



Tararua District Plan

Proposed Plan Change A – Growth Areas

Summary of Decisions Requested (Ordered by Submitter)

Notified 19 October 2026

1. Introduction

This document, Summary of Decisions, summarises the decisions requested for each submission received on Proposed Plan Change A. Where no decision has been specifically requested, Council Officers have, where possible, inferred the decision requested from the text of the submission.

Proposed Plan Change A was publicly notified on 7 November 2026 with the period for submissions closing on 5 October 2026.

A total of 61 submissions were received in relation to the proposed change, and this document provides a summary of those submissions in accordance with Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

It also includes the names and addresses of submitters so that they may be served a copy of any further submissions relating to their submission.

Copies of the full submissions can be inspected at the following locations during opening hours:

- Dannevirke Service Centre (26 Gordon Street),
- Eketāhuna Service Centre (31 Main Street),
- Pahiatua Service Centre (136 Main Street), and
- Woodville Service Centre (45 Vogel Street).

The full submissions can also be viewed or downloaded at any time on Council's website: www.tararua.govt.nz/plan-change-a/further-submissions

2. Further Submissions

Further submissions must be in accordance with Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. They can only support (in whole or in part) or oppose (in whole or in part) the submissions received on the proposed change, including any associated reasons. In supporting or opposing a submission only those matters raised in the original submission may be commented on.

The following persons may make a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submissions already received:

- Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Any person that has an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has; and
- Tararua District Council itself.

Any further submission should be made using Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, Procedures) Regulations 2003 or closely follow this format. Failure to include all necessary information or to complete the form correctly may prevent the further submission from being considered. Further Submission forms (Form 6) can be obtained from the Council Service Centres and Public Libraries or found on Council's website:

IMPORTANT: You must serve a copy of your further submission on the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of lodging it with Council. Each submitter's address for service is included in the Summary of Submissions report.

Closing date

Further submissions close at 5 pm on Tuesday 3 November 2026.

How to lodge a further submission

online: www.tararua.govt.nz/plan-change-a

email: submissions@tararua.govt.nz

post: Tararua District Council, PO Box 115, Dannevirke 4942

delivery: Tararua District Council, 26 Gordon Street, Dannevirke

Section 5 of this document includes the address for service of each person or organisation that has made a submission on Proposed Plan Change A.

3. Process from here

Once the Further Submission period has closed (2 November 2026), a hearing date will be set and a Planning Report identifying and summarising all the submissions received will be produced. The Planning Report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of these submissions, including whether the matters raised are valid considerations under the RMA. It will also contain any recommended amendments to the Plan Change to address matters raised by submitters.

Before a formal Council hearing is held, a pre-hearing meeting may be held to help clarify, mediate or facilitate a resolution on any matters raised in submissions.

The Planning Report will be circulated to all submitters and further submitters in advance of the formal Council hearing. At least 10 working days' notice will be given of the hearing date.

Anyone can attend the Council hearing, however only those submitters who have indicated that they wish to be heard will have the opportunity to speak. Submitters can nominate a representative or consultant to speak on their behalf.

The Hearings Committee will consider all relevant matters before making a recommendation to Council for a decision.

All submitters will receive formal notice of the decision on the Plan Change, including the reasons behind the decision reached. The decision will also be publicly notified.

Any submitter who is not satisfied with the decision has the further opportunity, under Clause 14 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, to lodge an appeal with the Environment Court.

4. Additional Information

For more information please contact Tararua District Council.

Email at planchangea@tararua.govt.nz

5. Summary of Decisions Requested

The below table summarises the decisions requested or inferred by submitters to Proposed Plan Change A. This is to enable people to establish whether a submission might be of interest to them. The summary is not a substitute for inspecting the original submission itself, and it is recommended that this is done once you have identified any submissions of particular interest.

Reference numbers have been assigned to the submissions received and to the specific points/matters raised in each submission in order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity (i.e. 1.1 being Submission Number 1, point number 1). This unique identifier(s) should be specifically referenced in any further submission you may wish to make relating to an original submission.

The submissions below have been organised by submitter.

Where it has been specified or is clear that the submission is either in support of, or opposition, to the proposed change this has also been identified in the summary table below. The term ‘In-part’ has generally been applied in the table to submissions that provide qualified support or opposition to a proposed provision, subject to incorporating further suggested changes. ‘Neutral’ has been used where the submitter has specifically identified they are neutral and ‘Not specified’ has been used where the submitter has not indicated whether they support or oppose and it is not clear.

Further Submissions must be received by Tararua District Council before 5 pm on Tuesday 3 November 2026.

Table 1: Service Addresses

Table 2: Summary of Decisions Requested

Table 1

Sub No.	Contact First Name	Contact Surname	Organisation	Postal Address 1	Postal Address 2	Postal Address - Town	Postcode	Email
1	Brent	Dais	Scanpower Ltd	PO Box 157		Dannevirke	4942	brentd@scanpower.co.nz
2	Damian	Spittal		69 Princess Street		Dannevirke	4930	service@damians.co.nz
3	Joe	Hospitallier		SH2 Dannevirke	RD 7	Dannevirke	4978	wisandstr@gmail.com
4	Stephen	Cooney		113 Fergusson Street		Woodville	4920	stephenwcooney@gmail.com
5	Nicola	Butler						nicolabutler.nz@gmail.com
6	Wendy	Kirkland		9 Anderson Street		Eketāhuna	4900	kirkland4me@gmail.com
7	Andrew William James	Smith		28A Princess Street		Dannevirke	4930	andys@inspire.net.nz
8	Graham and Carol	Stokes		615 State Highway 2		Pahiatua	4910	
9	Alan	Harvie		56 Herbert Street		Eketāhuna		
10	Leo James	Hammond		25 Edward Street		Pahiatua	4910	leo.hammond@fonterra.com
11	James Benjamin	Drinkwater		27 Edward Street		Pahiatua	4910	bendeeone@gmail.com
12	Rae	Powell	St Anthony's School	35 Riccarton Road		Pahiatua	4910	rae.terry@xtra.co.nz
13	Clive	Bickerstaff		14 Bengston Street		Eketāhuna	4900	bickerstaffclive@gmail.com

Sub No.	Contact First Name	Contact Surname	Organisation	Postal Address 1	Postal Address 2	Postal Address - Town	Postcode	Email
14	Jerry	Shearman	CEDA	Lincs Lane, Broadway Avenue		Palmerston North	4410	jerry.shearman@ceda.nz
15	Brian James	Smith		12 Stanly Street		Eketāhuna	4900	bjeasmith@xtra.co.nz
16	Robert David	Shannon		60 High Street		Eketāhuna	4900	bobthespreader@gmail.com
17	Kirsten Rona	Bonnington		617 SH2		Pahiatua	4910	kirstybonnington@gmail.com
18	Dorothy Joy	McNiel		1 Turnor Street	Parkville	Eketāhuna	4900	enjoynz@hotmail.co.nz
19	Mary	Macleod Watson		3a Jackson Street		Eketāhuna	4900	mary_macleodw@hotmail.com
20	Amorine	Ward		1 Septimus Street		Eketāhuna	4900	sarangravebeagles@yahoo.co.nz
21	Lorna Jane	McIver		16 Stanly Street		Eketāhuna	4900	lornajanemciver@hotmail.com
22	Janice M	Beckett		52 Cadman Road		Dannevirke	4930	janicem.beckett@hotmail.com
23	Murray James	Ramage	Cheal Consultants, Taupo	1 Stanley Street		Woodville	4920	murrayramage@xtra.co.nz
24	Jacob and Kelly	Smith		29 Hope Road	RD3	Woodville		kelly.drummond94@gmail.com
25	Sarah-Jayne	McCurrach	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	PO Box 790		Wellington	6140	resilience@naturalhazards.govt.nz

Sub No.	Contact First Name	Contact Surname	Organisation	Postal Address 1	Postal Address 2	Postal Address - Town	Postcode	Email
26	Kevin Robert	Eades		46 Ormond Street		Woodville	4920	eades1254@gmail.com
27	Patricia Joy	Cowley		37 Bridge Street		Eketāhuna	4900	cowpat24@yahoo.com
28	John Charles	Cowley		37 Bridge Street		Eketāhuna	4900	johnandpat2003@yahoo.com.au
29	Gary John	Groombridge		31 High Street		Eketāhuna	4900	garygroombridge@yahoo.co.nz
30	Peter	Kendrick		57 Cadman Road		Dannevirke	4930	oringi2004@gmail.com
31	John and Wendy	Napier		75 Hope Road	RD3	Woodville	4999	jcwnapier@gmail.com
32	Tony	Hitch		39 Newman Road		Eketāhuna	4700	winzracingboss@gmail.com
33	Grant and Barbara	Boyden Family Trust		C/- Lara Blomfield Law	PO Box 566	Napier	4140	lara.blomfield@icloud.com
34	Andrew	Bolton	Waipuna Trust	36 Waipuna Road		Woodville	4999	andrew.bolton@xtra.co.nz
35	Wayne	Eveleigh		57 Stanly Street		Eketāhuna	4900	eveleigh.family@xtra.co.nz
36	Jordan	Benett-Davies		21A Edward Street		Pahiatua	4900	jbennettdavies@gmail.com
37	Joel Anker	Aagesen		18 Bright Street		Eketāhuna	4900	aagesenjoel@gmail.com
38	Chad	Foley		12 Nelson Street		Woodville	4997	chadfoley93@gmail.com

Sub No.	Contact First Name	Contact Surname	Organisation	Postal Address 1	Postal Address 2	Postal Address - Town	Postcode	Email
39	Jocelyn	Amon		46 Herbert Street		Eketāhuna	4900	jocelyn.amon@gmail.com
40	Deborah Margaret	Paterson		24 Bridge Street	Parkville	Eketāhuna	4900	debbiep2452@gmail.com
41	David	Smith		51 High Street		Eketāhuna	4900	dave@kadmon.nz
42	Angela Elaine	Walker	Nexeus Properties Ltd (working on behalf of Totally Vets Ltd)	325 Pages Road		Timaru	7910	angela.walker@vetlife.co.nz
43	Aruna	Wickramasinghe	Horizons Regional Council	Private Bag 11025	Manawatu Mail Centre	Palmerston North	4412	Aruna.Wickramasinghe@horizons.govt.nz
44	Samantha	Cameron	Master Mower	26 Hunter Street		Dannevirke	4930	sammymcintosh@hotmail.com
45	Melissa	Corlett		15 Alfredton Road		Eketāhuna	4900	mel_corlett@outlook.com
46	Sophie	Whiting	Powerco Limited	PO Box 13 075		Tauranga	3141	planning@powerco.co.nz
47	Steen	McGhie		110 Mangatainok a Valley Road		Eketāhuna	4994	steenautoglas@gmail.com
48	Andrew	Day		21 Ballance Valley Road	RD3	Pahiatua	4983	Andrew-Day@xtra.co.nz
49	Angela	McFlynn	Diamond Family	C/- McFlynn Surveying & Planning	PO Box 13036	Mahora, Hastings	4155	angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz

Sub No.	Contact First Name	Contact Surname	Organisation	Postal Address 1	Postal Address 2	Postal Address - Town	Postcode	Email
50	Angela	McFlynn	McFlynn Surveying & Planning	PO Box 13036	Mahora	Hastings	4155	angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz
51	Suzanne	O'Rourke	Fonterra Limited	C/- Nick Grala - Harrison Grierson Limited	PO Box 5760	Victoria Street West, Auckland	1142	n.grala@harrisingrierson.com
52	Kristin / Mark	Doering / Freeman		1 Jackson Street		Eketāhuna	4900	kristin@techprojects.co.nz mark@techprojects.co.nz
53	Ian Robert & Maryanne	Barsdell		37 Cadman Street		Dannevirke	4930	barsdell@xtra.co.nz
54	June / Rob	Vermeer / Hullah		239 Adelaide Road		Dannevirke	4930	vermeerjune@gmail.com
55	Suzanne Elizabeth	Byers		68 Cadman Road		Dannevirke	4930	sue.byres@alliance.co.nz
56	Georgina	Morrison		117 Bridge Road		Pahiatua	4987	georginamorrisonnz@gmail.com
57	Peter Campbell	Raikes	Westfield Developments Limited	303 Frimley Avenue		Hastings	4120	pcraikes@outlook.com
58	Ian Robert	Mollison		21 Cadman Street		Dannevirke	4930	imollison@xtra.co.nz
59	Kirsty Jane	Silvester		PO Box 100		Woodville	4920	kirstysilvester@inspire.net.nz
60	Peter and Wendy	Jaspers		241 Peka Peka Road	RD1	Waikanae	5391	wendycj@outlook.co.nz
61	Kylee Jean	Joep		63 High Street		Eketāhuna	4900	queensquarters85@yahoo.com

