

Rangitīkei District Plan 2013

Proposed Plan Change 3 – Urban Growth

Summary of Submissions – **Ordered by Submitter (numerical)**

Notified: Thursday, 28 May 2026



1. Introduction

This document, Summary of Submissions, summarises the decisions requested for each submission received on Proposed Plan Change 3 – Urban Growth (Proposed Plan Change 3 or PPC3). 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 3 was publicly notified on 12 March 2026 with the period for submissions closing on 13 April 2026.

A total of 35 submissions (including one late submission) 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 usual opening hours:

Marion Head Office: 46 High Street, Marton

Marion Community Hub: 31 High Street, Marton

Te Matapihi – Bulls Community Hub: 4 Criterion Street, Bulls

Taihape Community Hub: 102 Hautapu Street (SH1), Taihape

The full submissions can also be viewed or downloaded from Council's website: www.rangitikei.govt.nz/ppc3

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
- Rangitikei 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:

www.rangitikei.govt.nz/ppc3

Further submissions will need to be supplied to Rangitikei District Council by **no later than 5:00pm on Friday, 12 June 2026**.

Further submissions can either be:

- **Posted to:** Rangitikei District Council, Attn: Strategy Manager, Private Bag 1102, Marton 4741
- **Emailed to:** districtplan@rangitikei.govt.nz
- **Submitted online at:** available at www.rangitikei.govt.nz/ppc3
- **Dropped into Council's Marton Head Office:** 46 High Street, Marton.

IMPORTANT: Any person making a further submission on Proposed Plan Change 3 is required under Clause 8A of Schedule 1 of the RMA to send a copy of it to the person who made the original submission. The copy must be sent to the original submitter within **five (5) working days** of submitting the further submission to Rangitikei District Council.

Section 5 of this document includes the address for service of each person or organisation that has made a submission on Proposed Plan Change 3.

3. Process from here

Once the 'further submission' period has closed (12 June 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 hearing is held, a pre-hearing meeting (or meetings) 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 hearing. At least 10 working days notice will be given of the hearing date. Anyone can attend the hearing, however only those submitters who have indicated that they wish to be heard in support of their submission will have the opportunity to speak. Submitters can nominate a representative or consultant to speak on their behalf.

A Commissioner or Independent Hearings Panel 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 Tiffany Gower, Council's Strategy Manager, via:

Phone: (06) 327 0099

Email: districtplan@rangitikei.govt.nz

5. Submitters

The following table provides the names and addresses for service of all those who made a submission in relation to Proposed Plan Change 3. Each submission has also been assigned a unique reference number (e.g. 01).

The purpose of this table is to help any person who makes a further submission to meet their legal obligation to supply a copy of their further submission to the person who made the original submission. The copy must be sent to the original submitter within five (5) working days of submitting the further submission to Rangitikei District Council.

Sub no.	Submitter name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
01	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	rrpeirce@farmside.co.nz	Yes
02	Al-lek and Michelle White	mjbest@xtra.co.nz	No
03	SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN		
04	Ashoka Masilamani	ashokamasi@gmail.com	Yes
05	Kilian O’Gorman	Kilian.Ogorman@tewhatuora.govt.nz	No
06	Noel Wright	noelandmaree@xtra.co.nz	No
07	Belinda Howard	belindah@inspire.net.nz	Yes
08	Teresa Stoltz	teresa@lawcorner.nz	No
09	Jordan Caskey	jordancaskey@hotmail.co.nz	Yes
10	Natasha Kirk	tashkirk1@gmail.com	Yes
11	NZTA Waka Kotahi (Attn: E. Thornton)	environmentalplanning@nzta.govt.nz	Yes
12	G & C Holdings Ltd (C/- Phocus Planning Ltd)	Phil@phocusplanning.co.nz	Yes
13	Hilary Powell	powellhilary5@gmail.com	No
14	Neil Oldfield	hatfieldhuntley@gmail.com	Yes
15	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (C/- Beca)	Jennifer.beardsall@beca.com	Yes
16	Sarah Hasler	Sarahhasler58@gmail.com	Yes
17	David Johnson	mrjd@xtra.co.nz	No
18	Rangitikei Development Ltd (C/- B. Simpson)	rangitikeidevelopmentltd@gmail.com	Yes
19	Ruth and Robert Snijders	5 Grey Street, Marton 4710	Yes

Sub no.	Submitter name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
20	Alan McCubbine	mccubbinea@gmail.com	No
21	Simone and Robert Pauletich	pauletichfamily@gmail.com	No
22	Tony Jury	Nedlohsov6@xtra.co.nz	No
23	Margett Purser	margettpurser@gmail.com	No
24	Baird Built (C/- K. Baird)	kyle@bairdbuilt.co.nz	Yes
25	Lynne Sheridan	lynne.s@farmside.co.nz	No
26	Stephan and Lynn Whitford	whitty969@gmail.com	No
27	Maree Marshall	mareemarshall23@gmail.com	No
28	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakopiri (Attn: S. Walker)	siani.walker.nz@gmail.com	Yes
29	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei (C/- F. Wallace)	felicity@inspire.net.nz	Yes
30	Hayden Gould	haydengould@gmail.com	Yes
31	Dean and Teresa Cunningham	themusselman@hotmail.com	Yes
32	Mangapapa Trust No 2 (C/- R. & S. Smith)	rpandspsmith@gmail.com	No
33	Margaret Webster	te-aunui@xtra.co.nz	No
34	Joanna Edmonds	207 Calico Line, RD1 Marton 4787	No
35	Horizons Regional Council (Attn: A. Wickramasinghe)	aruna.wickramasinghe@horizons.govt.nz	Yes
Late Submission			
36	Adam Dekker	adam@kpa.kiwi	Yes

6. Summary of Decisions Requested

The below table summarises the decisions requested or inferred by submitters to Proposed Plan Change 3. 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.

In addition to the reference numbers assigned to the submissions received (i.e. 01 being Submission Number 1), a unique numeric identifier (i.e. 01.1 or 01.2) has also been applied to the specific points/matters raised in each submission in order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity.

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 according to the numerical order that Council received the submissions.

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. Not specified' has been used where the submitter has not indicated whether they support or oppose and it is not clear.

Where a decision or relief has been stated or inferred then this has been identified in the 'Decision sought' column. Where a decision or form of relief is not clear then 'unclear' or 'no specific relief sought' has been used.

