

APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY TOPIC

Contents

Table 1 – Topic 1: Structure Plan Matters	2
Table 2 – Topic 2: Timing of Development of Area 7.....	6
Table 3 – Topic 3: Transportation.....	10
Table 4 – Topic 4: Three Waters	11
Table 5 – Topic 5: General	14
Table 6 – Topic 6: Activity Status	16
Table 7 – Topic 7: Riparian Management Plan.....	19

Table 1 – Topic 1: Structure Plan Matters

Submission point / Further submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
1/1	A B Maxwell	Proposed S5.9X – Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	In part	The proposed structure plan for Area 6 and Area 7 shows the Riparian Management Plan for the southern side of the Mangaone stream, "goes through the property of 404 Peake RD", which IS NOT in Area 7. The "20 metre Riparian Management plan and building setback" should run south of the boundary line between 404 Peake Rd and Area 7, not from the Mangaone stream.	That the rule, maps and relevant wording be changed to show the ":20 metre Riparian Management Plan and Building Setback" to be on the south side of 404 Peake Rd boundary and Area 7.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.2 – 4.1.5.
FS 1/1	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed S5.9X – Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Support	Agreed with the submission.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.2 – 4.1.5.
3/5	Kama Trust	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	In part	The Hautapu Structure Plan lists the following as an item to give effect to the structure plan: <i>Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6.</i>	That text on the Hautapu Structure Plan be amended as follows: <i>Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6 Area 7.</i>	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.9 – 4.1.11.

Submission point / Further submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
FS 1/7	Hautapu Landowners Group	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	Oppose	The provision in question already forms part of the District Plan as a result of (operative) Plan Change 17. The relief sought is not within the scope of PC33.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.9 – 4.1.11.
4/6	Waipā District Council	Proposed S5.9X – Hautapu Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Neutral	The proposed structure plan image for Area 7 shows notations extending over land that does not form part of Area 7. This includes Rural land to the north, and Area 6. The Structure Plan applies solely to land in Area 7. Because of this, any notations that are placed over land outside of Area 7 should be deleted.	Remove “20m Wide Riparian Buffer” notation from Rural Zone properties outside of Area 7, and remove any notations over Area 6.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.2 – 4.1.5.
FS 1/19	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed S5.9X – Hautapu Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.2 – 4.1.5.
4/7	Waipā District Council	Proposed S5.9X – Hautapu Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Neutral	The existing Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan map identifies “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” as text in the margin of the plan. This includes items that apply to Area 7 which have not been included on the proposed Structure Plan for Area 7. This can be addressed by adding an advice note which	Add an advice note to the proposed Area 7 Structure Plan as follows: <u>Development within Area 7 is subject to both the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan (S5.9) and the Area 7 Structure Plan (S5.9.X).</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.6 – 4.1.8.

Submission point / Further submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				makes it clear that any subdivision or development in Area 7 is required to be in general accordance with all information contained on both Structure Plans.		
FS 1/20	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed S5.9X – Hautapu Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.6 – 4.1.8.
4/8	Waipā District Council	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	Neutral	The existing Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan map identifies “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” as text in the margin of the plan. This includes items that apply to Area 7 which have not been included on the proposed Structure Plan for Area 7. This can be addressed by amending the text under the heading “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” (Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan) to include reference to Area 7 alongside Area 6.	That text within the Hautapu Structure Plan (S5.9) under the heading “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” be amended as follows: - Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6 <u>or Area 7.</u> - A right-turn bay and pedestrian/cycle crossing to be established at the Hautapu Road / Road 4 intersection prior to development within Area 6 <u>or Area 7.</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.6 – 4.1.8.

Submission point / Further submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
FS 1/21	Hautapu Landowners Group	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.1.6 – 4.1.8.

Table 2 – Topic 2: Timing of Development of Area 7

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
2/1	J V West	Not specified	Oppose	Oppose bringing forward deferred industrial to live industrial – - we as the Bruntwood Community are subjected to an extra five extra years of light, noise, visual and traffic pollution - it is prime agricultural land and should be protected as long as possible as directed by national government policy There is no need to bring this area of deferred industrial land to live industrial, as excess industrial land is currently available and will be available in the next five years. The applicant led council and submitters to believe at the hearing they had no need and would not do this.	To deny the request to bring Plan Change 33 of deferred industrial to live industrial.	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.3 – 4.2.10 and 4.2.15 – 4.2.23.
FS 1/2	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	The land is already zoned for industrial purposes and forms part of the C9 Industrial Growth Cell. PC33 only seeks to bring forward the timing of the land being able to be developed for industrial purposes.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.3 – 4.2.10 and 4.2.15 – 4.2.23.
3/1	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	PC33 is conditionally supported subject to:	Either that PC33 is:	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.11 – 4.2.23,

