

14 October 2022

Attn: Chief Executive Officer Rotorua Lakes Council Private Bay 3029 Rotorua Mail Centre Rotorua 3046 *Submission made via email: policy.planning@rotorualc.nz*

KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR THE ROTORUA LAKES COUNCIL PLAN CHANGE 9 UNDER CLAUSE 6 OF SCHEDULE 1 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

This is a submission on He Wāhi Noho mō te Katoa – Te Panonihanga o te Whakaritenga 9 | Housing for Everyone – Plan Change 9 ("PC9") from Rotorua Lakes Council ("the Council" or "RLC") on the Rotorua Operative District Plan ("the Plan"):

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities ("**Kāinga Ora**") does not consider it can gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. In any event, Kāinga Ora is directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- Adversely affects the environment; and
- Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to:

PC9 in its entirety.

This document and the Appendices attached is Kainga Ora submission on PC9.

The Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities submission is:

- Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora") is a Crown Entity and is required to give effect to Government policies. Kāinga Ora has a statutory objective that requires it to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities that:
 - a) Provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and
 - b) Support good access to jobs, amenities and services; and
 - c) Otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of current and future generations.
- 2. Because of these statutory objectives, Kāinga Ora has interests beyond its role as a public housing provider. This includes a role as a landowner and developer of residential housing and as an enabler of quality urban developments through increasing the availability of build-ready land across the Rotorua and Bay of Plenty region.
- 3. Kāinga Ora therefore has an interest in PC9 and how it:
 - a) Gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development ("NPS-UD") and The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 ("the Housing Supply Act");
 - b) Minimises barriers that constrain the ability to deliver housing development across public housing, affordable housing, affordable rental, and market housing; and
 - c) Provides for the provision of services and infrastructure and how this may impact on the existing and planned communities, including Kāinga Ora housing developments.
- 4. Kāinga Ora recognises and supports the Council for requesting to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards ("MDRS") through the Intensification Planning Instrument ("IPI").
- 5. The Kāinga Ora submission generally supports the provisions proposed in PC9, in particular:

- a) The new objectives and policies within the Strategic Direction Chapter which recognise the requirements of the NPS-UD, seek to enable a variety of housing types and densities and incorporates the requirements of the Housing Supply Act.
- b) The new rules within the Natural Hazards Chapter that provides a permitted pathway for low risk activities / low importance buildings.
- c) The proposed amendments to reduce the operative financial 'contribution rate' for additional residential units from 5%, down to 3.5% and the general simplification of the financial contributions provisions.
- d) The proposed amendments to:
 - enable papakāinga to locate on land that does not adjoin or is adjacent to a Marae;
 - ii. ensure that the provisions are consistent with the MDRS,
 - where appropriate; increasing the density of papakāinga development in rural zones; and
 - iv. provide further clarity around non-residential activities that form part of a papakāinga development in rural zones.
- e) The new objectives and policies for the Residential 1 and 2 zones, in particular how these differentiate between the zones to enable higher density in the Residential 2 zone.
- f) Enabling residential activities within the City Centre Zone and Commercial Zones.
- 6. The Kāinga Ora submission seeks amendments and relief sought to PC9 in the following topic areas:
 - a) **National Consistency** Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to PC9 to be consistent with the National Planning Standards (particularly the Definitions Section);
 - b) Spatial Extent Kāinga Ora generally supports the identification of the notified Residential 1 – Medium Density Residential Zone. However, Kāinga Ora seeks to expand the notified spatial extent of the Residential 2 – High Density Residential Zone within Rotorua urban areas as a means to further implement the

intensification policy requirements of the NPS-UD and provide for high density residential living close to the city centre;

- c) Rule Framework Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to specific objectives, policies and rules in PC9 for improved clarity, effectiveness and focus on the specific resource management issues / effect to be addressed;
- d) High Density Residential Kāinga Ora seeks amendments which would assist to differentiate the enabled / permitted development between the Residential 1 – Medium Density Residential Zone and the Residential 2 – High Density Residential Zone;
- e) Enablement of Papakāinga Kāinga Ora seeks further amendments to enable and provide for papakāinga development, more generally, through the residential zones. Kāinga Ora also seeks a new definition for papakāinga which does not restrict papakāinga to land held under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act (1993) and allows papakāinga on general title land; and
- f) Matters of Discretion Kāinga Ora seeks that the matters of discretion contained within the City Centre Zone, Commercial Zone and Residential Zone framework be simplified and clarified.
- 7. The changes sought from Kāinga Ora are made to:
 - a) Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;
 - Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction and regional alignment;
 - c) Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;
 - Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;
 - b) Provide clarity for all plan users; and
 - c) Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.

- 8. The Kāinga Ora submission points and changes sought in more detail to PC9 can be found in **Appendix 1**.
- Appendix 2 contains a planning map with the proposed spatial extent of the Residential
 2 High Density Residential Zone sought from Kāinga Ora in Rotorua.
- Appendix 3 contains a recommended simplified set of matters of discretion that Kāinga Ora seeks is incorporated into the Residential Zone chapter – specifically standard RESZ-MDA.

Kāinga Ora seeks the following decision from RLC:

That the specific amendments, additions or retentions which are sought as specifically outlined **in this submission document and Appendix 1-3**, are accepted and adopted into PC9, including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.

Kāinga Ora wishes to be heard in support of their submission.

Kāinga Ora seeks to work collaboratively with the Council and wishes to discuss its submission on PC9 to address the matters raised in its submission.

If others make a similar submission, Kāinga Ora are happy to consider presenting a joint case at a hearing.

Brendon Liggett Manager – Development Planning Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities, PO Box 74598, Greenlane, Auckland 1051. Email: developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz



Appendix 1: Decisions sought in PC9

The following table sets out the amendments sought to the PC9 and also identifies those provisions that Kāinga Ora supports.

Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.



Table 1

ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as sinkethrough for deletion
Gene	ral extent	of Residential 1 and 2 Zones			1
1.		Extent of Residential 1 Zone and Residential 2 Zone	Support in part	 Kāinga Ora generally supports the areas identified for rezoning in Rotorua through PC9. However, Kāinga Ora seeks to increase the spatial extent of the proposed High Density Residential Zone (being the Residential 2 Zone) within Rotorua Central. Specifically, Kāinga Ora seeks that the proposed High Density Residential Zone is extended south toward the Rotorua Golf Club from York Street and Seddon Street (the notified limit of the High Density Residential Zone) – effectively creating a conglomeration of High Density Residential Zoning bound by Fenton Street, Old Taupō Road and Amohau Street within Rotorua Central. If the additional Residential 2 zone expansion sought by Kāinga Ora is not adopted, Kāinga Ora seeks that this area then includes a height variation control to enable building heights of up to 5 stories through a permitted rule framework. 	 Kāinga Ora seeks the Residential 2 Zone is expanded a create High Density Residential Zoning bound by Fent within Rotorua Central. Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the plan Other than the changes sought in this submission and proposed in PC9 as notified. If the relief sought in 1 and 2 is not adopted, Kāinga Cup to 5 storeys is introduced and inserted into the residential properties/area marked for can be a new standard. Kāinga Ora seeks that the actit this height variation control. Consequential amendments may be required to give a standard.
Inter	pretation	L	1	•	
2.		Building footprint, Building coverage (or site coverage for buildings), Net-site area, Residential activity, Residential unit, Site coverage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of National Planning Standards definitions into the District Plan.	 Retain the proposed adoption of the National Planning State Building footprint Building coverage (or site coverage for buildings) Net-site area Residential activity, Residential unit, and Site coverage
3.		Building	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports amending the definition of 'building' to incorporate the National Planning Standard definition. However, Kāinga Ora queries why the operative definition of 'building' is retained and the proposed amendments (that is, the adoption of the NPS definition) only relates to 'natural hazards' (NHZ chapter).	Delete the operative definition of 'building' and amend the the scope of the definition to the entire District Plan, as fol For the purpose of NHZ Natural Hazards means a temporar construction that is: a. partially or fully roofed; and b. fixed or located on or in land; but excludes any motorised vehicle or other mode of trans

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.

l as shown within **Appendix 2** to this submission to nton Street, Old Taupō Road and Amohau Street

anning maps as shown in **Appendix 2**.

nd in Appendix 2, retain the zoning and changes

Ora seeks that a height variation control of allowing esidential zone provisions of PC9 in the District Plan change in Appendix 2. The height variation control ctivity of building up to five storeys is permitted under

e effect to the changes sought and this submission.

tandard definitions for the following terms:

ne proposed amendments to the definition to expand ollows:

ary or permanent movable or immovable physical

nsport that could be moved under its own power.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
4.		Impervious surface	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed definition of 'impervious surface.'	Retain the proposed definition of 'impervious surface,' as n
5.		Minor residential unit	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed consequential amendment to the definition of 'minor residential unit' to replace "household" with "residential." However, Kāinga	Amend the proposed definition of 'minor residential unit' to the National Planning Standards, as follows:
				Ora queries why the National Planning Standard definition is not adopted if amending this definition.	a household residential unit that does not exceed 72m ² exc unit that is ancillary to the principal residential unit, and is h residential unit on the same site.
6.		Landscaped Area	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the definition of 'landscaping' and its replacement with 'landscaped area.'	Retain the proposed deletion of the definition of 'landscapin 'landscaped area,' as notified.
7.		Overland flow path	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed definition of 'overland flow path.' However, Kāinga Ora seeks that a contributing catchment area is included within the definition to reduce the demand for all buildings cutting through an overland flow path require consent.	Amend the newly proposed definition of 'overland flow pat threshold, as follows:
					the land overflown by a concentrated flow of water in an in stormwater network, streams, rivers, or lakes with an upstr Overland flowpath includes a secondary flowpath which is a
					stormwater system gets blocked or when the capacity of the this definition, an overland flowpath includes, but is not lim or hard surfaces.
Strat	tegic Direct	ion			
8.	SDUD	SDUD-I1 – Well-functioning urban environment	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to issue SDUD-I1 insofar as updating the test to acknowledge and respond to the NPUS-UD's "well-functioning urban environments".	Retain the amendments to issue SDUD-I1, as notified.
9.	SDUD	SDUD-I6 – Quality Environments	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to issue SDUD-I6 to recognise the housing outcomes sought through both the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Supply Act.	Retain the amendments to issue SDUD-I6, as notified.
10.	SDUD	SDUD-O1, SDUD-O2, SPUD-P4, SPUD-P21	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed objectives and policy pertaining to the Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain newly proposed Objectives SDUD-O1 and SDUD-O2 a are consistent with the prescribed MDRS (including the cons ensure the correct references within the framework), as not

notified.

to incorporate the same definition as prescribed in

xcluding garaging. means a self-contained residential sheld in common ownership with the principal

ping' and its replacement with the definition

ath' to incorporate a contributing catchment

intense rainfall event, as it flows towards the stream contributing catchment exceeding 4,000m². s activated when the primary (often piped) the piped system is exceeded. For the purposes of imited to, an artificially designed route using formed