Table 2

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
1	IGDA - DEV02		Support	Oringi IDGA	Scanpower supports the proposed rezoning of Oringi Business Park from Rural to Industrial. The proposed zoning appropriately reflects the established and longstanding industrial character of the site. Oringi Business Park is an existing industrial hub that accommodates a range of commercial and industrial activities and associated infrastructure. The current Rural zoning does not accurately reflect the existing land use, investment, infrastructure, employment opportunities, and economic contribution generated by the site. The proposed rezoning recognises the current reality of how the land is being used and provides a more appropriate planning framework for future development and investment. It will enable the efficient use of existing infrastructure and support the ongoing growth of industrial and commercial activities in a location already established for that purpose. Scanpower notes that Tararua District Council has identified a shortage of industrial land within the district and that Plan Change A seeks	Retain the proposed rezoning of Oringi Business Park from Rural to Industrial. Retain the associated Industrial Growth Development Area provisions applicable to Oringi Business Park.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					to provide additional industrial growth opportunities. The proposed rezoning of Oringi Business Park directly supports this objective. The site is strategically located adjacent to State Highway 2 and has benefited from improved regional connectivity resulting from the completion of Te Ahu a Turanga Manawatū Tararua Highway. This improved connectivity enhances the attractiveness of Oringi Business Park as a location for industrial and commercial activities serving both the Tararua District and wider region. The business park contains significant existing infrastructure and has capacity to accommodate future growth. Scanpower has continued to invest in the site and considers it well placed to support additional employment, business activity, and economic development outcomes for the district. The proposed rezoning will provide greater certainty for existing occupiers and future investors while supporting efficient land use and reducing pressure for industrial development in less suitable locations. The rezoning is also consistent with the objectives of promoting economic	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					development, enabling employment opportunities, and ensuring sufficient industrial land is available to meet future demand. The proposal represents a logical and efficient planning response that aligns zoning with established land use and anticipated future growth. Scanpower considers that the proposed Industrial zoning, together with the Industrial Growth Development Area provisions, provides an appropriate framework to manage future development while ensuring growth occurs in a coordinated and serviced manner.	
2.1	Rezoning of Princess Street		Oppose	Dannevirke RGDA	Completely against this. People who have bought here already have animals and a lifestyle they're accustomed to - which is why they bought here. The changes will not only disrupt that, you'll want a rates increase to cover it - and what for? I have no interest in paying for a new road, footpaths and street lighting just so you can gain more ratepayers hoping someone here will sell to a developer. If I wanted more neighbours or noise pollution I would have bought in the middle of town. If the council genuinely wants more income you might be better served by looking at making	Do not rezone Princess street.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					yourselves more efficient like central government has already been asking you to do. Furthermore, it's somewhat hypocritical saying that you want to encourage growth here - when we added a tiny home to our property to gain one more bedroom we were absolutely not allowed to connect it to the town supply that we already pay metered rates for. Why? Because your own council said you're at capacity and couldn't cope with even one single more connection - yet you're now trying to sell growth. Again, if it wasn't clear, absolutely opposed to this.	
2.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	The rural part of Princess Street isn't wide enough for two vehicles to fit on the road at the same time. Town water is metered already. There's no current footpaths or room for them. Everyone in the street has their own septic system.	Do not rezone Princess street.
3	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose in part	General	We don't need more tract housing ruining the landscape and putting arable land out of commission. If we need to build housing, build apartment style community blocks that make better use of available land and are more aesthetically pleasing. That also produce and store energy	Amend Plan Change.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					and store water, and also have community gardens. More industry creating more jobs is fine. But no to data centres and other places that provide no jobs and consume resources. Any new industries must also include energy production and storage, and water storage and processing facilities.	
4.1	Woodville Proposed Growth Areas		Support in part	General	We support the growth of the area and the subdividing of the land around our property.	Support
4.2				Stormwater	Our major concern is that we already have a stormwater issue as we have no provided stormwater provision to get rid of excess water on our side of the street. In heavy rain instances like this week, we receive surface water on our land from both the road and from the proposed rural land to be rezoned. This is mainly as a result of no curbing on our side of the street and our land is below the level of the road by a considerable amount. We feel not sufficient thought went into consenting these developments by the council to ensure no water ingress. E.g does heavy rain results in the water table rising quickly due to	Address Stormwater Issues

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					the elevation of our land and not having a proper means of dissipating the water. We really only want assuring that council is going to ensure that storm water from the housing of rezoned land and from the street frontage will not continue to come into our property. If this is looked at then the consented soak pits people have in existing properties should be able to handle any level of stormwater generated on our properties. We feel this is an ideal time to ensure that Fergusson street has sufficient curbing and stormwater control to flow the water to storm water drains and that surface water captured on either existing or rezoned land can be dealt with properly . This is a chance to future proof the whole area especially as the building of proposed subdivisions of this size will generate more individual plots of water I presume.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
5.1	Rezoning of Princess Street			Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	My main concerns are: My animals and roosters: I currently keep sheep, hens, and two roosters on my property. Moving to a residential zone usually triggers urban bylaws that ban roosters entirely and heavily restrict livestock. I have no desire to get rid of my animals, and I am concerned that the rezoning will disrupt how I use my property. I would like the council to allow existing property owners to keep their animals and roosters under a grandfather clause or existing use rights, as long as they aren't causing genuine public nuisances. Loss of rural character and privacy: Transitioning the land around my property into residential zoning means losing the peace, privacy, and open space that comes with a rural environment. I am concerned about increased noise, loss of privacy from closer housing, and the general shift in neighbourhood character.	Decline Plan Change
5.2				Rates	I have no intention of subdividing at present, but I am very worried that rezoning my land residential will cause my council rates to skyrocket based on speculative development	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					value. It feels unfair to be penalized with higher rates just because of a council-initiated zone change when I just want to keep living the way I am.	
5.3				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	I am also concerned about whether the local infrastructure can actually handle this shift. Areas on the edge of town often have older networks that aren't built for high-density residential use, and I want to know how the council plans to manage things like stormwater, wastewater, and road wear before pushing growth into these areas.	
6	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose	General	I oppose to the plan change. I am not in favour of being told what I can and can't do with my land. I'm not happy with this decision. Strongly opposed!!!	Decline Plan Change
7	Relating to 28A Princess Street		Oppose	Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	I am concerned about losing my view and the noise disturbance from the new builds.	Decline Plan Change
8.1	Pahiatua - Residential Growth		Oppose	General	We have been living here for over 35 years. When we brought the house in the country, if we wanted to be in the bourgh we would of brought into it.	Decline Plan Change
8.2			Oppose	Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	We are not on town sewage and no foot paths down this end of town. We can't even walk on the path as it has been ripped up by trucks.	Decline Plan Change

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
9.1	Eketāhuna		Oppose	General	I oppose because I believe that the land you wish to change from Rural to Residential is not suitable to build on. My property is zoned as Rural. Please provide proof that there has been growth in Eketāhuna because from what I've been told by local Real Estate Agent properties in Eketāhuna and very slow to sell at the moment and this includes sections. I note one section has been on the market several years.	Further information on need for growth in Eketāhuna
9.2				Rates	I have asked Tararua District Council how much my rates will increase by and no reply.	
10.1	Drainage and Sewerage	Yes	Support in part	Stormwater / Flooding	I am writing to raise concerns regarding the proposed expansion of residential housing in the area, particularly in relation to capacity and adequacy of the existing drainage infrastructure. My section already experiences flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. This is an ongoing concern, and despite the issue being apparent, I am not aware of any adequate improvements having been made to address the existing drainage problems. I am particularly concerned about the impact that additional residential development will	I would like the Council to provide clear information on: • The drainage capacity and condition of the stormwater drainage system serving the area. • What improvements, if any, are planned to address the existing flooding problems. • How additional stormwater from the proposed residential

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					have on the situation. Increasing the number of houses and therefore the amount of stormwater runoff could place further pressure on an already inadequate system. I believe it is important that existing drainage issues are properly investigated and addressed before significant additional housing is approved or constructed. Residents should not be expected to accept an increased risk of flooding or sewerage problems because of new development when there are already concerns with the existing infrastructure. I would appreciate a written response outlining the Council's assessment of these issues, together with details of any proposed drainage upgrades and the timeframe for addressing the existing problems. <i>(Please note: there are photos included in the attachment with this submission)</i>	development will be managed. • What assessment has been undertaken to ensure that existing residents will not experience increased flooding or other drainage problems as a result of the development.
10.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Whether the existing sewerage infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in residential housing.	Provide more information on whether the existing sewerage infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in residential housing.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
11.1	Drainage and Sewerage	Yes	Support in part	Stormwater / Flooding	I am writing to raise concerns regarding the proposed expansion of residential housing in the area, particularly in relation to capacity and adequacy of the existing drainage infrastructure. My section already experiences flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. This is an ongoing concern, and despite the issue being apparent, I am not aware of any adequate improvements having been made to address the existing drainage problems. I am particularly concerned about the impact that additional residential development will have on the situation. Increasing the number of houses and therefore the amount of stormwater runoff could place further pressure on an already inadequate system. I believe it is important that existing drainage issues are properly investigated and addressed before significant additional housing is approved or constructed. Residents should not be expected to accept an increased risk of flooding or sewerage problems because of new development when there are already concerns with the existing infrastructure.	I would like the Council to provide clear information on: • The drainage capacity and condition of the serving the area. • What improvements, if any, are planned to address the existing flooding problems. • How additional stormwater from the proposed residential development will be managed. • What assessment has been undertaken to ensure that existing residents will not experience increased flooding or other drainage problems as a result of the development.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					I would appreciate a written response outlining the Council's assessment of these issues, together with details of any proposed drainage upgrades and the timeframe for addressing the existing problems. <i>(Please note: there are photos included in the attachment with this submission)</i>	
11.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Whether the existing sewerage infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in residential housing.	Provide further information on whether the existing sewerage infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in residential housing.
12	The land on Woodlands Road outside of Woodville		Oppose	Woodville IDGA	I strongly disagree that the land next to Woodlands Road should be changed for future industrial development. This is an area of natural beauty and with the new walking/cycling tracks, this would be an eyesore. If anything, the council should be promoting this area as one of natural beauty and peace and keeping industry well away. The council should not touch this land.	Decline Woodville IGDA

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
13.1	The level of growth projections set at maximum for Eketāhuna and the region.	Yes	Oppose in part	Eketāhuna RGDA	I acknowledge the Council's intention to plan for future growth and capitalise on regional connectivity. I do feel however, that with Proposal Plan Change A, the council has not undertaken sufficient due diligence. I believe that some agreed to re-zoning should occur but suggest that further analysis of the land, impact of costs on the rate payer and consideration of a changing footprint in living be considered. The amount of land being re-zoned in Eketāhuna seems to be at odds with that being projected by the BERL 2026 report. The report's aspirational scenario suggests 14 Hectares but the Council Draft Plan designates in total 84 Hectares... this over allocation of re-zoning land is evident in Dannevirke BERL aspirational 50ha to proposed 161ha, Woodville 26 ha to 216 ha and Pahiatua 27ha to 108 ha... this is a major variation from a BERL 117 ha region wide to total proposed under plan A of 570 ha. This level of re-zoning land against a commissioned report is an overreach of the Council's authority. It reads as though the council has been given an inch and so they justify taking a	That the Proposal Plan A be phased with phase one, that it be adopted according to the Medium (ha) proposed within the BERL 2026 report. That for the approval of phase two, whole of the Proposal Plan A is subject to further investigation undertaken into the feasibility of land under consideration, an economic impact assessment on rate payers and submission of an Economic Development Plan over 30 years for the region along with community consultation with regarding the shift towards tiny homes in the communities

