

**Appendix 2**  
**Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning**  
**Submissions Summary Report**

The following report provides a summary of submissions on Proposed Variation 4 to the Proposed Hastings District Plan. It has been prepared for use in the hearing of submissions, and to fulfill the requirements of Schedule 1 Clause 83(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act, 1991.

Sub #	Submitter Name	Submission Type	Summary submission points	Summary relief sought
1	Tom Harper	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support no build/earthworks / planting area on lots 14 and 15 Iona Plateau.</li> <li>2. Seeks additional amendments with respect to proposed development in the Iona Plateau neighbourhood to protect current property features.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks extension of no build / earthworks / planting area on lot 14 so that it protects privacy of an outdoor area.</li> <li>2. A mutually agreed height restriction for planting in the no build zone.</li> <li>3. Seeks height restrictions on lots 16,17 &amp; 18, and that ideally lots 15, 16, 17, 18 would be terraced down so as not to obstruct views.</li> </ol>
2	Vicki Gold	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern that the proposed development will place increased pressure on existing services and facilities of Havelock North that currently are inadequate or struggle to cope with existing population. These services / facilities include: Primary schools; Supermarket; and Medical services.</li> <li>2. Parking in the village centre is also insufficient.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A guarantee from MoE that a new primary school will be part of the proposed housing development.</li> <li>2. A new additional supermarket is agreed, approved and built.</li> <li>3. Concrete plans are in place to provide adequate medical coverage for the potential increase in population.</li> <li>4. A comprehensive plan is established to address the increase in traffic management in the Havelock North Village.</li> </ol>
3	Edward Hamilton	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No need for rezoning, no evidence of natural population growth requiring such a development.</li> <li>2. A development of such a scale will ruin the character of Havelock North village and beauty of wider surroundings.</li> <li>3. The development will place severe pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>4. More schools will be needed.</li> <li>5. More traffic through the village (which is at times already congested) and on Gilpin Rd which could become dangerous.</li> <li>6. Stormwater / rubbish pollution will be a problem particularly on the west side of Gilpin Road.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Iona Variation should be abandoned and the rezoning of 55ha be stopped.</li> </ol>
4	Stuart Rattray	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the overall variation for the Breadalbane Area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezoning of the area from Rural Residential to Residential.</li> </ol>

5	David and Colleen Youngquest	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support open space and walkways.</li> <li>2. Support retention of width and contour and character of Iona Road.</li> <li>3. Support reduced number of roads exiting onto Iona Rd.</li> <li>4. Support concept of larger sections on the outside and more density inside, with a mix of housing typologies, encourage variety and innovation. No cookie cutter housing or blocks of dwellings.</li> <li>5. Limit fence heights.</li> <li>6. Concern re potential for traffic along Middle Road and through the Middle Rd / Porter Drive intersection to increase.</li> <li>7. Improvement to public transport, cycle lanes and reduced speeds are important.</li> <li>8. Concerns of Increased traffic and speed along Margaret Avenue.</li> <li>9. Concern re effects of heavy traffic along Iona Road during construction.</li> <li>10. More green space internal to the Bull Hill neighbourhood.</li> <li>11. Consideration of parking, toilets and playground within the reserve areas.</li> <li>12. Rather than a permanent commercial structure provision could be made for a mobile supplier.</li> <li>13. Minimal street lighting to protect view of the night sky.</li> <li>14. Don't allow access to the upper Iona plateau to be gated or accessed via a private road.</li> <li>15. Density in Breadalbane Ave area – anything less than 1000m<sup>2</sup> would not maintain special character.</li> <li>16. Height of dwellings and structures to be considered in respect of impacts on adjoining properties (Breadalbane Ave area).</li> <li>17. Supports stormwater neutrality but concerned at how neutrality measured.</li> <li>18. Support retention of trees generally.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request standard to limit fence height and variety.</li> <li>2. Want some protection mechanism put in place to ensure that the no exit road shown on the structure plan in the Bull Hill neighbourhood will not be extended to Iona Road at some future date.</li> <li>3. Section sizes in Breadalbane not reduced from 1000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>4. Heavy traffic restrictions along Iona Road during development.</li> <li>5. Mitigate effects of street lighting.</li> <li>6. Existing mature and large trees protected in general.</li> <li>7. Ensure Iona Road retains its existing character as much as possible.</li> </ol>
---	------------------------------	------------------------	---	--