2 and Policies SPUD-P4 and SPUD-P21 where they onsequential amendments, including deletions, to notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
				In addition, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed addition to clause (ii) to clarify the prescribed three storey enablement will occur within the Residential 1 Zone, and that up to six storeys is enabled in the Residential 2 Zone. This reflects the proposed rule framework within the Residential 1 and 2 zones.	Retain the proposed addition clause (ii) of newly proposed enablement in the Residential 2 Zone, as notified.
11.	SDUD	SDUD-O3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Objective SDUD-O3 pertaining to 'sufficient development capacity and land supply' to recognise the requirements of the NPS-UD.	Retain the amendments to Objective SDUD-O3, as notified.
12.	SDUD	SDUD-O4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective SDUD-O4 insofar as it stipulates the rationale behind the spatial extent of the Residential 2 Zone within the District.	Retain newly proposed Objective SDUD-O4, as notified.
13.	SDUD	SDUD-O9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective SDUD-O5 noting this provides a cascade to prescribed Policy SPUD-P21.	Retain newly proposed Objective SDUD-O5, as notified.
14.	SDUD	SDUD-P1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P1 seeking the enablement of a variety of housing types and densities within the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P1, as notified.
15.	SDUD	SDUD-P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P2 regarding the provision of papakāinga, marae, Māori customary activities and commercial activities across the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P2, as notified.
16.	SDUD	SDUD-P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P3 insofar as it outlines the identified qualifying matters within the district.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P3, as notified.
17.	SDUD	SDUD-P6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SDUD-P6 insofar as it cascades from proposed Objective SDUD-O4 to further inform the spatial extent of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones within the District.	Retain newly proposed Policy SDUD-P6, as notified.
18.	SDUD	SPUD-P20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports newly proposed Policy SPUD-P20 on the basis that the policy responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the prescribed MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Policy SPUD-P20 in its entirety.

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
d Objective SDUD-O2 to recognise six storey
d.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
Haza	rds and Ris	sks	1		
19.	NH	NH-PA – Buildings in Areas Susceptible to Flooding	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy NH-PA insofar as providing for the development of buildings within areas susceptible to flooding where the risks are low and potential adverse effects can be avoided and or mitigated through design or, where the risks are high, further consideration is had to the design and location of the proposed development. However, Kāinga Ora considers further amendments are required to the policy to both specify that the policy relates to habitable buildings and increase the clarity of the policy to plan users through minor alterations to the language used within the policy. Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy NH-PB seeking to maintain the function of overland flow paths	 Amend newly proposed Policy NH-PA to provide additional <u>Minimise the risks to people and property associated with c</u> a. <u>In areas where the anticipated flood levels are low</u> property are less, requiring new habitable buildings buildings to have floor levels above the flood level f change and freeboard. b. <u>In areas where anticipated flood levels are higher a</u> property are greater, requiring a broad assessment buildings and their associated site works that correst flooding on site, including consideration assessment i. <u>The appropriateness of the proposed devel</u> site are mitigated; ii. <u>Whether the development will increase risk</u> iii. <u>Whether there is a need for safe evacuation</u> iv. <u>Impacts on overland flowpaths and river context</u> Maintain the function of overland flowpaths and river corriet.
				appropriate, in the context of the policy, to replace the word "considering" with "assessing."	 <u>Invalitant the function of overland nowpaths and neer contents and nee</u>
21.	NH	NH-PC – Impervious surfaces	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy NH-PC that pertaining to the management of impervious surfaces.	Retain newly proposed Policy NH-PC, as notified.
22.	NH	NH-P3 – Geothermal Hazards	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the consequential amendments to Policy NH-P3 to clarify the application of this policy to the residential extent of both Ohinemutu and Whakarewarewa villages.	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy NH-P3, as notifi

al clarity for plan users, as follows:

h development in areas susceptible to flooding by: w and, therefore, the likely risks to people and lgs and larger additions to existing habitable el for the 1% AEP event with an allowance for climate

r and, therefore the potential risks to people and nt for new buildings and larger additions to existing responds to the nature and scale of the anticipated ent of:

elopment, and the extent to which the flood risks on

isks to other people, property or infrastructure; ion routes or refuges; and

<u>corridors</u>

"considering" with "assessing," as follows:

ridors to safely convey flood water and reduce risk

nd flowpaths and river corridors;

overland flowpaths and river corridors;

nd flowpath; and

to the entry or exit points of overland flowpaths on a ure.

ified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
23.	NH	NH-P4 – Geothermal Hazards	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy NH-P4 which recognises the risks of geothermal hazards to people and property.	Retain newly proposed Policy NH-P4, as notified.
24.	NH	NH-R4 – Buildings in the 2% AEP Lake Flood Level Overlays NH-R5 – Buildings in areas affected by inundation by surface water	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standards NH-R4 and NH-R5. It is noted that proposed standard NH- R4 manages the development and additions to buildings in areas susceptible to flooding.	Retain the deletion of standard NH-R4 and NH-R5, as notified
25.	NH	NH-R4 New Buildings and additions to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding	Support	 Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard NH-R4 pertaining to buildings within areas susceptible to flooding. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports: a permitted activity pathway for the construction of 'low importance' buildings (as per the proposed definition) and / or additions to buildings less than 20m² within areas identified as susceptible to flooding. A permitted pathway for development of buildings where the maximum anticipated flood level at the building site is no more than 300m from clause (i) and (ii). A Restricted Discretionary Activity cascade for development that does not comply with NH-R4.2. A Restricted Discretionary Activity status for new buildings and additions to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding that do not fall within NH-R4.1 or NH-R4.2. 	Retain newly proposed standard NH-R4, as notified.
26.	NH	NH-R8 – Venting Structures in the Geothermal Systems Overlay	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard NH-R8 to enable the development / installation of necessary venting structures.	Retain newly proposed standard NH-R8, as notified.
27.	NH	NH-MD1 – Buildings in areas susceptible to flooding	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to buildings in areas susceptible to inundation.	Retain the newly proposed matters of discretion NH-MD1, a

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
ified.
I, as notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
Histo	rical and (Cultural Values	oppose		
	I			T	Γ
28.	НН	HH-R2A – New buildings that are on the same site as a heritage structure listed in the Historic Structures Schedule, or a specified adjacent site	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard HH-R2A insofar as it provides a Restricted Discretionary Activity pathway for new buildings to be located on the same site, or a specified site, as an identified heritage structure.	Retain newly proposed standard HH-R2A, as notified.
Subd	ivision				
29.	SUB	SUB-P31 – Sustainable design and development of land	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Policy SUB-P31 to require subdivision of a minimum size and shape to accommodate the intended built form outcomes of the relevant zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy SUB-P31, as not
30.	SUB	SUB-P35A – Sustainable design and development of land	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy SUB-P35A which provides for both subdivision around existing development and in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain newly proposed Policy SUB-P35A, as notified.
31.	SUB	SUB-R1 – The subdivision of sites or buildings not otherwise stated below.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the mandatory notification clause to outline the notification requirements prescribed by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain the notification clause inserted into standards SUB-F
32.	SUB	SUB-R5 – The subdivision of a cross lease title occupied by one or more existing household <u>residential</u> units to create freehold titles	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the mandatory notification clause to outline the notification requirements prescribed by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain the notification clause inserted into standards SUB-F
33.	SUB	SUB-R43 – The subdivision of sites or buildings on land susceptible to -inundation <u>flooding</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of clauses 1.a - b and clause 2 from standard SUB-R43 and their replacement with clause a (i)-(ii) as this reduces the complexity of the rule. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the change in activity status from 'Discretionary' to 'Restricted Discretionary' and the removal of the 'non- complying' activity status.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-R43, as

and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
otified.
-R1, as notified.
-R5, as notified.
s notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion
34.	SUB	SUB-S1.1 – Minimum site area	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes minimum vacant lot sizes and seek that a minimum shape factor is required instead as required by Rule SUB-S1.2 below.	Delete SUB-S1.1 in its entirety.
35.	SUB	SUB-S1.2 – Site design factor	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S1.2 pertaining to site design factor. Specifically, Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of a shape factor approach to the standard – supporting the proposed 8m by 15m rectangle for both the Residential 1 and Residential 2 Zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S1.2, as
36.	SUB	SUB-S8 – Site suitability	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of standard SUB-S8 pertaining to the subdivision of land or buildings susceptible to inundation from surface water – noting the proposed framework contained within the natural hazards chapter.	Retain the deletion of standard SUB-S8, as notified.
37.	SUB	SUB-S9.2.b – Shared Private Access	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to SUB- Table 3 – Minimum access and formation widths. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of 8-20 residential units – increasing the maximum number of residential units that may share a private access from '8' to '20'.	Retain the proposed amendments to Table 3 – Minimum a S9.2.b, as notified.
38.	SUB	SUB-S14.2 – Cross lease, unit title, company lease subdivision	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2, a
39.	SUB	SUB-S14.3 – Conversion of cross lease to freehold requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.3 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.2, a
40.	SUB	SUB-S14.6 – Subdivision of sites (other than cross lease titles) with existing buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.6 to include and recognises subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard SUB-S14.6, a

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
as notified.
access and formation widths within standard SUB-
, as notified.
, as notified.
, as notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
41.	SUB	SUB-MC1.2 – General matters of control	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the matters of control contained in SUB-MC1.2. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of matter (j) and the removal of 'maintain and enhance' from matter (g).	Retain the proposed amendments to the matters of contro
42.	SUB	SUB-MD2 – Areas susceptible to inundation	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed matters of discretion contained in SUB-MD2 on the basis that these matters are addressed within the Natural Hazards chapter. Specifically, these matters are considered when new buildings are proposed within areas susceptible to flooding and / or alterations are proposed to existing buildings in areas susceptible to flooding and these alterations do not meet the permitted activity criteria.	 Delete the proposed matters of discretion contained in SUE a. <u>The appropriateness of the proposed building locat</u> <u>minimises the risks to people and property on the s</u> b. <u>The extent to which development of the site will in</u> <u>on other sites or infrastructure; and the extent to v</u> c. <u>Whether the development of the site will reduce th</u> <u>river corridor or major overland flowpath; and</u> d. <u>Where overland flowpaths affect the site:</u> <u>a. the extent to which the development of the site will chang</u> <u>flowpaths and the impact on other sites and inf</u> <u>c. management of any potential erosion caused b</u> <u>d. provision for access and maintenance to the ov</u>
43.	SUB	SUB-AC1 – General assessment criteria	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the assessment matters contained in SUB-AC1.1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of 'maintain and enhance' from matter (j).	Retain the proposed amendments to the assessment matter
44.	SUB	SUB-AER6	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports increased density and diversity of housing.	Retain the anticipated environmental result SUB-AER6, as r
Gene	eral District	Wide Matters	•		
45.	FC	FC – R1 Financial contributions for reserves	Support	 Kāinga Ora generally supports the approach set out in standard FC – R1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to reduce the operative 'contribution rate' for additional residential units from 5%, down to 3.5%. Moreover, Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the following standards: FC-R1.1 Subdivision; and FC-R1.2 Residential units. 	Retain the notified amendments which seek to reduce the operative 5%, down to the now proposed 3.5%.

rol contained in SUB-MC1, as notified.