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					mile. Why have a commissioned report if the Council makes up a value of re-zoning land?	
13.2	The subsequent exposure to finance district wide infrastructure costs threatening sustained rate increases.			Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	This leads into my next concern around the financing of the infrastructure costs required to support the re-zoning from rural to residential. From an Eketāhuna perspective it is suggested in the Three Waters Infrastructure Options to support Growth report that cost will be modest. My concern is that living in Eketāhuna and walking the proposed re-zoning areas is the observable levels of flooding present in those zones - I can see how a desktop image or plan might be misleading and I doubt without some further on-ground evaluation of the land that the infrastructure cost will be "modest" That goes for the re-zoning district wide, given the increase in land that the council is seeking to re-zone I believe it is important that the council seeks further technical evaluations so as to assess natural hazards. The council will be responsible (and the council members liable,	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					unless they have failed to read the reports?) for designating land that is not economically suitable for residential. Having such a large swath of land requiring infrastructure comes at a cost. Not including estimates for roading infrastructure or open spaces the report details the potential capital investment required - council, as I understand, will fund this through borrowing the potential borrowing estimate and I am assuming that this is against the proposed 570ha in the plan not the BERL aspirational 117ha, is a total of \$48m-\$105m short term and \$69m-\$154m long term. Asking the community to take on such a debt without taking the time to provide an economic impact assessment of what that means to rate payers is, in my opinion, "rude". What is particularly egregious, again in my opinion, is that Eketāhuna ratepayers will be shouldering the same rate increase to support infrastructure costs in say Dannevirke without necessarily the benefit - we saw this with the township upgrades. By my estimation servicing a \$154m loan over 30 years at 2% interest	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					across say 11000 ratepayers equates to around \$6.9m pa or an increase of \$625 per rate payer.	
13.3	Failure to incorporate any economic development projections and specifically any comment on the growing trend of tiny homes being built.			General	Again, in the absence of an Economic Development Plan (to include economic growth, jobs growth etc) for the region I do not believe we have all the information available to assess whether the re-zoning, Plan A, is affordable at this time. This also segues into my final thought. Over the last five years I have noticed an influx of tiny homes into Eketāhuna - no doubt enjoying the rural life that is currently afforded to them. These individuals have expressed a life choice, sometimes not a choice, they are however, part of the fabric of Eketāhuna. They have a small footprint living on un-serviced land, living off grid. The decision to progress with the re-zoning	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Plan A will impact some of these individuals. Whilst as a ratepayer I see the argument that these individuals are not contributing to roading costs this discussion is outside of the proposal. I ask that the council consider the impact on this community and lives of individuals who are looking to get by as best they can. Indeed, the absence of any discussion document exploring the repurposing of land and impact on those already residing on it is again evidence that, in my opinion, an amendment to the proposal should be considered.	
14.1	In support of the Proposed Plan Change 2, the proposed Woodville Growth Areas in the Tararua District.		Support	Woodville IDGA	The Central Economic Development Agency (CEDA), funded by both PNCC and MDC, supports the proposed industrial growth area at Woodville as part of Tararua District Council's Plan Change A. From CEDA's perspective, the proposed Woodville industrial land has an important strategic role as a feeder into Te Utanganui – the Central New Zealand Distribution Hub. Te Utanganui is being developed as a nationally significant freight and distribution network, connecting road, rail, air and port infrastructure across central New Zealand. Its success will	That the proposed Plan Change 2, the proposed Woodville Growth Areas in the Tararua District proceed/is adopted

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					depend not only on investment within the core hub, but also on a well-connected network of industrial, logistics and production locations across the wider region. The proposed Woodville industrial area is particularly well placed in this regard. Its proximity to the Te Ahu a Tūranga Manawatū-Tararua Highway provides an opportunity for businesses in Woodville and wider Tararua to connect efficiently into the regional and national freight network, and in turn into Te Utanganui. CEDA considers that enabling appropriately located industrial land at Woodville will strengthen the wider supply chain ecosystem by providing additional capacity for businesses involved in manufacturing, logistics, storage and related activities. It also provides an opportunity for economic activity and freight movements to be located where they can efficiently access the strategic transport network. Recent industrial land forecasting and property sector engagement by the Palmerston North City Council suggests that there is strong market demand for small and medium-scale industry, particularly between 0.5-1ha.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Tararua's Industrial Growth Development Areas would be in a strong position to capture additional demand for small and medium industry to help Te Utanganui maintain a competitive advantage in the 2ha plus market. A key constraint to Palmerston North's land markets are the low number of landowners with a controlling interest in the release of land. We view that Proposed Plan Change 2 would enable a broadening of the local development sector to maintain a competitive land market. Likewise, Palmerston North's Future Development Strategy recognises the difficulties in providing affordable residential land for a growing workforce that supports Te Utanganui: • Bunnythorpe Village has favourable land values for affordable housing, but greenfield growth options are constrained by the Taonui Floodway on the west, planned Kiwirail Freight Hub on the south, and large-scale solar farms on the north and east. • Ashhurst's land values and proximity to Palmerston North are also favourable, however recent investigations into	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					rezoning greenfield land for housing have revealed stormwater and flood mitigations that are too uneconomic for Palmerston North City Council to proceed with. Increased pressure on the State Highway network is limiting the release of greenfield and rural-residential land close to the border between Palmerston North and Tararua.	
14.2				Woodville RGDA	Woodville's residential growth areas in Appendix 2 of the proposed plan change would enable broader village lifestyle options to those that work in Palmerston North. We therefore support Proposed Plan Change 2, the proposed Woodville Growth Areas and encourage Tararua District Council to recognise its role not simply as a local industrial development opportunity, but as part of the broader feeder network that supports Te Utanganui and the development of a more connected, resilient and productive central New Zealand freight system.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
15.1		Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the proposed change of my property from Rural to Residential under Plan Change A. I understand that Tararua District Council needs to plan for the future housing and that our towns need to grow. My objection is not to sensible growth. My concern is that my property is being treated as though the whole site is suitable for residential development when there is a significant rural portion with an established creek running through it. I ask Council to look at the actual characteristics of the land and the existing waterways in the neighbourhood before changing the zoning. The back portion of my property is currently used as a rural paddock. I regularly have sheep grazing there and also allow livestock to graze the area. This helps keep the grass and vegetation under control and helps prevent the creek and its margins from becoming overgrown. The livestock are also sometimes used to raise money for local community groups and are a special treat for our grandchildren to play with when they visit from Australia. This is an established use of the property, but	Retain the rural portion of my property as Rural. I ask Council to reconsider the proposed residential zoning affecting my property and to investigate these issues before proceeding with the proposal.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					more importantly, the creek is a physical feature that needs to be properly considered before this land is treated as residential development land. I am concerned that the proposed zoning does not adequately reflect what is actually on the ground. My concern is that putting the entire title into a Residential zone could create an assumption that the whole property is suitable for residential development. That may not be the case. I support appropriate growth in Tararua. However, I believe growth needs to be based on what the land can actually support. In this case, there is an existing creek, established rural use and a wider drainage system that needs to be properly understood before the zoning is changed.	
15.2				Stormwater / Flooding	Before the zoning is confirmed, I ask Council to properly investigate: - the creek running through my property and its catchment. - existing waterways and drainage paths on neighbouring properties.	Amend the proposed Residential Growth Area boundary to exclude the creek, its appropriate margins and any land identified as flood-prone, poorly drained or otherwise unsuitable for residential

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					- the cumulative effect of developing multiple neighbouring properties. - any flood-prone, poorly drained or low-lying areas. - overland-flow and stormwater paths. - the likely effect of future residential development on these waterways. A creek does not stop at a property boundary. Water and stormwater move between properties, and development of several properties in the same area could change where the water goes, how quickly it moves and how much enters the existing waterways. This is particularly important because Council's own proposed Residential Growth Development Area provisions recognise that development should respond to the physical characteristics of a site, be resilient to natural hazards, and properly manage stormwater and downstream effects. Council's flood-map information also recognises flooding, poor drainage and surface ponding as matters that may require further investigation before subdivision or new land uses occur. Once the creek, appropriate setbacks,	development, or Undertake a proper site-specific and neighbourhood-wide assessment of the waterways, drainage, flooding and stormwater effects before confirming the proposed residential zoning.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					drainage, stormwater requirements and any flood or other natural-hazard constraints are properly considered, the amount of land that can realistically be developed may be significantly less than the total area of the property. I therefore ask Council to assess the realistic developable area, rather than simply treating the entire property as residential development land because it falls within the proposed growth area. If the rural portion surrounding the creek is physically unsuitable or significantly constrained for residential development, I believe it should remain Rural or be excluded from the Residential Growth Area.	
15.3				Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	There is another practical concern with changing the surrounding area from Rural to Residential. Council's Plan Change A material recognises the potential for reverse-sensitivity issues, where new residential development can result in complaints about existing rural activities. My livestock use is already established. I do not want a situation where residential development is encouraged around an existing rural activity	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					and future residents then expect that activity to change or stop. It makes more sense to address that potential conflict through good planning now rather than after houses have been built.	
16.1	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	We opposed this re-zoning plan. This is all just money grabbing. You get paid thousands in rates money and where this all goes? I am happy the way my land is.	Decline Eketāhuna RGDA
16.2				Stormwater / Flooding	The land is farming land, the ground is too wet to build house.	
17	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose	General	I oppose the changes due to the effect it will have on me, Rates, Dog Registration and the financial implications it would have on me and my property costs.	Decline Plan Change
18.1		Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	This property is used as rural lifestyle land. It is rated as land only. I have no intention of selling it, or subdividing it myself. I am also not in a financial position to pay urban rates for this land.	Decline Plan Change
18.2				Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	I keep livestock on this property. They are pets, but if you rezone this area. That causes a problem! 20 years ago we purchased this property, so we	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					could have a small lifestyle holding. The back half of the property is a paddock with my pet alpacas in it. Plus, I live alone and can't afford another large rates hike because you want to rezone. Nor do I have any wish to give up my farm pets because you changed the goal posts (so to speak). Most of the people around my area all have farm stock.	
18.3				Stormwater / Flooding	It also floods very badly because of the creek when we have extreme bad weather. Your creek runs along the back and floods my land. There is no way this area will ever be any good for residential growth!!! Stop your creek from flooding my land would be a start!	
18.4				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Another strong point. In the last 20 years the old water pipes in the front of my property have burst 3 times. The whole system around this area is old and run down. Fix that before you think about adding more houses!!!	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
19.1	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	The submitter supports appropriate growth in Eketāhuna but considers the proposed residential growth area is larger than justified by projected demand. I recognise Eketāhuna needs to change and develop over time and I am not opposed to appropriate growth. My concern is the proposed Plan Change appears to create a level of development capacity considerably greater than the growth requirement identified for Eketāhuna, while Council's own evidence identifies significant existing constraints in wastewater, stormwater, flooding and roading. For these reasons, I request Council reconsider the scale and timing of the proposed Eketāhuna growth area and adopt a more cautious, staged approach directly linked to demonstrated demand, infrastructure capacity and the protection of existing residents and rural activities.	Reduce the extent of the proposed Eketāhuna residential rezoning to a level supported by the population and residential land-demand evidence. Demonstrate why the proposed amount of development capacity is required, given Council's own Eketāhuna-specific population and housing projections.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
19.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	They are concerned that existing wastewater, stormwater, flooding and roading constraints have not been adequately resolved and that development could increase risks and costs for current residents. The submitter considers growth should be carefully staged and supported by demonstrated demand, infrastructure capacity and clear funding arrangements. Council's own technical assessment indicates future development could increase pressure on existing infrastructure and increase surface-flooding risk for existing areas. I also consider insufficient attention has been given to the potential effects on existing smallholding and rural-lifestyle community and the risk of reverse sensitivity as residential development expands into an established rural environment. Demonstrate: • the current effective capacity of the Eketāhuna wastewater system; • the additional capacity required to service the proposed growth area; • the expected timing and cost of the necessary upgrades;	Stage the release of the proposed growth area, with additional areas becoming available only when actual demand and infrastructure capacity justify them. Clearly identify the infrastructure costs and funding arrangements, including the expected contribution from developers and the potential burden on existing ratepayers. Complete the necessary wastewater investigations and upgrades before additional development is permitted. Demonstrate sufficient wastewater capacity and treatment compliance for the proposed development. Undertake a detailed transport and roading assessment addressing existing road conditions, expected traffic volumes, intersections,

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					• how those upgrades will be funded; • that the upgraded system will have sufficient capacity for the proposed scale of development; and • that existing residents will not experience reduced service or increased environmental risk as a consequence of new development.	pedestrian safety and emergency access. Including: • the number of additional vehicle movements expected; • the roads that will provide access to the new development; • which roads will require upgrading; • whether intersections will require improvement; • whether roads will require widening or reconstruction; • how pedestrian and cycling connections will be provided; • how emergency access will be maintained; and • who will pay for the necessary roading improvements.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						Consider a smaller, staged and infrastructure-led approach to growth rather than rezoning the full proposed area immediately.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
19.3				Stormwater / Flooding	This is submitted as I will be affected by the flooding etc that will inevitably result from these changes. The existing flooding and stormwater situation is of particular concern to me as the consequences of additional development will not remain within the boundaries of the new development. Demonstrate: • avoid increasing flood risk to existing residents; • avoid transferring stormwater problems from new development onto existing residential areas; • provide sufficient stormwater attenuation and drainage; • cope with increased impermeable surfaces; • function during significant rainfall events; and • account for increasing rainfall and climate-related flood risks.	Resolve stormwater and flood-risk issues before development proceeds, with particular emphasis on ensuring existing residents do not experience increased flooding as a consequence of new development. Assess the cumulative stormwater effects of the entire proposed growth area, rather than relying solely on individual subdivision assessments. I request that the proposed residential zoning be reduced or staged until an appropriate stormwater and flood-risk solution has been demonstrated.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
19.4				Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	The submission also raises concerns about effects on rural-lifestyle properties, smallholdings, animal-keeping activities, productive rural land and the potential for reverse-sensitivity issues.	Assess effects on existing smallholding and rural-lifestyle activities, including potential reverse sensitivity. Clearly identify the implications of the proposed zoning for existing animal-keeping and rural activities.
19.5				Highly Productive Land	Another concern is the loss of rural land and the long-term consequences of converting land from rural to residential use. Council commissioned an assessment of highly productive land in relation to the proposed rezoning. However, the published Highly Productive Land Assessment states the proposed rezoning areas in Eketāhuna were not assessed in that report. I do not presume all of the Eketāhuna land proposed for rezoning is highly productive land, however, I consider Council should clearly demonstrate what assessment has been undertaken of the productive capability and long-term value of the Eketāhuna land proposed for urbanisation. Council should also demonstrate the amount of rural land being converted is the minimum	I request Council publish or identify the evidence relied upon to establish the productive-land implications of the Eketāhuna rezoning.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					reasonably necessary to meet identified development requirements.	
20.1	Eketāhuna Proposed Growth Areas	Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the proposed Eketāhuna residential growth areas under Plan Change A. While my property at 1 Septimus Street is not directly within the proposed growth area, I believe I will be directly affected by the consequences of this proposal and by the precedent it establishes for the future expansion and rezoning of Eketāhuna. Eketāhuna is a small rural community. It has not experienced the level of sustained growth that would, in my view, justify treating the expansion of its residential footprint as an immediate priority. There are already vacant houses, undeveloped sections and existing residential land within and around the township. This is particularly concerning when Council's own Housing Strategy identified approximately	I ask Council to reject the proposed Eketāhuna residential rezoning and associated Residential Growth Development Area provisions. If Council is not prepared to withdraw the proposal entirely, I request that the Eketāhuna growth areas not proceed until Council has undertaken and publicly reported a robust assessment of: - Existing vacant and developable residential land in Eketāhuna. - Actual residential demand and