6	David MacCallum	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the plan and layout, playground and reserve areas and retention of the avenue of trees.</li> <li>2. Supports rezoning of their own land partly as Area D Iona Terraces and partly Bull Hill neighbourhood.</li> <li>3. Seeks an extension to the Bull Hill neighbourhood to enable a more efficient use of the narrow part of his property that adjoins Iona Rd.</li> <li>4. Seeks the provision of an access point off the main spine road into the property at 155 Iona Road to enable the rear part of the site to have a separate access, rather than using the existing Iona Rd access point.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Bull Hill neighbourhood is extended as per attached plan or in a similar fashion.</li> <li>2. That a road access point be identified on the structure plan provided access to the property at 155 Iona Rd as per or in a similar fashion to the attached plan.</li> </ol>
7	Pete Wynne-Lewis	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposes variation and provisions as sees the area on the western side of Brookvale Road as a better option for development and one that should proceed ahead of the Iona area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks that the Brookvale area be rezoned ahead of Iona.</li> </ol>
8	Thomas and Karen Dear	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns regarding stormwater management, particularly Outlet I.</li> <li>2. Historic ponding issues on site, creation of land drainage across property.</li> <li>3. Would like piping of open drainage network through their property.</li> <li>4. Comprehensive Structure plan should be developed including all land between Middle Rd and Te Aute Road.</li> <li>5. Lower density housing.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the stormwater piped directly from outlet I to the to the storage facility and the overflow piped directly to the HBRC cross country drain.</li> <li>2. That the housing density of this area be lowered to help with stormwater runoff and to keep the present aesthetic qualities of this area intact.</li> <li>3. That a comprehensive structure plan be done for the whole area from Iona Rd to Te Aute Rd and bordered by Gilpin Road.</li> </ol>
9	Robert and Nicky Gardner	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stormwater management concerns with focus on Outlet G, Bull Hill and Breadalbane Ave.</li> <li>2. Don't think that the drainage as proposed will cope with the amount of water and concerned that their property will flood.</li> <li>3. Concerned about ongoing maintenance of open drainage network through their property and would like piping of open drain along the boundary of their property.</li> <li>4. Gilpin Rd not adequate to cope with the increased volume of traffic.</li> <li>5. Gilpin Rd needs upgrading and a wider bridge.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gilpin Road needs upgrading, a wider bridge and drainage done properly.</li> <li>2. Would like assurance that if their property gets flooded that the damage will be fixed.</li> <li>3. Wants drain running along their property boundary to be piped.</li> </ol>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Need more schools / supermarket.</li> <li>7. Concerned how traffic from the new development will impact movement through the village.</li> </ol>	
<b>10</b>	Brian and Jackie Mills	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stapleford Park is an existing established quality residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>2. It is unreasonable for two storey houses on the new development to be built within 50+ metres of Stapleford Park or be overlooked.</li> <li>3. The existing treelined boundary provides privacy and should be retained as part of the development and maintained by the developer.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No two storey houses to be built within a 50m radius of Stapleford Park.</li> <li>2. The existing tree lined boundaries to be retained around Stapleford Park and maintained by the developer.</li> </ol>
<b>11</b>	Peter Maidens	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly support rezoning of their property at 78 Lane Road and the provision of access through the proposed development.</li> <li>2. Assuming our land is rezoned we would also strongly support the use of our quarter owned access lot for service and pedestrian access to create a loop walk.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the proposed portion of land within 78 Lane Road is rezoned with access through the proposed development.</li> </ol>
<b>12</b>	Phillip Appleford	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oppose the rezoning of Breadalbane Ave as this is already a special character area (beautiful/peaceful) and will be ruined by more housing.</li> <li>2. Iona Road should be left to run straight through as it is to Middle Rd and that the land from the Bull Hill to the crossroads be left bare.</li> <li>3. Keeping Iona Road as it is currently will keep a good flow of traffic down Iona Rd and the lower triangle area could be used as a recreational area being part of the Bull Hill reserve improving the amenity of this area.</li> <li>4. Havelock North is losing its identity due to constant expansion, wants to keep Havelock North a unique place.</li> <li>5. Concern at what impact the development will have on traffic within the Havelock North village.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks that Breadalbane Special Character Area not be rezoned.</li> <li>2. Seeks that Iona Road be left as it is to run down to the crossroads and that no houses are built in the lower triangle area.</li> </ol>

13	Jamie Wilson	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oppose having land made available for sections next to my house. It will devalue my property, my privacy will be taken away also my view of the gully with native birds.</li> <li>2. Rezoning will destroy a quaint, quiet area. There is plenty of other vacant land out there.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the rezoning of the Breadalbane Avenue Special Character Area doesn't go ahead.</li> </ol>
14	Geoff Gage	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Support the Breadalbane Avenue portion of the Iona Development Area.</li> <li>2. The specifications stated in the variation align with our perception of how the Avenue will evolve.</li> <li>3. We request flexibility in section sizes to work around odd shaped land and to also accommodate established trees. This request was included in the variation document.</li> <li>4. It has been our wish to retain the character of the Avenue with its established trees and more rural style of properties. The Council has put in place conditions that allow us to retain that country feel.</li> <li>5. We will continue to work with the Council team to bring our vision to fruition.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confirm Council recommendations contained in Variation 4.</li> </ol>
15	Dale Prebble	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned that the location of the cul-de-sac head (shown within the boundaries of 66 and 78 Lane Rd) will create difficulties for both property owners in terms of the timing of subdivision development.</li> <li>2. Concern regarding the impact of the development on the intersection at Middle Rd / Porter Drive.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The cul-de-sac head at the bottom of 66 Lane Road needs to be located on the developers land.</li> <li>2. The transport assessment needs to be revisited to include traffic on the 3 roundabouts between the end of Middle Road and the bridge over the Karamu Stream.</li> <li>3. Long term solutions needs to be considered for access between Havelock North and Hastings to avoid turning the special character of the village into just another city suburb.</li> </ol>
16	Peter and Lois Rutter	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include a requirement that all activities comply with the structure plan and that this is legally binding on the developer and any subsequent developer.</li> <li>2. Request a 10m setback for any buildings from the Rural Residential Zone boundary.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the following amendments be enshrined in the Structure Plan to reduce noise, light pollution and loss of privacy. Reverse sensitivity will also be addressed by these amendments:</li> </ol>

			<p>3. That the main spine road have the following characteristics:</p> <p>(a) the carriageway alongside Lot 3 DP 28810 to be laid in hot mix asphalt or similar low noise material;</p> <p>(b) provision of low profile speed bumps on the spine road;</p> <p>(c) That the avenue of trees planted along the spine road shall be evergreen and not deciduous;</p> <p>(d) That flax plants be planted on developer's side of the common boundary providing a privacy buffer.</p>	<p>a) Legal covenants be put in place to ensure compliance with the structure plan;</p> <p>b) Seeks a 10m setback for buildings within the zone adjoining rural residential properties;</p> <p>c) Changes to the structure plan to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low noise material to seal spine road;</li> <li>• Provide low profile speed humps on spine road</li> <li>• The avenue of trees on the spine road should be evergreen;</li> <li>• That flax plants be planted on the developers' side of the common boundary of Lot 3 DP 28810 and the spine road to provide a privacy buffer.</li> </ul>
17	Noel Martin-Smith	Oppose	<p>1. Concerns that opening Reynolds Rd (currently no exit) to service the new subdivision will create unacceptable levels of traffic on Reynolds Rd and Breadalbane Rd.</p> <p>2. The MWH traffic impact assessment report (TIA) is flawed as it ignores the impact of the proposed development on Reynolds Rd and Breadalbane Rd.</p> <p>3. The TIA does not consider the impact of the rezoning of Breadalbane Avenue.</p> <p>4. The TIA references traffic counts that are outdated, estimated and/or irrelevant.</p>	<p>1. The proposed development should not be allowed to proceed until a full and thorough investigation (ie actual traffic counts over a period of time and not hypothetical models and/or nine hour traffic counts on a single road) has been conducted.</p>
18	Brian Rickford	Support with amendment	<p>1. This submission does not support non-residential uses in the Havelock North Rural Residential Zone and requests amendments to policies, rules and assessment criteria of this zone.</p>	<p>1. Amendments to the following Havelock North Rural Residential Zone Policies, rules and assessment criteria in relation to non-residential activities.</p>
19	Barry and Tanja Huxford	Support with amendment	<p>1. Strongly opposed to any dwelling other than single storey along the South and East boundaries of Stapleford Park as this will largely impact on the privacy and light of our property.</p> <p>2. The hedging surrounding Stapleford Park should be removed as it also impacts on the amount of sun we receive. This should be replaced by fencing no higher than 1.8m.</p>	<p>1. Dwellings no higher than single storey to be built surrounding Stapleford Park.</p> <p>2. Removal of existing hedging</p>

