-S21	Support	Not stated	Not stated.
SO192.1	Rex Voelkerling	Zone Extent	Oppose	Reconsider the boundaries.	Property was purchased under one set of laws and these are now changing.
SO192.2	Rex Voelkerling	MRZ-R7	Oppose	Delete	Concerns about loss of on-street parking availability and increase in overcrowding.
SO193.1	Sean Monaghan	MRZ-S2	Oppose	Reduce height significantly	Concerns about loss of quality of life from increased noise, shading, and busy-ness.
SO194.1	Horizons Regional Council	General	Amend	Provide evidence that PCI will enable sufficient infill capacity in the long term to meet HBA development targets, including adjusting the spatial extent of the MRZ to provide more development capacity	PCI does not enable all the infill development capacity as identified in the HBA.
SO194.2	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.3	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O2	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.4	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O6	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.5	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.6	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P2	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.7	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P3	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.8	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P4	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.9	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P5	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.10	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P10	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.11	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P13	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3 - O5, RPS-UFD,P1, P2, P4-P6 and P8
SO194.12	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O3	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13
SO194.13	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O4	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13
SO194.14	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O5	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO194.15	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P6	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13
SO194.16	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P7	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13
SO194.17	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P8	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1 and P1, RPS-HAZ-NH-O1, P12 and P13
SO194.18	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-O5	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-ETI O1 and P2
SO194.19	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P11	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-ETI O1 and P2
SO194.20	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P9	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-LF-FW-O3, O4, P4 and P12
SO194.21	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P10	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 and ETI-P5
SO194.22	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-P12	Support in part	Review MRZ-P12(b) to reflect "indigenous vegetation" is the preferred type of replacement	To align with NPS-IB Policy 14
SO194.23	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-O1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3, P1, P2, P4 and P5
SO194.24	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3, P1, P2, P4 and P5
SO194.25	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P2	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3, P1, P2, P4 and P5
SO194.26	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P5	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O1, O3, P1, P2, P4 and P5
SO194.27	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-O1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, P8, HAZ-NH-O2, P12 and P13
SO194.28	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, P8, HAZ-NH-O2, P12 and P13
SO194.29	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P3	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, P8, HAZ-NH-O2, P12 and P13
SO194.30	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P4	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, P8, HAZ-NH-O2, P12 and P13
SO194.31	Horizons Regional Council	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provisions RPS-ETI-O2, P4 and P5
SO194.32	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R7	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.33	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R8	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.34	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R9	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.35	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R10	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.36	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R11	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.37	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R12	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.38	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R13	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.39	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R14	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure they give effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5
SO194.40	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R15	Oppose in part	Revise to ensure rule gives effect to MRZ-P10	The rule does not address MRZ-P10 and does not give effect to One Plan provisions RPS-UFD-O5, ETI-O2, UFD-P8 or ETI-P5

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO194.41	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R10	Support in part	Revise MRZ-R10.1 in accordance with the suggested amendments (in red) below (or similar) to align it with MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-PIO and MRZ-P12. /i>MRZ-R10 - Construction, alteration or addition of buildings and structures within the Stormwater Overlay 1 Activity status. Restricted Discretionary Council's* discretion is restricted to. 1 The extent to which any <u>stormwater</u> effects, both on-site and off-site, are avoided or mitigated, 2 Whether the proposed mitigation measures can be effectively implemented and maintained, 3 The extent to which on-site mitigation measures will support and align with any catchment or sub-catchment plan to implement the city-wide Stormwater Strategy, and 4 The relevant matters in <u>MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4</u> , MRZ-P6, MRZ-PI, MRZ-PB, <u>MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P12</u>	To give effect to policies MRZ-P3, P4, P10 and P12
SO194.42	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R23	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provision LF-FW-P12
SO194.43	Horizons Regional Council	MRZ-R24	Support	Not stated	Aligns with One Plan provision LF-FW-P12
SO194.44	Horizons Regional Council	Section 32 report	Neutral	The s32 evaluation should use both SSP2-4.5 and SSP5-8.5 climate adaptation scenarios	As required by the National Adaptation Plan
SO194.45	Horizons Regional Council	Section 32 report	Neutral	Not stated	The s32 evaluation is based on the pre-PC3 version of the One Plan RPS-UFD chapter
SO194.46	Horizons Regional Council	General	Neutral	Any proposed water extraction requiring consent should align with the reasonably and efficient use policies in the One Plan	Not stated.
SO194.47	Horizons Regional Council	General	Neutral	Additional caution is required when regulating land use and development in and around the Council's Drinking Water Protection Zones	Not stated.
SO195.1	Age-Friendly Palmerston North	Entire Plan Change	Neutral	Consider the needs of older people and people with mobility and accessibility needs, including in relation to building accessibility, building design, housing typology and parking requirements	Palmerston North's population is aging - in the next decade there will be more older people than children.. Objective 1 and Policy 1 in the NPS-UD apply to all people.
SO196.1	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Definition - Education Facility	Support	Retain as notified	This term and definition is consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Standards 2019.
SO196.2	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Definition - Additional Infrastructure	Amend	Add new definition <u>Additional Infrastructure means:</u> <u>a. public open space</u> <u>b. community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002</u> <u>c. land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities</u> <u>d. social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities</u> <u>e. a network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001)</u> <u>f. a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas</u>	This is a defined term in the NPS-UD. The term 'additional infrastructure' will provide clarity for the plan reader as to what types of activities are considered under this definition.
SO196.3	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	The Ministry is supportive of Objective MRZ-O1 as it encourages non-residential activities (which implies educational facilities) to be located within the MRZ, provided it meets certain tests as set out in the objective.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO196.4	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MRZ-O2	Support in part	Amend MRZ-O2 Built development* in the Medium Density Residential Zone Built development* in the Medium Density Residential Zone positively contributes to achievement of a predominantly residential urban environment that: a. Comprises well-designed buildings, sites, streets, and neighbourhoods; b. Supports safe and secure environments that align with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles; c. Is characterised by an increased building density, a mix of building typologies, and building heights up to (and including) three storeys; d. Is adaptable and healthy; e. Provides a reasonable level of amenity for residents, adjoining residential properties and the street; f. Enables mode shift to public transport and active transport modes; g. Integrates with existing and planned infrastructure <u>including additional infrastructure</u> ; h. Connects with open space and the natural environment; i. Is resilient to the effects of climate change and natural hazards; and j. Is energy efficient	The Ministry requests that the term 'additional infrastructure' to be included in MRZ-O2(g) as built development, enabled by PCI, should also integrate with existing and planned additional infrastructure as well as infrastructure (as defined by the RMA). This change will signify that the MRZ is a suitable location for such facilities, along with the other 'additional infrastructure' activities listed in the definition and aligns with the purpose of the zone (as set out in MRZ-O1). It is important that at a strategic level that new development integrates with existing and planned additional infrastructure and that this is positioned at such a level.
