

## Appendix 2 – Recommended Decisions on Submissions

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
<b>Submitter 1: Hugh Wiffen</b>			
S1.1	Entire Plan Change	1) The submitter supports the plan change request to rezone the Gabites Block to Settlement Zone.	Accept
S1.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks Council to consider including the neighbouring properties along Maymorn Road in the Settlement Zone.	Reject The rezoning of sites outside of the plan change is not within the scope of the private plan change.
<b>Submitter 2: Wayne Chapman</b>			
S2.1	Financial Contributions.	1) The submitter seeks financial contributions to be made by the developer towards infrastructure and roading outcomes.	Reject The introduction of financial contributions is outside the scope of the private plan change.
<b>Submitter 3: Debbie Hawinkels</b>			
S3.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject
S3.2	Proposed zoning.	1) The submitter seeks to retain the existing zoning (General Rural and Rural Production) of the Gabites Block.	Reject
<b>Submitter 4: Beatrice Serrao</b>			
S4.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the wetland is not developed.	Accept Natural wetlands have been marked on the Structure Plan and setbacks from waterbodies (including wetlands) are proposed.
<b>Submitter 5: Rebecca Cato</b>			
S5.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter requests the application be approved with amendments of providing funding for community and urban design features.	Accept in part Requiring funding for community features is outside the scope of the

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
			private plan change.
S5.2	General.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The submitter seeks the following amendments so that the developer contributes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Funds for community facilities within the subdivision including their ongoing maintenance;</li> <li>b. A full transport plan is provided including a commitment to improve safety and accessibility to the site; and</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) A full intensive housing community plan is provided to ensure a healthy living environment for families that live there.</li> </ol>	<p>Reject</p> <p>Requiring funding for community features is outside the scope of the private plan change.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment has been provided as part of the private plan change request and has been peer reviewed by Council's traffic expert.</p> <p>The environmental effects of the proposal have been assessed. The provision of a housing community plan is outside the scope of the private plan change.</p>
<b>Submitter 6: Nathan King</b>			
S6.1	General.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The submitter opposes the plan change request unless the following is provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A spilt-level intersection at State Highway 2 and Plateau Road is provided before subdivision commences; and</li> <li>b) A traffic management plan is submitted with the development plan.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Reject</p> <p>The traffic assessment provided by the applicant and the peer review by Council have confirmed sufficient road capacity for the proposed plan change.</p>
S6.2	Minimum Allotment Size.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The submitter seeks an amendment to the minimum allotment size from 400m<sup>2</sup> to 1,000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ol>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>The minimum lot sizes for the North-West Area have been increased in response to existing reticulated network limitations.</p>
<b>Submitter 7: Tamara Carson</b>			
S7.1	Entire Plan Change.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The submitter opposes the private plan change request.</li> </ol>	<p>Reject</p> <p>The private plan change request has gone through the appropriate process and is recommended to be approved with modifications.</p>
<b>Submitter 8: Lisa and John Bryant</b>			
S8.1	Minimum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The submitter seeks amendments to the minimum allotment size in</li> </ol>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
	Allotment Size.	the following areas: a) North-West Area from 400m <sup>2</sup> to 2,000m <sup>2</sup> . b) Valley Flats Area from 1,000m <sup>2</sup> to 2,000m <sup>2</sup> c) Upper Plateau Area to 2,000m <sup>2</sup>	Changes to minimum allotment sizes in these areas are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations.
<b>Submitter 9: Rob Prest</b>			
S9.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. Or alternatively, seeks any decisions on the Gabites Block deferred to the PC50 review.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 10: Sonia Morgan</b>			
S10.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the private plan change request. 1) If the plan change proceeds, seeks upgrades to the local roading, schooling, school bus services, dental and health services in Upper Hutt.	Reject The requested upgrades are outside the scope of the private plan change.
S10.2	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) If the plan change proceeds, the submitter seeks an amendment to ensure a minimum allotment size of two acres.	Accept in part Some changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed
<b>Submitter 11: Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley</b>			
S11.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks that the current zoning is retained and any future development for the Gabites Block falls within the guidelines of the existing zone.	Reject
<b>Submitter 12: Jo Perez</b>			
S12.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks an amendment to increase the minimum allotment size to 2,000m <sup>2</sup> or larger.	Accept in part Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
S12.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the Council widen the verges of the roads for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Safe use by cyclists, foot traffic and horses, especially along Plateau, Parkes Line, Flux, Mangaroa Valley, Mangaroa Hill and Wallaceville Hill Roads; and</li> <li>b) Use or develop the existing paper roads to improve the valley.</li> </ul> 2) If the development is approved, the developer should also contribute to the upgrading of roads and shifting of fences to improve pedestrian safety.	Accept in part The private plan change proposes the construction of a shared user path along Maymorn Road.
<b>Submitter 13: Sofia Moers-Kennedy</b>			
	General.	1) The submitter seeks that a bridleway is added along Maymorn Road and the road leading to the Rail Trail in addition to the shared path.	Reject
<b>Submitter 14: Jaki Sifflett</b>			
S14.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. 1) However, if the plan change proceeds, the submitter seeks the proposed density be reduced by 50 percent and addresses infrastructure, roading and environmental concerns prior to the subdivision commenced.	Reject in part The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 15: Bob Anker</b>			
S15.1	Entire Plan Change	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 16: Peter Barnes</b>			
S16.1	Entire Plan	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request to be declined and a commitment to preserving the rural character of Mangaroa	Reject