20	HB Mountain Bike Club and Bennelong MTB Club	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is submitted that the pathways through the site should be identified as either shared pathways (walkways / cycle trails) or that there should be scope to provide separate trails for each mode through the reserve.</li> <li>2. Provision should be incorporated to facilitate future access from the reserve to Endsleigh Road by indicating a shared track or separate tracks along the western extent of the reserve boundary.</li> <li>3. Amend Policy ITP 5 so that it accommodates the potential for other or multiple modes through identifying pedestrian linkages and routes as off-road recreational corridors.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks amendments to the Structure Plan and to Policy ITP5 to facilitate the opportunity for pedestrian and off-road recreational linkages passing through the Reserve open space between Lane Road and Middle Road and to establish opportunity for future linkages through to Endsleigh Road.</li> </ol>
21	M and R Dixon	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the need for subdivisions to maintain the special character and amenity of the area as is reflected in Policies ISCP2, ISCP5, ISCP7.</li> <li>2. Support the following objectives and policies: ITO1, ITO3, ITP4, ITP7, ITP9 and ITP10.</li> <li>3. It is noted that the zone boundary of 78 Lane Road follows the natural contour of the ridgeline rather than the legal boundaries of the site.</li> <li>4. In contrast to the north of 78 Lane Rd the zone boundary departs from the ridgeline and instead follows the legal boundaries of the properties at 6, 8 and 50 Lane Rd and 151 and 153 Iona Road such that the rural residential zone boundary includes parts of the western flanks of the ridgeline despite these areas not being visible from Lane Rd.</li> <li>5. The areas not included in the Variation 4 rezoning and that are not visible from Lane Rd total approximately 2.4ha.</li> <li>6. It is submitted that in order to more accurately reflect the topographical features of the land and to obtain the greatest development yield while maintaining amenity and character of the Lane Road corridor that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zone boundary be amended to following the line of the ridge through the site at 6, 8 and 50 Lane Rd and 151 and</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve the variation with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Amend the structure plan to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show a structure road from Iona Rd generally following the existing access through to adjoin the site at 50 Lane Rd</li> <li>• Realign the Area D / Rural residential zone boundary to follow the ridgeline such that the entire western flank of the ridge falls within Area D irrespective of legal boundaries.</li> </ul> </li> <li>(b) Amend Policy ISCP7 as follows: <p>“Ensure the physical boundaries of the Iona Special Character Zone clearly mark the edge of the urban and rural residential area’s and provide a robust defence against applications for urban subdivision and development outside these boundaries that are not identified within the Hawkes Bay Regional Policy Statement for greenfield urban development.</p> </li> <li>(c) Add the following to provision 30.1.7V: <p><u>Within the Iona Terraces</u> Neighbourhood Area D all additional sites shall be accessed from Iona Road via the structure plan road in Appendix 13A. The access design (legal width and formation) shall be sufficient to service the projected residential density of sites access via the</p> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>



			<p>153 Iona Road such that the entire western flank of the ridge becomes zoned Iona Terrace Neighbourhood – Area D;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure plan identifying a structure road into Area D from Iona Road and the supporting provisions requiring that any additional sites created by subdivision shall be provided with access from Iona Road via the structure road;</li> <li>• At the time of any subdivision the structure road shall be provided in a manner that does not preclude projected zone density beyond the site being subdivided from being achieved (in terms of legal access width, formation and the allocation of legal access rights and legal provision for services conveyance).</li> </ul> <p>7. In its current form and in relation to the sites at 6, 8, 50 Lane Road and 151 and 153 Iona Road the proposed zone boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not achieve the greatest potential residential site yield that could be achieved whilst also maintaining Lane Road rural residential amenity values;</li> <li>• Does not represent the most efficient use of land in the manner indicated by HPUDS and the Regional Resource Management Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>structure plan road. No access will be allowed to additional sites off lane road.</p> <p>(d) Any other consequential and/or other changes necessary to address the matters identified in this submission.</p>
22	David Oliver	Oppose in its present form	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oppose the Iona rezoning in its present form.</li> <li>2. Propose that 151 Iona Rd be included in the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood Area D or in a similar fashion to the Iona Plateau neighbourhood (blue zone).</li> <li>3. The rezoning of 151 Iona Rd would recognise that it was land identified for subdivision and rezoning under HPUDS.</li> <li>4. Under the current rezoning proposal our land would be surrounded by dense rezoning of land in a horseshoe pattern.</li> <li>5. Development of new zones should occur in a consistent pattern not an erratic manner excluding particular properties.</li> <li>6. In the Havelock Hills each rural residential spine road has dense housing at the beginning of the spine (eg Te Mata Rd, Tauroa Rd,</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks inclusion of 151 Iona Road in the Iona Special Character Zone allowing 2-5 lots of 2000m<sup>2</sup>-8000m<sup>2</sup> sharing access via the existing access to Iona Road or to Lane Road.</li> </ol>