Where specific wording changes have been requested to Proposed Plan Change 3 by submitters these have been shown in the summary table as follows:

- *Italics underlined text* = New text to be included
- ~~Strikethrough text~~ = Text to be delete

Summary of Decisions Requested by Submitters and Reasons Table:

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
01	01.01	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Inferred – retain land down Wanganui Road as land zoned General Rural.	Questions the need to rezone land down Wanganui Road (inferred growth area MAR02) as this is good growing land. Considers it would be better to spend more on attracting light industry and technology here for job creation, especially for younger people, rather than putting more housing on arable land.
01	01.02	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	Zone Provisions	Lot size SUB-S5.1	Oppose	Seeks larger section sizes for properties on the urban edge at the Wanganui Road entrance.	Seeks control over size of sections as they do not want tiny sections at the entrance to the town and refer a recent example of a local subdivision where the sections were too small and the houses take up too much room on the sections. This resulted in high fences to provide for privacy and little outdoor space.
01	01.03	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	Zone Provisions	Bulk and location	Not specified	Unclear.	Allow for a variety of houses and refers to houses being built by Vincent Holloway in Christchurch for Brookfields as an example. Considers that garages should be situated to the rear of dwellings.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
01	01.04	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	Zone Provisions	Trees / vegetation	Amend	Introduce restrictions on the removal of trees and invest in recreation spaces.	Concerned about lack of protection for trees, shelterbelts and other vegetation. The recent removal of trees from land within MAR02 (inferred) has meant that neighbouring properties are more exposed to westerly winds. Also suggests that Council could establish a stand of native trees within the land to be rezoned and notes the need for more recreation spaces.
01	01.05	Reverend Robin W.K. Peirce	Other Matters	Not applicable (N/A)	Not specified	Seeks more designated space for off leash dogs.	The submitter infers they seek more domain space to be designated for off leash dog parks.
02	02.01	Al-lek and Michelle White	Infrastructure	Three Waters	Oppose	Delay the proposed rezoning and intensification until infrastructure capacity is proven and costings and timelines for upgrades are provided.	Opposes the rezoning of land and providing for greater intensification on the basis that current water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure has long standing issues and increased demand on these systems is not appropriate when they are beyond their limits already. Also concerned that social infrastructure (i.e. schools and healthcare) cannot support hundreds of new dwellings without parallel investment.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
04	04.01	Ashoka Masilamani	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support in part	Support the rezoning of General Rural to General Residential, subject to provision being made for public transport, pedestrian/cycling and walking.	Seeks that future development include provision for pedestrian / cycling access to connect the areas. George Street is a cul-de-sac which is not connected to adjacent sites being re-zoned which results in poor urban planning.
04	04.02	Ashoka Masilamani	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support in part	Seeks a footpath connecting George Street, Flower Street, BUL03 growth area (inferred), and Johnson Street.	Seeks a new pedestrian link to be included in the undeveloped section on George Street to connect to Flower Street, and future development to include pedestrian links to Johnson Street. (refer to original submission for proposed map).
05	05.01	Kilian O’Gorman	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support	Retain the rezoning of 60 Calico Line, Marton to General Residential as notified.	Supports the proposal to rezone 60 Calico Line, Marton from Rural Lifestyle to General Residential.
06	06.01	Noel Wright	Whole of Proposed Plan Change 3 (PPC3)	N/A	Oppose	Oppose PPC3 in full.	Opposes the plan change in relation to Bulls as infrastructure including Roading, Water and Wastewater are not up to standard for more intense development without significant ratepayer money being spent. Furthermore, raises concern about buildings exceeding single storey creating privacy issues.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
07	07.01	Belinda Howard	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose MAR01 rezoning and seeks that MAR01 is retained as General Rural due to flooding risk.	MAR01 is subject to flood hazard and stormwater issues. There is an existing dam within MAR01 that creates a 'lake' during heavy rainfall events and concerned about the impact / risk on neighbouring properties if MAR01 was to be developed, most notably concerned about 10 Armagh Terrace, Marton (refer to original submission for further information). This will be worsened by climate change and requires significant mitigation.
08	08.01	Teresa Stoltz	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support in part	Retain the rezoning of rural land in Marton to residential subject to addressing flood hazard / stormwater runoff risk in MAR07.	Generally supportive of the proposal to rezone rural land to residential purposes in Marton. However, highlights risk of increased runoff and potential impact on neighbouring properties if MAR07 is developed due to its higher elevation. Suggesting that runoff needs to be diverted away from existing dwellings to avoid flood risk.
08	08.02	Teresa Stoltz	Infrastructure	Transport	Not specified	Seeks upgrades for <i>Johnston [sic]</i> Road.	Seeks improvements to <i>Johnston [sic]</i> Road to enable <i>Johnston/Tutaenui</i> vehicular access to MAR01 and MAR07. Walkways (including Ingle

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							Walkway) require safety lighting to be installed.
08	08.03	Teresa Stoltz	Infrastructure	Transport	Amend	Seeks intersection upgrades for the Calico Line / Bond Street, Marton.	Seeks improvements to the Calico Line / Bond Street intersection in Marton. Notes that the statistics relied upon are outdated and do not include traffic accidents where police have not been called out. Seeking the installation of a raised pedestrian crossing across Calico Line and lighting.
08	08.04	Teresa Stoltz	Infrastructure	Transport	Amend	Seeks intersection upgrades for the High Street / Bridge Street intersection in Bulls.	Seeks improvements to High Street / Bridge Street intersection in Bulls e.g. install traffic lights.
09	09.01	Jordan Caskey	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 60 Calico Line, Marton (inferred) and retain General Rural Zone.	Opposes the rezoning of land to residential in Marton. Specifically requests that the land down Calico Line (60 Calico Line) stay rural. Considers that it would be more beneficial from a cost perspective to focus on larger areas of land proposed to be rezoned on the other side of Marton.
10	10.01	Natasha Kirk	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose rezoning of 60 Calico Line, Marton (inferred) and retain General Rural Zone.	Seeking that the land down Calico Line (60 Calico Line) remain zoned rural. Concerned about neighbourhood character, impact on property value, increased traffic, light pollution, pressure on

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							waterways and also raised the need for Council to address issue with drink water before considering this.
11	11.01	NZTA Waka Kotahi	Maps and zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Amend	Seeking more information on the effect, funding and timing of intersection upgrades and potential caps on development (i.e. new dwelling or lot numbers), dependant on delivery of any identified intersection upgrades.	Concerned about effect of urban intensification on traffic volumes on the State Highway network and the need for changes to accommodate additional traffic demand including but not limited to intersections and lane widening. Notes that urban intensification may occur in advance of funding agreement needed to facilitate upgrades to numerous intersections as identified in the Integrated Transport Assessment. Seeking staging or sequencing of the development to ensure any necessary upgrades are in place or financed, prior to development.
11	11.02	NZTA Waka Kotahi	Whole of PPC3	N/A	Support	Supports the need to accommodate urban growth in Marton, Bulls and Taihape.	Notes that the growth areas are well serviced and within close proximity to employment and amenities.
11	11.03	NZTA Waka Kotahi	Infrastructure	Transport - Rule TR-S6	Amend	Amend Rule TR-S6 to ensure that new development in Bulls, either through rezoning or Residential Intensification Area does not result in	Seeks the expansion of Rule TR-S6 in relation to any land rezoned or intensified with the potential for direct access to SH1 or SH3. Concerned that the urban

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						increased connections to SH1 or SH3 including new roads, or vehicle access (unless there is no alternative).	intensification adjacent to the State Highway network could result in new road or access to the State Highway network, particularly around Bulls.
11	11.04	NZTA Waka Kotahi	Zone Provisions	Reverse Sensitivity NOISE-R4	Amend	Amend NOISE-R4 which currently addresses reverse sensitivity effects from rail, to include road noise, informed by a Noise Assessment prepared by a suitable qualified and experience professional.	Seeks the expansion of Rule NOISE-R4 in relation to noise sensitive activities to include roads. Concerned that the urban intensification adjacent to the State Highway could give rise to increased reverse sensitivity and complaints in relation to road noise.
12	12.01	G & C Holdings Ltd	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Rezone the rear section of 233A State Highway 1, Bulls (Legal Description Lot 2 DP 320208) to General Residential Zone.	Rezone the General Rural Zone portion of 233A State Highway 1, Bulls to the General Residential. Outlines that the plan change underestimates growth, the location of the site is adjacent residential development, the site's access from State Highway 1 and potential for a secondary access from Wilson Street, potential for a walkable link to Bulls School, no flood risk compared to other areas being proposed to be rezoned, and the potential for the site to be stormwater neutral. The rezoning of