SO196.5	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MRZ-P1	Support	Retain as notified	It encourages non-residential activities (which broadly includes educational facility) to be located within the MRZ.
SO196.6	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MRZ-P5	Support	Retain as notified	It encourages non-residential activities (which implies, and broadly includes educational facility) where there is a benefit that supports the needs of the community and are commensurate with the purpose and planned built form of the MRZ.
SO196.7	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	MRZ-R12	Support in part	Amend MRZ-R12 Educational facility (including kohanga reo* and kura kaupapa*) 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: a. The educational facility has access* from a Minor Arterial or Collector Road, listed as such in 20.6.1.2 and 20.6.1.3; b. Any building used for educational purposes is offset from an adjacent residentially-used property by 6 metres; c. Building coverage must not exceed 40% of the site; b. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i) MRZ-S1 – Maximum building height; ii) MRZ-S2 – Height in relation to boundary; <u>iii) MRZ-S3 – Setbacks;</u> <u>iv) MRZ-S4 – Building coverage;</u> v) MRZ-S9 – Permeable surfaces*; vi) MRZ-S10 – Stormwater attenuation device; vii) MRZ-S11 – Minimum floor levels; and ...	the Ministry requests that standards b. and c. of Rule MRZ-R12 are deleted as these standards are more stringent than what is afforded by the density standards under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). We request that compliance with MRZ-S3 and MRZ-S4 is provided instead for MRZ-R12 to align with the performance standards provided by the Council and the density standards of the MDRS.
SO197.1	Crest Hospital Limited	Zone Extent	Oppose in part	Rezone that part of 12 Carroll Street which is zoned Residential to Institutional zone. *Edit 14 March 2025 address is 21 not 12 Carroll Street	Rezoning to MRZ does not recognise the historic, current and ongoing use of the site for hospital or institutional purposes.
SO198.1	Brett Hill and Tom Santing	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Concerns about loss of property values, environmental and urban design issues, noise and privacy and pressure on infrastructure and amenities.
SO199.1	Kāinga Ora	Stormwater Overlay	Oppose	Delete the overlay until all information is publicly available, fully assessed and further modelling is completed.	Stormwater mapping should be completed and reviewed prior to inclusion within the District Plan.
SO199.2	Kāinga Ora	Zone Extent	Oppose	Use mapping provided by Kāinga Ora to determine the zone extent.	The current zone extent excludes properties owned by Kāinga Ora which are viable for intensification. Rezoning these areas as MDZ would assist in meeting the demand for social housing within the city and enable Kainga Ora to appropriately manage its housing portfolio.
SO199.3	Kāinga Ora	Definitions	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora supports in full the changes to the definitions as informed by the national planning standards framework.
SO199.4	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-O1	Support in part	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the proposed objective.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.5	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>Amendment sought:</p> <p>Provide for subdivision designs and layouts that make efficient use of renewable energy and other natural and physical resources, and deliver well-connected, resilient communities, including development* patterns that:</p> <p>1.Optimise solar gain; 2.Incorporate water sensitive design*; 3.Manage stormwater effectively and efficiently; 4.Support walking, cycling and public transport opportunities and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety 5.Result in safe and adequate access* from the transport network to each allotment; 6.Are adaptable to the effects of climate change; 7.Are designed using crime prevention through environmental design principles; 8.Achieve high quality landscape outcomes, including encouraging the retention and integration of mature trees and native vegetation that contribute positively to an area's visual amenity; and 9.Orient lot frontages towards streets and other public spaces* to create quality streetscapes and where possible combine accessways to rear lots.</p>	<p>Kāinga Ora support in part the inclusion of the proposed policy, however the proposed policy includes matters that Kāinga Ora does not consider to be part of the general subdivision matters, particularly with regard to the urban design and landscaping outcomes, which should not form part of the consideration for standalone subdivision consents.</p> <p>Further there are no rules or standards relating to the proposed policy direction, which may impact upon Kāinga Ora development outcomes in the future.</p>
SO199.6	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-P2	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>Provide for the efficient integration and layout of subdivision and associated development* by:</p> <p>1.Encouraging joint applications for subdivision and land use; 2. Enabling subdivision around development* that has already been lawfully established; and ...</p>	<p>Vacant lot subdivision has its merits in itself. Kāinga Ora also consider that clause 3 provides sufficient direction to ensure that when the allotment is further developed, that a complying dwelling can be constructed.</p>
SO199.7	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-P3	Oppose in part	<p>Amend</p> <p>Take a risk-based approach to the subdivision of land affected by natural hazards so that new or exacerbation of existing natural hazards is avoided, <u>where practicable</u> and appropriate mitigation measures are <u>implemented during subdivision and development to manage the risks of the natural hazard. in place prior to development*..</u></p>	<p>Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a policy in relation to subdivision of land affected by natural hazards and especially the risk based approach, however, consider that the use of the term 'avoid' essentially creates a prohibited activity which is considered inappropriate where the effects of the natural hazard could be managed</p>
SO199.8	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-P4	Oppose	<p>Relief sought:</p> <p>Delete this policy in its entirety. If the overlay is to be retained, Kāinga Ora then seeks the following amendments:</p> <p><u>Manage Avoid</u> subdivision in the Stormwater Overlay <u>to mitigate adverse effects from stormwater runoff and flooding, including by the development and implementation of</u> unless the Council* is satisfied that a site-specific stormwater management plan prepared by a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant (preferably with experience in water sensitive design* concepts and elements) identifies:-</p> <p>1.the location, scale and nature of the development* proposed for the site;- 2.the extent of flood and/or overland stormwater flow hazards; 3.the on-site and off-site effects of the proposed subdivision on people, property and the environment;- 4.recommended mitigation measures to remedy or mitigate the on- and off-site effects of the subdivision;- and – 5.demonstrates that the on- and off-site adverse effects associated with subdivision will appropriately be mitigated</p>	<p>Kāinga Ora, in the first instance seek that all provisions in relation to the Stormwater Overlay are deleted. If complete and appropriate evidence is provided to justify the Stormwater Overlay, then Kāinga Ora seek as consequential relief that in the MDZ, that the policy be amended to allow for a greater degree of engineering consultants to submit designs for approval. Kāinga Ora also oppose to having a policy which reads as a District Plan standard, noting that this policy should be more high level, rather than setting a list of requirements for meeting this policy. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks that clauses 1-5 are removed from the policy and shifted to either assessment criteria or methods.</p>
SO199.9	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-P5	Support	Retain as notified	<p>Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a policy in the subdivision chapter in relation to servicing.</p>

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.10	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-R1.1	Support in part	<p>Amendment sought:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Controlled</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Where the site is not located within the Stormwater Overlay; and</p> <p>....</p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991 where the subdivision is associated with residential units or papakāinga* that are permitted under MRZ-R7 <u>or restricted discretionary under MRZ-R8.</u></p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 if the subdivision is associated with an application for the construction of 1-3 residential units or papakāinga* that do not comply with MRZ-R7 <u>or is a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R8.</u></p>	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a controlled activity status for subdivision where the relevant performance standards are met. Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of notification preclusions under this rule, however consistent with other relief sought in this submission, seek that an application under Rule MRZ-R8 also be precluded from public notification. This is consistent with the relief sought with the notification clause within MRZ-R8.