			<p>Kopanga Rd and Margaret Ave. The proposal to preserve lower lane road is inconsistent with current development history.</p> <p>7. We enter our property via Iona Rd by way of ROW. While our land fronts Lane Rd we do not have access by driveway. We therefore feel part of the Iona neighbourhood not Lane Rd.</p> <p>8. There are now a number of visible dwellings in lower Lane Rd (10) with more to come. Two properties are 2500m<sup>2</sup> and one 5400m<sup>2</sup>. Subdivision into smaller lot sizes would be consistent with these lot sizes and would serve as a transitional area from dense urban housing to full rural residential of middle and upper Lane Rd.</p> <p>9. We resent maintaining the appearance of our paddock / property for the gratification of Lane Road residents resistant to progress and development over the need for Council to house our growing population.</p> <p>10. Under the present proposal we are providing a spillover benefit to residents passing up Lane Road, but no benefits accrue to ourselves due to our location and views of urban dwellings and the new housing in our vicinity.</p> <p>11. Exclusion of our land is unfair and unreasonable to us, given our location and proximity to the development.</p>	
<b>23</b>	Jeremy Cranswick	Support with amendment	<p>1. Lot 13 is currently positioned in the centre of our outlook and more importantly with the elevation of the current proposed site up on the hill in front and above our property at 140 Lane Rd it will negatively impact the privacy of our home and living.</p> <p>2. The current restricted build / earthworks area on Lot 13 retains the current ridgeline surrounding the subdivision. This seems to favour the outlook of landowners who are quite some distance away and likely more elevated than the relevant ridgeline over the interests of a landowner who has a proposed building site 15m from their rural property.</p> <p>3. Current plan requires compulsory planting on large part of Lot 13 which includes the ridgeline. This means that the existing ridgeline is not going to be able to be seen due to the plantings. Therefore could the ridgeline be altered slightly without any long term impact</p>	<p>1. House site on Lot 13 Iona Plateau moved towards the western boundary of the Iona Plateau and into the current proposed restricted build/earthworks area (shown with blue shading on the current Masterplan Appendix 13A Figure 3).</p> <p>2. A height restriction of the house site with reference to the current topography. A restriction on roof height (and perhaps platform / floor height) should ensure privacy is achieved.</p> <p>3. A maximum height for the screening vegetation in front of 140 Lane Rd for areas not required for privacy.</p>

			to neighbouring landowners. Any impact on neighbouring landowners would be temporary until plantings grow, however a house site right in front of our property and impacting our privacy is permanent.	
24	Josephine & Simon Beamish	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the retention of special character features in the variation – including specifically the valley areas of ponds, and planted area; rural standards for road formation and street lighting; site coverage restrictions, building setbacks, building height and offset yards.</li> <li>2. In the Iona Plateau support boundary planting, the set building platforms, and the restriction on earthworks and fencing standards and would like assurance that these will be adhered to by the developer.</li> <li>3. Support the no car access to or from the subdivision area to Lane Road.</li> <li>4. Concerned density is too high in Iona Terraces and Bull Hill neighbourhoods and that this will create major noise and traffic issues.</li> <li>5. After planting much of the area in conjunction with others would like to continue to be involved in the development of the middle ridge reserve and wetland area including options to fence this area off from adjoining rural residential properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supportive of the variation but concerned with adverse effects of noise and traffic and would like to see details of how these issues will be managed.</li> <li>2. Would like their water easement acknowledged over land in the structure plan.</li> <li>3. Would like to be kept informed and involved in reserve development.</li> <li>4. Assurance that the developer will adhere to standards in the Iona Plateau including: boundary planting, the set building platforms, earthworks restrictions, fencing standards.</li> </ol>
25	David and Elizabeth Ashby	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Considerable concerns about our loss of privacy resulting from the proposed new housing in the Iona Terraces and Bull Hill areas. Although we appreciate having an open space rather than houses next to our property we do not feel comfortable with the proposed walking track on or near the ridgeline. We strongly request that the walking track be at the base of the hill or on the eastern side of the ridge below the ridgeline. This way the hillside would retain its natural appearance from the western side without a track and would help mitigate the feeling of being look down upon.</li> <li>2. We would like to see all existing trees and planting on the proposed reserve area retained, including the toetoe along out boundary.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Height restrictions placed on all new buildings, particularly in the Iona Terraces areas A, B and C so that new buildings cannot reach a height that will interrupt sightline from Western side.</li> <li>2. That any new walking track in the open space area be constructed at the base of or on the eastern side of the ridge so as to retain the natural appearance of the hillside from the west.</li> <li>3. That all existing planting in the reserve area be retained.</li> </ol>

			<p>3. It is very important to us that building platforms near the top of the ridgeline be well below the ridgeline itself and that strict height restrictions be in place, so as not to just mitigate privacy but also so that the proposed houses will be below the sightline of our property.</p>	
26	Christopher Miles	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed platform sites for lots 9, 10, 12 and 13 of the Iona Plateau were to be situated on the eastern side of the ridge. This would assist in screening these house sites from the existing lifestyle blocks adjacent to them on Endsleigh Road.</li> <li>2. The structure plan shows the proposed building platforms for these lots situated very close to or crossing the ridgeline in question.</li> <li>3. While provision has been made for tree planting on the western slopes of this ridge up from the western Endsleigh Road boundary, these plantings will have little or no effect on the screening of two-storied properties that may be built on the proposed platforms.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seek the relocation of building platforms on lots 9, 10, 12, and 13 in the Iona Plateau neighbourhood further east and lower down the eastern side of the ridge.</li> <li>2. Another option in conjunction with the above request is to restrict lots 9, 10 and 12 to be single storied.</li> </ol>
27	William Davidson	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Present drainage of stormwater is inadequate and during prolonged wet weather the existing drains cannot cope with the volume of water and ponding occurs on our properties.</li> <li>2. Stormwater from rezoning area will adversely affect stormwater runoff and ponding on our land and the whole area from Iona Road to Te Aute Rd.</li> <li>3. The Iona land is hilly and elevated above our properties on Middle Road.</li> <li>4. We are concerned that according to the structure plan the release of all stormwater from the four neighbourhoods is to be based on existing ponds, swales and site retention. During periods of rain our private drains have over flowed due to stormwater from opposite neighbouring properties.</li> <li>5. Major earthworks will take place during development which will no doubt result in larger volumes of runoff into the existing stormwater outlets to Middle Road.</li> <li>6. When the Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) is provided at subdivision stage it should include or show improvements to the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No stormwater to be diverted from outlet D to Outlet E</li> <li>2. Less or no greater stormwater discharge at outlet E</li> <li>3. A retention pond should be located on the stormwater path near outlet D</li> <li>4. Want assurance that the discharge of stormwater will be no greater than predevelopment flow and that no further flooding takes place on our properties due to the rezoning of the Iona land.</li> </ol>