UB-MD2, as follows:

ations and the extent to which the proposal a site from flooding;

increase risks from flooding to people and property which the proposal mitigates this effect;

the carrying capacity and storage capacity of any

ite will provide for the continued conveyance of

nge the entry and/or exit points of the overland infrastructure;

by any overland flowpaths; and

overland flowpaths

tters contained in SUB-AC1, as notified.

s notified.

ne 'contribution rate' for residential units from the



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought		
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as st	<mark>rikethrough</mark> for deletion and <mark>underli</mark>	ned for proposed additional text.
4	5. РК	PK-R1 – Papakāinga (including kaumatua flats)	Support in part	Käinga Ora supports in part, the proposed amendments to standard PK-R1. In particular, Käinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to: enable papakäinga to locate on land that does not adjoin or is adjacent to a Marae; ensure that the provisions are consistent with the MDRS, where appropriate; increasing the density of papakäinga development in rural zones; and providing further clarity around non-residential activities that form part of a papakäinga development in rural zones. However, Käinga Ora seeks that both the restriction on locating papakäinga on Māori multiple-owned land, or land which is otherwise under the jurisdiction of the Māori Land Court is removed and that a revised definition is included within the plan change to allow mana whenua to develop papakäinga on general title land – noting that the current definition of papakäinga is limited to land held under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act (1993). Moreover, Käinga Ora seeks amendments to ensure that provision is made for a permitted level of papakäinga development, similar to that of general residential developments, with the residential zones. Käinga Ora considers papakāinga housing to be inherently residential in nature and provisions should be drafted to reflect this. Moreover, the provision of a permissive framework for papakāinga housing is in accordance with policy 1(a)(ii) of the NPS-UD.	follows: <u>Papakāinga means residential and a</u> <u>recreational, and commercial activi</u> <u>tangata whenua on their ancestral</u> 2. Amend standard PK-R1 to r	ancillary activities (including social, ties) to support the cultural, enviro land.	 g' and replace with a new definition, as cultural, educational, conservation, commental, and economic wellbeing of bakāinga on Māori multiple-owned land, Land Court, as follows: 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: Compliance is not achieved with the performance standards for PK-R1(1). Matters of Discretion: a. Those matters of noncompliance and the objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion; b. Where performance standards of the zone are not met: the effects of the non-compliance in achieving the purpose of the relevant performance standard and the objectives and policies relevant to the matter of discretion; c. PK-MD1 General; d. The extent to which papakāinga affects the natural landscape,



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought		
	of Plan		Support in Part/				
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as <mark>s</mark>	rikethrough for deletion and <u>underlin</u>	ned for proposed additional text.
			Oppose			jurisdiction of the Māori Land Court; and d.—The land concerned must be vested in trustees whose authority is defined in a Trust Order or other empowering instrument which will ensure that: i.—The land remains vested in the trustees without power of sale; and ii.—The occupation or beneficial interest	 geothermal or wildlife resources; e. The extent to which papakāinga affects the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the district; f. The extent to which papakāinga affects streams, rivers, lakes or other elements of the water environment; and g. The extent to which papakāinga affects the
					Applicable Spatial Layers All Rural Zones	 beneficial interest in the land shall be restricted to members of the hapū. Activity Status: Permitted Where: The papakāinga or 	papakāinga affects the <u>planned</u> character and amenity of the underlying zone 4. <u>Activity Status: Restricted</u> <u>Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u>
						kaumātua flats have not been approved through the development plan process set out in PK-R2 Performance Standards: a. <u>Activities shall comply</u> with the performance standards of the zone	<u>Compliance is not achieved</u> <u>with the performance</u> <u>standards for PK-R1(3).</u> <u>Matters of Discretion:</u> a. <u>Those matters of non-</u> <u>compliance and the</u> <u>objectives and policies</u> <u>relevant to the matters</u>
						for household units, except in respect to RURZ-S4 Household unit density; b. The number of residential units per site	of discretion; b. <u>Where performance</u> <u>standards of the zone</u> <u>are not met: the effects</u> <u>of the non-compliance</u> <u>in achieving the</u>



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
					does not excee
					residential unit
					<u>2,000m² of net</u>
					area.
					c. <u>The density for</u>
					kaumātua flats
					exceed one per
					of land area;
					d. <u>Any places of a</u>
					and commercia
					industrial activ
					established in
					<u>conjunction wi</u>
					are directly ass
					with, the resid
					activities of the
					papakāinga.
					e. <u>Non-residentia</u>
					activities are se
					least 100m fro
					existing reside
					on a separate s
					f. <u>Non-residentia</u>
					activities shall
					<u>cumulatively e</u>
					500m ² in gross
					area on any or
					g.— <u>The activity m</u>
					located on Mā
					<u>multiple-owne</u>
					land which is o
					under the juris
					the Māori Land
					and and
					h. <u>The land conce</u>
					must be vestee
					trustees whose

<u>eed one</u>		purpose of the relevant	
nit per		performance standard	
et site		and the objectives and	
		policies relevant to the	
or		matter of discretion;	
ts shall not	с.	PK-MD1 General;	
oer 150m ²	d.	The extent to which	
		papakāinga affects the	
fassembly		natural landscape,	
cial or		geothermal or wildlife	
ivities are		resources;	
n	e.	The extent to which	
with, and	е.	papakāinga affects the	
ssociated		sustainable	
idential		management of the	
he			
		natural and physical	
ial		resources of the district;	
<u>tial</u>	f.	The extent to which	
<u>set back at</u>		papakāinga affects	
r <u>om any</u> Iontial unit		streams, rivers, lakes or	
l <u>ential unit</u>		other elements of the	
<u>e site.</u>		water environment; and	
<u>tial</u>	g.	The extent to which	
<u>ll not</u>		papakāinga affects the	
exceed		character and amenity	
<u>ss floor</u>		of the underlying zone.	
one site.			
nust be			
l āori			
ned land, or			
otherwise			
risdiction of			
nd Court;			
cerned			
ed in			
se			



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion
					authority is d <u>Trust Order c</u> <u>empowering</u> <u>which will en</u> i. <u>The land</u> <u>vested in</u> <u>trustees-</u> <u>power of</u> ii. <u>The occu</u> <u>beneficia</u> <u>in the lan</u> <u>restrictee</u> <u>members</u> <u>hapū.</u>
Zone	s – Reside	ntial			
47.	RESZ	Chapter-wide	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the prescribed Medium Density Residential Standard (MDRS) as required by the Housing Supply Act into the District Plan.	Retain, as notified, where they are consistent with the pro amendments, including deletions, to ensure the correct re
48.	RESZ	Introduction	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the introduction section of the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the corresponding amendments to the Residential Zones framework resulting from the implementation and integration of the prescribed MDRS - as required by the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora seek consequential changes to the zone descriptions to respond to the specific relief sought in this submission.	Amend the proposed amendments to the introduction se proposed amendments sought in this submission, where
49.	RESZ	RESZ-I1 – Activities in a Residential Zone RES-I2 – The design, layout and appearance of residential sites	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the relevant issues contained in the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the corresponding amendments to the Residential Zones framework resulting from the implementation and integration of the prescribed MDRS - as required by the Housing Supply Act.	Retain the proposed amendments to the issues section of

on and <u>underli</u> i	ned for proposed additional text.	
defined in a		
or other		
<u>s instrument</u>		
nsure that:		
l remains		
n the		
without		
f sale; and		
upation or		
al interest		
nd shall be		
id to		
rs of the		

rescribed MDRS (including the consequential references within the framework).

ection of the Residential Zones chapter to reflect the appropriate.

of the Residential Zones chapter, as notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
50.	RESZ	RESZ-O1 – MDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed Objective RESZ-O1 insofar as recognising the new Medium Density Residential Zone and the subsequent increasing housing supply and choice for the District as a result of the new zone.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O1, as notified.
51.	RESZ	RESZ-O2 – MDRS Objective	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Objective RESZ-O2. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the use of the phrase "surrounded by open space" as this could be confused with providing for Open Space Zone around proposed Medium Density Residential developments. Therefore, to avoid confusion, it is considered appropriate to delete reference to "open space" from this Objective and instead borrow the same phrase from RESZ-O9 ("integrated with on-site landscaped areas").	Amend the newly proposed Objective RESZ-O2 to remove r replace with "integrated with on-site landscaped areas", as <u>Development contributes to the creation of neighbourhood</u> <u>comprising residential buildings generally up to three store</u> <u>site landscaped areas.</u>
52.	RESZ	RESZ-O3 – MDRZ Objective RESZ-O10 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O3 and RESZ-O10 insofar as recognising the influence development has on the interface between the Residential Zone and streets / open space.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O10,
53.	RESZ	RESZ-O4 – MDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O4 insofar as it responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O5, as notified.
54.	RESZ	RESZ-05 – MDRZ Objective RESZ-012 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O12 insofar as ensuring the provisions of adequate infrastructure for residential development.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O5 and RESZ-O12,
55.	RESZ	RESZ-O6 – MDRZ Objective RESZ-O13 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objectives RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13 insofar as the objectives emphasise the rationale / aim of enabling greater densities of development is to support public and active transport over private transport.	Retain newly proposed Objectives RESZ-O6 and RESZ-O13,
56.	RESZ	RESZ-O8 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O8 insofar as recognising the High Density Residential Zone as an efficient use of land that has good accessibility to those matters identified in the objective.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O8, as notified.

re reference to "surrounding be open space" and as follows:

bods with a medium density residential built character preys, surrounded by open space integrated with on-

0, as notified.

2, as notified.