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					1,300 potential vacant residential sections across the four main towns, including Eketāhuna, and acknowledged that some existing undeveloped residential land is constrained by stormwater, water and wastewater infrastructure. I therefore question why the priority should be to create additional residential land when there is already undeveloped residential capacity within the existing urban areas. Questionable level of demand Council's justification for Plan Change A relies heavily on projected future growth. I recognise that Council has a responsibility to plan for the future. However, projections are not the same as demonstrated demand. The proposed growth needs to be considered against the actual circumstances of Eketāhuna. This is a small township with existing vacant properties and sections. Before additional rural land is rezoned for residential development, Council should demonstrate: the actual number of existing vacant residential sections and houses available in Eketāhuna;	development rates in Eketāhuna. - Existing stormwater, wastewater, water and reading capacity. - The cost to ratepayers of extending and maintaining infrastructure to the proposed growth areas. - The potential impact of urban expansion on existing rural properties and established rural activities. - The potential for reverse sensitivity and the resulting impact on existing landowners.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					- the number of those properties that are genuinely constrained and why; - the level of actual demand for additional residential sections; - how many new dwellings have been consented and constructed in Eketāhuna in recent years; - whether existing infrastructure can accommodate the proposed growth; and - the cost to ratepayers of extending and maintaining infrastructure into the proposed growth areas. I do not believe it is sufficient to rely on an aspirational growth scenario without first demonstrating that this growth is realistic for Eketāhuna and that the existing township cannot accommodate the level of demand being projected. Impact on existing rural properties and activities	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
20.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	My primary concern is that the proposal appears to be planning for significant future growth before Council has demonstrated that Eketāhuna has the existing infrastructure, demand and capacity to support that growth. It is not reasonable to expect existing ratepayers to carry the consequences of expanding a township when Council is already struggling to maintain some of the infrastructure serving the existing community. Growth should follow demonstrated need and infrastructure capacity, not the other way around.	
20.3				Stormwater / Flooding	I am particularly concerned about Eketāhuna's stormwater infrastructure. The existing infrastructure is already under pressure, and there are areas of Eketāhuna where open stormwater drains have experienced flooding and maintenance issues. Drummond Street is a particularly concerning example. Existing stormwater infrastructure should be functioning properly and be adequately maintained before Council commits the community to further residential expansion. This concern is not hypothetical. Council itself	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					recently issued a public notice regarding open stormwater drains, acknowledging that restrictions in these drains can increase the risk of flooding to nearby properties. Plan Change A states that new development should be properly serviced and that stormwater management is an important consideration. I believe Council should first demonstrate that the existing Eketāhuna stormwater network has sufficient capacity, resilience and maintenance to support the proposed additional development.	
20.4				Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	Although my property is not directly included in the proposed growth area, I am concerned about the longer-term consequences of the proposed expansion. Rezoning rural land around Eketāhuna changes the character and future direction of the township. Once the boundary of residential development is expanded, further expansion becomes easier to justify in the future. This is particularly important to me because I live on a property where I have an established hobby kennel and keep dogs as part of my longstanding involvement in the dog world. I have deliberately chosen to live on a property	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					where this activity is appropriate and compatible with the surrounding rural environment. If my property were eventually affected by future urban expansion or rezoning, the change from a rural environment to an urban environment could have significant consequences for my ability to continue this activity. Under Council's existing Dog Control framework, properties are generally limited to two dogs over three months unless a Three Plus Permit is granted, and boarding and breeding kennels are subject to additional requirements. For someone with an established hobby kennel, moving from a rural planning environment into an urban one could therefore create additional regulatory requirements, uncertainty and potential restrictions that do not currently exist. I do not believe established rural property owners should have to face this risk simply because Council has chosen to progressively expand the urban boundary of a township that has not demonstrated a clear need for that expansion. I also question the potential for reverse	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					sensitivity. Once new residential properties are established alongside existing rural properties and activities, complaints about noise, animals, traffic or other normal rural activities can arise. This can ultimately place pressure on existing landowners to modify activities that were established before the residential development occurred. The Council should not create this conflict unnecessarily.	
21	Eketāhuna Proposed Growth Areas	Yes	Oppose	Stormwater / Flooding	My section on Drummond Street floods dramatically around the storm water drain running through my section, making it undriveable and totally unusable a lot of times during winter the overflow from septic tanks must run into it at these times. It's not maintained at all except a useless spray I've seen once, which actually made it worse, I have sent picture to council last October because of this continued problem not being solved I have no faith in the upcoming proposal.	Decline Plan Change

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
22	Dannevirke RGDA		Oppose	General	We oppose the rezoning of 52 Cadman Road, Dannevirke, from rural to residential based on, but not limited to, the following reasons: • The character of the property: This is a 5-acre lifestyle property currently used for grazing livestock. The existing rural zoning is consistent with the way the property is used and with its rural character. The proposed change will, at some time in the future, have a limitation on the existing activities - this creates uncertainty and eventually restrict the legitimate rural use that has been established on the property. • Financial consequences: Residential zoning may result in higher rates and future costs associated with infrastructure, such as pavements, street lighting, rubbish collection, roading and other residential services. Also, there is a question about wastewater/sewerage systems that may be required to be updated and whether existing driveway entrances would need to be sealed/upgraded. The loss of	That the proposed rezoning of 52 Cadman Road, Dannevirke, from Rural to Residential be declined.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					income from livestock sales is also of concern. Property's saleability: A 5-acre lifestyle block currently appeals to people wanting space, livestock and the rural lifestyle near town. With residential zoning the property may instead become primarily attractive to a developer looking for subdivision opportunities, potentially reducing the pool of buyers. Overall, this appears to be an expensive and unnecessary change with significant uncertainty and potential costs to the owner, but little obvious benefit to the property's existing use. Furthermore, at a minimum, we request that the Tararua District Council provide affected property owners with clear information of the impacts of the rezoning of a rural property to a residential property.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
23.1	DEV02 Industrial Growth Development Area	Yes	Support	Woodville IDGA	The submitter supports Woodville's proposed Industrial Growth Development Area but seeks to extend it across their entire 14.13-hectare landholding, including an additional 4.2 hectares currently proposed to remain Rural. They consider this would create a more coherent zoning boundary and improve future access, servicing and industrial development opportunities following construction of the new highway. Logical Extension of Zoning Boundary-The requested rezoning represents a logical extension of the proposed Woodville IGDA. Extending the IGDA across the requested land would provide a clearer and more coherent zoning boundary and avoid splitting zoning across Section 14-17 SO 434380. Including the additional land would also allow future industrial development to be concentrated close to the new highway connection and roundabout. Access and Future Development - The construction of Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Tararua Highway has physically severed the submitter's land, including Sections 14 and 15 SO 434380. This has resulted in portions of	Amend the Plan Change A planning maps to include the remaining portions of Sections 14–17 Survey Office Plan 434380 and Lots 53–56 DP 135 within the proposed Industrial Growth Development Area (IGDA), together with any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the requested rezoning.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Sections 14 and 15 proposed to be rezoned as IGDA being left without physical and legal access. Until this access issue is resolved those areas will not be able to be practically developed for industrial purposes. Extending the IGDA to include the balance of Sections 14 and 15 and the other requested land would provide greater flexibility for future access, development layout, servicing and staging. Summary The submitter supports the establishment of the proposed Industrial Growth Development Area at Woodville but seeks an amendment to the proposed IGDA boundary. Under the notified Plan Change A, portions of Sections 14–17 SO 434380 are proposed to be included within the IGDA, while the remaining portions of these sections and Lots 53–56 DP 135 would remain Rural. The submitter considers that extending the IGDA to include this land would: • Provide a more concentrated and consistent zoning boundary across the landholding;	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					• Avoid splitting Sections 14–17 SO 434380 & Lots 53–56 DP 135 between Rural and IGDA; • Provide greater flexibility to address access to the portions of the landholding affected by the construction of Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Tararua Highway; • Concentrate future industrial development around the proposed Woodville industrial growth area and the new highway connection; • Avoid retaining pockets of Rural-zoned land adjoining land identified for future industrial growth; and • Provide additional land for future industrial development at Woodville and support the wider growth outcomes sought through Plan Change A.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
23.2				Stormwater / Flooding	Natural Hazards - Flooding has been considered in relation to the requested rezoning, as identified as being affected by flooding on the existing Flood Maps. Parts of Sections 14 and 15 SO 434380 that are not currently proposed for inclusion within the IGDA were apparently excluded due to flood risks. However, the submitter considers that the flooding of these areas is only marginally different from those affecting neighbouring land already proposed for inclusion within the IGDA. Flood risk can be appropriately mitigated through future subdivision, development design and site-specific engineering responses. Detailed investigation and appropriate mitigation can therefore occur as part of subsequent subdivision and development proposals.	
23.3				Highly Productive Land	The Loss of Productive Rural Land - The rezoning of above-mentioned lands to IGDA would not result in a significant loss of productive rural land, particularly when considered in the context of the wider industrial growth area proposed through Plan Change A. The Agribusiness Study concludes	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					(Jorneaux P.,2025) that the proposed growth areas around Tararua's towns will have minimal impact on agricultural productivity. The residual Rural area is unlikely to materially contribute to long-term primary production outcomes and may instead constrain the efficient development of the wider industrial growth area.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
24	The spatial mapping and zoning boundaries of the West Woodville Industrial Growth Development Area (DEV02), specifically the inclusion of my residential property.		Oppose	Woodville IDGA	Key concerns are: Under standard industrial zone rules, common domestic renovations, adding a garage, extending a bedroom, or building a sleepout would be restricted or require an expensive Resource Consent. We should not face bureaucratic or financial penalties to modify our own home due to a council-imposed zoning change. Reverse Sensitivity: Placing an active, long-standing residential/rural household inside a heavy logistics and industrial hub creates immediate conflict. Our household will be subjected to disproportionate levels of heavy vehicle noise, vibration, night-time light pollution, and dust from future adjacent industrial sites, severely impacting our health and well-being. Inefficient Infrastructure Realities: Our property is physically configured and serviced for domestic and rural lifestyle use. Forcing it into an industrial precinct creates unnecessary engineering challenges regarding stormwater, hydraulic neutrality, and acoustic buffering that could easily be avoided by altering the zone line.	Completely amend the boundaries of the DEV02 Industrial Growth Development Area to entirely exclude my property at 29 Hope Road, Woodville, maintaining its original Rural/Residential status. If the property is not excluded, Council must insert a site-specific precinct rule, scheduled activity exemption, or specific policy clause within DEV02. This clause must explicitly state that standard residential additions, alterations, and accessory buildings on this specific land parcel remain a 'Permitted Activity' for the duration of the current family's ownership or if sold with the purpose of being a home rural/property. Council must provide a formal assurance that the property will be eligible for an immediate