			<p>stormwater at Outlet F by diverting the stormwater from the stapleford complex off our property at 166 Middle Road into the road side drain.</p> <p>7. Location of Outlet F (sometimes referred to as Outlet I) is shown incorrectly on the Structure Plan. Outlet F is situated further north on Middle Road, halfway between the existing driveway (later to become the treed avenue) of the Lowes and the Stapleford Park complex.</p> <p>8. The present rural drainage network is not able to cater or copy with residential intensification and is not within the Hastings District Council urban drainage system.</p> <p>9. Ideally our rural stormwater network should be piped.</p>	
<b>28</b>	Hawkes Bay Regional Council	Support with reservations	<p>1. Not convinced that the rezoning and associated stormwater infrastructure planning in place is sufficiently sound.</p> <p>2. There is not a clear and effective solution to mitigating effects of increased stormwater discharges at Outlet D arising from the future development of the land.</p>	<p>1. Further assessment be undertaken on methods to address stormwater discharges particularly outlet D so that effects of any increased stormwater runoff from the development area on downstream properties and infrastructure are properly mitigated.</p> <p>2. Variation 4 be approved subject to amendments to address matters raised in the submission.</p>
<b>29</b>	Tahimana Private Residences Ltd	support	<p>1. Supports rezoning of Breadalbane Ave to Havelock North Character Residential Zone with a special character overlay.</p> <p>2. Supports density of 1 per 10m2 in this special character area.</p>	<p>1. Seek that the rezoning of Breadalbane Ave to Havelock North Character Residential Zone with a special character overlay with a density of 1: 1000m2 be approved.</p>
<b>30</b>	Hastings District Council	Support with Amendment	<p>1. 8.1 Havelock North SMA Remove reference to RCL6 within 8.1.2.3 The Iona Neighbourhoods Environments.</p> <p>2. Rule Table 8.3.3.1 Rule ISC10 and proposed new rules. Amend wording and rule structure to encourage comprehensive residential developments where subdivision and land use consent processing is integrated or where the location of parent sites for comprehensive residential development has been identified and approved as part of the initial overall subdivision application (see further discussion below) for areas A and B in the Bull Hill neighbourhood. See attachment for Areas A and B.</p>	<p>1. Relief sought is as per summary submission points column.</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Rule ISC13 – amend wording. Controlled Activities should be included to ensure that if any general or specific performance standards are not met that these activities are elevated to a higher status.</li> <li>4. 8.3.4E Stormwater - Insert a specific commercial coefficient for stormwater runoff for the commercial activities on the commercial node within the Bull Hill neighbourhood.</li> <li>5. 8.3.5A Residential Density – Bull Hill. Amend the density standard so that it aligns with existing density standards for urban development areas but exclude comprehensive residential development as it is not appropriate for this development type.</li> <li>6. 8.3.5B Residential Density Iona Terraces Amend the density standard so that it aligns with existing density standards for urban development areas.</li> <li>7. 8.3.5D Yards (except Comprehensive Residential Development Activities) Amend the Side yard rule by inserting a diagram to assist with the interpretation and administration of the rule.</li> <li>8. 8.3.5I Fencing adjoining land zoned Open Space Amend to clarify what is meant by open style.</li> <li>9. 8.3.6G Supplementary Residential Buildings Amend wording to clarify that density and outdoor living space standards do not apply to supplementary dwellings.</li> <li>10. 8.3.6H Amend wording of standard in relation to the sale of liquor to correspond with that in Rule ISC24.</li> <li>11. 8.3.6I Comprehensive Residential Development Specific standards Add in omitted standards re parent site size and shape, and building bulk. Add an exclusive use area per dwelling to compensate for the removal of the density standards 8.3.5A(b) and (c).</li> <li>12. Standard 8.3.7C Fencing in the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood To assist with interpretation make an amendment to (b) so that a permeability component is built in.</li> <li>13. Standard 8.3.7H Remove vegetation control area standard.</li> </ol>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>14. 8.3.9 Reference to Controlled Activity assessment criteria has been omitted.</p> <p>15. Assessment criteria 8.3.9A Add exclusions so that applications that don't meet parent site size and exclusive use areas for comprehensive residential.</p> <p>16. Assessment Criteria 8.3.9F(e) This criteria relates to a standard that has been removed and therefore is unnecessary.</p> <p>17. New Assessment Criteria 8.3.9K Add in assessment criteria where new standards parent site size and exclusive use areas are not met.</p> <p>18. SLD14 amendment and new rules for comprehensive residential developments. Remove comprehensive residential developments in the Bull Hill neighbourhood from Rule SLD 14 and provide new rules specifically for this activity in this new zone.</p> <p>19. SLD17 Amend Rule SLD17 to make it clearer and fix a reference error.</p> <p>20. 30.1.6A(2)(G)(i) - Amend the wording of this standard to improve clarity.</p> <p>21. 30.1.6E Creation of lots within the Bull Hill Neighbourhood and Table 30.1.6A and amend Iona Structure Plan to show Bull Hill areas A, B and C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend standards (c) and (d) by stating the equivalent min and maximum average site sizes in square metre areas rather than an overall per hectare section yield and put these in table 30.1.6A rather than a separate standard.</li> <li>- Add in a new standard that requires an overall subdivision plan for Bull Hill areas A and B and makes amendments to the structure plan to illustrate these areas on the Structure Plan Appendix 13A Figure 2.</li> <li>- Add in a minimum site size standard for comprehensive residential development parent and child sites so that these types of developments are specifically catered for.</li> </ul> <p>22. 30.1.6F Creation of lots within the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood and reference in table 30.1.6A - Remove this overall yield standard</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>of 13 residential sections per hectare in the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood areas A, B and C.</p> <p>23. New Standard in 30.1.7V(12) - To give effect to the design criteria outlined in the Structure Plan in respect of Iona road. To ensure that the concerns of local residents regarding the number of new roads that connect between Middle Road and Iona Road are addressed through District Plan provisions.</p> <p>24 30.1.7V(10) – Amend the reference in this standard to ensure it is correct.</p> <p>25. 30.1.8.(20)(d) Specific Assessment Criteria. Add in assessment criteria to ensure development within the Iona Terraces neighbourhood responds appropriately to the adjoining central ridge in the open space reserve.</p> <p>25. Consequential amendment to existing assessment criteria 30.1.8(20) - Add in the m2 area equivalent minimum and maximum average site size requirements to the assessment criteria as a result of the proposed amendments to the minimum site size standards in table 30.1.6A.</p> <p>26. 30.1.8(20) Specific Assessment Criteria - Add in new assessment criteria so that the staging and time frame for the completion of a subdivision can be considered as part of the consent process.</p> <p>27. New standard 30.1.7V and assessment criteria 30.1.8(20) regarding the timing of vesting stormwater detention areas –A concern has arisen around the timing of the vesting of the proposed stormwater detention areas shown on the structure plan. The concern is that unless this is done at the beginning of the process it may prevent landowners in the development, other than the primary landowner from developing if they are reliant on the detention areas.</p>	
<b>31</b>	Robin Wilkins	Oppose and seek amendments to be made	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questions the current eastern alignment of the rezoning boundary as it does not accurately reflect the apparent visual ridgeline as viewed from Lane Road.</li> <li>2. It is submitted that there is capacity for the eastern boundary to be moved further east to include a north facing basin.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We seek a rezoning that allows up to two building platforms/sites on our lower southern part of our property and one additional building platform / site on our eastern boundary as shown on our submitted plan.</li> </ol>