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							the site will not be inconsistent with the NPS-HPL.
13	13.01	Hilary Powell	Zone Provisions	Site Area - GRZ-S5	Oppose	Oppose a 250sqm site area within the Residential Intensification Area.	Oppose the 250sqm site area due to wastewater and stormwater infrastructures ability to cope with more intense residential development. The submitter has provided their experience with stormwater/flooding. Notes this plan change will facilitate a change to the dynamic of the community and strain health services, volunteer services and roads.
14	14.01	Neil Oldfield	Zone Provisions	Site area - SUB-S5.1.	Amend	Support the rezoning of 56 Wanganui Road, Marton, subject to the minimum site area being 500sqm.	Generally, in favour of 56 Wanganui Road, Marton being rezoned but seeks the minimum lot size to be amended to 500sqm due to the character of this area.
14	14.02	Neil Oldfield	Infrastructure	Flooding	Not specified	Unclear.	Notes that the Horizons Retention Dam fills once a year and the spillway has been used three times in the eight years the submitter has been here. Refers to a depression in a front paddock where water collects and forms a watercourse during weather events. This floods across the road, flows behind houses on Wanganui Road, before being piped. Notes that there was a recent upgrade of services along

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							Wanganui Road and that further upgrade will be required due to growth. Questions who will pay.
14	14.03	Neil Oldfield	Zone Provisions	Bulk and location - GRZ-S2	Amend	Amend rules to require a 3m setback for dwellings.	Seeks a minimum access of 3 metres on one side of any dwelling to allow emergency services access, in respect of fault lines. References 1.5m boundary space from dwelling to boundary in Hereford Heights and suggests this would require access on neighbours' property for the fire brigade to extinguish a fire.
14	14.04	Neil Oldfield	Other Zones	Business	Amend	Seeks provisions for providing new non-residential activities in the growth areas (inferred).	(Inferred) Seeks provisions to provide for businesses within the growth areas. Considers that there will be a shift of wealth to above the Wanganui Railway branch line.
14	14.05	Neil Oldfield	Other	Rates	Amend	Seeks staging development to allow rural rates to be applied until dwellings/infrastructure are built.	Seeks the staging of development, so that sections are released for development over time. Rural rating should remain until new titles are issued for residential development.
14	14.06	Neil Oldfield	Other	Recreation areas	Not specified	Seeks additional recreation areas within the growth areas.	Seeks clarification on whether provision has been made for parks or walking areas for proposed population increase.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
15	15.01	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Zone Provisions	GRZ-R1	Amend	Amend as follows: GRZ-R1 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: All General Residential Zone Standards are complied with (refer to GRZ-S1 to GRZ-S78).	The Rangitikei District Plan does not contain any explicit provisions requiring the provision of a firefighting water supply. Instead, it relies on the Council's Subdivision and Land Development Code of Practice. This approach relies on there being a clear link between the District Plan and the Subdivision and Land Development Code of Practice, and there does not appear to be one. This gap presents a risk to Fire and Emergency operations. The submitter seeks an amendment to GRZ-R1, a new standard to be included in General Residential Zone, and the inclusion of an additional matter of discretion to allow Council to consider the extent of non-compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.
15	15.02	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New Standard	GRZ-S8	Amend	Introduce a new standard as follows: <u>GRZ-S8 - Servicing</u> <u>i. All new buildings must be provided with a firefighting</u>	For the same reasons set out in Submission 15.01.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<p><u>water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion where this performance standard cannot be complied with:</u></p> <p><u>i. The suitability of the proposed water supply for firefighting purposes including effects on people's health and safety, and on property.</u></p> <p>Or to similar effect and any other consequential amendments required to give effect to the relief sought.</p>	
15	15.03	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Subdivision Provisions	SUB-P8	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports Policy SUB-P8 in so far as it seeks to ensure that the staging of development does not occur out of sequence with the delivery of necessary infrastructure extensions and/or upgrades.
15	15.04	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Subdivision Provisions	SUB-R1	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>SUB-R1.2.</p> <p>Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p>	For the same reasons set out in Submission 15.01.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<p>.....</p> <p>g. The extent to which there is capacity for connection to existing reticulated essential services and the sufficiency of the proposed water supply (<u>including firefighting water supply</u>), sewage disposal and stormwater services.</p>	
15	15.05	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Subdivision Provisions	SUB-R1	Amend	<p>Amend SUB-S2 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-S2 Essential services</p> <p>1. The development must provide the following connections for each allotment:</p> <p>a. A potable water supply, including connection to a reticulated supply of potable water where this is available within 50 metres of the allotment.</p> <p><u>aa. All new residential lots must be provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting</u></p>	For the same reasons set out in Submission 15.01.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<u>Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	
16	16.01	Sarah Hasler	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of MAR01 (inferred) to General Residential, seek the General Rural Zone is retained for MAR01.	Submitter has lived at 60 Tutaenui Road, Marton for 40 years and is opposed to the rezoning of the area (inferred MAR01 growth area).
17	17.01	David Johnson	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of MAR02 (inferred) growth area to residential and retain as General Rual.	Opposes the rezoning of adjoining land (inferred MAR02 growth area) from rural to residential. Concerned that this would adversely affect the enjoyment of their property and lower their property's value. Construction during development and ongoing noise from multiple dwellings would affect their peace and quiet
17	17.02	David Johnson	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Amend the planning maps to include a reserve along the boundary of 12 Dunallen Avenue if MAR02 (inferred) is developed.	If the MAR02 (inferred) growth area is rezoned, then a 15-20m wider reserve and / or walkway along 12 Dunallen Avenue is sought, as this would preserve their enjoyment of their property and benefit the wider community.
17	17.03	David Johnson	Zone Provisions	GRZ-I1	Oppose	Oppose GRZ-I1 and retain the operative wording of GRZ-I1.	Opposes the replacement GRZ-I1 as they consider this to be an attempt to take away residents'

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							rights to preserve the enjoyment of their property.
18	18.01	Rangitikei Development Ltd	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support	Support the rezoning of MAR02 and MAR07 to General Residential.	Supports the Marton Northwest Development Area and in particular the rezoning of the MAR02 and MAR07 growth areas. The submitter indicates that they need more suitable land to develop and that the town is out of suitable land. Suggests they can help the wider town flooding issues within these areas based on work done with their engineers.
19	19.01	Ruth and Robert Snijders	Infrastructure	General	Oppose	Oppose PPC3 in full.	Seeks to oppose PPC3 in full due to current infrastructure being inadequate, poor condition and with no resilience during times of emergency. There is only one <i>trunk</i> [<i>sic</i>] main from the Tutaenui Reservoir to Marton and that the Marton wastewater improvements will take at least 10 years. No information has been provided about electrical, telecommunication or gas infrastructure. Concerns raised about the three waters infrastructure being able to accommodate the intensification areas. Notes that Marton has a