3, as notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
57.	RESZ	RESZ-O9 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Objective RESZ-O9. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports reference of six storeys within the objective.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O9, notified.
58.	RESZ	RESZ-O11 – HDRZ Objective	Support	Kāinga Ora support proposed Objective RESZ-O11 insofar as it responds to the broader Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS provisions.	Retain newly proposed Objective RESZ-O11, as notified.
59.	RESZ	RESZ-P2 – MDRZ Policy	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P2 insofar as outlining the built character resulting from the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P2, as notified.
60.	RESZ	RESZ-P5 – MDRZ Policy	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P5 recognising the proposed rule framework contained within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones which cascade from this policy.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P5, as notified.
61.	RESZ	RESZ-P6 – MDRZ Policy	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed policy RESZ-P6. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that reference to "4+ residential unit developments" is deleted noting these design techniques should be encouraged for all developments where potential adverse effects on adjoining sites have been identified.	 Amend newly proposed Policy RESZ-P6 to extend clause 4 to the front boundary may also be appropriate mitigation, as f <u>Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on an achieve the planned medium density residential built chara</u> <u>Setting buildings back from side and rear boundarie</u> <u>Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear</u> <u>Providing opportunities for sunlight access to adjoin</u> <u>For 4+ residential unit developments</u>, encouraging trecesses, varied architectural treatment and landsc
62.	RESZ	RESZ-P7 – MDRZ Policy RESZ-P16 – HDRZ Policy	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policies RESZ-P7 and RESZ-P16. However, Kāinga Ora seeks that the policy is amended to be more absolute in the requirement for demonstration of adequate capacity in the infrastructure networks to support development. The amendments proposed better reflect proposed Objective RESZ-O5. Kāinga Ora also seek that infrastructure is confirmed at the point of connection so as to narrow the extent of any infrastructure assessment.	Amend newly proposed Policies RESZ-P7 and RESZ-P16, as f <u>Require p-Proposals for four or more residential units to mu</u> <u>the infrastructure networks to support the development at</u>

4 to all development and recognise landscaping on s follows:

n adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to aracter, including by:

ries;

ar boundaries;

oining sites;

ng the use of other design techniques such as building Ascaping along side and rear all boundaries.

s follows:

must demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in at the point of connection.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
63.	RESZ	RESZ-P8 – MDRZ Policy RESZ-P17 – HDRZ Policy	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policies RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17. However, Kāinga Ora considered "promoting" provision of cycle parking on site is more appropriate than requiring cycle parking – noting the appropriateness in the context of providing a consent pathway where such requirements cannot be met.	Amend newly proposed Policies RESZ-P8 and RESZ-P17, as f Require proposals for four or more residential units to Pron parking on site.
64.	RESZ	RESZ-P14 – HDRZ Policy	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy RESZ-P14 recognising the proposed rule framework contained within the Residential 1 and 2 Zones which cascade from this policy.	Retain newly proposed Policy RESZ-P14, as notified.
65.	RESZ	RESZ-P15 – HDRZ Policy	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, proposed Policy RESZ-P15. However, Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of clause 2 – noting the consequential amendments contained in this submission table regarding the Residential Zone rule framework – and, that reference to "4+ residential unit developments" in clause 4 is deleted - noting these design techniques should be encouraged for all developments where potential adverse effects on adjoining sites have been identified. Consequential renumbering required.	 Amend newly proposed Policy RESZ-P15 by deleting clause <u>Mitigate the potential adverse effects of development on a achieve the planned high density residential built character</u> <u>Setting buildings back from site and rear boundarie</u> <u>Limiting the length of buildings along side and rear</u> <u>Providing opportunities for sunlight access to neigh</u> <u>For 4+ residential unit development, eEncouraging recesses, varied architectural treatment and landscenter</u>
66.	RESZ	RESZ-R3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed amendments to the residential units' standard RESZ-R3 to reflect the prescribed requirements of the MDRS into the Residential Zones chapter frameworks – as relevant to both the Residential 1 and 2 Zones. However, Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to clause 3 of standard RESZ-R3 to provide for up to six residential units on a site as a permitted activity within the Residential 2 Zone. The amendments proposed as a means to differentiate the enablement of development provided for between the medium density of the Residential 1 Zone and the high density of the Residential 2 Zone. Note Kāinga Ora supports the consequential amendments and deletions of the remaining standards contained in the activity table resulting from these amendments.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-R3.3 to provide for 6 reside the Residential 2 Zone.

s follows:

omote the provisionde of adequate storage for cycle

e 2 and amending clause 4, as follows:

adjoining sites, without limiting the ability to er, including by:

ries;

ar boundaries;

ighbouring sites.

ng the use of other design techniques such as building Iscaping along side and rear all boundaries.

idential units on a site as a permitted activity within



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
67.	RESZ	RESZ-S1.2 – Maximum height and daylight envelope (Residential 2 Zone)	Support in part	 Käinga Ora supports, in part, the more enabling height and height in relation to boundary provisions for the Residential 2 Zone. However, Käinga Ora seeks the following changes to better enable flexibility in design choice for developments: the permitted height is increased from 19.50m to 22m. increase clause (i) from 12m to 19m and apply only to side boundaries. insert a new clause for buildings 25m from the frontage. delete the height in relation to boundary clause (iii); and insert a more sympathetic height in relation to boundary when adjoining a lower zone hierarchy. 	 Amend proposed standard RESZ-S1.2 to increase the maxim from 19.5m to 22m and provide more enabling height in rel a. Buildings must not exceed 2219.5m in height. b. Buildings must not project beyond a 60° recession provide in the second frontage. i. 19m 2m vertically above ground level along troad-frontage. ii. 8m vertically above ground level along all or c. Buildings must not project beyond a 60° recession provide ground level along all or c. Buildings must not project beyond a 60° recession provide ground level along boundaries where the Residentiat (Residential 1 Zone and Reserves 1-3 Zones). d. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of wa access way, the height in relation to boundary applitivation way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access e. This standard does not apply to— Aboundary with a road: existing or proposed internal boundaries where there is an existing or sites or where a common wall is proposed.
68.	RESZ	RESZ-S2 – Yard Requirements	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part the proposed standard pertaining to yards for the Residential 1 Zone. However, Kāinga Ora does not consider it appropriate for the Residential 2 Zone to comply with a front yard setback and seeks an alternative side and rear yard setback for the Residential 2 Zone when windows are proposed along these boundaries.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S2 to delete the front yard the following side and rear yard requirement specific to the <u>Om unless windows are proposed on side and rear walls, the</u>
69.	RESZ	RESZ-S4 – Residential unit density	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of the Residential 1 and 2 Zones from standard RESZ-S4 – insofar as removing residential unit requirements from these two zones.	Retain the deletion of the Residential 1 and 2 Zone requiren
70.	RESZ	RESZ-S3 – Site Coverage	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support the reduction of maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces from 80% to 70% within the Residential 1 zone and seeks that the operative	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S3 for the Residential 2 Zor coverage for buildings from 50% to 60%, as follows:

timum permitted height within the Residential 2 Zone relation to boundary standards, as follows:

n plane measured from a point:

ng all the side boundaries within 25m 3.5m from the

e side boundaries 22m from the frontage. -other boundaries, n plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ntial 2 Zone interfaces with a lower zone hierarchy

f way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian plies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of cess way.

within a site:

g common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent d.

rd requirement for the Residential 2 Zone and insert he Residential 2 Zone:

then a 2m setback is required.

ements from standard RESZ-S4, as notified.

Zone to increase the maximum permitted site



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion
				level is maintained. Kāinga Ora considers that the operative level of 80% provides appropriate on-site amenity and that any flooding effects are managed through the natural hazard chapter provisions. Kāinga Ora supports the adoption of the prescribed 50% maximum site coverage for buildings within the Residential 1 Zone. However, given the Residential 2 Zone is a high density residential zone, it is considered more appropriate to differentiate the two zones with increasing the enablement of the Residential 2 Zone. Therefore, Kāinga Ora seeks that the maximum site coverage for buildings in the Residential 2 Zone is increased from 50% to 60%. For clarity, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces.	 Residential 1: Maximum site coverage for buildings: 40%50% of t Maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces: Residential 2: Maximum site coverage for buildings: 560% of the Maximum site coverage for buildings: 560% of the Maximum site coverage for impermeable surfaces:
71.	RESZ	RESZ-S5 – Parking, access and turning (Residential 2 Zone)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the table contained in standard RESZ-S5 outlining the minimum access and formation widths for the residential zones. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of 9- 20 residential units – increasing the maximum number of residential units that may share a private access from '8' to '20'.	Retain the proposed amendments to the table outlining the standard RESZ-S5, as notified.
72.	RESZ	RESZ-S6A.1 – Minimum size of residential units (Residential 1 and 2 Zones)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the introduction of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within both the Residential 1 and 2 Zone framework. However, Kāinga Ora considers it more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from $35m^2$ to $30m^2$ and a 1 or more bedroom units from $45m^2$ to $40m^2$ – as consistent with relief sought for both the City Centre and Commercial Zones framework and nationally.	Amend proposed standard RESZ-S6A.1 to decrease the mir 35m ² to 30m ² and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m ² to 40m ² , as <u>Minimum size of residential units:</u> a. <u>The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 3</u> b. <u>The minimum net floor area a 1 or more bedroom</u>
73.	RESZ	RESZ-S6A.2 – Outdoor Living Space (per unit)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard RESZ-S6A.2 pertaining to outlook space. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed minimum dimensions noting the differences between both the Residential 1 and 2 Zones.	Retain newly proposed standard RESZ-S6A.2, as notified.
74.	RESZ	RESZ-S6A.4 – Windows to street (Residential 1 and 2 Zones)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the additional clauses to the prescribed MDRS glazing standard to enable clarity for plan users as to what constitutes towards glazing.	Retain proposed standard RESZ-S6A.4, as notified.

of the net site area. es: 80% <u>70%</u> 80% of the site area.

he net site area. There is no maximum site coverage. es: <u>80%</u> 100% of the site area.

the minimum access and formation widths within

ninimum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from as follows:

<u>e 350m²</u> m units shall be 405m²



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
75.	RESZ	RESZ-S6A.5 – Maximum Building Length (Residential 1 and 2 Zones)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed standard pertaining to maximum building length for both Residential 1 and 2. Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of an additional standard to restrict development potential.	Delete standard RESZ-S6A.5 in its entirety. <u>Maximum Building length (Residential 1 and 2 Zones)</u> a. <u>The maximum length of a building above ground flo</u> <u>and rear boundaries, after which there shall be a m</u> <u>building on the same site.</u>
76.	RESZ	RESZ-S6A.6 – Landscaped Area (Residential 1 and 2 Zone)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part the proposed standard pertaining to landscaping for the Residential 1 Zone. However, Kāinga Ora does not consider it appropriate for the Residential 2 Zone to comply with clause c of the standard noting the amendments sought in relation to the yard requirements for the Residential 2 Zone (that is, removing the front yard setback requirement)	 Amend proposed standard RESZ-S6A.6 to apply clause c to t a. <u>A residential unit at ground floor level must have a</u> <u>developed site with grass or plants, and can include</u> <u>treatment below them;</u> b. <u>The landscaped area may be located on any part of</u> <u>associated with each residential unit.</u> c. <u>For the Residential 1 Zone, at least 50% of the area</u>
77.	RESZ	RESZ-MDA – Residential units – specific non-compliance matters	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally opposes the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to residential units contained in RESZ- MDA. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified – such as referring back to the various matters are discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings.	Delete the proposed amendments to the matters of discret simplified set of matters, as per Appendix 3 of this submiss
78.	RESZ	RESZ-MDRB – 4+ residential unit developments	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed matters of discretion pertaining to development containing 4+ residential dwellings in RESZ-MDB. However, Kāinga Ora seeks a consequential change to the application of the listed matters of discretion for 6+ residential units within the Residential 2 Zone and seeks for the simplification of these matters and to recognise that the objectives and policies of the zones covers many of the matters identified by council. Kāinga Ora notes that any matters pertaining to parking and access should be addressed within the transportation chapter.	 Replace the proposed matters of discretion contained in RE submission, as follows: <u>RESZ-MDB 4+ residential unit developments in the Resident 2 Zone</u> <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>The development contributes to a safe and attractive</u> <u>The extent and effects on the three waters infrastrupoint of connection the infrastructure has the capace</u> <u>The degree to which the development delivers qual appropriate for its scale; and</u> <u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with any rassessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u>

floor level shall be 22m, measured parallel to side minimum separation of 4m between any other

o the Residential 1 Zone only, as follows:

a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a de the canopy of trees regardless of the ground

of the development site, and does not need to be

ea of the front yard must comprise landscaped area.

etion contained in RESZ-MDA and replace with a ssion.