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Precedent for Exclusion: Council has previously removed proposed industrial boundaries in other parts of the district (such as Dannevirke and Pahiatua) specifically to protect established residential neighbourhoods. The same protection must be granted here. Harm to resale value in the future, will not be sellable to. anyone a home and our property is not big enough on its own to be used for industrial purposes. The industrial zoning would expose the household to potential heavy-vehicle noise, vibration, dust, and night-time lighting, adversely affecting residential amenity and wellbeing. The property is configured and serviced for rural-residential use and is considered unsuitable for industrial development. Industrial zoning may create unnecessary infrastructure and mitigation requirements, including stormwater, acoustic buffering, and hydraulic-neutrality measures. The submitters consider that excluding the property would be consistent with Council decisions to protect established residential areas elsewhere in the district.	and permanent Rates Remission for Residential Land in Industrial Zones. The property's rates must continue to be calculated solely on its actual residential/rural use, completely ignoring any industrial valuation uplift, for as long as it remains under our ownership or use as a rural domestic property.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					They are concerned that rezoning would reduce the property's resale value because the site is too small for viable industrial use and may become difficult to sell as a home. They oppose restrictions or resource consent costs that could apply to ordinary residential additions, alterations, garages, or sleepouts. They oppose any increase in valuation or rates arising from industrial zoning while the property continues to be used solely as a private rural-residential home.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
25		Yes	Supports in part	Natural Hazards	NHC supports, supports in part, and seeks amendments to Plan Change A -Growth Areas, as outlined in this submission and Appendix 1 <i>(Please see full submission for Appendix</i> - Proposed residential growth areas -NHC supports the proposed residential growth areas in Dannevirke, Woodville and Eketāhuna, subject to our suggested amendments to DEV01-P6 being accepted. - Pahiatua proposed residential growth areas - NHC supports in part and seeks amendments to ensure that fault avoidance zones are added to avoid fault rupture hazard associated with active faults. - Resilient subdivision and building platforms -NHC supports provisions requiring subdivision to be resilient to natural hazards and climate change and requiring stable, flood-free building platforms. - Clarification of natural hazards risk provision -NHC seeks amendments to define or provide a metric for significant natural hazard risk. This should be	All growth areas - Retain the proposed growth areas, subject to our suggested amendments on DEV01-P6. Pahiatua - Include a fault avoidance zone within the Pahiatua Proposed Residential Growth Area. Ensure liquefaction hazard is assessed and managed, noting our suggested amendments to DEV01-P6. DEV01-O2 - retain the provision. DEV01-O5 - Include a definition and/or metric to determine what natural hazard risk is deemed “significant” by the Council. DEV01-P6 - The amendments are made. DEV01-SUB-R1 - Retain the provision. DEV01-S2-Building Platforms - Retain the provision. DEV01-S2- Building Platforms -

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					informed by the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards (NPS-NH) and would support consistent interpretation and application of rules and policies. Provided at Appendix 1 is a table containing submission points that address the above, and other matters of relevance. Overall, NHC: Supports the proposed residential growth areas for Dannevirke, Eketāhuna and Woodville, noting these areas generally have lower exposure to flooding, active faults and liquefaction. It seeks retention of these areas, subject to stronger requirements for assessing and managing liquefaction risk. Supports the Pahiatua growth area only in part, because the land is exposed to multiple natural hazards. NHC requests a fault avoidance zone and appropriate assessment and management of liquefaction risk. Supports provisions requiring development to be sustainable and resilient to natural hazards and climate change, and provisions allowing Council to consider land stability and the creation or worsening of natural hazards.	The amendment is made. <i>See Appendix 1 of submission for specific amendments.</i>

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Requests clearer criteria or a definition for determining when natural hazard risk is “significant”, to promote consistent decision-making. Seeks stronger wording requiring subdivision and earthworks to avoid significant natural hazard risks where practicable, or otherwise mitigate them, including risks from liquefaction, active faults, landslides, flooding and erosion. Supports requirements for stable, flood-free building platforms. Requests a preliminary geotechnical investigation for the entire proposed development at subdivision consent stage, followed by detailed investigations for each development stage, including identification of mitigation measures and any residual risks. In summary, NHC generally supports residential growth and subdivision provisions but seeks stronger, clearer and more comprehensive natural-hazard assessment and risk-management requirements.	
26	DEV01, DEV01 SUB	Yes	Support in part	Woodville RGDA	I support the change to residential providing the following requirements are met for my property off Tay St, being accessed by paper	Amendment - when re-zoning changes come into effect, (July 2028), that 3waters and TDC

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
	R1, Woodville				road to Part Lot 1 DP 3850. That the paper road will become a street with infrastructure? That the rates changes will not be instituted until the above is completed and with fore warning of finance increases that will be incurred?	Rates changes will not take place until each service is established and operating after the re-zoning has been adopted.
27.1	Eketāhuna		Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the proposal to re zone Rural properties to residential for the following reasons: Re zoning rural land to residential will also have a huge impact on animals. Population in Eketāhuna to other towns and land mass is a lot less.	Decline the proposed residential re zoning for this area [Eketāhuna RGDA] and retain its rural zoning until designated current infrastructure upgrades are guaranteed.
27.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Infrastructure capability. Water and wastewater Infrastructure in Eketāhuna will not have the capacity to support increased residential density without causing significant strain and disruptions to current residents already paying significant rates. Money needs to be spent on current existing Land as we are at capacity already	
27.3				Stormwater / Flooding	We have already had flooding into our property because current infrastructure needs replacing.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
28			Oppose	Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Our present infrastructure will not hold up under the proposed Plan Change. Forget the rezoning as the cost is not affordable. Yes, we do need growth but not a scale that is proposed. If it was to go ahead present rate payers will be paying for future ratepayers. At the cost of rates even now we cannot afford to have any increase on our rates. Especially with the water rates supposed to rise by x\$%. Therefore, I do not want the council to go ahead with the rezoning at all.	Decline Plan Change
29.1	Eketāhuna urban expansion	Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	My submission about the proposed zoning changes from rural to urban. Part of my property is zoned rural. For me to develop it the paper road which is Dramnad St needs to be carried on with services put in place. It is not fair to be charged urban rates if its land locked and can't have value i.e. a house built on it. I can't put a driveway down beside my house because its not legally wide enough and I don't have the fall to put drainage down to the back. It would have to be pumped and Im not doing that. Also the councils building department has to be brought back to everything done in house with people who are pro development and are	Decline Eketāhuna RGDA

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					people ready to work with owners to achieve good out comes and can come up with positive ways to get things done not knock everything and bully people. There used to be a moto right through the council if someone wanted to build a shop/factory/House or whatever MAKE IT HAPPIN that has disappeared.	
29.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	In Eketāhuna this is not up to new development people who have bought land in the last couple of years have been refused permission to connect up to water and sewer. Also the storm water system is not up to scratch in High St where I live all the driveway culverts have collapsed and the water pools on the grass verges and doesn't flow down to the end of the road and in to the river where it is supposed to go . My opinion is that this is just a money grab with no intent to upgrade Eketāhuna so it can grow Half my rates bill will be going to the new water company which is \$2200 that the council does not set any more. The water plant Assets and sewer plant Assets have been given away things we paid for and now they can't be borrowed against. The council needs to be downsized we as rate payers can't afford to	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					have all these High paid people working for us Most of these people don't even live in the Tararua and don't really care about the Tararua If they did they would move here. Thanks for your time. Please see photo provided [Photo] This is full in big down pours doesn't drain away all of the culverts have collapsed. There are a lot of things like this that have been like this for years they are never fixed for more development to happen this stuff needs doing and kept up with.	
30	Keeping of animals		Oppose in part	General	The Keeping of Animals and the relationship with the Keeping of Animals Bylaw 2024 Under s10, 10.1 what does the term "no person may keep, in an urban area..." without the approval of Council. What about current use, for rams as an example for Topping in what is an existing rural area being rezoned. The same can be said for roosters used to fertilise eggs. S.11 Slaughter of animals. I have no stockyards and take in weaners and slaughter on site via a licensed home kill operator - how does the rezoning impact this? The District plan itself seems silent on this issue s.14 Permits. Currently there are no permits required for the keeping of cattle (the bylaw is	Not specified

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					silent) or sheep. Should I in the future need to seek permission of neighbours to conduct what is a permitted activity ? and then what about permit costs? which links to s15.1(a) where neighbours may object. With this rezoning, as an existing landowner, what services do I get, and if I subdivide, would the council install a wastewater connection to the sewage system at my boundary.	
31	Plan Change A	Yes	Oppose	Woodville IGDA	We live on a lifestyle property bordering the proposed new re-zoning to Woodville industrial. We are concerned about the re-zoning for several reasons, including: • Our property value would drop due to industries purchasing land. • Noise and air quality pollution bordering our property potentially 24 hours a day. We purchased our property for the peace and quiet. • Our visual outlook would be adversely affected by looking out onto industrial land instead of farmland. • We have been affected negatively with the noise from the new highway, so this	Decline Woodville IGDA

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					proposal is a double blow to negatively affect out lifestyle. We are concerned that this proposed change isn't going to utilize the railway structure. The Tararua district council should only be looking at land adjacent to the railway network. Giving that advantage to industries. We are strongly against the proposed changes.	
32.1	Eketāhuna zone changes		Oppose in part	Eketāhuna RGDA	You council are worried about not having enough residential and industrial land for this influx of people you expect... Yet you council go out your way to say no to everyone's plans and usage of their own land. This does not bode well for your ideas of the area booming and the sooner you learn to work with people to a good outcome rather than alienate then all the better. I realise you've done things this way for so long your staff have no idea how to work with people rather than pick holes in everything. But that is the biggest issue facing this district. Property owners from neighbouring council areas have all told me how bad Tararua Council is to work with. Please for the love of God, change the attitude	Delay this Eketāhuna zoning change until real consultation with those in surrounding properties is entered into.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					to one of friendly, helpful navigation of the rules and regulations to good outcomes. Without this I doubt your district planning will matter very much... Valuing my land at 160000 when it sold for 62000 six months ago is also nuts. And it seems suspicious that this zone change is just a way to increase the rates take from people who thought they were buying rural sections in a rural community. I'm also concerned that you'll push this through regardless of what anyone says and then take this as a mandate to do it again next year to greater areas without regard to current residents.	
32.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Eketāhuna infrastructure and current drainage in the areas highlighted for zone change to residential may not be supported by current systems. I already pay over a thousand a year for water and wastewater that I'm not connected to. Anyone purchasing or developing these new areas should be funding the cost of proper infrastructure themselves as it's already a rort that those of us with no connections to services are paying through the nose to support	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					neighbours who are connected. Anyone using the services should pay more and give us lot collecting our own water and dealing with our own waste a bloody break.	
33.1	The proposed rezoning of its land from rural to industrial and its inclusion in the IGDA		Oppose	Woodville IGDA	Insufficient evidence of demand: The Trust says the Council has not demonstrated a need for 20–40 hectares of additional industrial land in Woodville. It argues that the approach is aspirational and speculative rather than supported by a Woodville-specific demand or absorption assessment. Constraints on current and future rural use: IGDA rules prioritise industrial activity, avoid non-industrial activity, and impose more demanding subdivision standards, including a Comprehensive Development Plan. The Trust considers these controls could materially restrict farming, rural development, and other non-industrial uses. Financial impact: The Trust says unwanted industrial zoning may increase rates while limiting the property’s viable uses if industrial demand does not eventuate. Consultation concerns: It contends that affected landowners were not adequately consulted.	The owned by the Boyden Family Trust to the north of Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Tararua Highway: Not be rezoned to industrial; Not be subject to the IGDA provisions; and retain its existing rural zoning.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
33.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Infrastructure and access uncertainty: The proposed land lacks reticulated three-waters services, with no immediate servicing programme. The Trust also notes no evidence that NZTA will permit access from the new state highway.	
33.3				Highly Productive Land	Highly productive rural land: The property is a single 22.8-hectare title and part of an operating dairy-heifer grazing farm. The submission argues that rezoning it conflicts with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land because the Council has not shown that the land is the minimum necessary for industrial capacity.	
34.1	The proposed rezoning of the Trust's land to industrial and its inclusion in the IGDA (see attachment		Oppose	Woodville IGDA	The Waipuna Trust opposes Plan Change A insofar as it would rezone its rural land west of Woodville for industrial use and include it within the proposed Industrial Growth Development Area. None of the reports provided in support of the proposed plan change or the Tararua District Urban Growth Strategy, or even the Urban Growth Strategy itself clearly demonstrate demand for a further 20-40 hectares of industrial land at Woodville. There appears to be little or no justification for PCA to adopt an	The owned by the Waipuna Trust/the Boyden Family Trust to the north of Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Tararua Highway: Not be rezoned to industrial; Not be subject to the IGDA provisions; and retain its existing rural zoning.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
	<i>in full submission)</i>				'aspirational' view of the demand for industrial zoned land in Woodville. The IGDA includes land use provisions which are intended to limit permitted activities to industrial only, with a small provision for ancillary activities. The Section 32 Report (page 7) states that this has been done to protect the integrity of the IGDA growth area to serve its purpose of providing for industrial growth within the district. Policy DEV02-P3 is to avoid non-industrial activities in the IGDA. This potentially constrains the ability of affected landowners to subdivide that land for non-industrial purposes or carry out other non-industrial activities. The Plan Change states that the existing provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply to the proposed development areas, except where explicitly provided for in the plan change provisions. It is unclear on its face to what extent PCA imposes restrictions on non-industrial activities on rural land. It potentially severely restricts the ongoing use and development of that land for primary production purposes. The proposed provisions will take precedence	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					for managing subdivision within the industrial areas. Future subdivisions in the IGDA must comply with additional development standards in order to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity. Standard DEV2-SUB-S6 requires the applicant to provide a Comprehensive Development Plan showing the staging of development, the design, layout and servicing of the stage to be consented and any future consequences for achieving adequate connectivity with adjoining IGDA land. These provisions are more onerous than the existing provisions for subdivision in the rural zone. It is inappropriate to rezone rural land to industrial (even by way of an overlay) in the absence of a quantified demand for additional industrial land or a demonstrable capacity shortfall for such land. The approach adopted by the Council, which its own documents acknowledge is 'aspirational' rather than demonstrable, is speculative at best.	
34.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	There is no evidence that NZTA would enable access to the proposed industrial area from the new State Highway. The land in Woodville proposed to be rezoned	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					to industrial is not infrastructure ready. The proposed plan change acknowledges that these sites do not have reticulated three waters networks available and there are no immediate programmes to provide reticulated networks in these locations (Plan Change A, Section 1.1, page 1).	
34.3				Highly Productive Land	The Trust considers the rezoning unjustified because there is insufficient evidence of long-term industrial demand in Woodville, confirmed access from the new state highway, or infrastructure readiness. It also argues that the proposal does not adequately address the protection of highly productive land, differs from the Urban Growth Strategy's recommended zoning, and could restrict the continued productive use and future subdivision of its approximately 360-hectare sheep and beef farming property. The Section 32 Report acknowledges that the areas proposed for rezoning are identified as containing highly productive land as defined by the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) (Section 32 Report, page 22). The requirements of clause 3.6 of the National	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) have not been met. In particular, the land proposed to be rezoned is not the minimum necessary to provide the required industrial development capacity, particularly for a 'business as usual' scenario. The Section 32 Report states that the property sizes within the proposed rezoning areas are predominantly less than 4 hectares and that this significantly limits the feasibility of land-based primary production on that land. However, that is not the case for the Waipuna Trust's land. The land immediately north of Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatu Tararua Highway that is proposed to be rezoned is owned by the Waipuna Trust. It is part of a much larger property of about 360 hectares which is a significant sheep and beef operation.	
35.1	Eketāhuna residential growth Area D225 Stanly street	Yes	Oppose	Stormwater / Flooding	The area chosen for change Stanly Street is a known flood prone area,	Stanly Street to be completely deleted from any change in the process
35.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	it has no adequate storm water services provided by council also no wastewater services and according to power line	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					companies is unable for new connections due to current power supply services currently at full capacity. the area also has no fibre internet supply available. Hardly a suitable area fit for change to "Residential"	
36	Pahiatua - Residential Growth	Yes	Support	Pahiatua RGDA	I Support the Plan Change A. Pahiatua needs to continue growing, and making more land available for residential subdivision will help provide additional housing opportunities, support future growth, and contribute to the long-term development of the town.	I am seeking for the land identified in the proposed Plan Change A area to be rezoned from Rural to Residential.
37.1	Eketāhuna Proposed Growth Areas	Yes	Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the proposed rezoning of the adjoining properties on High Street, Septimus and Bright Street, from Rural to Residential. This is productive working rural land currently used for rural purposes and livestock. It is not vacant land waiting for residential development. I also question whether there is sufficient actual demands for housing in Eketāhuna to justify rezoning productive rural land now, rather than allowing growth to occur in stages as demand is demonstrated.	I ask Council to retain these properties as Rural Zone; properly assess the existing drainage, flooding, and infrastructure conditions; demonstrate the actual need for this additional residential land; assess whether Eketāhuna's existing water, wastewater, stormwater, drainage, roading and other infrastructure can support the proposed development; explain what infrastructure upgrades