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							<p>reputation for poor water quality and that Bulls has issues with water pressure and how this has affected recent development. Indicates that most of the district's urban areas sit on poorly permeable soils, creating a flood risk. Noting that the plan change does not identify areas that will be used for stormwater attenuation. Questions the cost of reinforcing Council's infrastructure particularly where intensification is being promoted. Notes that Council has no Development Contribution Policy and that one should be introduced.</p>
19	19.02	Ruth and Robert Snijders	Process - notification		Not specified	No specific relief sought.	<p>Concern is raised with the notification, the public drop-in sessions and the information that was included in letters sent to property owners within the Residential Intensification Areas. The Section 32 Evaluation Report lacked evidence to support the two issues that it highlighted. A housing density map should have been provided. Considers that PPC3 and associated documentation is a poorly thought through exercise.</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
19	19.03	Ruth and Robert Snijders	Rezoning	N/A	Oppose	Oppose PPC3 in full.	<p>Marton has a large number of new unsold sections e.g. Harveston. Notes that Marton is characterised by large sections which are underdeveloped. Suggests that the population has remained relatively static, with neighbouring districts experiencing more growth. Local employment options are low with most residents of Marton and Bulls commuting for employment. Comments on lack of industrial interest and large areas of underdeveloped residential land adjacent railway / industrial land (inferred Kensington Road area).</p>
19	19.04	Ruth and Robert Snijders	Other matters	Highly productive land	Not specified	No specific relief sought.	<p>Identifies that significant proportions of land highlighted for residential development is very productive agricultural land.</p>
19	19.05	Ruth and Robert Snijders	Other matters	Development Contributions	Amend	Seeks an updated Development Contributions Policy.	<p>The Council does not have a Development Contribution Policy, nor does it collect development contributions, instead its subsidising growth.</p>
20	20.01	Alan McCubbine	Rezoning	General	Oppose	Oppose the growth areas and seek the reconsideration of the intensification of residential areas to be more considerate of existing	<p>Current provisions in the operative plan would require agreement from those affected by a proposed intense development and this proposal would remove this right.</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						residents. That Council does not change Chapters in the District Plan that take away rights of residents.	Intensification could affect the enjoyment of neighbours of their own property. Recent examples of intensification show problems with neighbours being overlooked. Concerned that there would not be sufficient provision for onsite parking and cars would be parked on the roadside. Notes that population growth has dropped in the last couple of years and that the Council should have a more realistic view of growth. Opposes amendments to the General Residential Zone because this would take away the need to consult those affected by development.
21	21.01	Simone and Robert Pauletic	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support	Support the rezoning of 98 Tutaenui Road, Marton to General Residential, as notified.	The plan change enables logical, planned urban expansion that addresses the shortage of residential land and provides for future housing growth in an efficient and coordinated way.
22	22.01	Tony Jury	Zone Provisions	GRZ-I1	Oppose	Oppose the amendments to GRZ-I1 and retain the existing wording.	Concerned that the plan change is facilitating more dwellings on neighbouring properties resulting in more noise and disturbance than expected. Infers that the ability to object to this type of development

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							is being removed. Seeks that there should be opportunity for mitigation.
23	23.01	Margett Purser	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Oppose the flood hazard at 22A Wanganui Road, Marton.	Seeks clarity on the flood hazard at 22A Wanganui Road and seeks clarity on how development of the 30 Wanganui Road, Marton site will mitigate flooding. Seeks clarity on whether future work will remove this natural hazard, and therefore, remove it from submitter's and other titles. Suggests this could be a requirement of approved new subdivision and future building work. Seeks a guarantee that the plan change will not affect surrounding areas, buildup, create further hazard.
24	24.01	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-I2	Amend	Amend or replace GRUZ-I2. Proposed alternative wording for GRUZ-I2: <u>The rural environment contains a range of productive, residential, cultural, and business activities. While primary production remains an important component of the General Rural Zone, other</u>	Seeks amendment to the General Rural Zone provisions so that the District Plan takes a more enabling and effects-based approach to rural land use. Seeks the removal or amendment of provisions that prioritise rural amenity, open space and an 'unbuilt' character as dominant outcomes. Replace these with provisions that focus on managing actual adverse effects and protecting specifically

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<u>activities may also establish where they are compatible with the surrounding environment and do not unreasonably constrain primary production.</u>	identified environmental values. Reasons for this is the existing provisions go beyond protecting productive rural land and unnecessarily restrict other opportunities such as residential, business and community activities that could provide economic, social and housing benefits to the district.
24	24.02	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-O2	Amend	Amend or replace GRUZ-O2. Proposed alternative wording for GRUZ-O2: <u>Enable a range of land uses within the General Rural Zone while ensuring adverse effects on surrounding activities, infrastructure, and identified environmental values are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.</u>	For the same reasons set out in submission point 24.01.
24	24.03	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-O3	Amend	Amend or replace GRUZ-O3. Proposed alternative wording for GRUZ-O3: <u>Provide for activities not directly associated with primary production where</u>	For the same reasons set out in submission point 24.01.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<u>they support rural communities or deliver economic, social, cultural, or housing benefits to the district, while managing reverse sensitivity and other adverse effects.</u>	
24	24.04	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-P2	Amend	<p>Amend or replace GRUZ-P2.</p> <p>Proposed alternative wording for GRUZ-P2:</p> <p><u>Provide a General Rural Zone that:</u></p> <p><u>a. supports primary production and rural-based activities;</u></p> <p><u>b. enables other residential, business, service, industrial, and community activities where they are appropriate to the site and surroundings;</u></p> <p><u>c. manages adverse effects on infrastructure, transport networks, and adjacent activities; and</u></p> <p><u>d. protects specifically identified natural features, landscapes, and significant environmental values.</u></p>	For the same reasons set out in submission point 24.01.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
24	24.05	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-P5	Amend	<p>Amend or replace GRUZ-P5.</p> <p>Proposed alternative wording for GRUZ-P5: <u>Manage the scale, layout, and design of development in the General Rural Zone so that adverse effects on neighbouring properties, transport safety, and specifically identified landscape, natural, and cultural values are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.</u></p>	For the same reasons set out in submission point 24.01.
24	24.06	Baird Built	Other zones	Rural - GRUZ-P5	Oppose (requesting new provision)	<p>Insert a new policy.</p> <p>GRUZ-PX <u>Enable non-primary production activities in the General Rural Zone where they:</u> <u>a. provide net benefit to the district or local community;</u> <u>b. are of a scale and intensity appropriate to the receiving environment;</u> <u>c. do not unreasonably compromise the operation of primary production activities;</u> <u>and</u></p>	For the same reasons set out in submission point 24.01

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<u>d. can avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on infrastructure, transport, natural hazards, and identified environmental values.</u>	
25	25.01	Lynne Sheridan	Maps and Zoning	Planning Maps	Not specified	No specific relief sought.	The maps are not clear as to where the individual growth areas were as they were shaded all the same colour. There was an abundance of information presented and that it was complex and time consuming to go through.
25	25.02	Lynne Sheridan	Rezoning	Growth	Not specified	No specific relief sought.	There are many empty building sites around Marton and the need for more land <i>to be zoned [sic]</i> is not clear. Recognises that it is important to enable seamless growth.
25	25.03	Lynne Sheridan	Other matters	Climate change	Amend	Amend provisions to require 2000 litre rainwater collections tanks for new dwellings. Introduce a minimum porous surface requirement per site.	The National Adaption Plan and Council's Climate Change Strategy identify risks that climate change poses including risk to potable water supplies and to buildings. These risks have not been taken into account during the development of the plan change especially in relation to residential intensification. Seeks that rainwater collection capability should be available on residential