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
	Change.	and Whitemans Valley by; a) Refusing to support any future developments; and b) Instead, more land should be acquired there for restoration of wetlands and native forest regenerations.	The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 17: Debbie Batson</b>			
S17.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the minimum allotment size be increased to 1,500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 2,000m <sup>2</sup> average and to improve local facilities and infrastructure.	Accept in part Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.
<b>Submitter 18: Dean Spicer</b>			
S18.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request is withdrawn until the following occurs: a) The developer changes the minimum allotment size for all lots to no less than 2,000m <sup>2</sup> b) An independent ecological report is commissioned. c) Consultation has been completed with Waka Kotahi and Kiwi Rail to understand that the new housing development does not exceed roading and rail capacity.	Reject in part Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects. An independent ecological review has been provided as part of the private plan change request. Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail have been consulted with and had the opportunity to submit on the plan change.
<b>Submitter 19: Dean Spicer</b>			
S19.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 20 Antoinette Spicer:</b>			
S20.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
		delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 21: Barry and Fiona Evans</b>			
S21.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks UHCC to answer all the questions listed on the submission form.	Accept  The questions have been addressed in the s32 evaluation provided as part of the private plan change request and in the s42A report that has been prepared for the hearing.
S21.2	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject  The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 22: Marita Maass</b>			
S22.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks a plan must be in place to deal with the increased needs relating to water, wastewater, traffic, education and health facilities before this development proceeds.	Reject  The issues raised have been addressed in the s32 evaluation provided as part of the private plan change request and in the s42A report that has been prepared for the hearing.  The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 23: Bridgewater Trust</b>			
S23.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject  The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
<b>Submitter 24: Kathryn Regan</b>			
S24.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject  The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 25: Kim Gibbs</b>			
S25.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: a) A minimum allotment size of 2,000m <sup>2</sup> with an average of 2,500m <sup>2</sup> throughout the development as the main purpose is to protect the environment and wetlands. b) Further residential units cannot be increased on future lots without consultation or assessment of environment and community effects.	Accept in part  Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.  The number of residential units per site are limited to one residential unit plus one minor residential unit.
S25.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the developer prior to a decision on the plan change will do the following: a) Invest in improvements to access roads for Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road to widen roads, provide safe pathways. Increased pedestrian signage, and reduced speed limits to accommodate residents. b) Mitigate additional runoff into waterways. c) Consult with the Ministry of Education and Local Board of Trustees to plan for the impact of additional families in the area on local schools. d) Include requirements that new homes meet passive home standards, recognising the micro-climate and different energy needs in the area.	Reject in part  The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.  The private plan change with amendments provides an appropriate consenting framework to address the points raised at the time of subdivision and development.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
<b>Submitter 26: Janet Pitman</b>			
S26.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) UHCC does not allow for the rezoning of the Gabites Block to Settlement Zone and Low Density Residential, or</li> <li>b) UHCC to consider larger minimum allotment size of 2,000m<sup>2</sup> with an average size of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> for the Gabites Block.</li> </ol>	Reject in part  Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.
<b>Submitter 27: Lance Burgess</b>			
S27.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Do not allow the North-West, Station Flats and Hilltop Basin to be any denser than 2,000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>b) Do not allow the Hilltops to be any denser than 1 hectare.</li> </ol>	Reject in part  Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.
<b>Submitter 28: Nerolie Burgess</b>			
S28.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Do not allow the North-West, Station Flats and Hilltop Basin to be any denser than 2,000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>b) Do not allow the Hilltops to be any denser than 1 hectare.</li> </ol>	Reject in part  Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.
<b>Submitter 29: Rob and Sharon Houghton</b>			
S29.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reduce the number of properties proposed.</li> <li>b) Reduce the number of dwellings proposed for the North-West corner.</li> <li>c) Increase the minimum allotment size to “lifestyle blocks” especially those bordering properties along Roseveare Grove and Plateau Road.</li> </ol>	Reject in part  Changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects.



Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
<b>Submitter 30: Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>			
S30.1	SUB-DEV3-S2 North-West area.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-S2: <u>Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply is unavailable all allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self-sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L a firefighting water supply, and appliance access to such supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509: 2008.</u>	Accept in part  Changes to the provisions relating to firefighting requirements are proposed to address the issues raised.
S30.2	SUB-DEV3-S2. All other areas.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-S2: <u>All allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self-sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L and a firefighting water supply, and appliances access to such supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	
S30.3	SUB-DEV3-S2.	1) The submitter supports SUB-DEV3-S2 to be retained as notified.	
S30.4	SUB-DEV3-P1.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-P1: <u>Are serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing including adequate provision and access to a firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	
S30.5	SUB-DEV3-S6.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-S6: <u>Roads, accessways and private driveways must be constructed to enable Fire and Emergency appliances to access structures and/or on-site firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Note: The requirements for firefighting access are further detailed in Fire and Emergency's 'Designer's Guide to firefighting operations – Emergency vehicle access' (December 2021).</u>	

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
S30.6	SUB-DEV3-P2.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-P2: <u>Ensure all new buildings and dedicated self-sufficient firefighting water supply can be accessed by fire appliances.</u>	
S30.7	DEV3-ECO-R1.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB- DEV3-ECO-R1: <u>Activity Status: Permitted.</u> <u>Where:</u> a) <u>The trimming or removal of vegetation is to:</u> (i-x) (xi) <u>For the creation or maintenance of a firebreak.</u>	
S30.8	General.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to ensure that the key access requirements, specific roading and access widths, surface and gradients to support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances are maintained. This includes, but is not limited to the following: a) The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliances to access hoses and pumps. b) A clear passageway / vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings. c) The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. d) The height clearance along accessways (for example trees, hanging cables and eaves) must exceed 4m.	
<b>Submitter 31: Sue Boyle</b>			
S31.1	Entire Plan	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be	Reject