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				a) Plan provisions being incorporated to protect against adverse effects on the Kama Trust land within the C9 Growth Cell by ensuring: i. Any potential adverse effects on the transport network arising from PC33 are appropriately mitigated; ii. Any potential adverse water supply, stormwater and wastewater effects arising from PC33 are appropriately mitigated; and b) Retaining the sequencing trigger in Appendix S1 of the ODP for the C9 Growth cell in respect of Area 7.	a) Approved if Kama Trust's matters of concern are satisfactorily addressed; or b) Declined if their matters of concern are not satisfactorily addressed; and c) Such other additional relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	and Topics 3 (Transportation) and 4 (Three Waters).
FS 1/3	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	The submission states a position of 'conditional support' for PC33 but the detail is the submission opposes the primary purpose of PC33.	Approve PC33 without the modifications and limitations proposed by the submitter.	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.11 – 4.2.23, and Topics 3 (Transportation) and 4 (Three Waters).
3/2	Kama Trust	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(a)	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of rules proposing that subdivision and development of Area 7 occurs in conjunction with Area 6 under a co-ordinated subdivision consent application process incorporating both Areas 6 and 7.	That Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(a) and all related provisions be deleted.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.16 – 4.2.17.
FS 1/4	Hautapu	Proposed	Neutral	Kama Trust has shown no willingness or	Accept the relief sought in the	Accept. Refer Paragraphs

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
	Landowners Group	Rule 15.4.2.XX(a)		intention to co-ordinate the development of Areas 6 and 7. On that basis, the HLG is neutral in relation to the relief sought to delete Rule 15.4.2.XX(a). The rule was included in the proposed plan change as an option to enable a more co-ordinated and cost effect outcome for Kama Trust and HLG in relation to the servicing of Areas 6 and 7.	submission.	4.2.16 – 4.2.17.
3/3	Kama Trust	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(b)	Oppose	PC33 seeks to rewrite a critical sequencing trigger in the ODP, introduced through PC17. Appendix S1 – Future Growth Cells includes the following provision in relation to the C9 Growth Cell: <i>The deferred status of the Industrial Zone (Area 7) can be uplifted via a plan change once Area 6 of the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area has reached 80% development (i.e. 80% of the developable land area is the subject of s.224 certificates) or by 31 March 2030, whichever occurs sooner.</i> This is a necessary control, which was carefully considered through the PC17 process, and the ‘backstop’ of 31 March 2030 is critical. Amending the date to 31 March 2026 significantly disrupts the intended sequencing approved under PC17.	That Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(b) and all related provisions be deleted.	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.18 – 4.2.23.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
FS 1/5	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(b)	Oppose	Rule 15.4.2.XX(b) is the core element of PC33. The HLG accepted the outcome of Plan Change 17 based on assurances from Kama Trust that they would have completed development of its land (Area 6) within 18 months of Plan Change 17 becoming operative. That time period has been well exceeded, and the development of Area 6 has not progressed.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept in part. Refer Paragraphs 4.2.18 – 4.2.23.

Table 3 – Topic 3: Transportation

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
3/4	Kama Trust	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Oppose	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW requires the first subdivision of Area 6 to vest the entire length of the proposed road between Hautapu Road and Area 7 shown on the Hautapu Structure Plan as “Road 4”. A rule is unnecessary and opposed.	Rules to be incorporated within PC33 to ensure that any adverse effects on Area 6 arising at the time that the road connection between Area 6 and Area 7 occurs, are adequately addressed.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.3.2 – 4.3.9.
FS 1/6	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Oppose	Rule 15.4.2.WW is consistent with the outcome required by Kama Trust’s subdivision consent relating to Area 6. To avoid any risk of the current subdivision consent not being implemented (and an alternative proposal advanced), Rule 15.4.2.WW is required to ensure that the land for Road 4 is vested in Council to avoid a potential lockout situation.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.3.2 – 4.3.9.
3/6	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about any further adverse effects on the wider transport network due to the additional traffic that PC33 will generate.	PC33 is amended as necessary to ensure these potential effects are addressed.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.3.10 – 4.3.12.
FS 1/8	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	The outcome sought is not sufficiently specific to understand what is proposed. This creates significant uncertainty should the point of submission be accepted.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.3.4 – 4.3.5.