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							sites (i.e. min 2000 litres) and that 'effective' amounts of porous surface are provided on a site. This would provide emergency water supply during dry periods and provide for improved stormwater management (inferred).
25	25.04	Lynne Sheridan	Other Matters	Development Contributions	Amend	Require Development Contributions for new builds that trigger infrastructure upgrades.	Requests the introduction of Development Contributions for all new builds triggering infrastructure upgrades.
25	25.05	Lynne Sheridan	Infrastructure	Three Waters	Not specified	Clarity is sought on how the new water authority will manage the infrastructure capacity issues.	Seeking clarity on how the water authority will provide capacity of infrastructure for new development.
25	25.06	Lynne Sheridan	Maps and Zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Not specified	Clarity on the reasons for intensification areas.	Concerns with the areas proposed for intensification given existing narrow roads. The Council should allow the opportunity for intensive subdivision on a case-by-case basis throughout the Residential Zone to avoid creating 'ghettos' within our small town. Refers to granny flat provisions. Identifies issues that come with intensification including adequate infrastructure, requirement for porous surfaces, additional vehicle crossings and parking on site, neighbour noise (dogs / people),

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							safety and congested roadside parking. Asks how these issues will be mitigated.
25	25.07	Lynne Sheridan	Other Matters	Character	Not specified	No specific relief sought.	The aesthetics of Marton include street trees, the amount of green space, the quieter pace of life and the fact that children can walk to school and ride their bikes around town are the things that make people want to live here. Ensure that the treescape of Marton is continued.
25	25.08	Lynne Sheridan	Infrastructure	Transport	Amend	<p>New subdivisions are created in a grid roading pattern to complement our existing roading system unless it is geologically impossible.</p> <p>That subdivision must provide for future connection to adjoining land.</p> <p>That new roads are wide enough to ensure accessibility by all emergency vehicles when roadsides have vehicles parked along them.</p>	Seeks that Council ensures that new subdivisions are created in a grid roading pattern to complement our existing roading system unless it is geologically impossible. This ensures easy connectivity throughout town and avoids creating satellite suburbs with poor connectivity. Seeks to avoid 'gated communities'. Wants to see subdivisions provide accessibility to land on their periphery, to enable future development. Roading in new subdivisions needs to be wide enough to ensure safe accessibility by all emergency vehicles when roadsides have vehicles parked

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							there. Enable effective movement between activities.
26	26.01	Stephan and Lynn Whitford	Maps and zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Oppose	Delete Oaklea Avenue, Marton from the Residential Intensification Area.	Opposes the introduction of the Residential Intensification Area for Oaklea Avenue, Marton. Has concerns about the ability of infrastructure to cope with more intensive development. There are issues with stormwater especially during intense rainfall (refer to original submission for further information on flooding). More residential buildings with less permeable surfaces will exacerbate stormwater problems and increase flood hazard. There are existing wastewater line issues. The line has been blocked several times in recent years, and which has required a special truck to clear the line. Also, problems with aging power infrastructure.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
27	27.01	Maree Marshall	Zone Provisions	GRZ-I1	Oppose	Oppose the replacement of GRZ-I1.	Opposes the replacement of GRZ-I1 as it will reduce amenity rights. Proposed changes will reduce amenity values to accommodate additional residential zoning / subdivision / developments. Existing homeowners have purchased and built homes on the basis of the existing provisions, and the new provisions could affect our quality of living (e.g. daylight, privacy and noise). The Council is already consenting new builds and not ensuring sufficient drainage or requiring suitable flood hazard mitigation.
27	27.02	Maree Marshall	Zone Provisions	GRZ-O1	Amend	Retain the following wording for GRZ-O1; “This includes the efficient use of existing infrastructure, and integration of pedestrian, cycling and vehicle transportation networks.”	Opposes the removal of “This includes the efficient use of existing infrastructure, and integration of pedestrian, cycling and vehicle transportation networks” from GRZ-O1. Considers that this clause is very important as it is a feature of our rural town – the walkways and our ability to move safely around town. Notes health and recreational benefits. Identifies need for additional walkway / cycleways.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
27	27.03	Maree Marshall	Maps and Zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Oppose	Oppose the intensive residential area and provisions in existing residential areas, in particular Bond Street.	Opposed to more intense residential development in existing residential areas in particular the Bond Street block as this would be out of character for this area. Suggests that more intense development should be undertaken in the new subdivision areas where people buying those sections know the conditions they are buying into.
27	27.04	Maree Marshall	Infrastructure	RDC 3 Waters Growth Strategy Growth Assessment	Oppose	Oppose the recommendations of the RDC 3 Waters Growth Strategy Growth Assessment (Appendix 12 of the s32 Report).	There needs to be more specific reports done once proposed developments are applied for to ensure network upgrades are accurate. Concerned about attenuation ponds and the risk of these being poorly designed and maintained which will have implications for the stormwater network and potentially increase flooding in the town. References the pond for the Bredins Line subdivision and the retention dam down Wanganui Road and the issues that these have. Has concerns for their own property which is adjacent a known flood hazard area and has potential to