RESZ-MDB to reflect changes sought in this

ential 1 Zone, or 6+ residential units in the Residential

nent is compatible with the planned urban built form

<u>ctive public realm and streetscape;</u> <u>tructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the</u> <u>pacity to service the development.</u> <u>Juality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is</u>

relevant standard as specified in the associated



ID	Section Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan	Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
				 Attractive and safe streets and open spaces: Whether development provides a quality and a space. This includes orientating residential unit pedestrian access, and minimising long expans doors. Whether the orientation of development and thabitable rooms maximises visibility over the security. Whether development optimises landscaping versidential units at ground level and visual interestication of outdoor living spaces are of residential units at ground level and visual interestication of outdoor living privacy between residential units and optimises Whether principal living rooms and outdoor living spaces are of the extent to which outdoor living spaces are of the extent to the overall quality of our residential units. Whether storage areas for rubbish are sufficient screened. Whether storage areas for rubbish are sufficient screened. Effects on adjoining sites:

- d attractive frontage to the street or public open nits to front the street with clear and direct nses of blank walls and at grade carparking/garage
- d the placement of doors, windows, balconies and e street and public open space to enhance safety and
- g within the front yard to provide privacy for Iterest and safety along the street.
- living spaces are orientated and designed to provide ise sunlight access.
- e directly accessible from the principal living room.
- ted to allow opportunities for large scale trees on outlook space and allow some privacy between
- site, whether it is located to provide convenient taccess, amenity and use.
- iently sized, conveniently located and appropriately
- anned future character for the zone, whether: Ily attractive when viewed from neighbouring sites sites, through the orientation and design of es relative to adjoining sites, and the use of #
- for sunlight access to adjoining sites through form along side or rear boundaries, acknowledging to achieve this in the High Density Residential zone <u>d.</u>

hat is easily identifiable is provided from the street to



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
					 b. Whether a good level of connectivity is provide and to local services and facilities c. Whether vehicle access and carparking areas a prioritise pedestrian movement. d. Whether storage areas for rubbish are sufficien screened and can be safely serviced by approp proposed). e. Whether access for emergency service vehicle the site safely and efficiently. f. Whether each residential unit has sufficient sp least one bicycle. g. For 20 or more residential in accordance with APP1 (4)(b) demonstrating and efficiently. 5. Infrastructure capacity and stormwater management a. Encourage development to apply low impact s
79.	RESZ	RESZ-AER11-12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed anticipated environmental result pertaining to increasing residential density and diversity of housing in the Residential 1 and 2 Zones and improving the perception of neighbourhoods as safe and attractive with convenient access.	Retain the newly proposed anticipated environmental resul
Zone	s – City Ce	ntre			
80.	CCZ	CCZ-O4 - Vibrancy and vitality of the city centre CCZ-O6 – Reverse sensitivity CCZ-P4 – Vibrancy and vitality of the city centre CCZ-P8 - Vibrancy and vitality of the city centre CCZ-P10 - Vibrancy and vitality of the city centre	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Objective CCZ-O4 and CCZ-O6 and Policies CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P12, CCZ-P13 and CCZ-P14, in response to the proposed amendments to the City Centre Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table. In particular to promote and enable residential activity through the city and taking the opportunity to providing further clarity to the operative objective and policy framework of the City Centre Zone.	 Amend Objectives CCZ-O4 and CCZ-O6, as follows: CCZ-O4 Rotorua Central Mall <u>is promoted and retained as having</u> and centre of the district. CCZ-O6 Subdivision, use and development that enables the continue activities. Amend Policies CCZ-P4, CCZ-P8, CCZ-PP10, amend and control Policy CCZ-P14, as follows: CCZ-P4 Enable residential, <u>dwellings</u> and tourism accommodation to the continue of the continue of the continue of the continue of the control of the content of the con

ided within the site to the existing transport network

s are designed as low speed environments that

iently sized, conveniently located and appropriately opriate collection vehicles (if on site collection is

les is appropriately designed so that staff can access

space within the site for the secure storage of at ial units, whether a transport assessment is provided og that the adjacent road network can operate safely

ent

t stormwater design.

sults contained in AER-11-12, as notified.

an integral role to the primary commercial and retail

nued efficient operation of existing development and

d combine Policies CCZ-P12 and CCZ-P13, and delete

n throughout the city centre.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
		CCZ-P12 – Design and appearance of buildings CCZ-P13 – Design and appearance of buildings CCZ-P14 – Reverse Sensitivity			Only allow for residential dwellings and tourism accommode focussed streets identified in the Planning Maps when design commercial activity occurs on the street level. avoids revere CCZ-P8 Enable Fthe continued operation and development of the law where this complements the natural and cultural values ass CCZ-P10 Enable and pProvide for Rotorua Central Mall to continue a strong pedestrian linkages with Tutanekai Street. CCZ-P12 / CC-P13 (combine) The application of urban design principles within building d and safe pedestrian focussed environment, through building Seek inpovative building design that provides visual interest
81.	CCZ	CCZ-P5 – Vibrancy and vitality of the city centre	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed amendments to Policy CCZ-P5. However, Kāinga Ora considered that the policy can be further simplified and still retain the outcome	Seek innovative building design that provides visual interes walkability of the city centre through the use of prominent CCZ-P14 Manage the location and design of new subdivision, use an reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities. Amend Policy CCZ-P6 to simplify the wording, as follows: Encourage the provision of high amenity residential units a
				 (that is, high amenity residential units within the City Centre Zone) that the policy is seeking to enable. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion to references to private open space, storage and outlook space consequential to the deletion sought of those specific standards. Kāinga Ora considers that the proximity of the City Centre to outdoor spaces and amenities is sufficient to provide amenity for residents. 	the provision of high amenity residential <u>units</u> a ground level. This will be achieved by e <u>E</u> nsur <u>eing</u> residential units provide quality outdoor living spaces, <u>outlook spaces, storage space</u> and shape that will enable for the functional use of the unit
82.	CCZ	CCZ-R2 – Alterations to a building exterior	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the permitted activity status for the maintenance and repair of a building exterior or the external alterations less than 25m ² for a building within the City Centre Zones 1 and 2. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the cascade to Restricted Discretionary Activity when compliance cannot be achieved with rule COMZ-R2.1.	Amend rule CCZ-R2 insofar as refining the matters of discre two Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the sa

odation but only on the upper storeys of pedestrian signed in a manner that to ensure active retail and erse sensitivity impacts on commercial activities.

e lakefront along the northern interface of the lake associated with Lake Rotorua.

e as part of the city centre through maintaining

design to pPromote <u>and seek for</u> a vibrant, active ling design.

est and diversity to the streetscape and enhances the nt entrances and different building elements.

and development within each zone to avoid adverse

accommodation within the City Centre 1 zone above

ide good access to sunlight from living rooms, good acces, appropriate noise insulation, and are of a size nits.

retion for non-compliance with CCZ-R2.1 to avoid same rule.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
				However, Kāinga Ora queries why non-compliance with rule CCZ-R2.3 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	
83.	CCZ	CCZ-R3 – Construction of new buildings	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to rule CCZ-R3 to change the activity status from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activity for new buildings within City Centre Zones 1 and 2. However, Kāinga Ora queries why non-compliance with rule CCZ-R3.2 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	Amend rule CCZ-R3 insofar as refining the matters of discretwo Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the sa
84.	CCZ	CCZ-R16 – Residential Units	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-R16. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of the non-compiling activity status for locating residential units within the City Centre 2 Zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-R16, as
85.	CCZ	CCZ-R16A – Conversion of a building to residential units	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed standard CCZ-R16A to enable a framework for the conversion of a building within the City Centre 1 and 2 Zones to a residential unit – where it is not located on the ground floor of Tutanekai Street.	Retain newly proposed standard CCZ-R16A, as notified.
86.	CCZ	CCZ-S1 – Maximum height and daylight envelop	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-S1. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the increases to the maximum permitted height within City Centre Zone 1 from 20m to 32m and supports the proposed 24m height limit for the City Centre 2 and 3 Zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard CCZ-S1, as no
87.	CCZ	CCZ-S3 – Household unit density	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S3 pertaining to household unit densities for the City Centre 1 and 3 Zones.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S3, as notified.
88.	CCZ	CCZ-S4.1 – Minimum size of residential units	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the inclusion of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within the City Centre Zone performance standards. However, Kāinga Ora considers it more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from $35m^2$ to $30m^2$ and 1 or more bedroom units from $45m^2$ to	Amend proposed standard CCZ-S4.1 to decrease the minim 35m ² to 30m ² and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m ² to 40m ² , as <u>Minimum size of residential units:</u> c. <u>The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 3</u> d. <u>The minimum net floor area for 1 or more bedroom</u>

retion for non-compliance with CCZ-R3.2 to avoid same rule.

as notified.

notified.

