

30 June 2025

Attn: District Plan Team
Kaipara District Council
Private Bag 1001
Dargaville 0340

Submission by email via: districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz

**KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES SUBMISSION ON THE
PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN UNDER CLAUSE 6 OF
SCHEDULE 1 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

**This is a submission by Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities (“Kāinga Ora”) on the
Proposed Kaipara District Plan (“PDP” or “the Plan”) from Kaipara District Council
(“the Council”):**

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

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

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

The Proposed Kaipara District Plan (“PDP”) in its entirety.

The Kāinga Ora submission is:

1. Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) is a Crown Entity and is required to give effect to Government policies. Kāinga Ora has a statutory objective that requires it to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities that:
 - a) Provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and
 - b) Support good access to jobs, amenities, and services; and
 - c) Otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being of current and future generations.
2. Because of these statutory objectives, Kāinga Ora has interests beyond its role as a public housing provider. This includes a role as a landowner and developer of residential housing within the Kaipara District.
3. Kāinga Ora therefore has an interest in the PDP and how it:
 - i. Minimises barriers that constrain the ability to deliver public, affordable, and market housing development across the District; and
 - ii. Provides for the provision of services and infrastructure and how this may impact on the existing and planned communities, including Kāinga Ora housing developments.
4. Whilst overall, Kāinga Ora is supportive of the PDP, the following amendments to the PDP are sought to ensure that Plan methods, including rules and assessment framework are suitably enabling of development that is desired by the objectives and policies of the Plan:
 - i. **Strategic Direction** – Kāinga Ora supports the majority of the objectives and policies in the Strategic Direction chapter, particularly in regard to ensuring that land development capacity is provided within or adjacent to existing urban areas, that sufficient infrastructure is available to support future demand, and that the urban form is consolidated and integrated. However, Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to SD-UFD-O4 and SD-UFD-P2. Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement to achieve “high quality urban design” is not an effective outcome and is open to interpretation and subjective assessment which may lead to ineffective and inefficient administration or impose unnecessary costs on landowners and

developers and thereby reducing housing affordability. Kāinga Ora seeks that the wording is changed to “a good level of design quality” to be consistent with GRZ-05.

- ii. **Financial Contributions** – Kāinga Ora is concerned that the financial contributions provisions are not sufficiently clear and may in practise result in duplication of charges for the provision / or upgrading of services and infrastructure. Kāinga Ora seek the deletion of provisions requiring the payment of financial contributions for infrastructure where these costs are collected through development contributions.
- iii. **Transport** – Kāinga Ora considers that the threshold notified in the PDP for traffic generation in the General Residential zone is not efficient or effective method to achieve the intended outcome. Specifically, Kāinga Ora consider that the thresholds are set too low, and that the perceived environmental benefits of the rule are not commensurate with the administrative costs of the consent process, including the need for traffic assessments, when these traffic movements would be of little or no environmental effect. Kāinga Ora seeks that either the number of daily one-way movements permitted for the General Residential zone is raised to 60, or that the matters of discretion are amended for the degree of information required within a traffic impact assessment to be more relative to the degree that the trip generation rules are infringed.

Kāinga Ora also seeks to reduce the required number of carparking spaces for residential activities in the General Residential zone from 2 to 1. This is to enable efficient use of land and to enable the landowner to provide the number of carparking spaces that their activity needs without unnecessary regulatory burden.

- iv. **Natural Hazards** – Kāinga Ora supports the majority of the objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter. However, Kāinga Ora seeks clarification to policy NH-P5 regarding an adaptive management approach to managing natural hazard risks. Kāinga Ora seeks that “adaptive planning approach” be defined to assist with understanding the intention of policy NH-P5. Kāinga Ora also seeks Flood Hazard mapping to sit outside of the District Plan as a non-statutory layer due to their dynamic and changing nature. Locating the mapping outside of the plan allows for it to be updated with the most current information i.e. when improvements are made that reduces flood risk or new information is available that increases accuracy of the assessment of risks present at any given property.