			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. John Hudson Landscape Architect states that the landform flattens along the ridge at the southern end of the property at 153 Iona Rd in the vicinity of the existing house and shed then forms a basin at the northern end of this site enclosed by its driveway to the west and higher land to the east. The variable landform and diverging topography creates a ridgeline that is less distinct than occurs further up Lane Road. This in turn creates the opportunity to consider the land within 153 Iona Road for inclusion within the rezoning and structure plan area.</li> <li>4. It is proposed that this area could be included within area D of the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood and identified for a density of 1000m2.</li> <li>5. Based on this density the area has the potential to provide an additional 3 dwellings and will not be substantially visible from Lane Road due to the location of the potential platforms east of the apparent ridgeline from the road.</li> <li>6. Should Council have concern that multi-level dwellings may be visible, planning controls could be introduced to control height.</li> </ol>	
<b>32</b>	Malcolm and Michelle Hart	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No design treatment proposed for the proposed road between Middle Road and Reynolds Rd extension and behind the properties in Chestnut Court or other roads in the structure plan.</li> <li>2. The structure plan does not provide confidence that the dead end road behind the Chestnut Court properties will not be extended at some future date creating a rat run through to Iona Road.</li> <li>3. Any such extension should be signalled early to ensure that design concepts (road calming measures, road surface, street planting, lighting etc) that would provide adjacent landowners with the confidence that their amenity is protected from noise associated with traffic.</li> <li>4. Linking this dead end road with Iona Rd would be a retrograde step in our view and could create a rat run feeding the traffic from Iona Plateau and Terraces neighbourhoods to Middle Rd.</li> <li>5. There are a significant number of mature trees of varying varieties on the Lowe property. Subdivision assessment criteria are included</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The structure plan be amended to provide greater detail, taking into account the whole street design for the Bull Hill Neighbourhood to ensure the design outcome for the Bull Hill neighbourhood is achieved.</li> <li>2. Significant single mature trees over and above those identified in the avenue should be identified on the structure plan for retention throughout the Bull Hill neighbourhood.</li> <li>3. That the northern road feeding into the Bull Hill neighbourhood (between Stapleford and Breadalbane Rd) not following through to connect to Iona Road.</li> <li>4. That further geotechnical assessment coupled with soil engineering requirements and foundation design recommendations must be identified as subdivision stage if residential sites traverse overland flow paths.</li> </ol>

			<p>to assess whether proposals retain existing mature trees. In order to provide adequate protection for these mature trees the criteria in the Structure plan should be consistent with the subdivision criteria.</p> <p>6. The geotechnical report identify the presence of significantly weaker or less robust soils in the vicinity of the natural overland flowpaths that are present. This land is likely to be compromised by lateral spread and other geotechnical considerations. If it is intended that residential sites traverse the overland flow paths further geotechnical assessment should occur.</p> <p>7. There appears to be no specific controls to protect legitimate farming activities from complaints from new residential activities.</p> <p>8. The structure plan does not show any reserve land in the eastern Bull Hill neighbourhood. This could be achieved with a wide road berm along the back to the existing character zone properties that could be planted with trees to soften the visual effects of the new development area from the existing character residential zone.</p>	<p>5. That specific controls be imposed in all neighbourhoods including minimum standards for housing design to mitigate noise impacts on residents.</p> <p>6. That the roads reserve running along the property boundaries of the existing Character Residential Zone be wide enough to allow for a reserve strip of sufficient width to sustain tree plantings and provide a green buffer to mitigate the visual effects of the development on the existing character residential zone.</p>
33	Powerco	Support with amendment	<p>1. Supports the development proposed in the Iona area and seeks to ensure that gas infrastructure, can be provided to developments in an appropriate and timely manner.</p> <p>2. It is best for new infrastructure provision to occur simultaneously with the new development to minimise disruption to other infrastructure (e.g. particularly having to dig up roads) and also reduce costs to end consumers. Furthermore, the earlier this is addressed, the more readily such facilities can be accommodated within the overall design of an area.</p> <p>3. Supports section entitled other infrastructure services in the Structure Plan Appendix 13A.</p> <p>4. Supports Objective HNSMAO5.</p> <p>5. Supports rule SLD2 in 30.1.5 which provides for special purposes subdivision as a controlled activity.</p> <p>6. Seeks adverse effects on existing and proposed network utility services to be considered when street trees are chosen.</p>	<p>1. Seeks amendments to the following provisions:</p> <p>a) Anticipated outcomes:</p> <p>b) BHAO1</p> <p>c) BHAO8.</p> <p>2. Seeks the inclusion of definition for a non-residential activity.</p>