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
	Change.	delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 32: John Boyle</b>			
S32.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 33: Brett Stanaway</b>			
S33.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks that the plan change does not allow or approve 400m <sup>2</sup> or 600m <sup>2</sup> minimum allotment sizes anywhere on the Gabites Block.	Reject in part While changes to minimum allotment sizes are proposed in response to reticulated network limitations and landscape effects, the provisions still provide for 400m <sup>2</sup> /600m <sup>2</sup> allotments in the North-West Area, subject to meeting standards
<b>Submitter 34: Judith Swildens</b>			
S34.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the zoning for the Gabites Block to remain as it is to protect the rural landscape of Maymorn for future generations.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 35: The Maymorn Collective</b>			
35.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
<b>Submitter 36: Helen Regan</b>			
S36.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 37: Lynn Bialy</b>			
S37.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the delay of the private plan change request until UHCC can consider plan change PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 38: Kim Williams</b>			
S38.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks a traffic survey that needs to be carefully, owned, administered and managed by UHCC with direct engagement with the local community as they both play a vital role.	Reject in part A transport assessment has been provided as part of the private plan change request and peer reviewed by Council's traffic expert. Should the need for a traffic survey be identified at the subdivision stage this can be appropriately addressed.
S38.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks UHCC and the developer to address the need to protect the valley against light pollution created by the Gabites Block.	Accept in part The application has been amended to address light pollution in more detail
<b>Submitter 39: Michael Byrne</b>			
S39.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks that approval of the private plan change is deferred until greater clarity can be provided on the impact on the local infrastructure in a consolidated and readable way to enable proper consultation.	Reject in part The application provides sufficient information to undertake an assessment. Where the information has been found to be insufficient this will be addressed through further information and amendments. The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
			modifications.
<b>Submitter 40: Greater Wellington Regional Council</b>			
S40.1	General.	<p>1) The submitter supports the private plan change with the amendments set out below:</p> <p>a) To correct all references to the “Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region” (RPS).</p> <p>b) Ensure alignment with all relevant Te Whanganui-a- Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kahui Taiao recommendations.</p> <p>c) Include wetlands and waterbodies for the Gabites Block Natural Area definition</p> <p>d) Inclusion of identified natural watercourses and wetlands in future site mapping and structure planning with development setbacks along identified watercourses to create a riparian buffer.</p> <p>e) Amend the development plan transport provisions to require an EV charging station as part of the development plan provisions.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>The application has been amended to respond to and address issues raised in the submission.</p>
S40.2	SUB-DEV3-S4	<p>1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks a requirement that stormwater be adequately treated (e.g., sediment ponds) before being discharged into natural waterways or wetlands.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to the stormwater provisions</p>
S40.3	SUB-DEV3-S2.	<p>1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks to clarify whether bore water could be used as water supply. In addition, if it is possible that bore water could be used for water supply, seek reassurance that bore water has not been contaminated by prior land use.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>The plan change does not prevent the future exploration of bore water use.</p>
S40.4	SUB-DEV3-S1.	<p>1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks an increase in the development density to maximise the number of dwellings on the</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
		site closer to the potential yield of 457 dwellings, within the identified constraints.	The proposed density of development responds appropriately to relevant restrictions
S40.5	General.	1) The submitter supports efforts taken to protect and enhance areas of significant indigenous biodiversity at the site and has no concerns with the proposal from a geographical hazard perspective. The submitter seeks consideration of opportunities to encourage the planting of the slopes and ridgelines outside of the natural area to native vegetation, to help to secure erodible land and create corridors for indigenous flora and fauna.	Accept in part Amendments are proposed to the relevant provisions
S40.6	DEV3-ECO-P2 and DEV3-ECO-R2.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the wording to remove “identified” before “biodiversity value” when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values. For example: Avoid adverse effects on identified indigenous biodiversity values where practicable; Minimise other adverse effects on the identified biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable.”	Accept in part Amendments are proposed to the relevant provisions
S40.7	DEV3-ECO-R2.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to change the Permitted Activity status for removal of non-indigenous plants that are not pest plants to Restricted Discretionary or Controlled Activity status. The submitter suggests including a specific rule permitting the removal of pest plants within the Gabites Block Natural Areas, where appropriate for restoration and maintenance of these areas.	Accept in part Amendments are proposed to the relevant provisions
S40.8	DEV3-S6.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to ensure that all houses on lots along the eastern property boundary are required to be setback from this boundary at a scale distance to protect from future forestry harvest.	Reject The responsibility for ensuring the safety of surrounding properties during harvesting lies with the owner of the forestry block.
S40.9	DEV3-ECO-Appendix 2. DEV3-ECO-	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the framework of principles for biodiversity offsetting and compensation to be consisted with the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) and	Accept in part The frameworks have been amended