SO199.11	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-R1.2	Oppose	<p>Delete the rule in its entirety.</p> <p>If the overlay is to be retained, Kāinga Ora then seeks the following amendments:</p> <p>.... Notification</p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly public and limited notified notification in accordance with section 95A <u>and 95B</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>	Consistent with the relief sought, Kāinga Ora seek that provisions associated with the Stormwater Overlay are deleted. If complete and appropriate evidence is provided to justify the Stormwater Overlay, then Kāinga Ora seek that an application under this rule also be exempt from limited and public notification. Kāinga Ora does not consider limited notification a helpful procedure to be able to mitigate or assess any such infringements which are technical in nature with a range of mitigation options available.
SO199.12	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-R1.3	Oppose	<p>.... Notification:</p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991. An application under this rule is precluded from being limited notified in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991 except in relation to the width of a site access* and earthworks.</p>	Kāinga Ora does not consider limited notification a helpful procedure to be able to mitigate or assess any such infringements which are technical in nature with a range of mitigation options available.
SO199.13	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-S1.1	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>Each allotment must have practical, physical and legal access* to a public road by way of either:</p> <p>a. an access leg* at least 3 metres wide forming part of the lot; or</p> <p>b. a shared access* consisting of up to six access strips* lying adjacent to one another and giving access* to no more than five other lots, and in respect of which reciprocal rights-of way are granted or reserved; or</p> <p>c. an access strip* held in common ownership with the allotment and up to five other allotments; or</p> <p>d. any right-of-way running with and appurtenant to the land in which the allotment is comprised</p>	Kāinga Ora support the proposed standard, however, consider that limiting shared access for up to 5 dwellings is too low given that the effects can easily be managed through widths and pedestrian access through the Land Transport Chapter.
SO199.14	Kāinga Ora	SUB-MRZ-S2	Support in part	Move rule to the land transport chapter of the district plan.	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a standard in relation to vehicle crossings for medium density development, however, seek that this rule is moved to the land transport chapter of the District Plan as opposed to repeated in the Subdivision and Medium Density Residential Zone Chapters.
SO199.15	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-O1	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora support the general intent stated through this objective, particularly the identification of the need to provide a range of housing options (particularly papakāinga) in locations that meet the demand as well as the needs of the community

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.16	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-O2	Oppose in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>Built development* in the Medium Density Residential Zone positively contributes to achievement of a predominantly residential urban <u>environment that supports Medium Density living</u>, that:-</p> <p>a) Comprises well-designed buildings, sites, streets, and neighbourhoods;- b) Supports safe and secure environments that align with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles;- c) Is characterised by an increased building density, a mix of building typologies, and building heights up to (and including) three storeys;- d) Is adaptable and healthy;- e) Provides a reasonable level of amenity for residents, adjoining residential properties and the street;- f) Enables mode shift to public transport and active transport modes;- g) Integrates with existing and planned infrastructure;- h) Connects with open space and the natural environment;- i) Is resilient to the effects of climate change and natural hazards; and j) Is energy efficient</p>	Kāinga Ora consider that this Objective should be simplified. The subsequent clauses are more appropriate as a policy. See amendments sought to MDZ-P3 below.
SO199.17	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-O4	Support in part	<p>Amendment sought:</p> <p>Avoid residential intensification ensures that unless the on-site and off-site effects of flooding (including from stormwater) on people, property and the environment as a result of residential intensification are appropriately mitigated managed.</p>	Kāinga Ora generally support the inclusion of an objective which seeks to limit the impact of development on flooding. Kāinga Ora would however seek that the word 'avoid' is removed from the objective as this would imply a prohibited activity status.
SO199.18	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-O6	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of this policy as it relates to supporting Mana Whenua and especially the provision of papakāinga in the MDZ.