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						would be required; and clearly explain who would pay for those upgrades and any additional costs to existing landowners and ratepayers. I believe the existing Rural zoning is appropriate and should be retained.
37.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Eketāhuna also faces broader infrastructure constraints. Its existing water, wastewater, stormwater, roading, and drainage infrastructure may not have sufficient capacity to support significant residential expansion without substantial upgrades. Any increase in development could place additional pressure on those services, increase maintenance requirements and further costs for the Council, existing ratepayers and affected landowners. It could also place additional demand on already constrained infrastructure and worsen existing drainage, flooding, wastewater and roading issues.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
37.3				Stormwater / Flooding	I am particularly concerned about the drainage and water issues. There is no council-maintained drainage infrastructure on these private properties. The land relies existing private and natural drainage and can become very wet and water-saturated. Councils own Three Waters report identifies Eketāhuna's reliance on open drains and overland flow, existing stormwater constraints and saturated soils in the proposed north-eastern growth areas. It also warns that new development can increase surface flooding risks for existing areas. I am concerned that residential development would increase runoff and alter existing waterflows, potentially affecting neighbouring properties.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
38	Rezoning in Woodville - residential/urban.		Support in part	Woodville RGDA	We received a letter on 30 September (dated 28 September) advising us of the proposed rezoning. Unfortunately, this was the first time we became aware of the proposal, and we had not seen any previous communication regarding it. We own a 1.6-acre lifestyle property on Nelson Street and have a number of questions about how the proposed rezoning may affect us. We generally understand the reasons behind the proposal and the need to provide for future growth, and we are supportive of that in principle. However, we have not been provided with enough information to fully understand what rezoning our property from rural to residential would mean in practice. We are keen to better understand the potential impacts on our property, including rates, services, livestock, future development opportunities, and our ability to continue using and enjoying the property as we do today. The questions below are intended to help us better understand those implications and form an informed view on the proposal. If the rezoning goes ahead, what impact is it likely to have on our rates? We appreciate there	Provide further information.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					may be no immediate change, but are rates expected to increase over time (as a result of rezoning) and, if so, by roughly how much? We currently have our own water supply and septic system. Does Council intend to install reticulated water, wastewater and stormwater services to our property or the street frontage as part of this rezoning? If so, what is the expected timeframe? If this infrastructure is not expected to be installed in the short term (say 1-3 years), will properties in the rezoned area still face increased rates or other charges as though the services were already available or planning to be installed? If reticulated services are eventually installed, will connection be mandatory, and who would be responsible for the connection costs? We currently keep sheep on the property, including ewes and a ram. Would the proposed rezoning affect our ability to continue keeping livestock on the property? If the land is rezoned, what is the minimum land size for a dwelling? Has any traffic or road safety assessment been carried or planned to be as part of this	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					proposal? Are there any plans to review the speed limit or make improvements such as footpaths, crossings or other safety measures? We would support reducing the speed limit from 100 km/h to 50 km/h given the number of people walking along the road (Nelson Street and the State Highway).	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
39	Eketāhuna Residential Growth Area; DEV01; LOTS 21-24 DP 1535 rezoning Eketāhuna Residential Growth Area; DEV01; LOT 20 DP 1535 rezoning		Oppose in part	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the proposed Rural to Eketāhuna Residential rezoning of this title in its present form. The property is a former trucking yard with large sheds and yard space suited to business uses. Existing-use rights do not preserve reasonable flexibility for future businesses. Residential subdivision cannot presently be realised because additional servicing is not available. Council did not answer my questions before submissions closed. The key concerns are that: The property contains substantial sheds and yard space suited to business-related uses. Residential zoning may restrict future business use of the site. Current water, electricity and servicing constraints may prevent subdivision or residential development. Council did not respond to questions about infrastructure and future land-use options before submissions closed. The rezoning could result in higher service-related rates despite connections or subdivision not being available. The submitter seeks retention of the current	Remove LOT 20 DP 1535 from the proposed Eketāhuna Residential Growth Development Area and retain its present zoning; or apply a site-specific provision, overlay or suitable mixed or business-compatible zoning that allows future residential development if services become available while preserving reasonable business use of the existing sheds and yard; confirm what infrastructure capacity is currently available, what upgrades are needed, who would fund them and when they are expected; and ensure the title is not rated as though additional connections or subdivision are available when they are not.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					zoning or a site-specific mixed or business-compatible approach that preserves future residential potential and reasonable business use. They also request clarification of infrastructure capacity, upgrades, funding and timing.	
40.1		Yes	Support in part	Existing Use rights/Reverse sensitivity	I own a small holding adjoining the proposed growth area and kept livestock, dogs and machinery on the property. I am concerned with the introduction of new residential housing around me; this will create reverse sensitivity problems with dogs barking moving stock and noisy machines sometimes working early or late.	That they kept all costs to an acceptable level and it's done in a timely manner with more consultation.
40.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	I regularly use Drummond Street and have concerns about its width condition and suitability for extra traffic. I am concerned that the increase in housing and residents in Eketāhuna will place extra strain on the limited services we have available.	
40.3				Stormwater / Flooding	I am concerned about our stormwater drains not keeping up with the extra water and rubbish that seems to accumulate with extra housing and the small size off pipe that goes from Drummond Street to an open drain on Bridge Street as flooding has occurred in the past.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
41	Zoning / Proposed Growth Areas in Eketāhuna		Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the changes as they stand, after community consultation there are many concerns and everyone I have surveyed also opposes. I do not think the land area chosen on the western side of Eketāhuna is suitable residential development. It is very damp and low in many areas and my understanding is that there is not capacity for services as it stands. We had an open community discussion about it and I did a survey of everyone there and every single signatory opposed the change. I do not think the proposal is clear in regard to how this is viable and an area had been chosen without taking into account the conditions and natural features the land has and again in many cases is not suitable for residential development. The low areas make it very difficult to control vegetation growth without grazing animals and by forcing residential development there will be areas where pest plants can proliferate as access to controlling them is limited in many cases to animals.	I think proof of viability needs to be provided first with a clear roadmap of how the area is to be developed before rezoning properties for residential development including how it is going to be paid for and by who and when. Also there needs to be a closer look at the land itself and the terrain, the area is very wet and there are springs and natural waterways that cannot be controlled. As I understand the services are at or near full capacity as it is. this can then be revisited in the future when more clarity is established.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
42	To rezone 31 Bevan Street, Woodville from Rural to Residential and include in the RGDA		Oppose in part	Woodville RGDA Existing Use Rights	The submitter is therefore concerned that the proposed Residential zoning could constrain the future development, intensification and expansion of the breeding centre and undermine the significant investment made in acquiring 31 Bevan Street for this purpose. See submission attachment for full details. Totally Vets Limited opposes the proposed rezoning of its 6.49-hectare property at 31 Bevan Street, Woodville, from Rural to Residential and its inclusion in the Woodville Residential Growth Development Area. The property was purchased to become the principal base for the Tararua Breeding Centre, consolidating specialist livestock breeding, animal housing and handling, quarantine, laboratory, storage and associated activities currently undertaken across several Woodville sites. The submitter considers that the existing Rural zoning better reflects the established and intended use of the property. It is concerned that Residential zoning could restrict the future development, intensification and expansion of the breeding centre. It also raises the risk of reverse sensitivity effects, as nearby residential	Exclude 31 Bevan Street, Woodville from the proposed Residential Zone and Residential Growth Development Area and retain the Rural zoning of the property. Amend the adjoining Residential Zone and Residential Growth Development Area boundaries and/or provisions to avoid or appropriately manage reverse sensitivity effects on the breeding centre, including by retaining adjoining land in the Rural Zone where necessary or requiring appropriate separation distances, setbacks, buffers, subdivision layouts and building locations for new residential development. In the alternative, if 31 Bevan Street is retained within the proposed Residential Zone and/or Residential Growth Development Area, include

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					development could lead to complaints or pressure to constrain operational effects such as animal noise, odour, lighting, stock and commercial vehicle movements.	appropriate site specific or other provisions that recognise and provide for the ongoing operation of the Tararua Breeding Centre at 31 Bevan Street; enable the progressive consolidation at 31 Bevan Street of activities associated with the established breeding centre that are currently undertaken at other locations; provide for the reasonable development, alteration, intensification and expansion of the breeding centre, including animal housing and holding areas, quarantine and isolation facilities, yards and animal handling facilities, semen and embryo collection and processing facilities, laboratories, liquid nitrogen manufacture and associated infrastructure, semen and product storage facilities, offices and staff facilities,

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						buildings and structures, stock truck and commercial vehicle access, servicing and infrastructure, and other activities ancillary to or associated with the operation of the breeding centre; and require subdivision, residential development and other sensitive activities within the surrounding Residential Growth Development Area to be designed, located and managed to avoid or otherwise appropriately address reverse sensitivity effects on the breeding centre, including through appropriate separation distances, setbacks, buffers, subdivision design, building location, mitigation measures and/or other appropriate planning mechanisms. Make any consequential amendments to the objectives, policies, rules, standards,