Table 4 – Topic 4: Three Waters

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
3/7	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about the manner in which wastewater is proposed to be managed under PC33 given Area 7 is located 'downstream' of Area 6.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.2 – 4.4.6.
FS 1/9	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	The outcome sought is not sufficiently specific to understand what is proposed. This creates significant uncertainty should the point of submission be accepted. PC33 is supported by a Three Waters Assessment that sets out the manner in which wastewater will be managed. It is also noted that the development of Area 7 will result in more cost-effective outcomes for the development of Area 6 due to cost sharing for infrastructure such as the proposed wastewater pump station.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.2 – 4.4.6.
3/8	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	The submitter has significant concerns about the manner in which stormwater is proposed to be managed under PC33. The technical material to support PC33 also promotes integration with Area 6 by potentially removing the stormwater device on Area 6, and relocating it, significantly expanded, to within Area 7	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.7 – 4.4.10.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				where it will serve both areas. The proposal under PC33 would result in significant inefficiencies, requiring redesign of the stormwater system for Area 6. PC33 refers to old soakage relates which were tested at a significant distance from Area 7.		
FS 1/10	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	As noted above, the prospect of Areas 6 and 7 being developed in a co-ordinated and more cost-efficient manner appears to be remote or non-existent. On that basis, there is no issue to address. The Three Waters Assessment in support of PC33 confirms that stormwater can be managed within Area 7 with no adverse effect on Area 6.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.7 – 4.4.10.
3/9	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about how potable water is proposed to be supplied to Area 7 under PC33 and how it affects Area 6.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.11 – 4.4.14.
FS 1/11	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	The outcome sought is not sufficiently specific to understand what is proposed should the point of submission be accepted. PC33 is supported by a Three Waters Assessment that sets out the manner in which potable water will be supplied. It is also noted that the development of Area 7 will result in more cost-effective outcomes for the	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.4.11 – 4.4.14.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				development of Area 6 due to cost sharing for infrastructure such as water supply pipelines.		

Table 5 – Topic 5: General

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
3/10	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	PC33 is not supported by sufficiently up to date and detailed technical assessments, including in relation to transport, Geotech and three waters. Much of the technical material is recycled from PC17.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.5.2 – 4.5.6.
FS 1/12	Hautapu Landowners Group	Not specified	Oppose	While much of the technical work was prepared as part of Plan Change 17, it has been updated for PC33 and is fit for purpose.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.5.2 – 4.5.6.
3/11	Kama Trust	Not specified	In part	The relevant PC33 provisions require amendment because, as currently drafted, they: ▪ Are inconsistent with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA; ▪ Are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; ▪ Will not adequately avoid, remedy and mitigate the adverse effects associated with PC33 on the environment; ▪ Will not achieve integrated management of the effects of use, development or protection of land and associated resource of the Waipa District;	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.	Reject. Refer Paragraphs 4.5.2 – 4.5.6.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				- Will not enable the efficient use and development of Kama Trust's land; - Do not represent the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC33 or the operative objectives and policies, in terms of s.32 of the RMA; and - Are not consistent with sound resource management practice.		
FS 1/13	General	Not specified	Oppose	The outcome sought is not sufficiently specific to understand what is proposed should the point of submission be accepted. In any event, the HLG disputes the points of submission and is concerned that, overall, the submission by Kama Trust is effectively trade competition.	Reject the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.5.2 – 4.5.6.

Table 6 – Topic 6: Activity Status

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
4/1	Waipā District Council	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.WW. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	That the following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.
FS 1/14	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.
4/2	Waipā District Council	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.XX. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear.	That the following text is added to the end of Rule 15.4.2.XX: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.		
FS 1/15	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.
4/3	Waipā District Council	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.YY. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	The following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.
FS 1/16	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.
4/4	Waipā District Council	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.ZZ	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.ZZ.	That the following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.ZZ: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource</u>	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	consent for a discretionary activity.	
FS 1/17	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.ZZ	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.6.2 – 4.6.3.

Table 7 – Topic 7: Riparian Management Plan

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
4/5	Waipā District Council	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Neutral	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY requires that as part of the first subdivision consent application involving land adjoining the Mangaone Stream, a Riparian Management Plan must be submitted for certification by WDC and subsequent implementation. It is not clear from the proposed rule: - What the minimum extent of the Riparian Management Area will be; or - When the required management plan is required to be implemented. In addition to this, any requirement to prepare and implement the management plan should also be triggered by any proposed development of land adjoining the Mangaone Stream. The rule should be amended to ensure that: - The minimum extent of the Riparian Management Area is identified and that this includes the Riparian Buffer and stormwater devices close to the stream.	That proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY is amended to read as follows: A Riparian Management Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the first subdivision <u>of Area 7 consent application or the first development</u> involving land adjoining the Mangaone Stream for certification by the Waipā District Council and subsequent implementation. [...] a) Clarification (by way of mapping) as to the precise area and extent of the riparian management area. <u>At a minimum, this area shall include:</u> <u>The Riparian Buffer shown on the Structure Plan; and</u> <u>Any stormwater management device in close proximity to the Riparian Buffer.</u> [...]	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.7.2 – 4.7.4.

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
				The provision and implementation of the Riparian Management Plan occurs as part of the first subdivision or development in Area 7.	g) Planting / Fencing Implementation Programme <u>for giving effect to the Riparian Management Plan, noting that:</u> i. <u>Any works certified by the Plan shall be completed the sooner of either:</u> ▪ <u>Prior to approval of the first subdivision pursuant to section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991; or</u> ▪ <u>Within the first planting season following the completion of construction activities associated with the first development.</u> [...] <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>	

Submission point	Submitter Name	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation
FS 1/18	Hautapu Landowners Group	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Support	The point of the submission is noted and agreed with.	Accept the relief sought in the submission.	Accept. Refer Paragraphs 4.7.2 – 4.7.4.