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
	Appendix 3.	Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) guidance.	
S40.10	SUB-DEV3-P5.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to allow additional parking for the Rail Trail and Pākuratahi park users within the road reserve boundary adjustments on Maymorn Road and connections between the development roads and park tracks should also be made where appropriate (e.g., Pandy Track in Pākuratahi Forest).	Accept in part Parking for and connections to Regional Parks and walking and cycling trails are outside the scope of the private plan change
S40.11	SUB-DEV3-P5.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to require the first subdivision in the Valley Flats Area to adjust the boundary of Maymorn Road, to provide sufficient width in Maymorn Road for a future cycleway and walkway.	Accept
S40.12	General	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the speed limits on the affected stretches of Maymorn Road from 100kph to 50kph.	Reject The responsibility for speed limits lies with Upper Hutt City Council and is outside the scope of the plan change.
S40.13	Integrated Transport Assessment.	1) The submitter supports with additional analysis of the proposed plan change for the impact of increased traffic caused by the development on the Mangaroa School gate.	Reject The traffic assessment provided by the applicant and the peer review by Council have confirmed sufficient road capacity for the proposed plan change.
S40.14	DEV3-NH-P1.	1) The submitter seeks the following insertion into DEV3-NH- P1:  <u>3) The earthworks adopt effective erosion and sediment control measures to retain silt and sediment on the site.</u>	Accept in part Amendments are proposed to the relevant provisions.
<b>Submitter 41: Mary Beth Taylor</b>			
S41.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and that pending plans and policies such as the draft PC48, PC50 and NPS-IB (National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity) needs to be implemented before this private plan change. In addition, a Biodiversity Restoration Plan to accompany the land use	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
		application.	
<b>Submitter 42: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency</b>			
S42.1	General.	1) The submitter supports the application in part, but is seeking better provision and greater certainty of construction timing for multi-modal travel connections.	Accept in part The provisions have been amended to provide greater certainty.
S42.2	Structure Plan.	1) The submitter seeks the following amendments to the structure plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A minimum, single sided sealed footpath within the road corridor throughout the site to facilitate internal site circulation.</li> <li>b) The shared user path ('SUP') along the roadside boundary of Maymorn is constructed to a clear path width of no less than 2.5m on Ausroads "Cycling Aspects of Ausroads Guide (2017)" Figure 7.2, assuming less than 50 pedestrians will typically be using the path during peak hours prior to onside works commencing on the subject site.</li> <li>c) The applicant constructs a ('SUP') connection including a safe road crossing to the passenger platform of the Maymorn Train Station.</li> </ul>	Accept in part The plan change has been amended to provide greater certainty and to require the provision of a safe road crossing.
<b>Submitter 43: Paul Baker</b>			
S43.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and 14.6 hectares of relatively flat land in the valley retained for agriculture purposes.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 44: Lesley Francis</b>			
S44.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with



Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
			modifications.
<b>Submitter 45: Tony Chad</b>			
S45.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and that pending plans and policies such as the draft PC48, PC50 and NPS-IB (National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity) needs to be implemented before this private plan change. In addition, a Biodiversity Restoration Plan to accompany the land use application.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 46: Christopher Northmore</b>			
S46.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 47: Bob Orriss</b>			
S47.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks a comprehensive lizard survey be undertaken on the assumption that the plan change goes ahead in some shape or form.	Accept The requirement for a lizard survey to be undertaken at the time of first subdivision has been added.
<b>Submitter 48: Richard Bialy</b>			
S48.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.
<b>Submitter 49: John and Margaret Ankcorn</b>			
S49.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Officer Recommendation
			modifications.
S49.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks the new cycleway connecting to Pākuratahi Forest / Remukata Rail Trail consider existing users as equally important.	Accept in part The application proposes the creation of a cycle trail and walkway along the Maymorn Road boundary of the site.
<b>Submitter 50: Paul Persico</b>			
S50.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	Reject The plan change has gone through the prescribed process for private plan change requests and is recommended to be approved with modifications.