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						development area provisions and planning maps necessary to give effect to the relief sought above. Grant such other or alternative relief that gives effect to the substance and intent of this submission.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
43.1			Support	General	Horizons Regional Council generally supports Proposed Plan Change A – Growth Areas, subject to further work.	
43.2				Highly Productive Land	Some of the land proposed to be rezoned through the PPC is recognised as Highly Productive Land (HPL) under clause 3.5(7) of the NPS-HPL. While we understand that some of the proposed urban rezoning on LUC 3 land is exempted from being recognised as HPL under clause 3.5(7)(iii) of the NPS-HPL. The remaining the LUC 3 land is subject to clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL, and the LUC 2 land is subject to clauses 3.6(4) and 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL. Horizons notes that the proposed residential rezoning extent in Woodville, Pahiatua, and Eketāhuna significantly exceeds the residential demand-supply gaps identified in the Tararua District Land Assessment¹. The Section 32 Report does not provide additional information demonstrating how the PPC meets the requirements of clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL. Additionally, neither Section 32 Report nor the Tararua District Land Assessment identifies the industrial land capacity requirements necessary to inform the NPS-HPL	Highly Productive Land: • provides additional information to demonstrate that the PPC meets the requirements of the NPS-HPL; and • make any necessary amendments to the proposed rezoning extents if the additional information shows that the PPC does not give effect to the NPS-HPL.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					assessments. While acknowledging that the Section 32 Report addresses the assessments against clauses 3.6(4)(a) and 3.6(4)(b) of the NPS-HPL, Horizons considers that the assessment against clause 3.6(4)(c) needs to be more detailed to demonstrate that the requirements of this clause are met.	
43.3				Ecology	The Section 32 Report states (page 30) that “There are no known biodiversity sites or locations within the PCA growth areas.” However, Horizons has identified some potential wetland areas that may meet the requirements outlined in the NPS-FM, National Environmental Standards for Freshwater, and those outlined in Schedule 6 of the One Plan. Horizons does not seek any amendments to the PPC on this basis but wishes to flag the potential requirement of ecological assessments at the development stage.	None specified
43.4				Natural Hazards	Horizons acknowledges that the Operative District Plan and the proposed provisions for the residential and industrial growth areas under this PPC partially address the requirements of RPS HAZ-NH Policy 10(2) and RPS HAZ-NH Policy 12.	Natural Hazards retains DEV01-P6, DEV01-S2, DEV02-P6, and DEV02-S2 as notified;

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					However, Horizons notes that the requirements of RPS HAZ-NH Policy 10(4)(b) are not addressed by either the proposed provisions or the Operative District Plan.	- include additional provisions to fully give effect to RPS HAZ-NH Policy 10; and - give effect to NPS-NH in relation to hazards, including flood and seismic hazards.
43.4				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	Horizons supports DEV01-O3, DEV01-P4, DEV02-O3, and DEV02-P4 as these provisions give effect to RPS UFD Policy 1.	Infrastructure Horizons seeks that Tararua District Council retains DEV01-O3, DEV01-P4, DEV02-O3, and DEV02-P4 as notified.
43.6				Stormwater / Flooding	Horizons supports DEV01-O4, DEV01-P5, DEV01-S5, DEV02-O4, DEV02-P5 and DEV02-S5 as these provisions align with RPS UFD Policy 4(1)(g) and RPS UFD Policy 8(1)(a) .	Stormwater Horizons seeks that Tararua District Council retains DEV01-O4, DEV01-P5, DEV01-S5, DEV02-O4, DEV02-P5 and DEV02-S5 as notified.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
44.1	DEV01 Residential Growth Development Area	Yes	Oppose in part	Dannevirke RGDA	I wish to make a submission opposing the proposed rezoning of our property from Rural to Residential under Plan Change A and respectfully request that our property be excluded from the rezoning area. The proposed zoning does not reflect the physical characteristics, limitations, and ongoing challenges associated with our land. Rezoning would result in significant financial disadvantage to our family while providing little or no practical benefit. Topography and Site Constraints The topography of our property presents additional development challenges. The physical characteristics of the site make residential development difficult and potentially uneconomic. The proposed rezoning appears to overlook these significant constraints. Financial Impact on Our Family Rezoning our property residential would create a substantial financial burden. We would be required to pay higher rates and contribute towards urban services and infrastructure that we are unable to	We respectfully request that Tararua District Council exclude our property from the proposed residential rezoning and retain its current rural zoning. The proposed residential zoning does not appear appropriate for the characteristics of our land and would unfairly impose additional costs and disadvantages on our family while offering little practical benefit.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					meaningfully use because of the flooding risk, topographical limitations, and development constraints affecting the property. In effect, we would be paying for the benefits of residential zoning without having any realistic ability to realise those benefits ourselves. This would place our family in a worse financial position while providing no corresponding advantage.	
44.2				Stormwater / Flooding	We understand and support the need for growth within the Tararua District. We recognise that the Council must plan for future housing demand and that decisions need to be made regarding where residential development should occur. However, we question the appropriateness of using the Tapuata Stream corridor and surrounding flood-prone land as a basis for extending residential zoning boundaries. Flooding and Natural Hazard Risk Our property experiences regular flooding,	We would like to respectfully invite the Mayor, Chief Executive, Councillors, Planning Team, and Infrastructure Manager to visit our property and see firsthand the challenges and constraints associated with rezoning this land for residential development. A site visit would provide an opportunity to observe the area's unique

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					occurring at least annually and often multiple times within a year. The flooding has already caused considerable losses and ongoing costs, including: • Damage to and replacement of fencing. • Damage to temporary farm bridges and accessways. • Loss of productive land. • Losses associated with stock and farming activities. Given the frequency and severity of flooding events, we do not consider the land suitable for residential development. Rezoning the property residential does not alter the natural hazard risks that currently affect the site. Waterway Setback Requirements Current consenting requirements require a 20-metre setback from waterways. Due to the size, shape, and configuration of our land parcel, complying with these setback requirements would significantly restrict, or potentially eliminate, any realistic residential development opportunities. As a result, despite being zoned residential, the practical ability to utilise the land for residential purposes would be severely limited.	characteristics, including the impact of flooding, the proximity and ongoing movement of the stream, and the practical limitations these factors place on future development. We believe that viewing the site in person will give decision-makers a clearer understanding of why rezoning this land from rural to residential is not appropriate and why the proposed zoning does not accurately reflect the realities of the land. We welcome the opportunity to discuss our concerns on-site and answer any questions that may assist in the Council's consideration of our submission.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					The Tapuata Stream is a dynamic waterway that is constantly changing in response to flood events, erosion, sediment movement, and changing weather patterns. Our firsthand experience over many years has shown that flood behaviour is not static. The stream regularly affects our property and surrounding land in ways that may not be fully reflected in a single flood assessment or model. Given the known history of flooding, the extent of flood-prone land identified within the Council's own mapping, and the ongoing changes occurring within the stream environment, we believe a more precautionary approach should be taken. It is difficult to understand why land so closely associated with a waterway that regularly floods and changes course and flow characteristics would be considered appropriate for residential rezoning. While we appreciate the need to accommodate future growth, we submit that growth should occur on land that is demonstrably suitable for residential development, where flood risk and natural hazard constraints are minimal. In contrast, our property is significantly	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					constrained by flooding, waterway setbacks, topography, and natural hazard risk, making it fundamentally unsuitable for residential zoning. For these reasons, we believe retaining the current Rural zoning for our property would better reflect the realities of the land and avoid imposing unnecessary financial and practical burdens on our family. Impact of Future Development Upstream and Surrounding Areas We are also concerned that future residential subdivision within the surrounding area will increase stormwater runoff entering local waterways. Even where attenuation tanks and stormwater management systems are installed, increased development intensity has the potential to alter water flows and place further pressure on the stream network affecting our property. Any increase in water volumes or flow rates would worsen existing flooding issues and increase safety risks. This is particularly concerning for our family and children, who currently enjoy and use the property. Increased flooding and water flow would reduce our	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					ability to safely enjoy our land and could further impact its long-term usability.	
45	Eketāhuna residential growth area		Oppose in part	Eketāhuna RGDA	I oppose the majority of the land outlined in the Eketāhuna map. I do agree that Drummond St should change as it is already being heavily developed, but the rest of the proposed changes are not land that is easily able to be developed, there is ground saturation issues, the ability to connect to any water connections, the power grid is also falling short of being able to handle more loading. Much of the land on high street and surrounds can only be maintained by the grazing of stock due to the slope of the land and water drainage issues.	That the growth areas in Eketāhuna be reconsidered and more suitable land be found to change into residential for growth.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
46	DEV01-P2, DEV01-P4, DEV01-Sub-R1, Standards			General	Powerco supports the overall intent of Proposed Plan Change A to ensure that subdivision and development are appropriately serviced and integrated with existing and planned infrastructure. The submission seeks a practical planning framework that protects electricity distribution assets, minimises conflicts with new development, maintains safe electrical clearances, and provides sufficient space for the operation, maintenance and access of the electricity network.	Retain DEV01-P2 as notified. Amend DEV01-P4. Amend the notification provisions for DEV01-SUB-R1. Add a new standard, DEV01-S7. <i>See Appendix 1 of submission for specific amendments.</i>
47	Eketāhuna		Oppose in part	Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	I am against adding residential zoning in Eketāhuna, because water and sewage are not available for new connections.	Plan to upgrade infrastructure first.
48.1	Whole PC	Yes	Support in part	General	I acknowledge that this plan change is quite limited in scope and is occurring at a time of rapidly changing and uncertain higher order planning instruments, including the replacement of the RMA which sits above the NPSHPL and the untethering of previous Court decisions. Some specific points a) The proposed area for industrial expansion in Woodville isn't easily connected to the rail so is unnecessarily artificially limiting the types and	Where possible and where within scope, that my submissions inform the amended final decisions

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					scale of potential industry. b) I'm doubtful the rezoning of the Fonterra site in Pahiatua allows for other industries as it is my understanding that Fonterra owns this entire zone, although the area does pass the rail connectivity test, cited for Woodville above. As a result of this process (Plan change A) a greater number of industries ought to be able to be easily established rather than conferring monopolistic power to the incumbents. c) Unfortunately it appears Eketāhuna has no industrial land zoned which risks being self-fulfilling.	
48.2				Highly Productive Land	I generally support this plan change if it results in less loss of rural productive land (section 32 report, key development trends, unnumbered para) and less urban sprawl, while protecting highly productive land. In my view urban houses shouldn't be built on LUC 1 land at all and only on LUC 2 where there isn't land of a lower LUC available to connect to council services. It's not clear from this proposal that there has been adequate consideration of the LUC mapping , as outlined in Appendix 3, in the selection or deselection of areas for urban expansion and the inherent	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					hierarchy of the LUC system. Fragmentation of land ownership shouldn't override the underlying scarce natural resource that is attempting to be protected by the National Policy Statement Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL), I note that there are many economic instruments available to and used by farmers to aggregate land outside of ownership. I would also point to Iwi owned land that is very highly fragmented in ownership but still able to be aggregated for use.	
49	Proposed Residential rezoning at Pahiatua, including the southern Pahiatua growth area and associated planning maps; and DEV01 Residential Growth		Oppose in part	General	The Diamond Family supports the provision of additional land for residential growth at Pahiatua but considers that the proposed Residential zoning should be extended to include the land identified as Additional Residential 1 and Additional Residential 2 in the attached submission. The Diamond Family also opposes the proposed DEV01 Residential Growth Development Area provisions. The reasons for the submission are set out in the attached submission. In Summary, the submission outlines: Case for additional residential zoning. The submission argues the two areas would create a more logical and continuous urban boundary,	That the WN209/119, WN247/289 and 436442 be rezoned residential. Deletion of DEV01 and reliance on the underlying Residential Zone and operative subdivision provisions. If DEV01 is retained, a full rewrite of all DEV01 provisions is sought, including removal of unnecessary or duplicated requirements and provisions relating to matters that will

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
	Development Area provisions.				rather than leaving Rural-zoned land between existing and proposed residential areas. Additional Residential 1 has direct frontage to Jervois Street, allowing connection to the existing local road network without new State Highway 2 access. The land is described as generally gently contoured. Although a drainage corridor crosses part of it, the submission says this can be incorporated into subdivision, stormwater, and open-space design. It argues that servicing, hazards, drainage, and stormwater can be addressed through normal subdivision processes, as they will need to be for Council's proposed growth areas. The submitter also challenges the adequacy of the notified growth capacity. Council proposes about 47 ha of residential rezoning, but the submission estimates only about 21 ha may be genuinely available for further development. Adding the 7.3582 ha in Additional Residential 1 would lift this indicative available area to about 28 ha, closer to BERL's estimated 27 ha requirement before allowing for roads and infrastructure. The contribution from Additional Residential 2 is not quantified. Objection to DEV01 The Diamond Family opposes DEV01	no longer be within the scope of district land use consenting, and amendment of information and assessment requirements so that they are relevant and proportionate to the particular subdivision.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					and asks that it be removed. The submission says the maps do not clearly identify the Residential Growth Development Area where DEV01 would apply, creating uncertainty. It argues DEV01 adds a disproportionately restrictive subdivision regime, including restricted-discretionary consent status, lot-size controls, comprehensive development plans, geotechnical investigations, and detailed stormwater requirements. In the submitter's view, these requirements duplicate or exceed the operative subdivision provisions and should only apply when relevant to a particular proposal. The submission further argues that DEV01 may not align with the transitional Resource Management Act framework and new Planning Act direction, which emphasise proportionate consent and information requirements. It also questions whether the Ministerial exemption underpinning Plan Change A allowed Council to introduce this broader new regulatory framework. If DEV01 is retained, the submitter seeks a complete rewrite to remove duplication and unnecessary blanket requirements, exclude matters that may fall outside future district land-use	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					consent scope, and make assessment requirements proportionate to each subdivision.	
50	DEV01 Residential Growth Development Area and DEV02 Industrial Growth Development Area, including all associated objectives,		Oppose	General	McFlynn Surveying & Planning opposes DEV01 and DEV02 in their entirety. The proposed provisions introduce unnecessary and overly prescriptive additional regulation for subdivision and development, duplicate matters already addressed through the Operative District Plan, and are not adequately justified by the section 32 assessment. There are also fundamental issues with the spatial application of the proposed RGDA and IGDA provisions, their consistency with the transitional RMA framework, and the scope of the Ministerial exemption under which Plan	The submitter seeks deletion of DEV01 and DEV02 in their entirety, with subdivision and development managed through the underlying zone and operative subdivision provisions. If either DEV01 or DEV02 is retained, the submitter seeks a full rewrite of all relevant objectives, policies, rules, standards and matters of