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							flood if stormwater / flood hazard is not appropriately addressed.
27	27.05	Maree Marshall	Other Matters	Development Contributions	Oppose	No specific relief sought.	<p>Upgrades to the 3 Waters network should not be put on ratepayers and that Council or the new Waters CCO should consider development levies / contributions. Growth should fund growth.</p> <p>Council in recent years, has waived developer levies / contributions and even provided rates rebates on sections. This has increased the demand on the infrastructure network.</p>
28	28.01	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Taihape Growth Areas	Oppose	Oppose PPC3 urban growth maps and provisions in relation to Taihape.	In relation to Taihape, PPC3 enables urban growth without clearly aligning infrastructure capacity, environmental limits, and cultural values.
28	28.02	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Infrastructure	General	Oppose in part	<p>Relief sought:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Require development to be contingent on available infrastructure capacity, Introduce staging or trigger-based provisions linked to infrastructure performance, Require assessment of infrastructure capacity at 	<p>The plan change enables growth and intensification in Taihape without requiring that development is aligned with infrastructure capacity (most notably wastewater). There is no explicit framework to ensure that growth is staged, sequenced, or contingent on infrastructure readiness.</p> <p>Concerned that the plan change increases the risk of system</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						subdivision and development stage, d. Develop a Taihape-specific infrastructure servicing approach, e. Provide for Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in infrastructure planning and oversight.	overload, environmental effects and inefficient investment.
28	28.03	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Infrastructure	Wastewater	Oppose in part	Relief sought: a. Confirm the catchment of the Taihape Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) b. Provide evidence of current and projected WWTP loading, including cumulative demand from all serviced areas, c. Assess whether existing and planned capacity upgrades adequately cater for total demand, d. Require infrastructure capacity assessments to include peak flows, wet weather performance, and future growth scenarios, e. Ensure that any additional connections or servicing	The plan change does not adequately manage the cumulative effects of wastewater arising from increased development in Taihape. There is limited direction to assess or manage long-term impacts on receiving environments, particularly the Hautapu Awa. Concerned about declining water quality, increase contaminant loads and adverse effects on cultural values and mauri. Seeks clarity on whether the Taihape WWTP receives wastewater from other settlements beyond Taihape and, if so, whether this has been taken into account. Uncertain whether the WWTP has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional demand.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						<p>expansions are explicitly accounted for in the plan change,</p> <p>f. Confirm that wastewater discharges will remain within environmental limits, including protection of the Hautapu Awa</p> <p>g. Enable Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in reviewing wastewater capacity, performance and monitoring.</p>	
28	28.04	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Infrastructure	Stormwater	Oppose in part	<p>Relief sought:</p> <p>a. Require cumulative assessment of stormwater effects</p> <p>b. Strengthen provisions to protect water quality and receiving environments for the Hautapu Awa and Ōtaihape waterways</p> <p>c. Provide clear setbacks and buffers from waterways</p> <p>d. Require design and management of stormwater to avoid adverse effects</p> <p>e. Enable Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in</p>	<p>The plan change does not adequately manage the cumulative effects of stormwater arising from increased development in Taihape. There is limited direction to assess or manage long-term impacts on receiving environments, particularly the Hautapu Awa. Without clear provisions, incremental development may result in declining water quality, increase contaminant loads and adverse effects on cultural values and mauri.</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						environmental monitoring and assessment.	
28	28.05	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Taihape Structure Plan	Amend	Prepare a Taihape Structure Plan or Spatial Plan framework.	The plan change does not include a clear spatial or structure planning framework for Taihape. In the absence of a coordinated approach, development may occur in a piecemeal manner, leading to inefficient infrastructure provisions, poor urban form, and development in unsuitable locations. Taihape has distinct environmental, infrastructure, and cultural characteristics that require a tailored planning response. A structure plan would avoid ad hoc, or uncoordinated development outside identified areas. Link subdivision and development to this framework. Identify and sequence growth areas integrate infrastructure, environmental constraints, and cultural values. It should include Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in plan development and implementation.
28	28.06	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Amend the zoning for the Taihape Area School located at 26 Huia Street, Taihape which is General Residential	The educational land uses are not correctly zoned. Inferred that this should be a Special Purpose School Zone.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						Zone. Include other education facilities (e.g. Kura and schools).	
28	28.07	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Amend the zoning for the Otaihape Health Trust (Te Whatu Ora) located at 1 Hospital Road, which is General Residential Zone. Include other health facilities.	The hospital and associated health services land uses are not correctly zoned. Inferred that this should be a Special Purpose Hospital Zone.
28	28.08	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Amend the zoning for the Taihape Memorial Park located at 12 Kokako Street which is General Residential Zone. Include other recreational grounds and open space areas.	The recreation grounds and open space areas are not correctly zoned. Inferred that this should be an Open Space or Recreation Zone.
28	28.09	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Amend the mapping to include known slip prone or hazard-affected areas.	Risk of development in unsuitable locations.
28	28.10	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Maps and zoning	Planning Maps	Amend	Engage with Ngāti Tamakōpiri to verify spatial information including sites of significance and landscape context.	Mapping should also be informed by local knowledge, including input from Ngāti Tamakōpiri, to ensure culturally significant sites and landscape features are appropriately recognised.
28	28.11	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Tangata Whenua	Cultural values and Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Amend	Relief sought: a. Recognise Ngāti Tamakōpiri values and cultural landscapes in Taihape	Considers that the plan change does not adequately recognise or provide for Ngāti Tamakōpiri values in Taihape nor establish a

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						b. Identify and protect sites of significance including along the Hautapu Awa c. Require Cultural Impact Assessments where relevant d. Embed kaitiakitanga and mauri-based considerations in decision-making e. Require early and ongoing engagement within Ngāti Tamakōpiri f. Provide for Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in monitoring and implementation g. Include provisions that support partnership, not just consultation	framework for partnership in planning and decision-making. Cultural values, sites of significance and the relationship of Ngāti Tamakōpiri with the Hautapu Awa are not clearly embedded in the plan.
28	28.12	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Tangata Whenua	Papakāinga	Amend	Relief sought: a. Introduce specific papakāinga provisions across relevant zones (refers to the draft National Environmental Standard for Papakāinga as a starting point)	While the plan change signals support for Māori development it does not provide clear or enabling rule provisions for papakāinga or development on Māori land. Existing rules relating to lot size, servicing and subdivision create barriers that limit development opportunities. Seeking flexibility for servicing, density, and land use

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						b. Engage with Ngāti Tamakōpiri in developing the provisions c. Provide flexibility for lot size, density and servicing on Māori Land d. Enable a range of activities including housing, communal facilities and cultural uses e. Support integrated development on multiply owned Māori Land f. Reduce unnecessary barriers while managing environmental effects	including enabling a range of housing and community activities.
28	28.13	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Process - notification		Amend	Relief sought: a. Provide a Taihape-specific section 32 assessment b. Include detailed evidence on infrastructure capacity, including wastewater c. Assess environmental effects on waterways and receiving environments d. Assess growth demand and development capacity for Taihape	The section 32 evaluation relies on a district-wide evidence base and does not provide sufficient Taihape-specific analysis. Key matters including infrastructure capacity, environmental effects and cultural values are not adequately or appropriately assessed in relation to the scale and location of growth proposed for Taihape. Considers that the section 32 evaluation does not adequately verify the accuracy of Taihape spatial data and mapping

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
						e. Incorporate Ngāti Tamakōpiri values and input into the evidence base f. Review provisions where evidence does not support current settings	which undermines confidence in the proposed residential intensification and growth assumptions.
28	28.14	Te Runanga o Ngāti Tamakōpiri	Other matters	Monitoring	Amend	Relief sought: a. Require active monitoring of infrastructure performance, including wastewater and water quality to meet compliance requirements and cultural monitoring using CHI and mauri-based frameworks b. Establish clear triggers and response actions c. Require regular reporting and review of outcomes d. Strengthen policy wording to be clear, specific and directive e. Enable Ngāti Tamakōpiri involvement in monitoring, reporting and implementation	Identifies that the plan change does not set out how outcomes will be monitored or how issues will be identified and addressed over time. Notes that there is limited direction on tracking infrastructure performance. Environmental effects, or cultural outcomes and no clear triggers for action where issues arise. Additionally, some policy provisions lack clarity, reducing their effectiveness and making them difficult to apply in practice.
29	29.01	Interested Residents of	Process - notification		Not specified	No specific relief sought.	The large volume of information provided by Council for the plan change may obscure significant

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
		Marion and Rangitikei					issues and make it difficult for residents and ratepayers to access and assess. Requests Council provides clearer communication early in the consultation period, not only relying on advertisements and online notices e.g. newspaper articles discussing the key proposal, together with maps and mail drops to residents and ratepayers.
29	29.02	Interested Residents of Marion and Rangitikei	Process – notification documents		Oppose in part	Seeks clarity on the population growth forecast.	Questions the accuracy of forecast population growth to 25,000. Notes that Rangitikei District’s population fell 0.3% in 2025 to 16,000 and that population growth has averaged 0.2% over the past 5 years (based on Infometrics NZ, Regional Economic Profile: population growth, 30 June 2025). Also notes that over the past 30 years the district’s population has decreased by 2.6%. The submitter observes that existing planning rules permit subdivision of sites of 400sqm net and that this allows for population increase, indicating that in Marion several new residential subdivisions remain unsold. Also indicating that vacant Defence

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							Force housing could provide housing for growth in Bulls.
29	29.03	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Rezoning	General	Not specified	Clarity is sought on PPC3, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why it only provides for residential development • What community uses are being planned to support the increased population (schools, shops etc.) • What surveys have been undertaken to understand why new residents have move or left the district. 	Considers that zoning of property can be destructive of existing quality of character, amenity and access, and that it should be carefully managed. Questions why the plan change is only providing for residential development. Seeks clarity about what community resources are being planned for to support increased population. E.g. schools and corner stores. Indicates that new residents in the Marton Northwest Structure Plan Area will have to drive everywhere unless other amenities are planned e.g. parks. Asks what has been done to understand why new residents have moved to our towns or why existing residents leave.
29	29.04	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Other matters	Climate change	Not specified	Seeks clarity on the provision of Climate Change under PPC3.	Questions how the plan change improves Rangitikei district's resilience to climate change in the next hundred years and beyond. Asks what consideration has been given to:

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water runoff / landscaped areas • Shading and surface materials for driveway / hard & soft landscaping / street trees • Access paths / safe cycling tracks / pedestrian routes • Impact of fault lines / seismic risk.
29	29.05	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Infrastructure	General	Not specified	That upgrades to essential services are in place before planning rules enable further subdivision.	Specifies that upgrades of essential services (the 3 Waters) need to be put in place before planning rules are relaxed to enable further subdivision.
29	29.06	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Infrastructure	Transport	Not specified	That new roads are appropriately designed and provide for good connection. That suitable vehicle access and on-site car parking is required.	Seeks that new roads in subdivision are designed to relate to existing roading patterns and allow freedom of navigation, avoid headlights penetrating private property as they pass, and provide cycling and pedestrian links. Notes that smaller lots sizes will increase parking on roads as there is less space on site for visitors and residents to park. Smaller lots sizes can restrict access to properties for ambulance and fire engines. Refers to the fact that in rural towns residents need to drive as public

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							transport is poor, so there is more need for car parks than in larger cities.
29	29.07	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Other matters	Development contributions	Amend	Seeks that Development Contributions are mandatory.	Development contributions should be mandatory and set the true costs of new residential development, in terms of Council infrastructure and required upgrading costs.
29	29.08	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Maps and zoning	Marton Northwest Structure Plan Area	Support in part	Retain the Martin Northwest Structure Plan Area subject to the relief sought requesting amenity access within 15 minutes' walk.	<p>Generally supportive of the Marton Northwest Structure Plan Area as it offers the best ground conditions for future long term urban development. This support is conditional to the rezoning including amenities within 15 minutes walking distance, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks including a playground • An area for local retail / commercial activities • Landscaping such as trees, along with generous berms and footpaths on at least one side of each street (this should allow for disabled access) • Provisions to upgrade services before development begins.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
29	29.09	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Other matters	Hazardous Activities and Industries List	Not specified	Seeks that up-to-date Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) are used for PPC3.	Seeks that Council use up-to-date records for a) Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL), at point 4.2.4.9 and b) State of the Environment monitoring information, at 4.2.1.2 when delivering this plan change.
29	29.10	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Maps and zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Oppose	Does not support the introduction of the Residential Intensification Area for Marton.	<p>Not supportive of the Residential Intensification Area for Marton for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing planning rules allow subdivision for smaller sites at 400sqm net which is more suitable for rural towns. Supports residents being able to subdivide to smaller than 400sqm if criteria are met and this is assessed via a resource consent. existing streets within the Residential Intensification Area are too narrow and increased traffic and more vehicles parking on the street would create hazards. Notes that Bond Street is a heavy traffic bypass and is also a main pedestrian walkway for elderly residents from Edale Masonic Home. Smaller lots sizes would reduce vegetation and trees

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							which effects heat loading, character and birdlife. Also concerned that small lots will increase impermeable areas.
29	29.11	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Maps and zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Support in part	Retain the Residential Intensification Area for Taihape.	Taihape has a lack of residential land that is on level ground.
29	29.12	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Maps and zoning	Other – mixed use	Support in part	Existing commercial land in Taihape could be rezoned to allow mixed use land with level access to amenities and inclusion of green spaces.	Planning for urban intensification needs to include green areas. Existing commercial properties may require remediation or encapsulation. The submitter encourages Council to provide incentives for mixed use development in Taihape.
29	29.13	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Maps and zoning	Residential Intensification Areas	Oppose	Oppose the Residential Intensification Area for Bulls.	Bulls has significant infrastructural (wastewater, stormwater and water) problems.
29	29.14	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Subdivision	SUB-S5	Support in part	Support SUB-S5 which allows smaller lots of 400sqm being subject to resource consent.	Supports the option for any residential site in town to be subdivided into lots smaller than 400sqm if criteria, such as impermeable area, bulk and location, fencing and services etc. can demonstrate compliance with resident and community needs. These submissions should be

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							assessed by Council as Resource Consents.
29	29.15	Interested Residents of Marton and Rangitikei	Other matters	Cost	Not specified	Unclear.	Questions what costs the community incur if the plan change is approved. Seeks that Council demonstrates that there is need to provide additional residential capacity. States that Development Contributions must be mandatory. These should reflect the cost of new residential development on Council's infrastructure.
30	30.01	Hayden Gould	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Support	Rezone MAR02 and MAR07 growth areas from General Rural to General Residential.	Supportive of the Marton Northwest Structure Plan Area and the rezoning of MAR02 and MAR07 growth areas. Submitter notes that they are a developer and small business owner and sees the benefit of this proposed rezoning for the town. Considers that this will provide for more attractive sections, offering elevation, space, views and modern infrastructure and living. Feels that the demand for living in this area will be high within good time. Notes that this will benefit local businesses and trades.
31	31.01	Dean and Teresa Cunningham	Maps and zoning	Marton Northwest	Oppose in part	Oppose the Marton Northwest Structure Plan.	Opposes this in relation to their property (20 Tutaenui Road) as:

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
				Structure Plan Area			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shown access on / through their land will involve the relocation of up to 8 power poles, and the public open space incorporates their house and garden.
31	31.02	Dean and Teresa Cunningham	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose in part	Oppose the rezoning of 20 Tutaenui Road, Marton and seek retention of General Rural Zone.	<p>Opposes the rezoning of 20 Tutaenui Road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost of power and wastewater connection will prohibit them from undertaking any residential subdivision development; Concerned about the increase in values and therefore rates, without any indication of what this would be; and Concerned this will affect their ability to sell their property. <p>Notes that they are not residential property developers. If they were to develop their land it would be to provide quality lifestyle sections in line with the most recent development they did. Indicating that access and the cost of power</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							connection are the prohibiting factors at this stage.
32	32.01	Mangapapa Trust No 2	Rezoning	Planning Maps	Oppose	Defer the rezoning of MAR01 for at least 10 years. Deferred as Rural Lifestyle Zone rather than General Residential Zone.	<p>Opposes the rezoning of the land adjoining their property to the north (inferred MAR01 growth area). Reasons for opposition are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not believe that the need exists and will not for decades (if ever). • Infrastructure and services need to be upgraded before opening any further greenfield sites. • Quality of the land to be taken out of production and turned into 400sqm sites with 1.8m high fences does not fit at all with a rural town philosophy of space and tranquillity. <p>Suggests rezoning deferred for at least 10 years. Advocates for a staged rezoning approach to Rural Lifestyle Zone with little or no fencing and soft, clever planting.</p>
33	33.01	Margaet. Webster	Zone Provisions	GRZ-I1	Oppose	That the operative wording of GRZ-I1 is retained.	Opposes the removal of GRZ-I1 as they consider this has the potential to negatively affect their quality of life. Notes increase noise and decreased daylight, views and privacy.