SO199.19	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P3	Oppose	<p>Amendments Sought:</p> <p>Residential buildings and structures, including papakāinga*, are compatible with the planned built form of the Zone when:</p> <p>1. Site layouts are coherently planned and the layout responds to the characteristics of the site and context, including adjacent waterways and public open space*;- 2. Site layouts provide a good level of pedestrian access and amenity and achieve legible, visually attractive access* to the development*;- 3. Residential units have appropriately sized and located private outdoor living space with a reasonable level of privacy and sunlight;- 4. Building designs and site layouts provide a reasonable level of privacy and access to sunlight for residential units on the site and for those on neighbouring sites;- 5. Development* frontages provide a legible connection to the street through orientation, entrance location, fencing and glazing, and they are not dominated by garages;- 6. Developments* integrate landscaping with building and access* design;- 7. They provide visual interest through the modulation and articulation of façades and roof forms.-</p> <p><u>1. Comprises well-designed buildings, sites, streets, and neighbourhoods;</u> <u>2. Supports safe and secure environments that align with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles;</u> <u>3. Is characterised by an increased building density, a mix of building typologies, and building heights generally up to (and including) three storeys;</u> <u>4. Provides a reasonable level of amenity for residents, adjoining residential properties and the street;</u> <u>5. Supports mode shift to public transport and active transport modes;</u> <u>6. Integrates with existing and planned infrastructure;</u> <u>7. Connects with open space and the natural environment; and</u> <u>8. Is resilient to the effects of climate change and natural hazards</u></p>	The proposal will introduce urban design and landscaping rules within the policies which will constrain proposed intensification that would otherwise be acceptable. Further this policy will could create an instance where minor non compliances with district plan standards will be subject to greater degrees of urban design scrutiny through a s.104 assessment. Kāinga Ora also oppose the inclusion of a policy which reads as a rule assessment, particularly for some matters which are subject to individual interpretation.
SO199.20	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P4	Support in part	Amendment sought: Move policy to the Land Transport Chapter or alternatively amend existing	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of this policy within the District Plan, however, consider this would be more appropriate as either a policy in the land transport chapter of the district plan.
SO199.21	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P6	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a stormwater policy.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.22	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P7	Oppose	Delete the policy. Or if the Stormwater Overlay is to be retained, then the following amendments sought: Manage Avoid -subdivision in the Stormwater Overlay <u>to mitigate adverse effects from stormwater runoff and flooding, including by the development and implementation of unless the Council* is satisfied that</u> a site-specific stormwater management plan prepared by a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant (preferably with experience in water sensitive design* concepts and elements) identifies:-	If fulsome and complete evidence is provided to support the Stormwater Overlay, then Kāinga Ora generally seek that the reference to an individual's qualifications are removed from the proposed wording as this is considered too restrictive.
SO199.23	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P10	Oppose	Delete	This policy is not supported by any rules or standards.
SO199.24	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P11	Oppose in part	Amendment Sought: Manage the effects on new or altered buildings and noise sensitive activities* near existing infrastructure, including by requiring: 1. Appropriate setbacks and design controls where necessary to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure and mitigation of effects on adjacent noise sensitive activities*. 2. All future buildings, earthworks and construction activities maintain safe electrical clearance distances in compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for electrical safe distances (NZECP-34:2001).	Kāinga Ora also consider that the Proposed MDZ policies should not state NZECP standards and seek that reference to this standard is deleted.
SO199.25	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-P12	Oppose	Amendment sought: Encourage the retention and incorporation of existing vegetation into the required landscaped areas <u>where possible, considering the amenity provided, health and practical location of existing vegetation within the site.</u> Encourage replacement planting to: a. Be of equal or better quality in terms of species, form, scale and texture; b. Use locally sourced species <u>where possible</u>	Kāinga Ora support the general principle of retaining vegetation to prevent loss, however this policy gives weight to the retention of vegetation, whilst working around existing vegetation during construction introduces increased costs and difficulties to developments. Further, this policy provides scope to introduce pseudo- protected tree status. In addition, requiring locally sourced species is often not possible due to lack of supply, especially on larger projects.
SO199.26	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-R7	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora supports this rule
SO199.27	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-R10	Oppose	Delete	Kāinga Ora seek the deletion of all provisions relating to the Stormwater Overlay until such time that complete and fulsome evidence is provided to support the Stormwater Overlay.
SO199.28	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-R13	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora support the permitted activity status for Community Houses.
SO199.29	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-R24	Oppose	Delete	The threshold of 4 carparking spaces is too low. Stormwater treatment matters should be included as a matter of discretion within Rule MRZ-R8. Further, this rule should be located within the Land Transport Chapter and be based on an area and not the number of carparks.
SO199.30	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S1	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora supports this rule
SO199.31	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Seek that the existing standard be replaced with <u>1. Buildings must not project beyond a 45° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way....</u>	Kāinga Ora opposes this standard and seeks a comprehensive review in order to better provide for flexibility in built form/residential typologies while still managing the potential for adverse effects to adjoining properties.
SO199.32	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S3	Support in part	Amendment Sought: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed: 1. Shading effects on adjoining sites;- 2. Loss of privacy effects on adjoining residential sites;- 3. Dominance effects on adjoining residential sites. and 4. Safety effects on the land transport network and pedestrians.	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed standard for setbacks, however, seek the deletion of shading effects and loss of privacy effects as matters of discretion as these are best considered for HIRB and Outlook Space standard infringements.
SO199.33	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S4	Support in part	Amendment sought: Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed: 1. The effects of increased building coverage on stormwater discharges from the site and flows; 2. Shading effects on adjoining sites;- 3. Loss of privacy effects on adjoining residential sites; and- 4. Dominance effects on adjoining residential sites.	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed standard for maximum building coverage, however, seeks the deletion of shading effects and loss of privacy effects as matters of discretion as these are best considered for HIRB and Outlook Space standard infringements.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.34	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S5	Oppose in part	<p>Amendment sought</p> <p>1. A ground floor residential unit, papakāinga* or community house* must have a landscaped area of grass and/or plants covering at least 20% of the site;</p> <p>2. Where a site fronts a public road, at least 30% of the required landscaped area must be located in the front yard, for a depth of at least 1m;</p> <p>3. At least one specimen tree capable of growing to a minimum height of four metres after five years must be provided for each ground floor residential unit, papakāinga* or community house*;</p> <p>4. The specimen tree must be located in the outdoor living space required by MRZ-S7(2) where this is provided at the street frontage of a residential unit, papakāinga* or community house*;</p> <p>Matters of discretion if the standard is infringed:</p> <p>1. Effect of increased hard standing on visual amenity;</p> <p>2. The contribution of landscaping to visual interest; and</p> <p>3. Integration of landscaping and building and access* design.</p>	Kāinga Ora support the introduction of a standard which requires that a percentage of the site be landscaped, however, consider that the additional requirements proposed in relation to specimen tree planting and front lot landscaping will introduce additional costs to development, particularly in regard to landscape design and will create additional layers of approval. Kāinga Ora consider that a blanket 20% will provide for adequate levels of vegetation per site.