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
	policies, rules, standards and matters of discretion.				Change A was progressed. The reasons for the submission are set out in the attached submission. In summary: Main concerns Unclear coverage: The planning maps rezone land but do not identify or map the RGDA or IGDA, so it is unclear where DEV01 and DEV02 apply. Questionable legal scope: The submission questions whether the Ministerial exemption that enabled Plan Change A extended beyond rezoning land to creating a broad new regulatory framework. Conflict with incoming law: Transitional RMA amendments due to apply from 30 October 2026 require consent processes and information demands to be timely, cost-effective, necessary, and proportionate. The submission says DEV01 and DEV02 move in the opposite direction. Potentially irrelevant consent matters: Some proposed controls could address matters that the new framework will exclude from district land-use consent decisions, including certain residential design and amenity matters and, for	discretion, including amendments necessary to: - remove provisions that are inconsistent with the transitional RMA framework or relate to matters that will no longer be within the scope of district land use consenting; - remove or amend all DEV01 and DEV02 provisions capable of applying to district land use consenting to ensure they do not regulate or provide a basis for considering matters specified in section 104(1A); - remove unnecessary or duplicated provisions; - ensure information and technical assessment requirements apply only where they are relevant

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					industrial development, trade competition, demand, retail distribution, and financial viability. Insufficient evidence: The section 32 assessment is said not to demonstrate that existing provisions cannot manage access, infrastructure, stormwater, natural hazards, and subdivision design, or that the proposed controls are the most efficient option. Specific issues with DEV01 Residential subdivision would shift from controlled to restricted discretionary activity status. Blanket requirements for geotechnical reports, detailed stormwater plans, and comprehensive development plans are considered unjustified and duplicative. The 450 m² average lot-size requirement may undermine the stated goal of providing varied housing and site sizes. Broad infrastructure, connectivity, open-space, and water-sensitive-design requirements may impose obligations regardless of a site's scale or circumstances. The provisions contain an inconsistency: they refer to consultation with tangata whenua as a	and proportionate to the particular proposal; • remove blanket requirements for technical information where the need for that information has not been established; • ensure activity status and matters of discretion are proportionate to the effects being managed; • ensure that Council-level infrastructure and stormwater issues are not inappropriately transferred to individual applicants; • address the unidentified spatial application of the RGDA and IGDA provisions; • remove the undefined references to “current Engineering Standards”,

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					discretionary matter while generally preventing public or limited notification. Specific issues with DEV02 Industrial subdivision would also become restricted discretionary and face similar blanket technical and planning requirements. Water and wastewater servicing requirements may not be appropriate for every industrial allotment or eventual use. Stormwater controls could result in duplicate assessment at subdivision and later development stages. The 30% gross-floor-area cap on ancillary activities is described as arbitrary and unsupported by evidence. A drafting error refers to the RGDA in an IGDA subdivision rule, indicating the provisions need further testing.	or replace them with clearly identified requirements whose status and application are established through the District Plan; and • correct drafting errors and other internal inconsistencies. The submitter also seeks any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought.
51	DEV02 Industrial Growth Development Area		Support in part	Pahiatua IGDA	Fonterra supports the overall approach taken through PCA. The remaining matters raised in this submission focus on ensuring the provisions support the established operations and provide for future development opportunities at the Pahiatua Site. Please refer to the attached submission document for a detailed description of the requested	Support the industrial zoning as notified. Insert definitions and/or a figure at the beginning of the IGDA provisions identifying the relevant land and activity. Existing Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Site means the

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					amendments. Fonterra generally supports Plan Change A, particularly the proposed Industrial zoning of both the existing Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Site and the adjoining Buckley Block. It considers the zoning recognises the established industrial operation, provides a buffer from incompatible surrounding land uses, and enables future development. However, Fonterra seeks amendments to ensure the rezoning does not unintentionally reduce the operational and development framework that currently applies to the site. Its submission focuses on: clearly defining the existing Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Site, the Buckley Block, the wider dairy manufacturing site as it expands, and the Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Activity; retaining a permitted activity pathway for the existing operation and its future expansion; carrying forward the existing site-specific building height and noise standards; allowing Fonterra to continue using, maintaining and upgrading its on-site water and wastewater systems, with connection to Council systems remaining optional where	area as identified on Figure DEV02-1. Amend DEV02-GIZ-R1. Insert DEV02-GIZ-Building Height. Insert DEV02-GIZ-NOISE - Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Activity. Amend DEV02-P4. Amend DEV02-SUB-S3 - Water Supply and DEV02-SUB-S4 - Wastewater Disposal. Amend DEV02-GIZ-S1 - Water Supply and DEV02-GIZ-S2 - Wastewater Disposal. Amend DEV02-SUB-S5 - Stormwater Management and DEV-GIZ-S3 - Stormwater Management. Amend DEV02-SUB-S2 - Building Platforms. Amend DEV-02-SUB-S6. <i>See Appendix 1 of submission for specific amendments.</i>

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					suitable; avoiding unnecessary stormwater management plans where existing systems can accommodate the proposed development without materially changing stormwater effects; and providing targeted exemptions from building-platform, geotechnical and Comprehensive Development Plan requirements for operational subdivisions or boundary adjustments where those requirements are not relevant. The submission distinguishes the Pahiatua Dairy Manufacturing Activity from other industrial activities that may establish on the Buckley Block, so that Fonterra's requested site-specific provisions do not automatically apply to unrelated development.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
52.1	Eketāhuna Proposed Growth Area from Rural to Eketāhuna Residential		Oppose	Eketāhuna RGDA	To oppose the proposed Plan Change A pertaining to Eketāhuna specifically changing the area bordered by High Street, Simpson St and Bright Street from current Rural to Residential zoning. The specific reasons for my opposition are (but not limited to): Council's own research does not support population pressure sufficient to warrant to alteration of the special nature of Eketāhuna. rural environs. BERL states that no population growth between 2013 + 2025. Despite there being considerable uninhabited houses in the residential area. Eketāhuna rural land is classed as highly productive. Council's own Section 32 report requires Council to establish: the urban zoning is required; there are no other reasonably practicable and feasible options, and the benefits outweigh the cost of losing? [see original submission]. Council has not assessed the Eketāhuna rezoning area against its own criteria.	I seek that the rezoning provision for Eketāhuna be deleted as council has appeared to have shown no evidence that it is necessary nor desirable and the above stated negative impacts have not been mitigated.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
52.2				Infrastructure Provision / Capacity	About the proposed growth area change from Rural Eketāhuna to residential Eketāhuna, which I oppose. Council evidence identifies significant existing wastewater constraints, yet the infrastructure report says that alternative options for accommodating growth in Eketāhuna have not been explored. Stormwater will be an issue due to very limited piped stormwater systems. So, connecting new growth to existing stormwater networks will exacerbate surface flooding risk for existing areas. Also, the proposed growth area has saturated soils, which I experience on my own property too. Also, the road (Simpson Street) which I use regularly is with its width not suitable for any additional traffic.	

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
53	Under Plan Change A - Proposed <u>Rural</u> to Dannevirke Residential - Residential Growth Development Area (DEV01)	Yes	Oppose	Dannevirke RGDA	We wish to oppose the rezoning on Cadman Road. Our primary reasons and concerns are the significant flooding risk associated with this property and the Tapuata Stream, which flows through this property, this is a existing and recurring issue and is not simply a theoretical risk associated with future development. We are particularly concerned that land affected by the Tapuata Stream flooding is being considered for residential development.	We ask Council to specifically consider: • The actual extent regularity and speed of flooding experienced on our property from the Tapuata Stream and tributary. • Whether the proposed residential zoning boundary takes sufficient account of the flood prone areas on our property. • The findings of Councils Tapuata Stream flood assessment and whether those findings demonstrate that this particular land is suitable for residential development. • The effects of more frequent or intense rainfall events on the

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						Tapuata Stream and surrounding land. • Whether future residents would have safe access and egress during a significant flood. • Whether houses, roads, driveways, and other development could increase stormwater runoff or alter existing flood flows. • Whether development of this land could increase flooding impacts on neighbouring properties. • Whether Council infrastructure, including stormwater, water and sewerage would be capable of safely servicing residential development in this location.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						The viability of infrastructure required to make land habitable, we understand that Council is seeking additional land for future residential growth, however the suitability of individual areas for residential development needs to be considered carefully. Where there is an existing natural hazard in this case, the presence of the Tapuata Stream and the flooding that already occurs on our property should be given significant weight when considering whether this land should be rezoned residential. We therefore request that our property be excluded from the proposed residential growth area plan and remain rural. If Council is not prepared to

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
						exclude the property, we request that a detailed, site-specific assessment of the flood risk be undertaken before the proposed rezoning is confirmed including consideration of actual flooding history of our property. We have dates, photo evidence of previous flooding on the property and would ask Council to take this into account.
54	Whole PC	Yes	Oppose	Dannevirke RGDA	We do not consider our property to be an appropriate greenfield residential development site. Our property is already a lifestyle/rural property - it is not vacant development land. it is an established lifestyle property with an existing dwelling and established rural/lifestyle use. Rezoning to residential would unnecessarily change the character and	Reject the proposed rezoning of my property at 239 Adelaide Road Dannevirke, from Rural to Residential and retain the existing rural zoning of my property. If Council is not prepared to retain the existing rural zoning, I seek that the proposed rezoning of my

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					potential use of an existing property in order to provide residential development capacity.	property be declined unless and until Council can demonstrate that the proposed Residential zoning is appropriate having regard to the effects on the rural character of the area, traffic, road safety, stormwater, wastewater, infrastructure capacity and the existing use and character of the property.
55	Lot 1 DP 8692 Blk Tahoraiti SD	Yes	Oppose	General	Increase in rates. I would not benefit if this proposal went ahead. No town sewerage system. No extra land for subdivision.	Decline Plan Change
56	Pahiatua Residential Growth Development Area		Support in part	Pahiatua RGDA	We support the residential zone being extended to the West Side of the Main Road at the North end of town in addition to the East Side new zone.	That the provision for the Pahiatua residential zone be amended to include the West Side of the Main Road.
57	Pahiatua Growth Area		Support	Pahiatua RGDA	I support the plan change which affects our property at the end of Titoki Street. New Zealand needs growth and housing in provincial areas. The Government is promoting this. Rezoning of this land will/may allow up to 12	I seek the decision from the Tararua District Council that the Plan Change A to Residential will be granted for our property at the end of Titoki St.

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
					houses to be built which will be a boost to the Tararua District economy. Our property details are as follows: Titoki St Pahiatua, 4910/PT Lots 78DP907 PT Lot DP20451	
58	Land Subject to Flooding		Support in part / Oppose in part	Stormwater / Flooding	There are areas of land adjacent to the stream forming one of the boundrys for Tararua District Councils proposal plan change A that are subject to flooding during heavy rain. These areas should be identified and surveyed out of Plan Change A & remain Rural zoned.	n/a
59	Woodville Proposed Residential Growth Area		Support	Woodville RDGA	I support the change of zoning from rural to residential of parts of my property at Fergusson Street, Woodville. I would like to propose that the area to the west of that is also rezoned residential (see submission for picture attachment with marking on the map). Sections are marked and there are paper roads already in existence.	Plan Change Approved I would like to propose that the area to the west of that is also rezoned residential
60		Yes	Support	Woodville RGDA	We support this submission would increase availability for more properties to be developed in Woodville.	Approve Plan Change
61	Residential Growth Developmen		Oppose		I am absolutely opposed to being changed from rural to residential as the land is not suitable on the north western side of our infrastructure will not handle any more houses until it has been	Decline Plan Change

Sub No.	Specific Parts of Plan Change A	Whole of Plan Change	Position on Provisions:	Topic	Submission	Decision sought from Council
	t Area, DEV01				fixed. Actually give people (THE RATEPAYERS) a choice at whether they want to be moved from rural to residential, would be a lot more pleasing. This is peoples livelihoods and future!!!	