

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
1	Rev. Harry S.L. Newton St Luke's Church, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend provision (Section 4.1.9.1 Road Network) to mitigate potential impact on users of Church Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No upgrade of Church St adjacent to the church property required - considered safe by Council Roding staff Upgrade of Church / Reading St intersection proposed
F1	Graeme & Helen Gray	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Church Street requires upgrade between East and Reading Streets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade proposed
F2	Michele & Terry Falleni	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Church Street footpath needs to be extended to Reading Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade proposed
2	Graeme & Helen Gray 20 Market Road, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept Plan Change – need for complex, close to amenities Request that land adjacent on south side of Market Road also be included in urban residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need recognised, site considered appropriate with suggested amendments and conditions Rezoning the additional land on south side of Market Road as urban-residential is outside the scope of the plan change request
F2	Michele & Terry Falleni	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F5	Cathryn Kerr & Marty Stevens	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road is out of scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road beyond scope of notified plan change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
3	Robyn Dorothy Easter 28A McMaster Street, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept Plan Change and request existing significant trees numbered T1 to T20 in Treecology Report (Appendix 23 & 23A) be protected and monitored during the construction process and throughout the lifetime of the development of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition strengthened to protect and monitor the significant trees identified in the Treecology Report (Appendix 23 & 23A) - recognises the importance of trees to the area and site

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care should be taken to protect significant trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reasons given above
4	Dr Robert Tuckett, Chairman Board of Trustees for Arbor House Rest Home	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept the Plan Change – fully meets needs of area, ideally situated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need recognised, site considered appropriate with suggested amendments and conditions
F2	Michele & Terry Falleni	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
5	Marty Stevens & Cathryn Kerr 26 Market Road, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept Plan Change - need for such a complex Request that land adjacent on south side of Market Road also be included in urban residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See reasons for Submission #2 above See reasons for Submission #2 above
F1	Graeme & Helen Gray	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F2	Michele & Terry Falleni	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road is out of scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road beyond scope of notified plan change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
6	Sija Spaak 81A Reading Street, Greytown	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction noise, dust, length of time of construction Increased traffic Distance of dwellings from their boundary Planting between property and residents' houses Effect on yurt accommodation business, attraction for people who come to stay is the "peace and quiet" of the setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP AP A AP AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects managed through Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) Addressed through other submissions Increased setback distances recommended Increased separation will enable more planting Ultimate use of the retirement complex is not considered to generate any more noise than that which can be expected within a rural area

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar concerns raised in their original submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed in response to original submission
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More extensive setbacks along all boundaries would reduce reverse sensitivity issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback distances recommended on some boundaries to minimise effects
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share concerns - construction dust, noise and traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects managed through CEMP
7	New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks further assessment /information to be provided by the applicant of potential traffic impacts at local road intersections with SH2, and of what pedestrian and cycle routes are currently available to support the proposed urban expansion Any other relief that would address potential effects on the state highway and transport network infrastructure Effects of standard residential development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N N AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the applicant is working with NZTA Request not specific Non-complying Activity status to reduce risk
8	Leigh Hay, Chair Greytown Community Board	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept the Plan Change – under provision of services Support single story structures Support retaining large number of trees and planned gardens – add to the landscape of Greytown Economic and community effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP A A N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need recognised, appropriate with recommended amendments and conditions Maximum height limit provision recommended Conditions included to protect and monitor the significant trees. Recognises the importance of trees to the area and site N
F2	Michele & Terry Falleni	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept the Plan Change – under provision of services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need recognised, appropriate with recommended amendments and conditions
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single storey structures be supported by 6m height limit provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum height limit provision recommended

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ)	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Plan Change so that the provision of a water supply system is added to the proposed matters over which the Council retains control within new Controlled Activity Rule 5.5.3 for the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area. Amend internal road width to 4m to meet the requirements of the Code. Seeks that a condition be attached to the resource consent (wording suggested) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A A A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply system is vital part of development. Including additional matter to be considered is a reasonable request 4m width will ensure safe and efficient functioning and fire access Condition included in recommended conditions and wording considered practical
10	Terry & Michele Falleni 30 Market Road, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept Plan Change – need for facility, site ideal, very close to town and Medical Centre Request that land adjacent on south side of Market Road also be included in urban residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See reasons for Submission #2 above See reasons for Submission #2 above
F1	Graeme & Helen Gray	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F2	Cathryn Kerr & Marty Stevens	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road is out of scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning south side of Market Road beyond scope of notified plan change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For reason given above
11	Gordon & Sue Dinnison 73A Reading Street, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request 10m setback as per existing District Plan setback against Boundary 8 and 9 (their boundary) Request temporary screening along their boundaries for Stage 1 & 2 and early establishment of planting Stormwater management appropriately addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A A A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback to 10m will allow for more extensive multi-layered boundary planting Reasonable request to minimise adverse effects, included in recommended conditions Included in recommended conditions
F3	Sija Spaak & Ashley Lienert	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share concerns regarding construction phase of development – noise, hours, traffic effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects managed through CEMP