- v. **Subdivision** – Kāinga Ora generally supports the Subdivision Chapter proposed. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports that no minimum net site area requirement applies to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit, however, seeks that this is not only restricted to multi-unit developments for which resource consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units). Kāinga Ora also supports that subdivision in accordance with an approved land use consent is a controlled activity. Changes to the minimum vacant lot sizes are also sought to reflect the changes sought to the density standards within the General Residential Zone.
- vi. **Earthworks** – Kāinga Ora seeks that the permitted threshold for earthworks volume in residential zones is deleted. Kāinga Ora considers that the threshold for earthworks volume of 200m³ is not efficient or appropriate when considered alongside the permitted earthworks area amount of 2,500m². The potential effects of earthworks at this scale can be more efficiently managed through appropriate standards including requirements for sediment and erosion control.
- vii. **Noise** – Kāinga Ora seeks that the NOISE-R13 only applies to those areas of the State Highway Noise Control Boundary where the posted speed limit is 70km/hr and above. Kāinga Ora does not consider that the noise levels along SH12 at lower speeds would cause adverse effects that warrant the level of mitigation required within this rule.
- viii. **General Residential Zone** – Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed General Residential zone. However, to better support the proposed objectives and policies to enable more housing supply and housing choice, Kāinga Ora seeks the following amendments:
- Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the minimum net site area for residential units outside Dargaville that are connected to a reticulated wastewater system from 600m² to 400m² and propose no density restrictions for residential units in Dargaville connected to a reticulated wastewater system. These amendments will enable more housing supply and choice to be provided for contributing to the housing supply and diverse housing needs of Kaipara residents. Kāinga Ora considers that the development and performance standards are adequate to control good quality urban form.

- To ensure consistency of design quality, Kāinga Ora seeks to amend policy GRZ-P2 to remove the reference to “high-quality” and replace this with “...a good level of design quality” regarding urban neighbourhood character. This will also assist with keeping design and build costs more affordable for those redeveloping their sites without compromising design quality.
- Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the minimum side yard setback rule to 1m and provide the same 1m yard setback rule from rail corridors. These provisions will provide for design flexibility whilst maintaining the residential amenity of adjoining sites.
- Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the outdoor living space minimum area from 50m² to 20m² to reflect the need to provide for a range of housing types and further enable redevelopment on sites.
- Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the matters of discretion under GRZ-MAT1 and GRZ-MAT2, respectively, to recognise the anticipated outcome of the zone. Kāinga Ora also considers it is more appropriate to assess buildings and outdoor living courts in relation to the immediate surrounding area as opposed to the wider neighbourhood character and therefore seeks to amend this under GRZ-MAT1.

5. The changes sought are made to:

- i. Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;
- ii. Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, and relevant national direction and regional alignment;
- iii. Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;
- iv. Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;
- v. Provide clarity for all plan users; and
- vi. Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.

6. The Kāinga Ora submission points and changes sought can be found within Table 1 of **Appendix 1** which forms the bulk of the submission.

Kāinga Ora seeks the following decision from Kaipara District Council:

That the specific amendments, additions, or retentions which are sought as specifically outlined in **Appendix 1**, with text changes shown in red and are struck through or underlined, are accepted and adopted into the Proposed Kaipara District Plan including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.

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

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



Brendon Liggett
Development Planning Manager
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

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

Appendix 1: Decisions sought to the Proposed Kaipara District Plan

The following table sets out the amendments sought to the Proposed Kaipara District Plan and also identifies those provisions that Kāinga Ora supports.

Proposed changes are shown as ~~striketrough~~ for deletion and underlined for proposed additional text.

Table 1

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Strategic Direction					
1.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-O1 Residential, commercial, and industrial land	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective as notified.	<i>Retain SD-UFD-O1 as notified.</i>
2.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-O3 Infrastructure	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective as notified.	<i>Retain SD-UFD-O3 as notified.</i>
3.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-O4 Urban design	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement to achieve “high quality urban design” is aspirational and could be interpreted to an unachievable standard which could impose additional costs on landowners and developers and thereby reduce housing affordability.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks that the wording is changed to “a good level of design quality” to be consistent with GRZ-O5.</p>	<p><i>Amend SD-UFD-O4 as follows:</i></p> <p>“Urban development incorporates <u>a good level of design quality</u> high quality urban design that contributes positively to the local context, amenity and anticipated outcomes for the zone.”</p>
4.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-O5 Urban consolidation and integration	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective as notified.	<i>Retain SD-UFD-O5 as notified.</i>

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
5.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-P1 Housing and business land development capacity	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy as notified.	<i>Retain SD-UFD-P1 as notified.</i>
6.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-P2 Urban amenity	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement to achieve “high quality urban design” is aspirational and could be interpreted to an unachievable standard which could impose additional costs on landowners and developers and thereby reduce housing affordability.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks that the wording is changed to “a good level of design quality” to be consistent with GRZ-05.</p>	<p><i>Amend SD-UFD-P2 as follows:</i></p> <p>“Urban character and amenity values are managed through <u>a good level of design quality</u> high quality urban design, recognising that amenity values and characteristics change over time.”</p>
7.	Strategic Direction	SD-UFD-P3 General residential zone	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy as notified.	<i>Retain SD-UFD-P3 as notified.</i>
Financial Contributions					