imum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from as follows:

e 3<mark>50m²</mark> om units shall be 405m²



ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/ Support in Part/	Reasons	Relief Sought Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
			Oppose	40m ² – as consistent with relief sought in the Commercial Zone framework.	
89.	CCZ	CCZ-S4.2 – Outdoor Living Space (per unit)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this standard and considers the City Centre is a zone where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. Deletion sought.	Delete CCZ-S4.2.
90.	CCZ	CCZ-S4.3 – Storage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S4.3 pertaining to storage within residential units.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S4.3, as notified.
91.	CCZ	CCZ-S4.4 – General Amenity – Heating and Ventilation	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S4.4 pertaining to hearing and ventilation within residential units.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S4.4, as notified.
92.	CCZ	CCZ-S4.5 – Outlook Space	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. Deletion sought.	Delete standard CCZ-S4.5.
93.	CCZ	CCZ-S9 – Landscaping	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard CCZ-S9 pertaining to landscaping within the City Centre 2 Zone.	Retain the deletion of standard CCZ-S9, as notified.
94.	CCZ	CCZ-S5 – Parking, access and turning	Neutral	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to standard CCZ-S5 in response to the proposed amendments to the City Centre Zone through PC9. In particular, reference should be made to the specific standards document (and, therefore, the document should be notified pre-notification of plan change).	 Amend standard CCZ-S5 to reference the specific standards [] 1. City Centre 1 Zone and City Centre 3 Zone: a. [] d. All vehicle crossings into local roads shall be provid of document] Rotorua District Council. Where new Highway, written consent from the New Zealand Tr
95.	CCZ	CCZ-MDA – Building design and site layout	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally opposes the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion pertaining to building design and site layout, contained in CCZ-MDA. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified	Amend the proposed amendments to the matters of discress simplified set of matters or as follows: CCZ-MDA Building design and site layout

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text. rds document the standard pertains to, as follows: ided and constructed to the standard of [insert name ew vehicle crossings are proposed onto a State I Transport Agency shall be provided. cretion contained in CCZ-MDA and replace with a



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
				- such as referring back to the various matters of discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings.	 Compliance with the performance standards of the zet Whether the development provides a quality and attr this includes, minimising long expanses of blank walls distinct elements. Techniques to achieve this include and roof form, horizontal and vertical rhythms and fa Whether the building has well proportioned windows size of the building; How the building façade of each tenancy or lot is visu materials and architectural design features; Whether entities within a building's form and façade; The provision of separate pedestrian entranceways fe How all buildings greater than one floor in height are division between the ground floor of a building, the n How servicing and loading is proposed to be managed access for servicing purposes is provided to the rear or access for servicing purposes is provided to the rear of access for servicing purposes is provided to the rear of access for servicing purposes is provided to the the buildings over 25m in height: Whether the building is pedestrians on public streets and public open spaces. The extent to which: The principles of CPTED are implemente of any adjoining road or reserve and cor environment. The amenity of the adjoining properties and enhanced. Whether buildings provide a variety of architectural or maximising doors, windows, and balconies overlookir Whether safe and direct pedestrian access that is eas activities on the site.

zone;1

attractive frontage to the street or public open space, alls and visually breaking the mass of buildings into de the use of recesses, variation in building height facade modulation and articulation;

ws and opening that relate to the shape, form and

isually different through the use of different her tenancies are visually expressed as separate

s for each tenancy or lot;

re designed to ensure a clear visual horizontal e middle portion and the roof line;

ged for buildings that have street frontage. vehicle r of buildings that have street frontage;

idjoining the front boundary (excluding corner sites)

e building façade; or

g is designed to minimise adverse wind conditions for es.

es and location of outdoor activities mitigates on adjoining sites.

nted, including provision for the passive surveillance contribution to an active pedestrian orientated

ies and the properties within the zone is maintained

al detail at ground and middle levels including king the street.

s are designed to maximise outlook over adjoining

easily identifiable is provided from the street to



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
					 14. Whether suitable provision is made for on-site rubbish is sufficiently sized to cater for the rubbish generated collection. For new buildings, rubbish areas should be being altered and this is not possible, the rubbish area appropriately screened. 15. Whether mechanical plant/units for heating and verre the case of residential units, separated from the outor 16. Additional matters for residential units: a. Where residential units are proposed are enable passive surveillance of the adjoin could be achieved by: i. Providing balconies overlooking the ii. Providing a planted setback and/co iii. Fences or landscaping should be headle them to overlook the street of the adjoin good standard of amenity for solar access while balancing the need for natural cross ventilation and the provision of at least one bicycle, we have a storage of at least one bicycle, we have a storage of at least one bicycle, we have a storage of at least one bicycle, we have a storage of at least one bicycle.

bish storage and sorting of recyclable materials, that ted by the activity, and is accessible for rubbish be located within the building. Where a building is areas should not be visible from the street and be

entilation will be screened from public view, and, in utdoor living space for other residential units.

l at ground floor, whether they are designed to joining street and provide privacy for residents. This

; the street;

/or fenced setback where the site adjoins the street.

e low enough to allow for direct sightlines from a alcony;

ate of the ground floor residential units above the height sufficient to provide privacy for residents and reet.

I, proportioned and orientated within a site to or future residents, including by maximising passive

I for buildings to front the street, and encouraging vision of communal open space.

fficient space within the site for the sheltered and , which is conveniently located for users.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
96.	CCZ	CCZ-MD2 – Residential units – specific non-compliance matters	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part, the proposed deletion of matters 1 – 4 from CCZ-MD2 and their replacement with a revised set of matters. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of "furniture" within the matters of discretion when not achieving standard CCZ-S4.1 – minimum size of residential units and seeks deletion of the outdoor living space and outlook space matters consequential to the deletion sought of these provisions within the CCZ.	Amend the matters of discretion for minimum size of resider follows: Standards not achieved Matter of Discretion Minimum size of residential unit 1. Effects on the q 2. Whether the lay room for the da both furniture a 3. Whether each u shared laundry) Outdoor living space 1. Effects on the q 2. Whether the lay room for the da both furniture a 3. Whether each u shared laundry) Outdoor living space 1. Effects on the q 2. Whether the out is of a functiona of residents. Outlook space 1. Privacy effects of a 3. The extent to w unit's habitable activity is place 1. Privacy effects of a
Zone 97.	comz	ercial Introduction	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the introduction section of the Commercial Zones Chapter – specifically, those amendments to the COMZ1, COMZ2, COMZ3, COMZ4 and COMZ6 zone descriptions.	Image: minimised to minimised totaminimised to minimised to minimised to minim

idential units to remove reference to "furniture," as

on		
יוע		n
	J	

quality of on-site living environments

ayout of residential units provides sufficient

day to day needs of residents, including space for the and internal circulation.

n unit has access to communal facilities (e.g. y) and/or storage facilities within the building.

quality of on-site living environments.

outdoor living space is conveniently located and nal size and dimension for the intended number

s on adjacent sites

quality of on-site living environments

which direct overlooking of another residential

le room windows and outdoor living space is

maintain a reasonable standard of privacy,

ugh the design and location of habitable room

conies or terraces, setbacks, or screening.

secondary outlook spaces of a reasonable size

on have been provided from habitable rooms

th an outlook space infringement.

o opportunities for residential units to be provided of 6 descriptions, as notified.

I floor area and building heights from the Ilk and location from the Commercial 4 Zone

esidential' within the Commercial Zone 4



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
98.	COMZ	COMZ-I1 – Commercial Centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the Commercial Centres issue 1 to represent the revised framework resulting from PC9.	Retain the proposed amendments to issue COMZ-I1, as not
99.	COMZ	COMZ-I2 – The design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the design and appearance of buildings issue to represent the revised framework resulting from PC9.	Retain the proposed amendments to issue COMZ-I2, as not
100.	COMZ	COMZ-O2 – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O2. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports recognising that the commercial zone is "mixed-use" with the proposed enablement of residential development above the ground floor within the zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O1, a
101.	COMZ	COMZ-O3 – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports replacing the proposed amendments to Objective COMZ-O3. Specifically, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed replacement of the word "avoids" with "mitigates."	Retain the proposed replacement of the word "avoids" with
102.	COMZ	COMZ-O3A – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the newly proposed Objective COMZ- O3A. The introduction of this objective now establishes a policy framework to recognise the proposed enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial Zone. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the outcomes the proposed objective seeks to achieve.	Retain the newly proposed Objective COMZ-O3A, as notified
103.	COMZ	COMZ-O4 – Commercial activities located within Non- commercial Zones	Neutral	Kāinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Objective COMZ-O4, in response to the proposed amendments to the Commercial Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table.	Amend Objective COMZ-O4, as follows: Subdivision, use and development that enables the continu- activities
104.	COMZ	COMZ-P1 – Commercial centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P1 insofar as enabling increased density and scale of the Commercial Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P1, as notified.

n and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
otified.
otified.
, as notified.
ith "mitigates" in Objective COMZ-O3, as notified.
ïed.
nued efficient operation of existing development and



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
105.	COMZ	COMZ-P2 – Commercial centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Policy COMZ-P2 to enable a range of activities within the Commercial 1 Zone (Ngongotahā Village). In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the word "maintain" from the policy.	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy COMZ-P2, as no
106.	COMZ	COMZ-P5 – City Entranceway Accommodation	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the newly proposed policy COMZ-P5 insofar as the policy recognises the proposed enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial 4 Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P5, as notified.
107.	COMZ	COMZ-P7 – Southern Edge Commercial Centre	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment to Policy COMZ-P7 to introduce the word "residential" into the policy. The policy framework for the Southern Edge Commercial Centre would now provide for the establishment of residential activities – thus responding to the enablement of residential development to locate above ground floor within the Commercial Zone.	Retain the proposed amendment to Policy COMZ-P7 to incl
108.	COMZ	COMZ-P8 – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports proposed Policy COMZ-P8 insofar as it recognises the influence of commercial development on streets and public open spaces.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P8, as notified.
109.	COMZ	COMZ-P10 – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P10 insofar as the policy enables increased density of housing within the Commercial Zone.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P10, as notified.
110.	COMZ	COMZ-P12 – Design and appearance of buildings	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed outcomes sought through proposed Policy COMZ-P12.	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P12, as notified.

notified.

nclude the word "residential", as notified.



