

## Appendix 2 – Decisions on Submissions on PPC36

The Summary Reasons in the Table below should be read in conjunction with the fuller reasons set out in the body of this Decision Report.

No.	Submitter name	Point #	Decision	Summary Reason
1	Rob and Deborah Ewen	1.1	Reject	This is not submission “on” PC53 and so there is no scope to consider the relief sought.
		1.2	Reject	The evidence is that existing facilities will be able to cope with any additional pressure arising from PPC36. See also sections 5.3.1, 5.3.11 and 5.3.12 in the body of the Decision Report.
		1.3	Reject	See section 5.3.10 in the body of the Decision Report.
		1.4	Reject	The access road is the subject of further resource consents. See also section 5.2 in the body of the Decision Report.
2	Edward Lawton	2.1	Reject	The evidence is that infrastructural requirements can be met by the Proponents. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
		2.2	Reject	There is no evidence that approving PPC36 will result in more campervans or freedom campers.
3	Raenea Lawton	3.1	Reject	The evidence is that existing roading network can cope with any additional traffic resulting from PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
4	Stephen Sanderson	4.1	Accept	It is appropriate that existing infrastructure designed to service Whareroa North and the Southern Settlements Structure Plan 2013 (SSSP) are acknowledged. See also sections 5 and 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
		4.2	Accept	The access road is the subject of further resource consents. See also section 5.2 in the body of the Decision Report.
5	Maggie Stewart	5.1	Accept	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling Whareroa North to proceed to subdivision consent stage.
6	Desarie Drayton	6.1	Accept	It is agreed that the word “generally” should be omitted from Policy 3a.2.1(v).
		6.2	Accept in part.	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling Whareroa North to proceed to subdivision consent stage. However, it is agreed that the word “generally” should be omitted from Policy 3a.2.1(v).
		6.3 6.4	Accept in part.	Having weighed the evidence and considered the proposed amendments to the notified version of PPC36 it is considered that ‘controlled activity’ status is appropriate for the subsequent subdivision consent. See also section 5.4 in the body of the Decision Report.
		6.5	Reject	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling Whareroa North to proceed to subdivision consent stage.
		6.6 6.9	Reject	The evidence is that existing facilities and the roading network will be able to cope with any additional pressure arising from PPC36. See also sections 5.3.1, 5.3.11 and 5.3.12 in the body of the Decision Report.

		6.7	Reject	We received no evidence indicating that traffic on the proposed access road will result in adverse effects on existing dwellings.
		6.8	Reject	The access road is the subject of further resource consents. See also section 5.2 in the body of the Decision Report.
7	Dr Ruth and Simon Ewen	7.1	Reject	The evidence is that the existing wastewater treatment plant can cope with the additional load from the residential development to be enabled by PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
		7.2	Reject	The evidence is that existing roading network can cope with any additional traffic resulting from PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
		7.3 7.4	Reject	These are not submissions “on” PC53 and so there is no scope to consider the relief sought.
		7.5	Reject	The access road is the subject of further resource consents. See also sections 5.2 and 5.3.5 in the body of the Decision Report.
		7.6	Reject	See section 5.3.12 in the body of the Decision Report.
8	Hokowhituatu Duncan Cormac McKenzie	8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 8.6 8.7	Accept	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling Whareroa North to proceed to subdivision consent stage.
9	Ian Sutcliffe	9.1	Reject	See sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 in the body of the Decision Report.
		9.2	Reject	The evidence is that existing roading network can cope with any additional traffic resulting from PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.
		9.3 9.4	Accept in part	The evidence is that the existing wastewater treatment plant can cope with the additional load from the residential development to be enabled by PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report. However, in response to issues raised we impose additional matters of control relating to wastewater.
		9.5	Accept in part	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling Whareroa North to proceed to subdivision consent stage. However, it is agreed that additional matters of control are required to ensure that potential adverse effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated when the subdivision consent is granted.
		9.6 9.7	Reject	See sections 5.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.5 and 5.3.2 in the body of the Decision Report.

		9.8	Reject	This is not a submission “on” PC53 and so there is no scope to consider the relief sought. Even if that is incorrect, existing ratepayers will not fund the development. All infrastructural development costs will be met by the proponents.		
10	Cory Skipper	10.1	Reject	See section 5.3.2 in the body of the Decision Report.		
11	Kia Paranihi	11.1	Accept	It is appropriate that the inclusion of Whareroa North in the Southern Settlements Structure Plan 2013 (SSSP) is acknowledged. See also section 5 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		11.2 11.5	Accept	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling the Trustees to proceed with Whareroa North to the subdivision consent stage.		
		11.3	Accept in part	See sections 5.3.5 and 5.3.8 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		11.4	Accept	See section 5.2 in the body of the Decision Report.		
12	Michael Ewen	12.1	Accept in part	It is appropriate that PPC36 is approved thereby enabling the Trustees to proceed with Whareroa North to the subdivision consent stage. However, in response to issues raised we impose additional matters of control relating to Lake water quality.		
13	Robert and Jo Coleman	13.1	Accept in part	Population growth has been slow, but that does not materially affect the merits of PPC36. See also section 5.1 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		13.2	Reject	See section 5.3.3 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		13.3	Reject	This is not a submission “on” PC53 and so there is no scope to consider the relief sought. Even if that is incorrect, existing ratepayers will not fund the development. All infrastructural development costs will be met by the proponents		
		13.4	Reject	The evidence is that the existing wastewater treatment plant can cope with the additional load from the residential development to be enabled by PPC36. See also section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		13.5	Reject	These is not a submission “on” PC53 and so there is no scope to consider the relief sought.		
		13.6 13.7	Reject	The access road is the subject of further resource consents. See also sections 5.2 and 5.3.5 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		13.8	Accept in part	The existence of vacant lots in other areas does not significantly denigrate from the merits of PPC36. See also section 5.1 in the body of the Decision Report.		
14	Michael Townson Miller	14.1 14.2 14.3 14.4	Reject	See sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.5, 5.3.11 and 5.3.12 in the body of the Decision Report.		
		15	Ministry of education	15.1	Accept in part	See section 5.3.1 in the body of the Decision Report regarding roading issues. No amendments were sought to PPC36.
		16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	16.1 16.2	Accept	See section 5.3.7 in the body of the Decision Report.

		16.3 16.4 16.5		
17	Waikato Regional Council	17.1	Reject	See sections 5.1 and 5.6 in the body of the Decision Report.
		17.2	Reject	See sections 5.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.5 and 5.6 in the body of the Decision Report.
		17.3	Accept in part	See sections 5.2 and 5.3.2 in the body of the Decision Report. However, in response to issues raised we impose additional matters of control relating to indigenous biodiversity.
		17.4	Accept in part	See sections 5.2 and 5.3.3 in the body of the Decision Report. However, in response to issues raised we impose additional matters of control relating to landscape character, natural character and visual amenity.
		17.5	Reject	See sections 5 and 5.2 in the body of the Decision Report.
		17.6	Accept in part	See sections 5.3.5 and 5.6 in the body of the Decision Report. However, in response to issues raised we impose additional matters of control relating to geotechnical matters.
		17.7	Reject	See sections 5, 5.2 and 5.4 in the body of the Decision Report.