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More extensive setbacks along all boundaries would reduce reverse sensitivity issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback distances recommended on some boundaries to minimise effects
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share view that 7.5m building setbacks be 10m to avoid effects on amenity values, health and safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback to 10m will help to avoid effects on amenity, health and safety
12	Shaun & Vicky Westhead 103 East Street, Greytown	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request discussion with developer to install double glazing in their dwelling to reduce traffic noise, pollution & dust Want footpath extended and curbing installed on Church Street/ East Street corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a matter Council would enforce as noise generated from the road is not regulated by the District Plan Upgrade proposed
F1	Graeme & Helen Gray	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support upgrade of Church Street between East and Reading Streets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade proposed
13	Greytown School Board of Trustees	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request 1 main entry off Reading Street as parking will be restricted Lack of on-site parking Recommend a new pedestrian crossing at the Reading Street / McMaster Street intersection be located away from the School existing berm side parking Construction traffic use Market Road entrance to reduce effects on the school Pipe under Reading Street requires upgrading 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R R A R A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple vehicle entries allow better integration with the community and effects minor with the upgrade of parking in front of school proposed Parking complies with District Plan requirements Pedestrian crossing to be provided - final location of pedestrian crossing to be agreed to by the School Dispersing construction traffic is better – CEMP Will occur as part of Reading St upgrade
F3	Sija Spaak & Ashley Lienert	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding construction phase of development – noise, hours, traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed through CEMP
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of vehicle entrances restricts parking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrances acceptable - parking upgrade to occur

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict timing of use of Reading St entrance for construction traffic, unfair all traffic to use Market Road Water races under road be upgraded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispersing traffic is considered better – managed by CEMP Stormwater management in conditions
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	O in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water race pipe under Reading St requires upgrading Disagree that all construction traffic should use Market Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade to pipe to occur as part of Reading St upgrade Dispersing traffic is considered better – managed by CEMP
14	Ministry of Education	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit new access points to the proposed retirement village off Reading Street Develop dedicated parking adjacent to the playing fields, and potentially reducing speed limits Capacity/flooding issue with existing pipe under Reading Street to be remedied – water race Construction Management Plan - coordinate /communicate with the School in developing details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R A A A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrances acceptable - parking upgrade to occur Parking upgrade to occur, 'School Zone' speed restrictions to be imposed Upgrade to pipe to occur as part of Reading St upgrade CEMP to be developed in consultation with the School - recommended condition
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention and good function of water races 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade to pipe to occur as part of Reading St upgrade
15	Scott & Elizabeth Norman 81B Reading Street, Greytown	Amend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request at least 10m setback, and significant planting/fencing Restrict start time on Saturday mornings to significantly later 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10m setback recommended, with then scope for increased planting Agree request is reasonable
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share view that 7.5m building setbacks be greater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10m setback recommended
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More extensive setbacks along all boundaries would reduce reverse sensitivity issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback distances recommended on some boundaries to minimise effects

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F8	Shaun & Ann Stephens	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hours of construction during business hours only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable for some time restrictions - CEMP
16	Powerco	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No relief sought - wants to ensure electricity can be supplied to the site and required upgrading of network can be done in a timely manner Should development be approved, Powerco requests to be kept informed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Note recommended to be added to resource consent
17	Schubert Wines Ltd 42A McMaster Street, Greytown	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decline the Plan Change Request and resource consent application Seek boundary setbacks on Boundary 3 & 4 be 25m - understand current District Plan setback to be 25m Seek maximum building height be 6m Seek that appropriate acoustic insulation standards be specifically referenced in Permitted Activity Standards for the Character Area Seek a more comprehensive development plan and location of individual buildings required Concern over loss of primary production land Does not support new Standard for Permitted Activities 5.5.2 to enable the development in the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area Does not consider Permitted Activity Standards for the Character Area are appropriate or sufficient, concept plan is too vague Concern introduction of Rule 5.5.3 provides for development of a retirement village within the Character Area as a Controlled Activity with lack of finalisation of design. Need not be notified or served - Seek status of activity be Non-Complying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R R A A R R R R R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considered proposal can be approved with suggested amendments and conditions 25m is considered too onerous - 10m is current District Plan standard on the existing site and recommended as suitable setback Maximum height limit provision recommended Considered reasonable request considering residents may be sensitive to noise – reduce reverse sensitivity effects Development plan is considered comprehensive enough for its purpose Not a significant area, part of ‘town’ in soil maps. Benefits of proximity to existing infrastructure outweighs the production value of soils Standards help to give certainty, agree provisions must be robust, want entire development to proceed not part of it Development plan is comprehensive enough Development plan is considered comprehensive enough for its purpose. Non-complying status is considered too onerous, tougher than existing DP provisions