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.
	COMZ	COMZ-P13 – Design and appearance of buildings COMZ-P9 – Design and appearance of buildings COMZ-P11 – Design and appearance of buildings COMPZ-P15 – Reverse Sensitivity	Support in part Support in part	 Käinga Ora supports proposed Policy COMZ-P13 insofar as outlining the criteria to achieve 'quality' on site living environments for residential units located within the Commercial Zone. Käinga Ora seeks deletion of reference to private outdoor space and outlook consequential to the relief sought to delete the relevant private open space and outlook standards within the commercial zone. Consequential renumbering will be required. Käinga Ora considers that consequential amendments are necessary to Policies COMZ-P9, COMZ-P11 and COMZ-P15, in response to the proposed amendments to the Commercial Zone through PC9 and as consequential amendments to the relief sought in this submission table. In particular taking the opportunity to providing further clarity to the operative policy framework of the Commercial Zone as it responds to the enablement proposed through PC9. Käinga Ora supports the permitted activity status for the maintenance and repair of a building exterior or the external alterations less than 25m² for a building within the Commercial Zone 5 which currently has no permitted pathway for these activities and therefore would fall under rule COMZ-R1 as a non-complying activity. 	Retain newly proposed Policy COMZ-P13, as notified. a. Require the design of residential buildings to achieve quality on site living environments for people to providing: Private open space that is functional and accessible; A reasonable level of visual privacy and outlook; Safe and convenient pedestrian access to residential units from the street; and Where located outside of commercial centres:
113.	COMZ	COMZ-R2 – Alteration to a	Support in part		Manage the location and design of new subdivision, use and development within each zone to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities. Amend both COMZ-R2.1 and COMZ-R2.3 to include a reference to 'Commercial 5 Zone', as follows:
		building's exterior			Applicable Spatial Layers a. Activity Status: b. Activity Status: All Commercial Zones Permitted Restricted Discretionary Where: Where: Where: Alterations I-In Compliance is not achieved Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and with the performance

le by



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought	
	of Plan		Support in Part/		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for de	etion a
			Oppose		Troposed changes are shown as strikethough for de.	10110110
				In addition, Kāinga Ora supports the cascade to Restricted Discretionary Activity when compliance cannot be achieved with rule COMZ-R2.1 and COMZ-R2.3.	a. <u>The active</u> mainteners of the bu- façade <u>ev</u> b. Do not m external building- otherwis c. <u>External less than</u> Performance a. Height C b. <u>Commer</u> <u>Commer</u> <u>Vards CC</u> c. <u>Commer</u> <u>coverage</u> d. Parking, turning C e. Glazing (and 3 Zo f. Veranda 1, 2, 3 ar COMZ-53 g. Landscap (<u>Commer</u>	nance ar uilding <u>xterior</u> ; nodify f claddir façade se speci lalterat <u>n 25m²</u> . e Stand COMZ-S rcial 1 Z rcial 4 Z OMZS2; rcial 4 Z OMZS2; access COMZ-S comz access COMZ-S (Common ones) CO ahs (Cor nd 6 Zo 8; and ping CC
					Applicable Spatial Layers [] All Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones	

<u>s</u> Are	sta				
and repair	(2) .				
g	Matters of Discretion:				
<u>or</u> ; or	a.	The extent to which the			
y the		activity will avoid,			
ding of the		remedy or mitigate the			
de unless		effects of the non-			
ecified.		compliance on			
rations are		achieving the purpose			
<u>1².</u>		of the relevant			
ndards:		performance standard			
2-S1;		and the objectives and			
L Zone and		policies relevant to the			
1 Zone:		matters of discretion;			
5 <u>2</u> ;	b.	How the degree of non-			
		compliance will reduce			
WZ-S3:		the amenity of the zone			
		and affect adjoining			
ss and		sites;			
Z-S6;	c.	How the activity			
mercial 1,2		provides more efficient			
COMZ-S7;		and practical use of the			
Commercial		remainder of the site;			
Zones)	d.	<u>Height – specific non-</u>			
d		compliance matters			
COMZ-S9		<u>COMZ-MDA</u>			
<u>5 Zone</u>).	e.	Natural hazards COMZ-			
		MD4; and			
	f.	Financial contributions			
		COMZ-MD6			
	[]				


ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought				
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underlined</u> for proposed additional text.				
114.	COMZ	COMZ-R3 – New buildings	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the change from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary Activity for new buildings within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zone. Moreover, Kāinga Ora supports the cascade to Restricted Discretionary Activity when compliance cannot be achieved with rule COMZ-R3.3. However, Kāinga Ora queries why non- compliance with rule COMZ-R3.1 results in the same activity status, albeit a more comprehensive matters of discretion.	Amend rule COMZ-R3 insofar as refining the matters of discretion for non-compliance with COMZ-R3.1 to avoid two Restricted Discretionary Activity cascades within the same rule.				
			Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-R32. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the 'Commercial 6 Zone' within the applicable spatial layers – thus enabling residential units within the Commercial 6 Zone as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the relevant performance standards. However, it is noted that while the 'Commercial 4 Zone' is included within the 'applicable spatial layers' column, it is not listed in the clause 1 'where'. Therefore, Kāinga Ora seeks that reference to the 'Commercial 4 Zone' is included within the 'where' statement for standard COMZ-R33.	Amend standard COMZ-R32 to include reference to the 'Commercial 4 Zone', as follows: Applicable Spatial Layers Commercial 1, 2, 3, and 4 and 6 Zones If the units are in Commercial Zones 1, 2 or 3, 4, or 6 Zones they are not located on the ground floor. Performance Standards: a. B. b. []				
				achieving the purpose of the relevant performance standard and the objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion; b. []					



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought			
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as <mark>stril</mark>	for proposed additional text.		
116	COMZ	COMZ-R33 – Conversion of buildings to residential units	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora seeks that the conversion of buildings into residential units should be a permitted activity within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 zones to align with COMZ-R32 above. Consequentially, this will provide a consolidated list of matters of discretion.	Amend rule COMZ-R33 to a permitter Applicable Spatial Layers Commercial 1, 4 and 5 Zones All Commercial Zones Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones	Activity Status Controlled Restricted Discretionary Permitted a. Height COMZ-S1; b. Yards COMZ-S2; Commercial 4 Zone: Site coverage COMZ-S3; Household unit density COMZ- S4; c. Residential unit design and landscaping COMZ-S5 d. Parking, access and turning COMZ-S6; e. Glazing COMZ-S7 (Commercial 1 Zone); f. Verandahs (Commercial 1 Zones) COMZ-S8; and g. Landscaping COMZ- S9.(Commercial 5 Zone) Matters of Control Discretion: a. Access to a private outdoor living area facing north, east or west. b. Provision for secure storage in a convenient location. c. Mitigation of potential reverse sensitivity effects of the activity on adjoining sites.	Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: Compliance not achieved with the performance standards in COMZ-R33(1). Matters of Discretion: a. The extent to which the activity will avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the non- compliance on achieving the purpose of the relevant performance standard and the objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion; b. How the degree of non- compliance will reduce the amenity of the zone and affect adjoining sites; c. How the activity provides more efficient and practical use of the remainder of the site; d. Building design and site layout COMZ-MD1; e. Residential units – specific non-compliance matters COMZ- MD3; f. Natural hazards COMZ-MD4; and g. Financial contributions COMZ- MD6.	



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought	
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion	
					d. Maintenance of the streetscape at the same and adjace	
117.	COMZ	COMZ-S1 – Maximum height and daylight envelope	Support	Kāinga Ora support the proposed amendments to the performance standard pertaining to maximum height limits in the Commercial Zone. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the proposed increase in height from 12m to 20m in both the Commercial 1 and Commercial 2 zones.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S1, as	
118.	COMZ	COMZ-S2 – Yard requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S2 pertaining to yard requirements within the Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the removal of front and side yard setbacks for Commercial 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 Zones except where the site adjoins a Residential 1 or 2 Zone.	Retain the proposed amendments to standard COMZ-S2, as	
119.	COMZ	COMZ-S3 – Site Coverage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the site coverage performance standard COMZ-S3 from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S3, as notified.	
120.	COMZ	COMZ-S4 – Household unit density	Support	Support the proposed deletion of the household unit density performance standard COMZ-S4 from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S4, as notified.	
121.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.1 – Minimum size of residential units	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the introduction of a standard pertaining to the minimum size of residential units within the Commercial Zone framework. However, Kāinga Ora considers it is more appropriate to lower the minimum net floor area threshold for studio units from 35m ² to 30m ² and 1 or more bedroom units from 45m ² to 40m ² – as consistent with relief sought for the City Centre Zone framework.	Amend proposed standard COMZ-S5.1 to decrease the min 35m ² to 30m ² and a 1 bedroom unit from 45m ² to 40m ² , as <u>Minimum size of residential units:</u> e. <u>The minimum net floor area a studio unit shall be 3</u> f. <u>The minimum net floor area 1 or more bedroom un</u>	
122.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.2 – Outdoor living space (per unit)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this standard and considers the Commercial Zones are zones where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities. Deletion sought.	Delete standard COMZ-S5.2.	

n and	underlined	for	proposed	additional	text
i anu	undernited	101	proposeu	auditional	IEAL.

the amenity	
and sites in	
cent zones.	

, as notified.

, as notified.

ninimum net floor area threshold of a studio unit from as follows:

<u>e 3<mark>50</mark>m²</u> units shall be 4<mark>50</mark>m²



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
123.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.2 – Storage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of standard COMZ-S5.2 pertaining to storage within residential units from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S5.2, as notified.
124.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.3 – General amenity – heating and ventilation	Support	Kāinga Ora support the proposed deletion of standard COMZ-S5.3 pertaining to heating and ventilation within residential units from the Commercial Zone framework.	Retain the deletion of standard COMZ-S5.3, as notified.
125.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.4 – Outlook space	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living. Deletion sought.	Delete standard CCZ-S4.5.
126.	COMZ	COMZ-S5.5 – Landscaped area (Commercial Zone 4)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed standard COMZ-S5.5 pertaining to landscaping for residential units located on the ground floor within the Commercial 4 Zone – recognising residential units can locate on the ground floor of the Commercial 4 Zone as a Discretionary Activity.	Retain newly proposed standard COMZ-S5.5, as notified.
127.	COMZ	COMZ-S6 - Parking access and turning	Neutral	Kāinga Ora considers that COMZ-S6 should refer to the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (or new applicable document).	 Amend standard COMZ-S6 to reference the specific standar [] All Commercial Zones: All vehicle crossings into local roads shall be provided a Infrastructure Technical Specifications Rotorua Districtories onto a State Highway, written consent from the New Zee
128.	COMZ	COMZ-MDA – Height-specific non-compliance matters	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed matters of discretion contained in COMZ-MDA as they relate to non-compliance with the various height standards of the Commercial Zones.	Retain the proposed matters of discretion contained in CON

dards document the standard pertains to, as follows:

d and constructed to the standard of <u>the Regional</u> ict Council. Where new vehicle crossings are proposed v Zealand Transport Agency shall be provided.

COMZ-MDA, as notified.