			7. Seeks the exclusion of network utility services from outcome BHA08.	
34	G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd	Support with amendment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overall plan change and rezoning to Iona Special Character Zone is supported.</li> <li>2. Acknowledge collaborative Iona working party process that led the structure plan development and provided the basis for Variation 4.</li> <li>3. Particularly supportive of the comprehensive approach to Variation 4.</li> <li>4. The identification of future neighbourhood with different characteristics and planning approaches for managing the effects of development is also supported by the submitter.</li> <li>5. The different neighbourhoods will result in a variety of housing options which will provide choice to the residential market and help protect and enhance the character of the Iona and lower western Havelock Hills areas.</li> <li>6. This approach gives effect to the NPS on urban development capacity, the managing the built environment section of the Regional Policy Statement component of the Hawkes Bay Regional Resource Management Plan. It gives effect to the objectives and policies of section 2.4 urban strategy of the Hastings District Plan and in turn these documents all give effect to the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>7. Purpose of the Zone – the Environment Ministers’ housing yield expectation of at least 390-400 dwellings is not sufficiently articulated in the objectives and policies of variation 4 and unless this is rectified it is unlikely to be met.</li> <li>8. Stormwater Disposal Provisions – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The report by Tonkin and Taylor (T &amp; T) specifies a significantly smaller stormwater detention area than that shown on the structure plan for Outlet G. T &amp; T report does not recommend the need for the stormwater detention area shown on the structure plan for Outlet D.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose of the Zone: That amendments are made to the following provisions to ensure the necessary housing yield expectations can be achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.1.2.3 The Iona Neighbourhoods Environments;</li> <li>• Objective HNSMA08 and Policy HNSMAP11</li> <li>• Paragraphs 2 and 3 of section 8.3.1 Introduction</li> <li>• Objective ISCO1, explanation to Policy ISCP1, Policies ISCP2, ISCP5;</li> <li>• 8.3.2.1A Bull Hill Neighbourhood Introduction – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph</li> <li>• Anticipated outcomes – BHA01, BHA02, BHA04 and deletion of BHA06</li> <li>• Policies BHP1, BHP3, Objective BHO2, Policies BHP5, BHP7</li> <li>• Anticipated outcomes – ITAO1, ITAO2, ITAO3</li> <li>• Objectives ITO1, Policies ITP1, ITP4, ITP6, ITP8, Objective ITO3 and delete ITP9 in its entirety.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Amend 8.3.5A Density in the Bull Hill neighbourhoods to ensure that the housing yield expectations can be achieved.</li> <li>3. Amend Assessment Criteria 8.3.9F Activities not meeting the density standards in 8.3.5A within the Bull Hill Neighbourhood.</li> <li>4. Amend assessment criteria 8.3.9G Activities not meeting the density standards in 8.3.5B within the Iona Terraces neighbourhood.</li> <li>5. Amend standard 30.1.6A.Gi Bull Hill Neighbourhood - the minimum site sizes (subdivision section).</li> </ol>