SO199.35	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S6	Oppose	Delete	Kāinga Ora oppose the inclusion of a shade provision and considers that the occupier of a residence should be able to choose where and how such shade could be provided and located i.e. the use of a moveable outdoor umbrella when desired. Kāinga Ora is uncertain how this rule would be monitored for compliance and any consent notices etc would be too onerous.
SO199.36	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S8	Oppose in part	<p>Amendment sought:</p> <p>1. An outlook space must be provided for every residential unit, papakāinga* or community house* which meets the following minimum dimensions (measured from the centre point of the applicable window):</p> <p>a. 6 4 metres in depth x 4 metres in width outlook space for a main living area; and</p> <p>b. 3 metres in depth x 3 metres in width outlook space for the primary bedroom; and</p> <p>c. 1 metre in depth x 1 metre in width outlook space for all other habitable rooms.</p>	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of an outlook space standard within the proposed medium density zone, however, seek that the outlook space for the main living room is reduced to a 4x4m dimension to be consistent with the outdoor living requirements. Kāinga Ora also seek the deletion of an outlook space from the primary bedroom as this constrains viable locations of the primary bedroom against side boundaries which require a setback of 1m.
SO199.37	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S10	Support in part	<p>Amendment sought:</p> <p>Delete Clause 3 of the rule, or alternatively amend as follows:</p> <p>1. Every site must include a stormwater attenuation device which is sized to contain a minimum 18 litres of water per 1m² of new impervious area.</p> <p>2. Each stormwater attenuation device must be maintained on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>3. Any above-ground stormwater attenuation tank must be located in a side or rear yard that is not located within a side or rear yard must be screened.</p>	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a Stormwater attenuation device standard within the proposed MDZ, however seek that the location of tanks not be subject to a performance standard.
SO199.38	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S11	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora supports this standard
SO199.39	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S13	Oppose	Delete	Kāinga Ora consider that the location of the door does not impact upon the neighbourhood, street amenity or public and as such should not be a standard under the district plan. The glazing requirements within MRZ-S12 are considered appropriate to provide for street frontage engagement.
SO199.40	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S15	Support in part	Retain wording as notified, add relevant standards to Section 20: Land Transport as opposed to the MRZ standards for consistency.	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of the proposed standards for onsite carparking, onsite manoeuvring and vehicle crossings, however consistent with relief sought elsewhere consider that these should be within Section 20: Land Transport of the District Plan so as to not duplicate matters in the District Plan.
SO199.41	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S16	Support in part	Retain wording as notified, add relevant standards to Section 20: Land Transport as opposed to the MRZ standards for consistency.	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of the proposed standards for onsite carparking, onsite manoeuvring and vehicle crossings, however consistent with relief sought elsewhere consider that these should be within Section 20: Land Transport of the District Plan so as to not duplicate matters in the District Plan.
SO199.42	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S17	Support in part	Retain wording as notified, add relevant standards to Section 20: Land Transport as opposed to the MRZ standards for consistency.	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of the proposed standards for onsite carparking, onsite manoeuvring and vehicle crossings, however consistent with relief sought elsewhere consider that these should be within Section 20: Land Transport of the District Plan so as to not duplicate matters in the District Plan.
SO199.43	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S18	Oppose in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>1. Bicycle parking must be provided for all residential units at a rate of 1 bicycle park per residential unit;</p> <p>2. Bicycle parking must be provided either within each residential unit or within a secure structure (which may be communal, <u>within a garage or within a residential unit which has direct ground floor access</u>);</p>	Kāinga Ora seek that bicycle parking should also be able to be included within the dwelling unit if ground floor access is provided.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO199.44	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S19	Support in part	Amendment sought: 1. Each residential unit must have access to a screened rubbish storage area which is sized to accommodate one 240l wheelie bin and one recycling crate. collection, however seek that matter 2 is deleted as no matters of discretion relate to onsite amenity. 3. Where there are more than 20 residential units on one site, and the site fronts an Arterial or Collector Road, on-site turning for trucks is required.	Kāinga support the inclusion of the proposed standard for onsite rubbish storage and collection, however seek that matter 2 is deleted as no matters of discretion relate to onsite amenity.
SO199.45	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S20	Support	Retain as notified	Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of the proposed standard for fences and standalone walls.
SO199.46	Kāinga Ora	MRZ-S21	Oppose in part	Move this standard to the General Chapter and include a note that states that this standard is only applicable to MRZ-R20 and MRZ-R22. Confirm that the 'grille and diffuser' are external components to the dwelling only.	Kāinga Ora seek that this rule is relocated to the General Rules Chapter. In addition to this relief sought, this standard should only apply to mechanical ventilation required for MTZ-R20 and MRZ-R22. Noise related to any other mechanical ventilation (domestic heat pumps etc) is adequately considered within the Noise Chapter. Kāinga Ora is also uncertain whether grille or diffuser are the internal components to the system.
SO199.47	Kāinga Ora	Chapter 10	Oppose	Retain existing wording in introduction	Kāinga Ora oppose the deletion of wording in relation to intensification in the introductory chapter of the General Residential Zone. Whilst the MDZ will enable increased levels of intensification, this should not prevent intensification to appropriate levels within the GRZ.
SO200.1	Paul Robertson	MRZ-S2	Support	Retain as notified	The height in relation to boundary as proposed seems fair and reasonable to me, but only on certain sites.
SO201.1	Jonathan and Jill Hogg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Rethink the impact of development on infrastructure, loss of privacy and loss of greenspace.	Concerns about reduced section sizes, increased impermeable surfaces, lack of neighbour consent for taller buildings, loss of privacy, increase in noise, increased on-street parking
SO202.1	New Zealand Defence Force	R10.7.1.9 and R10.7.4.10	Support	Retain application to the MRZ	TMTA can include a range of activities, from office/classroom-based activities to large scale military exercises, and might involve search and rescue operations, infrastructure support, bomb deactivation training, small construction tasks, weapons firing, personnel movement etc. It is appropriate to provide for minor TMTA as a permitted activity in these zones consistent with the current District Plan approach.
SO202.2	New Zealand Defence Force	MRZ-O5	Amend	Amend Objective MRZ-O5 to provide appropriate protection against adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) of development in the vicinity of infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance.	NZDF seeks a policy framework and provisions that give effect to the RPS and provide appropriate protection against adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) associated with new development and noise sensitive activities on existing infrastructure, activities, and physical resources of national or regional importance.