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern introduction of new subdivision standard 20.1.2(a) to provide future subdivision in Character Area as a Controlled Activity Concern about introduction of Assessment Criteria at 22.1.1, concept plan too vague Concern introduction of Assessment Criteria at 22.2, particularly 22.2.18(v) importance to boundary 3 Concerns relating to potential stormwater runoff, potential use of water race for stormwater disposal, re-routing of water race which flows through Schubert property. Not adequately addressed Setback distance to manage impact on neighbours Limit maximum building height of 6m Future subdivision – don't want further changes beyond consent and submitted plans Manage stormwater runoff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R R R AP A A AP AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision not intended; joint ownership of internal services would make this difficult - residential buildings will have Licence to Occupy Development plan is comprehensive enough Assessment Criteria considered appropriate Will be controlled through CEMP - included in recommended conditions 10m setback recommended Maximum height limit provision recommended Agree certainty of development required at this stage – plan change provisions must be robust Included in recommended conditions
F7	Scott & Elizabeth Norman	S in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission be accepted to extent that building setbacks be 10m Permitted building height be limited to 6m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10m setback recommended Maximum height limit provision recommended
18	Sarah Sowman	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request consideration to increase setback to 15m on Boundary 2 Request reduction in construction times to no later than 5pm Monday to Friday, and no later than 12pm (if at all) on a Saturday Existing trees within setback area to remain Significant noise disruption during construction for lengthy time periods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R AP AP AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary 2 adjoins existing urban-residential zone – 15m is considered too onerous Agree some restrictions on time is reasonable to minimise adverse effects of construction – managed by CEMP Understand the intention is to retain existing trees where possible Managed by CEMP

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) / No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 15m setback as more extensive setbacks along all boundaries would reduce reverse sensitivity issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased setback distances recommended on some boundaries to minimise effects
19	Sam Wilkie	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Papawai Road provides safer access for construction traffic Section 4.1.9.1 indicates no changes are proposed to Reading/McMaster or Reading/Market/Church St intersections McMaster Street footpath narrow, safety risk and likely increase in pedestrian, cycling, mobility scooter traffic Traffic management/operations during construction not identified, will have effects on McMaster Street, Church Street (St Luke's), SH2, and Greytown School development in 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R AP R AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispersing construction traffic is preferred – managed by CEMP Upgrades to these streets and intersections proposed Footpath assessed as safe by Council roading staff – upgrade not proposed Managed by CEMP
F4	Gordon & Sue Dinnison	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading / McMaster St intersection upgrading required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade proposed
20	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	S with amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request Stormwater management provisions proposed in 5.5.2(1)(9) specifically refer to water sensitive urban design (WSUD) measures (wording suggested) Support matters in control in 5.5.3(c) clause (x) which provides for safe pedestrian and cycle access throughout the site Neutral whether proposed change of land use is appropriate in this location. Notes non-complying status for residential development not for retirement village purposes, and agrees if land is not used for retirement village purposes other controls may be required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A N AP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended wording is considered appropriate Support noted Identified risk if land is not used for retirement village purposes, controls considered sufficient

Appendix 1: 190034 The Orchards Retirement Village – Schedule of Recommendations on Submissions / Further Submissions

#	Submitter / Further Submitter	Support (S) / Oppose(O) / Neutral (N)	Decision sought in submission / further submission	Recommendation: Accept (A) / Reject (R) / Accept in Part (AP) No Decision Needed (N)	Reasons for recommendations
F6	Schubert Wines Ltd	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use and transport integration – location provides good connections with Greytown’s existing infrastructure, facilities and township. Supports inclusion of urban design principles Note that resource consent may be required from GWRC relating to earthworks, discharges to the water race and contaminated land and discharges Should Council approve the resource consent application, seek that proposed condition 16 be amended (suggested wording); cycle pedestrian paths within site be provided in detailed design Supports amended stormwater management provisions Supports identification of Policy 59 of the RPS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N N A A A N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted Support noted Added as note to resource consent recommendation Amended wording to condition 16 is considered appropriate. Refer above On balance proposal considered consistent with RPS