			<p>(b) Do not accept the need for vesting the land required for stormwater purposes and does not wish to vest more land than is required to ensure adequate mitigation of stormwater effects. Plan Provisions should not require the vesting of private land unless it can be justified on an effects mitigation basis. An easement arrangement would be more appropriate given that the land falls outside of the rezoning area and includes a dwelling and buildings.</p> <p>(c) The stormwater detention area for outlet D is identified over the Iona Special Character Zone in the Bull Hill neighbourhood. The efficient use of this land is critical to ensure sufficient development capacity for a housing yield of 390-400. This land should not be identified for stormwater detention purposes and lost to residential development. The April 2018 T &amp; T report states that this stormwater detention options has potential effects caused by filling the floodplain and diverting the stream as well as significant earthworks and cost to construct an offline pond at Outlet D would be greater than other options.</p> <p>9. Promotion of Comprehensive Residential Development (CRD)</p> <p>(a) For the housing yield expectations to be met CRD in the Bull Hill neighbourhood needs to be promoted as the best option to achieve higher densities with good urban design and amenity outcomes;</p> <p>(b) Confusion in the rules applying between section 8.3 and 30.1 and if full compliance with the relevant standards is not achieved the default status is non-complying. There could be situations where a minor breach in standards could produce a better overall outcomes and therefore a non-complying status is not an appropriate way of promoting the use of CRD;</p> <p>(c) A graduated approach is sought where a breach of general or specific performance standards would be treated as a restricted discretionary activity. Comprehensive and detailed assessment criteria are included in the Variation so there is no need for such an activity to be full discretionary;</p>	<p>6. Amend specific subdivision assessment criteria 30.1.8.2(20)k, l, and m.</p> <p>7. Amendments to the Structure Plan Appendix 13A – amendments to the introduction of the structure plan document and stated objectives of the Iona structure plan.</p> <p>8. Stormwater Disposal Provisions</p> <p>(a) Amend Policy ISCP6</p> <p>(b) Amend stormwater design outcomes of the Structure Plan Appendix 13A</p> <p>(c) Amend Appendix 13A Figure 2 to show a reduction of the stormwater detention area at G and that this to be provided by way of easement rather than vesting</p> <p>(d) Outlet D stormwater detention area to be deleted.</p> <p>9. Promotion of CRD</p> <p>(a) Rule Table 8.3.3.1 ISC10 should be a permitted activity, amendments to ISC11, new rule where CRD involves no subdivision and does not meet all the general or specific performance standards – Restricted Discretionary</p> <p>(b) 8.3.5C Building Height – CRD developments to have increased height allowance to 10m</p> <p>(c) Amend assessment criteria 8.3.9 – remove cross reference to 8.2.9 as these are not appropriate or relevant to CRD. A reference to new tree plantings should be added to criterion c) in 8.3.9.</p> <p>(d) Rule Table 30.1 Subdivision and Land Development – Make CRD a RD activity if it does not comply with 30.1.6</p> <p>(e) 30.1.6E Creation of Lots within the Bull Hill and Iona Terraces Neighbourhood. Delete the maximum yield standard 30.1.6E for the Bull Hill neighbourhood.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>(d) Changes are sort to ensure that the comprehensive residential development provisions are logical, appropriate and workable.</p> <p>10. Iona Plateau Neighbourhood</p> <p>(a) Objectives and Policies of this neighbourhood are general supported in their intent;</p> <p>(b) Some rules, standards and assessment criteria are unrealistically rigid, and restrictive. Particularly the requirement for any subdivision not meeting every performance standard in section 30.1.6 and 30.1.7 to default to non-complying;</p> <p>(c) The intent of the structure plan in providing certainty for neighbouring landowners by specifying the subdivision lot boundaries, building platform and road layout is supported to an extent, but some flexibility is required to be able to respond to detailed earthworks and geotechnical design once this work is completed;</p> <p>(d) Some wording changes requested to ensure plan provisions are logical appropriate and workable.</p> <p>11. Bull Hill Commercial Node</p> <p>(a) Support the intent of the commercial node but request changes to some provisions relating to it</p> <p>(b) Request that the location be shifted across to the western side of the indicative road into a portion of what is currently shown as Open Space Zone. This would provide opportunities for outdoor seating areas to open out into the open space reserve and would integrate well with the proposed playground in the reserve reducing the need to cross any roads for access. This location provides a buffer to the residential use.</p> <p>(c) Commercial floor area limit should only to public floor space so that kitchen, storage and toilet facilities are excluded. 50m2 floor space makes standard requiring a maximum of two tenants irrelevant as such a limit does not provide sufficient floor space for two tenants. A 50m2 floor space limit is very</p>	<p>(f) Standard 30.1.7V Subdivision within the Bull Hill and Iona Terraces Neighbourhoods - amend 30.1.7V.11(a) to include correct reference to CRD standards.</p> <p>10. Iona Plateau Neighbourhood</p> <p>(a) 8.3.2.3A introduction 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph;</p> <p>(b) Objective IPO1 and Policies IPP1, IPP2 and IPP3, Objective IPO2;</p> <p>(c) Rule Table8.3.3.2 – IPN8 should be restricted discretionary rather than discretionary. IPN10 – should be Discretionary rather than Non-complying;</p> <p>(d) Amend 8.3.7D Density to include 21 lots;</p> <p>(e) Amend wording of 8.3.7E Nominated Building Area;</p> <p>(f) Section 27.1 Earthworks – standard 27.1.6A Extent of Earthworks – Amend wording of exception re Iona Plateau Neighbourhood;</p> <p>(g) 30.1.5 Subdivision Rules - Create a specific rule (SLD17A) for the Iona Plateau neighbourhood where subdivision does not meet general site standards and terms (excluding 30.1.7W(1)(a) and that these be considered restricted discretionary activities. Amend SLD27 to include specific reference to 30.1.7W(1)(a);</p> <p>(h) Amend standard 30.1.7W(1);</p> <p>(i) Amend Assessment criteria 30.1.8.2(20)(n).</p> <p>11. Commercial Node</p> <p>(a) Amend anticipated outcome BHA08, Policy BHP8;</p> <p>(b) Amend Rule table 8.3.3.1 – ISC12, ISC23 and ISC24;</p> <p>(c) Amend specific performance standards 8.3.6H for Commercial Node;</p> <p>(d) Amend assessment criteria 8.3.9I;</p> <p>(e) Amend Appendix 13A Iona Structure Plan Commercial Node design outcome and criteria;</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>restricting for café activities. Floor space limits in other areas within the District are larger.</p> <p>(d) Other valid commercial uses such as hairdressers and takeaway food premises – a more generic commercial activity provision is sought with assessment criteria added to ensure that it is appropriate.</p> <p>(e) Making on-licence sale of liquor a non-complying activity is restricting to the operation of a café and is not justified into terms of effects. Add assessment criteria to address effects of on licence liquor sales</p> <p>(f) The operating hours should be extended so that they relate to the more restrictive night time noise limits.</p> <p>12. Development Contributions and Servicing</p> <p>(a) The structure plan is for a development area that would warrant a specific development contribution policy section with a targeted household unit equivalent rate bearing in mind relevant local government act legislation and the extent that the broader community would benefit from the roading and reserve areas to be vested.</p> <p>(b) The Structure plan needs to clarify that it is the Council that will be extending the watermain and wastewater services network to service the Zone referred to.</p> <p>(c) In addition, the Structure Plan should clarify that it is only the Open Space Areas approved on subdivision that need to be vested not necessarily the areas shown on the Structure Plan itself, to allow some flexibility in the boundary and extent of such areas to be considered through the subdivision consenting process.</p> <p>13. Iona Terraces Density Provisions</p> <p>(a) Refinement is required to the Iona Terraces Density provision to achieve the expected housing yield.</p> <p>14. General Changes</p>	<p>(f) Amend Appendix 13A Figure 2 Iona Structure Plan to show the commercial node in one of two alternative locations within the open space zone.</p> <p>12. Development Contributions and Servicing</p> <p>(a) Amend the Structure Plan Appendix 13A in respect of Infrastructure services – water, wastewater, other infrastructure services and roading;</p> <p>(b) Amend reference to open space areas being vested in Appendix 13A to clarify that it is only the open space areas as approved on subdivision that need to be vested, not necessarily that the areas shown on the Structure Plan itself. This is to allow some flexibility in the boundary and extent of such areas to be considered through the subdivision consenting process.</p> <p>13. Iona Terraces Density Provisions</p> <p>(a) Amend 8.3.5B and minimum site sizes in the subdivision section 30.1.6B.2Gii.</p> <p>14. General Provisions</p> <p>(a) Amend specific Subdivision standard 30.1.7U – need for a cultural effects assessment to be provided for the whole zone upon initial subdivision rather than every subdivision application;</p> <p>(b) Amend Policy BHP6 to include retirement villages and amend 8.3.5C Building Height to allow retirement villages to have a 10m maximum height limit.</p> <p>15. Changes to Appendix 13A Figure 2 Structure Plan Map</p> <p>a) request for a 1500m2 area to be included in the Bull Hill neighbourhood subject to more detailed design of detention areas within the open space zone;</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>(a) Refinement to various provisions is required to ensure that they are workable and practicable in providing for residential development and in meeting the overall expected housing yield.</p> <p>15. Changes to Appendix 13A Figure 2 Structure Plan Map</p> <p>(a) Refinement is required to the Structure Plan map to help achieve the housing yield expectations and ensure the area set aside for development is workable and practicable. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- request for a 1500m2 area to be included in the Bull Hill neighbourhood subject to more detailed design of detention areas within the open space zone;</li> <li>- request that an area of open space zone near outlet d be included in the Bull Hill neighbourhood;</li> <li>- request that the stormwater detention area shown over the Bull Hill neighbourhood near outlet d be removed;</li> <li>- request two extensions of the Iona Plateau neighbourhood – creating one additional lot;</li> <li>- request amendments to the open space zone / development area boundary of Iona Terraces neighbourhood along the ridgeline;</li> <li>- request additional height / vegetation / setback / screening controls to enable additional land in the zone footprint in this area;</li> <li>- request removal of no build / earthworks area in Iona Plateau and shift the building platform on Lot 13 to the south west;</li> <li>- request to exclude areas from Iona Terraces neighbourhood Area D and retain these in rural residential zoning as the alignment of the cul-de-sac as proposed (that services this area) is impractical due to topographical constraints and would be better assessed in detail at a later stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) request that an area of open space zone near outlet d be included in the Bull Hill neighbourhood;</li> <li>c) request that the stormwater detention area shown over the Bull Hill neighbourhood near outlet d be removed;</li> <li>d) request two extensions of the Iona Plateau neighbourhood – creating one additional lot;</li> <li>e) request amendments to the open space zone / development area boundary of Iona Terraces neighbourhood along the ridgeline;</li> <li>f) request additional height / vegetation / setback / screening controls to enable additional land in the zone footprint in this area;</li> <li>g) request removal of no build / earthworks area in Iona Plateau and shift the building platform on lot 13 to the south west;</li> <li>h) request to exclude areas from Iona Terraces neighbourhood Area D and retain these in rural residential zoning.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--