SO202.3	New Zealand Defence Force	MRZ-P11	Amend	MRZ-P11 Effects on of buildings and activities near infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance. Manage-Avoid the effects on of new or altered buildings and noise sensitive activities near existing infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance including by requiring: 1. Appropriate setbacks and design controls where necessary to protect infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance from reverse sensitivity effects achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure and mitigation of avoid effects on adjacent noise sensitive activities. 2. All future buildings, earthworks and construction activities....	NZDF seeks a policy framework and provisions that give effect to the RPS and provide appropriate protection against adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) associated with new development and noise sensitive activities on existing infrastructure, activities, and physical resources of national or regional importance.
SO203.1	Enviro NZ	Chapter 5.4(c)	Support in part	Include Waste storage in the list of information that must be provided with an application.	If there is a proposed standard for rubbish storage and collection then development plans need to show the location of the storage and access to the storage. The location of waste storage is not often thought about when providing plans for resource consent. If the space allocated for waste management (rubbish) is not designed at the outset, this can generate adverse effects on amenity and the health and safety of residents, road corridor users and collection staff. Assessment of multi-unit dwellings needs to include the space and location allocated for waste storage bins and their access to and from the street.
SO203.2	Enviro NZ	R10.6.3.3	Support in part	Add waste management to the matters of discretion and add the Rubbish Storage and Collection standard to the Performance Standards. Add amendment to assessment criteria 4(i) (i) Sufficient . Suitably screened and an accessible location provision is made for rubbish storage and collection	If these specific areas in the Residential chapter have a density minimum of 1502 per dwelling, then all the urban design elements, including waste management, need careful planning to avoid poor functionality and future cost to residents. Given the recognition for the need of a waste management standard in the Medium Density Zone it seems that those higher density areas remaining under the remit of the Residential zone should also be required to design suitable waste management areas.
SO203.3	Enviro NZ	Chapter 10A - Introduction	Support in part	Include reference to incorporating space for waste and waste recycling	This introductory paragraph leaves out the necessity of having appropriate waste storage facilities on site which impacts directly on greenhouse gas emissions. Without sufficient storage on site to separate refuse, waste minimisation targets cannot be achieved as organic waste and recyclables are landfilled, contributing to the city's greenhouse gas emissions profile. Appropriate waste storage facilities are also essential to minimise the adverse health impacts of badly stored refuse as an increasing warm climate leads to greater bacterial production with associated potential disease and odour effects.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO203.4	Enviro NZ	MRZ-O2	Support in part	... f. Enables mode shift to public transport and active transport modes; g. Integrates with existing and planned infrastructure, <u>including waste storage and collection</u> ; h. Connects with open space and the natural environment; ...	Waste is often the 'forgotten' infrastructure and the proposed amendment allows waste storage and collection to be considered as essential infrastructure in the design of higher density residential developments. Without consideration of waste storage and collection in the design of residential neighbourhoods, the quality and functionality of the neighbourhoods are affected through poor outdoor amenity, hygiene, safety for residents and pedestrians, and operational difficulties for waste collectors.
SO203.5	Enviro NZ	MRZ-P3	Support in part	... 7.They provide visual interest through the modulation and articulation of façades and roof forms. <u>8.Site layouts incorporate sufficient, screened rubbish storage areas that allow for waste separation and accessible and safe collection.</u> ...	Waste is often the 'forgotten' infrastructure and the proposed amendment allows waste storage and collection to be considered as essential infrastructure in the design of higher density residential developments. Without consideration of waste storage and collection in the design of residential neighbourhoods, the quality and functionality of the neighbourhoods are affected through poor outdoor amenity, hygiene, safety for residents and pedestrians, and operational difficulties for waste collectors.
SO203.6	Enviro NZ	MRZ-P4	Support in part	Amend Enable residential activities and buildings when: 1. The safety and efficiency of the land transport network is maintained, including by providing for safe vehicle turning and manoeuvring where off street parking is provided <u>and safe kerbside waste collection</u> ;	Intensive residential developments can create a proliferation of individual bins on the roadside which creates obstructions and safety hazards. Monitoring in Auckland has found this is a common occurrence where bin collection is not considered at the design and resource consent stages. Without the proposed amendment there will be little provision to require on-site bin or waste collection if the kerb space is inadequate or unsuitable.
SO203.7	Enviro NZ	MRZ-R11	Support in part	Add requirement to comply with MRZ-S19	Accessory buildings, even with complying with coverage, can have the potential to alter and dislocate the areas needed for waste storage and collection. Ensuring that any new accessory buildings and/or additions continue to cater for the waste storage areas will ensure that this essential infrastructure continues to operate efficiently and effectively without adverse effects.
SO203.8	Enviro NZ	MRZ-R14		Add requirement to R14.1 comply with MRZ-S19	Visitor accommodation usually has on-site rubbish collection and therefore those parts of the on-site rubbish storage and collection standard that refer to on-site collection should apply. This will ensure that visitor accommodation is designed to meet the minimum standards for this storage.
SO203.9	Enviro NZ	MRZ-S19	Support in part	1.Each residential unit must have access to a screened rubbish storage area <u>which is sized to accommodate one 240l wheelie bin and one recycling crate with a minimum area of 1.5m2 and a minimum dimension of 1 metre in any direction, except:</u> <u>2.a. where</u> Communal rubbish storage areas are provided. 2. <u>The location of any storage area</u> must be screened or located so as not to be visible from a public road <u>and/or adjacent sites, and must not encroach into driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking and outdoor living spaces.</u> <u>3.Bins must be accessible for residents to get to the kerb.</u> <u>4.Where kerbside collection is employed, a kerbside space of 1m per dwelling is available without impeding the public footpath.</u> <u>5.Where on-site waste collection is used:</u> <u>a. the space must be accessible for the collection vehicle.</u> <u>b.where</u> there are more than 20 residential units on one site, and the site fronts an Arterial or Collector Road, on-site turning for trucks is required. Matters of discretion where the standard is infringed: 1.Safety effects on the land transport network and pedestrians; 2.Effects on the safe internal site circulation and manoeuvring areas, including for pedestrians; and <u>3.Accessibility, odour and noise effects of rubbish storage location.</u> 4.Location and size of rubbish storage area.	The proposed standard needs to be fit for purpose, and should provide sufficient space to accommodate different kerbside collected waste streams both now and in the future. It does not give effect to the NZ Waste Strategy.