ID	Section Specific Provision	Sec	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
129	COMZ COMZ-MD1 – Building design and site layout	COI	Support Support	Käinga Ora generally opposes the proposed amendments to the matters of discretion pertaining to building design and site layout, contained in COMZ-MD1. It is considered that the overall framework could be simplified and clarified – such as referring back to the various matters are discretion which are already set out in the activity table listings. Consequential renumbering will be required.	 Delete the proposed amendments to the matters of discretisimplified set of matters. COMZ-MD12 Building design and site layout X How the building provides an active edge though provides that do not consist of mirriquality and attractive frontage to the street or public expanses of blank walls and visually breaking the matterials and attractive frontage to the street or public expanses of blank walls and visually breaking the matterial rhythms and facade modulation and articulat X. Whether the building has well proportioned windows size of the building façade of each tenancy or lot is visumaterials and architectural design features; Whether entities within a building's form and façade, and are through the use of entrances, pedestrian shelter and X. The provision of separate pedestrian entranceways fithan one storey in height are designed to ensure a clefoor of a building, the middle portion and the roof line a. How servicing and loading is proposed to be manage vehicular access for servicing purposes is able to be giftentage. X. Whether the roof line of any portion of a building adjits highlighted though the incorporation of: b. materials different to that used on the building c. architectural design features. X. Whether: a. The location of buildings and structures and Hadverse cumulative effects on adjoining sites
					adverse cumulative et adverse cumulative et a. The principles of CPTED are in

etion contained in COMZ-MD1 and replace with a

Foviding a minimum of 50% of each building storey irrored glass. Whether the development provides a lic open space, this includes, minimising long mass of buildings into distinct elements. Techniques in building height and roof form, horizontal and lation;

ws and opening that relate to the shape, form and

isually different through the use of different her tenancies are visually expressed as separate re located to front and activate the street, including and glazing;

s for each tenancy or lot. How all buildings greater clear visual horizontal division between the ground line.

ged for buildings that have street frontage. How e gained from the rear of buildings that have street

adjoining the front boundary (excluding corner sites)

ding façade or;

d location of outdoor activities mitigates potential <u>es.</u>

g provision for the passive surveillance of any ctive pedestrian orientated environment. Al detail at ground and middle levels including

king the street.



			-	-	
ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion and
			Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as surkethrough for deletion and
					X. <u>Whether internal space at all levels within buildings a</u>
					streets and public open space.
					5. Whether safe and direct pedestrian access that is easily
					activities on the site.
					6. Whether suitable provision is made for on-site rubbish
					is sufficiently sized to cater for the rubbish generated b
					collection. For new buildings, rubbish areas should be k
					being altered and this is not possible, the rubbish areas appropriately screened.
					 Whether mechanical plant/units for heating and ventila the case of residential units, separated from the outdoor
					8. Whether any parking areas visible from the street and s
					landscaping.
					9. <u>Additional matters for residential units:</u>
					a. Where residential units are considered to be ap
					designed to enable passive surveillance of the a
					<u>residents. This could be achieved by:</u>
					i. <u>Providing balconies overlooking the stree</u>
					ii. <u>Providing a planted setback and/or fence</u>
					Fences or landscaping should be low eno
					pedestrian to the front of the balcony;
					iii. <u>Raising the balcony and floor plate of the</u>
					the adjoining street to a height sufficient them to overlook the street.
					b. Whether residential units are located, proport
					good standard of amenity for future residents
					while balancing the need for buildings to from
					ventilation and the provision of communal op
					c. Whether each residential unit has sufficient s
					storage of at least one bicycle, which is conve
130.	COMZ	COMZ-MD3 – Residential units	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports, in part, the proposed deletion of	Amend the matters of discretion for minimum size of resident
		 specific non-compliance 		matters 1 – 4 from COMZ-MD3 and their replacement with	follows:
		matters		a revised set of matters. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the	
				inclusion of "furniture" within the matters of discretion	Standards not achieved Matter of Discre
				when not achieving standard COMZ-S5.1 – minimum size	
				of residential units and seeks deletion of the outdoor living	

ngs are designed to maximise outlook over adjoining

easily identifiable is provided from the street to

bish storage and sorting of recyclable materials, that ted by the activity, and is accessible for rubbish be located within the building. Where a building is areas should not be visible from the street and be

entilation will be screened from public view, and, in utdoor living space for other residential units. and screened from public view by buildings and

be appropriate at ground floor, whether they are the adjoining street and provide privacy for

street;

enced setback where the site adjoins the street. enough to allow for direct sightlines from a

of the ground floor residential units above the level of cient to provide privacy for residents and enable

oportioned and orientated within a site to provide a dents, including by maximising passive solar access front the street, and encouraging natural cross al open space.

ent space within the site for the sheltered and secure onveniently located for users.

idential units to remove reference to "furniture," as

<u>iscretion</u>



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought	
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethroug	gh for deletion a
				space and outlook space matters consequential to the deletions sought of these provisions within the COMZ.	Yards – side and rear yards sites adjoining residential and rural zones	1. <u>Visual dor</u> neighbour
					Minimum size of residential unit	 Effects on Whether Sufficient including circulation Whether Whether (e.g. share the buildi
					Outdoor living space	1. Effects on 2. Whether located an the intend
					Outlook space	 <u>Privacy eff</u> <u>Effects on</u> <u>The exten</u> <u>residentia</u> <u>outdoor li</u> <u>reasonabl</u> <u>design an</u> <u>balconies</u> <u>Whether</u> <u>reasonabl</u> <u>from habi</u> <u>space infr</u>
131.	COMZ	COMZ-AER11 – Anticipated Environmental Results	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed anticipated environmental result pertaining to increasing residential activity within centre and commercial areas, where permitted.	Retain the newly proposed anticipated envir	ronmental resul
Deve	lopment A	reas	1			

lominance, privacy, and shading effects on ouring sites.	
on the quality of on-site living environments er the layout of residential units provides nt room for the day to day needs of residents, og space for both furniture and internal ion.	
er each unit has access to communal facilities ared laundry) and/or storage facilities within ding.	
on the quality of on-site living environments.	
er the outdoor living space is conveniently and is of a functional size and dimension for ended number of residents.	
effects on adjacent sites	
on the quality of on-site living environments	
ent to which direct overlooking of another	
tial unit's habitable room windows and r living space is minimised to maintain a	
able standard of privacy, including through the and location of habitable room windows,	
es or terraces, setbacks, or screening.	
er any secondary outlook spaces of a able size and orientation have been provided	
i bitable rooms associated with an outlook ifringement	
sults AER-11, as notified.	



ID	Section	Specific Provision	Support/	Reasons	Relief Sought
	of Plan		Support in Part/ Oppose		Proposed changes are shown as strikethrough for deletion a
132.	PHDA	Pukehāngi Heights Development Area Wharenui Development Area	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to the Pukehāngi Heights Development Area and the Wharenui Development Area to integrate and implement the Housing Supply Act.	Retain the proposed amendments to the development area MDRS and seek to integrate and implement the requiremer
Арре	endices – P	arking Access and Turning			
133.	APP1	4B – Information requirement for a Transport Assessment (20-100 residential units or lots)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to APP1.4B to require a transport assessment for 20 or more residential units and considers that in the case of land use consent applications, thresholds for Integrated Transportation Assessments should be tied to number of car parking spaces rather than number of units – noting each residential unit is not required to provide on-site car parking.	Delete the transport assessment requirements in full and reassessment however, the trigger for this assessment should residential units. <u>A transport assessment is a simple review of the effects of a surrounding the site and must be prepared by a suitably quadof the development on the safe and efficient operation of the road network can accommodate relevant service vehicles (vemergency service vehicles.</u> <u>A transport assessment is required for a subdivision or land</u> <u>lots on a site and up to 100 carparks or more residential unit</u> <u>Assessment will be required in accordance with APP1 (4)(a)</u> .

reas where they are consistent with the prescribed nents of the Housing Supply Act, as notified.

retain the requirement for an integrated transport uld be tied to 100 on-site carparks, rather than 100

of a development on the road network immediately qualified person. Its purpose is to assess the effects f the adjacent road network, including ensuring the s (waste collection trucks, delivery trucks) and

nd use consent for 20 or more residential units or units or lots, above which an Integrated Transport (a).



Appendix 2: Maps

The following maps set out the amendments sought from Kāinga Ora to PC9.



Rd Springfield JACKSON PARK	Springfield Rd	0101 2014	no Rd	ROTORUA GOLF CLUB Hemo	Rd 30	3	Whakar	ewarewa:
Kāinga Ora Proposed Changes	City Centre 1 Zone City Centre 2 Zone	Reserve 1 Zone Reserve 2 Zone		Map Scale @ A3: 10,000	N	Revision	1.0	Kāinga Ora Proposed
RLC Notified PC9 Zone Changes	City Centre 3 Zone	Reserve 3 Zone	0	250	500	Status Author	Final JS	Zoning
b Medium Density Standards	Commercial 2 Zone	Residential 1 Zone		200		Verifier Date	JFH 10/10/2022	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Applied	Commercial 3 Zone	Residential 2 Zone		Metres		Dale	10/10/2022	Plan Change 9 - Rotorua Central
Rezoned to Residential 2 Zone	Commercial 4 Zone	Residential 3 Zone						
High density zoning (5-6	Commercial 5 Zone	Road		ains data derived in part or wholly from ca, and therefore, no representations				
storeys)	Commercial 6 Zone	Rural 1 Zone	are made by E	Beca as to the accuracy or completene	ess of this	Project Client	PC9 Submission Kāinga Ora	
Rezoned to Residential 1 Zone	Industrial 1 Zone	Water Zone		ontains information sourced from Rote n Copyright Reserved. Esri Communi		Discipline	GIS	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities
Business and Innovation 1 Zone	Industrial 1E Zone		Contributors, I	INZ, Eagle Technology, Esri, HERE, IETI/NASA, USGS. Map intended for	Ġarmin,	Drawing N	o. GIS-4281218-R1	Homes and Communities



Appendix 3: Matters of Discretion for Residential 1 and 2 Zones

The following provides proposed wording for standard RESZ-MDA, as sought from Kāinga Ora as part of the submission on PC9.

Please note that the layout of this section does not follow the layout of the existing rule framework and plan structure – noting difference in how standards are named / combined.

Kāinga Ora seeks the proposed provisions are re-structured to align with the plan structure and chapter format, along with incorporating any references to existing matters.



Proposed RESZ-MDA Residential Units – specific non-compliance matters

<u>Standard</u>	Activity Status where compliance not achieved
Building Height	 <u>Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed:</u> <u>Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u> <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects;</u> <u>Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; and</u> <u>Wind effects (where a building exceeds 25m).</u>
Height in relation to boundary	 <u>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</u>
<u>Yards</u>	 <u>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</u>
Building coverage	 <u>Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed:</u> <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u>
Outdoor living space (per unit)	 <u>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</u> <u>The extent to which:</u> <u>Any proposed outdoor living space provides a good standard of amenity relative to the number of occupants the space is designed for;</u> <u>Other on-site factors compensate for a reduction in the size or dimension of the outdoor living space; and</u> <u>The availability of public open space in proximity to the site.</u>
Outlook Space (per unit)	 <u>Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:</u> <u>The extent to which:</u> <u>Acceptable levels of natural light are provided</u> to habitable rooms; and <u>The design of the proposed unit provides a healthy</u> <u>living environment.</u>



Windows to Street	Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:
	 <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>Passive surveillance and safety.</u>
Landscaped area	Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed:
	 <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>Hard surfacing is minimised as far as practicable.</u>
Fences and Walls	Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed:
	 <u>Streetscape and visual amenity effects;</u> <u>Passive surveillance to the street, public open space</u> or public walkway; and