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
34	34.01	Joanna Edmonds	Zone provisions	GRZ-I1	Oppose	That the operative wording of GRZ-I1 is retained.	Opposes the removal / rewriting of GRZ-I1 as they consider this to be an attempt to remove the need for new developments to be consulted on with the public.
35	35.01	Horizons Regional Council	Rezoning	General Growth	Support in part	No specific relief sought.	Generally supportive of the plan change as it gives effect to section 31(1)(aa) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Notes that the plan change is also broadly consistent with the Objective 1 of the Regional Policy Statement's Urban Form and Development Chapter. Acknowledges Council's voluntary approach to giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development as this reflects a positive and enabling approach to urban growth planning. Considers further refinement and / or supporting evidence is required to ensure the District Plan gives effect to higher order documents including the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
35	35.02	Horizons Regional Council	Other matters	Highly Productive Land	Oppose	Seeks that the Council provide evidence and supporting technical documentation to demonstrate compliance with clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL.	<p>Considers that the section 32 report does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL as it does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantify existing housing capacity, including plan-enabled capacity under the operative District Plan, and feasible or commercially viable capacity; • Assess the contribution of proposed intensification to meeting development capacity needs; and • Quantify the development capacity enabled through rezoning of HPL including the total yield anticipated from the proposed rezoning.
35	35.03	Horizons Regional Council	Other matters	Flood Hazard	Amend	Amend the plan change provisions to explicitly require that safe access and evacuation routes are maintained during flood events to give effect to the RPS HAZ-NH Policy 10(4)(b).	<p>Acknowledges that the Natural Hazards Chapter of the District Plan addresses the flood related risks within the district but indicates that these provisions do not clearly give effect to the RPS HAZ-NH P10(4)(b) which requires that during a 0.5% AEP flood event safe evacuation can be achieved. The plan change does not include</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							any explicit requirement to maintain safe access routes during flood events or access flood depth and velocity effects on evacuation pathways.
35	35.04	Horizons Regional Council	Other matters	Flood Hazard	Amend	Amend the Residential Intensification Area to exclude areas that overlap with the modelled inundated extent resulting from a potential failure of the Marton B Dam.	A proportion of proposed intensification overlay overlaps with the modelled inundated extent associated with a potential failure of Marton B Dam (classified as a Dangerous Dam).
35	35.05	Horizons Regional Council	Other matters	Flood Hazard	Amend	Amend the provisions to ensure that future development does not impact existing flood management infrastructure (i.e. dams and associated systems) and does not increase runoff that compromises flood [sic] protection, and maintains safe and practical access for operation and maintenance of flood management assets.	<p>Amend the provisions to ensure that future development does not reduce the effectiveness or capacity of existing flood management infrastructure (i.e. dams and associated systems), does not increase or alter runoff characteristics in a manner that compromises flood [sic] protection, and maintains safe and practical access for operation and maintenance of flood management assets.</p> <p>The proposed growth area on the western side of Marton (MAR01 and MAR07) has the potential to affect the operation and performance of</p>

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							existing flood management infrastructure, including detention dams and associated drainage systems (Figure 1). These assets are critical to maintaining the current level of flood protection for the Marton urban area.
35	35.06	Horizons Regional Council	Infrastructure	3 Waters Growth Strategy	Not specified	Clarify the flood modelling approach used in the Three Water Growth Strategy.	Questions the model used by GHD in the 3 Waters Growth Strategy in relation to stormwater and flood hazard. Indicates that this assessment does not provide sufficient information to demonstrate alignment with the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards (NPS-NH) and the One Plan in relation to managing existing flood hazard and risk. Also notes differences between the BUL03 Growth Area Flood Risk memo and the GHD report in relation to the BUL03 growth area. Notes that the Tutaenui Stream provides flood protection and channel maintenance as part of scheme operation. Future development must avoid increasing flood or erosion risks, not adversely affect the performance of drainage

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							infrastructure and must maintain access for Horizons Regional Council's on going maintenance activities.
35	35.07	Horizons Regional Council	Infrastructure	Stormwater	Amend	Amend the plan change provisions to require hydrological neutrality (or equivalent stormwater management outcomes) for greenfield development, and manage stormwater quality across the plan change area.	RPS HAZ-NH Policies 12 and 13 require territorial authorities to manage stormwater to avoid or mitigate adverse effects, including increased runoff and flood risk from urban development. Additionally, the NPS-FM Policy 3 requires that "Freshwater is managed in an integrated way that considers the effects of the use and development of land on a whole-of-catchment basis, including the effects on receiving environments." The submitter is concerned that the plan change does not appropriately provide for stormwater management including that it is Council's intention to require greenfield development to be hydrologically neutral, however, this is not reflected in the plan change provisions. Further, GRZ-S4 Maximum Site Coverage does not address the site permeability or ensure that post-development runoff is managed to pre-

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							development levels. The Marton Northeast Structure Plan does not include stormwater management elements.
35	35.08	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Ecology	Amend	Amend the proposed provisions introducing necessary tools to assure future development will maintain features within the landscape that provide habitat or act as ecological corridors that may be used by bats, birds or lizards.	Agree with the Ecological Constraint Study by Boffa Miskell. Which concluded they recommend maintaining features within the landscape that provide habitat or act as ecological corridors that may be used by bats, birds or lizards.
35	35.09	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Ecology - GRZ-S2	Amend	Amend the setback with similar to GRUZ-S8: Buildings or structures must not be constructed within: a. 15 metres of a river, lake edge, or wetland.	This was a recommendation in the Ecological Constraint Study by Boffa Miskell. The setback standard would protect waterways.
35	35.10	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Ecology - RLZ-S1	Amend	Amend the setback with similar to GRUZ-S8: Buildings or structures must not be constructed within: a. 15 metres of a river, lake edge, or wetland.	This was a recommendation in the Ecological Constraint Study by Boffa Miskell. The setback standard would protect waterways.
35	35.11	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Proposed RLZ-O2	Support in part	Retain objective as notified.	Supports RLZ-O2 (subject to the relief sought in 35.03).

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
35	35.12	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Proposed RLZ-O4	Support in part	Retain objective as notified.	Supports RLZ-O4 (subject to the relief sought in 35.03).
35	35.13	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	RLZ-P1	Support in part	Retain policy as notified.	Supports amendments to RLZ-P1 (subject to the relief sought in 35.03).
35	35.14	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Proposed GRZ-O2	Support	Retain objective as notified.	Supports GRZ-O2.
35	35.15	Horizons Regional Council	Zone provisions	Proposed GRZ-P7	Support	Retain policy as notified.	Supports GRZ-P7.
36 (LATE)	36.01	Adam Dekker	Rezoning	BUL03	Support	Rezone BUL03 from General Rural to General Residential.	Supports the rezoning of BUL03. It will unlock development potential for Bridge Street and another development between Johnson and Flower Street. The submitter wants to integrate small commercial blocks and public spaces amongst their subdivisions. The subdivisions provide employment.
36 (LATE)	36.02	Adam Dekker	Natural Hazards	Flooding - BUL03	Not specified	No specific relief sought.	While part of the BUL03 parcel is identified as a potential flood zone area under the 1 in 200-year flood maps; when the Tutaenui Stream flooded in June 2023, the submitter personally walked the entire site to investigate the effects of this flooding on their land and found the site to be unaffected by the flooding, regardless of its proximity

Sub no.	Sub Point	Submitter name	Issue	Provision reference	Support / oppose	Relief sought	Reasons
							to the stream. Any potential hazard in this regard can be mitigated through civil construction works and landscaping.
36 (LATE)	36.03	Adam Dekker	Rezoning	BUL03	Amend	Rezone the secondary rural title adjoining BUL03 to General Residential.	This can be included in any potential new subdivision for the purpose of mitigating stormwater issues or in any other way that this area may be able to support the development of our surrounding land and the wider community of Bulls.