SO203.10	Enviro NZ	SUB-MRZ-P1	Support in part	Add "including safe waste kerbside collection" to point 4.	There is a cumulative impact of multi-unit developments requiring space on the streets for kerbside collection. This needs to be managed at the subdivision stage for street design so that safe kerbside rubbish collection can be achieved. Accidents with cars, pedestrians and particularly cyclists on poorly designed roads occur when waste collection has not been considered.
SO204.1	Arohanui Hospice Ltd	Zone Extent	Amend	Rezone 1 and 11 Heretaunga Street and 758 - 766 Tremain Avenue as MRZ. SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN - S0204 - AROHANUI HOSPICE LTD	A Medium Density Residential zoning on the site will allow for flexibility for future development given the site is well connected to public transport networks, within the walkable catchment for employment opportunities, schools and retails and in close proximity to open space and recreation opportunities. In addition, the site provides an ideal opportunity for increase housing supply.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO204.2	Arohanui Hospice Ltd	New rule	Amend	Include a new rule which makes a retirement village or residential centre an RDA activity on the Arohanui Hospice site. *Edit 14 March 2025. The summary of submissions appears to indicate that it relates only to the Arohanui Hospice site. Arohanui Hospice propose that this new rule is applicable to the entire Medium Density Zone.	Providing for these activities as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the MRZ generally or more specifically on the submission site would signal a more enabling pathway for these activities and would be consistent with the purpose of the MRZ.
SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN - S0204 - AROHANUI HOSPICE LTD					
SO205.1	Ben Foster	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain as notified	they will enable greater choice for developments near community / suburb centres.
SO206.1	John Ireland	MRZ-S2	Amend	Open the application for directly affected neighbours comments, suggestions and objections. This should be mandatory.	Negative impacts on neighbours. Having a 5 metre boundary fence with a 45 degree pitch on the multi-story building leading to a total height of 11 metres will create shading issues that should be sorted out before any project starts.
SO207.1	Mary Pattie	Zone Extent	Oppose	Delete the MRZ around Buick Crescent, Awapuni.	Delete this change within my residential area, as this will spoil what has been a very desirable location to live in.
SO207.2	Mary Pattie	MRZ-S1	Oppose	Delete	These heights are too high. This would negatively impact on living in what is a nice quiet part of town. Also you might be placing people in danger with the potential of flooding which does occur from time to time in this part of town.
SO208.1	Development Nous	Zone Extent	Amend	Include 567 and 567A Featherston Street in the zone	The sites meet the location requirements and are aligned with the plan change.
SO209.1	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	MRZ-O5	Support	Retain as notified	NZTA supports the inclusion of objectives and policies to achieve appropriate mitigation for reverse sensitivity effects for noise sensitive activities adjacent to State Highway 3
SO209.2	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	MRZ-P11	Support	Retain as notified	NZTA supports the inclusion of objectives and policies to achieve appropriate mitigation for reverse sensitivity effects for noise sensitive activities adjacent to State Highway 3
SO209.3	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	MRZ-R20	Support	Retain as notified	The proposed rule provides certainty that adverse effects on noise sensitive activities adjacent to state highway 3 will be mitigated.
SO210.1	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	New rule	Amend	Include a liquefaction hazard overlay for the moderate-very high liquefaction potential and rules restricting development within liquefaction prone areas.	Rules for development within liquefaction prone areas should follow the MBIE/MfE Planning and Engineering Guidance for Potentially Liquefaction Prone Land1. Notably, areas assigned a high liquefaction classification should require a site-specific assessment of liquefaction issues.
SO210.2	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-O2	Support	Retain as notified	We support that residential urban environments should be resilient to the effects of climate change and natural hazards.
SO210.3	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-O4	Amend	That the following amendments are made: 1. A definition or explanation for what the council deems as "appropriately mitigated" for flooding is included. 2. That "appropriately mitigated" is assessed using the following criteria: a) The effectiveness of any proposed natural hazard mitigation works and the alternative design options considered, including low impact design. b) Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures. c) The extent to which the mitigation works transfer, or create, unacceptable hazard risk to other people, property or infrastructure. d) The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site. e) Whether or not the work would be carried out under the supervision of either a Chartered Professional Engineer with experience in geotechnical engineering or a Professional Engineering Geologist (IPENZ registered).	It is important to clarify what level of mitigation is required for the council to deem the effects of flooding "appropriately mitigated". Providing a definition or explanation is necessary to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies.
SO210.4	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-P6	Support	Retain as notified	We support the use of on-site mitigation measures for subdivision to manage flooding. Permeable surfaces, stormwater attenuation, minimum floor levels, and maintaining peak stormwater flows to pre development levels are all effective techniques for managing flooding and can reduce the impacts to people and property during a flood event.
SO210.5	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-P7	Support	Retain as notified	We support avoiding development in the Stormwater Overlay and requiring a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant to prepare a site-specific management plan. The Stormwater Overlay represents an area
SO210.6	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R7	Support	That the provisions for both permitted and restricted discretionary activities be retained subject to amendments to MRZ S11.	We support the construction of up to three residential units and papakāinga being a permitted activity provided they are outside of the Stormwater Overlay and meet the requirements for managing flood hazard. We also support it being a restricted discretionary activity if compliance with standards MRZ-S1-S20 is not achieved. However, we have provided recommendations for amendments to MRZ S11 as part of this submission.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO210.7	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R8	Support	Retain as notified	We agree that the construction of four or more residential units or papakāinga should be a restricted discretionary activity.
SO210.8	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R9	Support	That the provisions for both permitted and restricted discretionary activities be retained subject to amendments to MRZ S11.	We support that the addition or alteration of buildings and structures within the MDRZ is a permitted activity, provided compliance with standards MRZ-S1 - MRZ-20 is achieved. However, we have provided recommendations for amendments to MRZ S11 as part of this submission.
SO210.9	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R10	Support	Retain as notified	We support that the construction, alteration, or addition of buildings and structures within the Stormwater Overlay is restricted discretionary.
SO210.10	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R11	Support	Retain as notified	We support that this is a permitted activity provided it achieves the relevant standards.
SO210.11	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-R13	Support	That the provisions for both permitted and restricted discretionary activities be retained sub	We support the construction of a new community house being a permitted activity provided it is outside of the Stormwater Overlay and meets the requirements for managing flood hazard.
SO210.12	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-S9	Support	Retain as notified	We support the requirement of minimum permeable surfaces as part of flood management in the MDRZ. Permeable surfaces can result in less runoff and reduced stormwater during a flood event, which in turn can reduce the impacts to people and property.
SO210.13	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-S10	Support	Retain as notified	We support the requirement for all sites to have a stormwater attenuation device. We also support that it must be regularly maintained, and that its capacity is in relation to development of impermeable surfaces.
SO210.14	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	MRZ-S11	Amend	That the following amendment is made: 1. The finished floor and ground level for all buildings, accessory buildings and structures must be at least at the required freeboard for the <u>2%-1% AEP</u> flood extent for the site (including an allowance for climate change). 2. Access to occupied buildings and structures must be above the <u>2% 1% AEP</u> flood extent. Advice Note: The required freeboard will be provided by Palmerston North City Council <u>and will be based on a RCP8.5 climate change scenario.</u>	We recommend that minimum floor levels are built to at least 1% AEP flood extent rather than a 2% AEP flood extent. 1% AEP represents a larger flood event and so developing to this level is taking a precautionary approach to development. Using at least 1% AEP is also becoming standard across the country with many other councils (such as Wellington City Council, Auckland Council, and Whangarei District Council) adopting minimum floor levels for a 1% AEP flood event. We also recommend the RCP8.5 climate change scenario rather than the RCP6.5 scenario that has been used to support Plan Change I (PC I: Stormwater Servicing Assessment). RCP8.5 represents the upper estimate of likely futures and provides for a precautionary approach to natural hazard risk management. The National Adaptation Plan1 outlines that councils should use the RCP8.5 climate change scenarios for detailed hazard and risk assessments in coastal and non-coastal areas.
SO210.15	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	SUB-MRZ-O1	Amend	Include a definition and/or metric to determine what natural hazard risk is deemed "significant" by the council.	However, it is important to clearly define what level of natural hazard risk is "significant" to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies. NHC has developed a Risk Tolerance Methodology1 that is designed to integrate a risk tolerance assessment into existing risk management approaches. This methodology could be used by the Council to develop a metric to determine "significant" risk.
SO210.16	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	SUB-MRZ-P3	Amend	That the following amendments are made: 1. Further direction for what is meant by "appropriate mitigation measures" 2. That "appropriate mitigation measures" are assessed using the following criteria: <u>a) The effectiveness of any proposed natural hazard mitigation works and the alternative design options considered, including low impact design.</u> <u>b) Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures. c) The extent to which the mitigation works transfer, or create, unacceptable hazard risk to other people, property or infrastructure.</u> <u>d) The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site.</u> <u>e) Whether or not the work would be carried out under the supervision of either a Chartered Professional Engineer with experience in geotechnical engineering or a Professional Engineering Geologist (IPENZ registered).</u>	We support using a risk-based approach for subdividing land subject to natural hazard risk. Further direction on what "appropriate mitigation measures" are, would be useful to ensure that new or exacerbated impacts from natural hazards are avoided or reduced. Providing more direction is also necessary to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies.
SO210.17	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	SUB-MRZ-P4	Support	Retain as notified	We support avoiding development in the Stormwater Overlay to avoid the impacts of flooding on people and property, and we support requiring a suitably qualified stormwater design consultant to prepare a site-specific management plan.
SO210.18	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	SUB-MRZ-R1	Support	That the provisions for both permitted and restricted discretionary activities be retained subject to amendments to MRZ-S11.	We support subdivision being a controlled activity in the MDRZ, where the site is not located in the Stormwater Overlay, and it complies with standards MRZ-S1-MRZ-S20. However, we have made recommendations for MRZ-S11 within this submission.
SO211.1	Ben Gadsby	Zone Extent	Amend	Amend zone extent to exclude areas within 3 houses of the end of streets with a cul-de-sac and areas where long driveways already exist that service multiple properties. Also conser areas where there is high prssure on the wastewater network.	The reasons is due to already have pressure on the on road parking density and density of road side collection bins.

Submission Point Main	Original Submitter	Provision	Position	Relief Sought	Reason(s)
SO212.1	Brett Alcock, Cindy Tan and June Alcock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	Not stated
SO213.1	Andrea and Justin Coker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delete the plan change.	Concerns about reduced section sizes, increased impermeable surfaces, lack of neighbour consent for taller buildings, loss of privacy, increase in noise, increased on-street parking
SO214.1	Gillian Rapson	Zone Extent	Amend	Reduce zone size by about 75%	The extent of the zone is too much
SO214.2	Gillian Rapson	Reserves rezoning	Oppose	Do not rezone reserves to housing.	Reserves will become more important in the future. Increased density of large buildings makes open green spaces even more rare and relatively less open.
SO214.3	Gillian Rapson	Stormwater Overlay	Amend	More equitability in cost of identification of stormwater issues.	The cost should be spread across the zone as the assessment will apply at a larger scale than just a single section/site.
SO214.4	Gillian Rapson	General	Amend	Separate grey water from sewage in new development	Treating sewage is expensive. The additional cost of extra plumbing lines is relatively small at the construction stage.
SO214.5	Gillian Rapson	MRZ-S11	Amend	New dwellings in the areas identified as flood exposed should have their ground floors higher off the ground, and in very flood-prone levels there should be a requirement for wooden floors	Flooding preparation is needed.
SO214.6	Gillian Rapson	MRZ-S3	Amend	Clarification required.	is there are requirement for open spaces between buildings or groups of buildings.
SO214.7	Gillian Rapson	MRZ-S2	Amend	Not stated.	Concerns about loss of privacy, views, sunlight access.
SO214.8	Gillian Rapson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Introduce compensation for current owners of adjacent and affected buildings for loss of capital and enjoyment value.	The current owners of adjacent and affected dwellings are the ones who experience the loss of capital value and enjoyment value in their property or properties.
SO214.9	Gillian Rapson	MRZ-S5	Oppose	Not stated	Concern about loss of views and sun from tree growth, concerns about maintenance responsibility.