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
8.	Financial Contributions	FC-P2 Infrastructure or services solely for development	Oppose	Kāinga Ora queries the requirement for financial contributions for infrastructure / services when Council collect development contributions for the same. Kāinga Ora oppose 'double dipping' of fees paid for infrastructure / services.	<i>Delete FC-P2 in its entirety.</i>
9.	Financial Contributions	FC-P4 Actual effects	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy as notified.	<i>Retain FC-P4 as notified.</i>
10.	Financial Contributions	FC-S6 Calculation of contributions for network utilities	Oppose	Kāinga Ora queries the requirement for financial contribution for installing or upgrading network utilities (including wastewater supply, stormwater disposal and water supply) when Council collect development contributions for the same. Kāinga Ora oppose 'double dipping' of fees paid for network utilities.	<i>Delete FC-S6 in its entirety.</i>
Transport					
11.	Transport	TRAN-S1 Traffic generation	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the threshold notified in the PDP for traffic generation in the General Residential zone is too low. Consent would essentially be required for	<i>Either</i> <i>Amend TRAN-S1 1. as follows and retain the rest of the standard including matters of discretion:</i>

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>four or more dwellings under this standard. The restriction places additional cost and burden on an applicant to apply for consent and provide a traffic assessment.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also seeks clarification of “excluding traffic generated by single dwellings” – Does this mean that all dwellings of detached typology would be excluded from the traffic generation calculation or just if the site has one single dwelling?</p>	<p>1. The total traffic generated from each site must not exceed with the following limits (excluding traffic generated by single dwellings, temporary military activities and construction traffic):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 60 daily one way movements for <u>General Residential zone</u>, General rural zone and Māori purpose zone; 20 daily one way movements for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> General residential zone; Rural lifestyle zone; 200 daily one way movements for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial zone; Light industrial zone; and Heavy industrial zone. <p>Or</p> <p><i>Amend TRAN-S1 4. as follows to reflect the level/degree of information required to accompany a resource consent application:</i></p> <p>3. Matters over which discretion is restricted:</p> <p>(a) For non-compliance of Rule 1(b):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is a small degree of non-compliance (21 – 60 movements)-

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					<p><u>measures required to remedy or mitigate those adverse effects adjacent to the site.</u></p> <p>- <u>Where there is a larger degree of non-compliance (60+) - potential adverse effects on public realm, movement networks, safety and security, and/or on the transport network and any measures required to avoid, remedy or mitigate those adverse effects adjacent to the site.</u></p> <p><u>For non-compliance of Rule 1(a) and 1(c)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The trip characteristics associated with the proposed activity; c. The design of features intended to ensure safety for all users of the access site, and/or intersecting roads including but not limited to vehicle occupants, vehicle riders and pedestrians; d. Transport network safety and efficiency, particularly at peak traffic times (of both the activity and road network); e. Mitigation to address adverse effects, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Travel/trip planning and timing;

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought						
					<div><div>ii. Providing alternatives to private vehicle trips;</div><div>iii. Staging of the development activity or subdivision; and</div><div>iv. Contributing to improvements to the road network, where appropriate; and</div><div>f. The effect of traffic on the amenity and character of the surrounding area.</div></div>						
12.	Transport	TRAN Table 1 - Traffic Intensity Factor	Support in part	Kāinga Ora notes that the incorrect table heading has been drafted and seeks that this be amended for clarity.	<div>Amend TRAN-Table 1 as follows:</div> <div>TRAN Table 1 - Traffic Intensity Factor:</div> <table><tr><td>Land Use Activity</td><td>Car Parking Space Required <u>Daily One-Way Movement</u></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td></tr></table>	Land Use Activity	Car Parking Space Required <u>Daily One-Way Movement</u>		
Land Use Activity	Car Parking Space Required <u>Daily One-Way Movement</u>										
...	...										
13.	Transport	TRAN Table 2 – Car parking spaces required	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora seeks that the car parking spaces required to be reduced to 1. This is to enable efficient use of land and allow landowners to choose to propose more parking spaces if they need without making it mandatory. Kāinga Ora recognises that 1 car	<div>Amend TRAN-Table 2 as follows:</div> <div>TRAN-Table 2 – Car parking spaces required:</div> <table><tr><td>Land Use Activity</td><td>Car Parking Spaces Required</td></tr><tr><td>Residential:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Residential Units</td><td>21 per unit</td></tr></table>	Land Use Activity	Car Parking Spaces Required	Residential:		Residential Units	2 1 per unit
Land Use Activity	Car Parking Spaces Required										
Residential:											
Residential Units	2 1 per unit										

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				parking space is still required due to the lack of public transport serving the district.
Natural Hazards					
14.	Natural Hazards	Mapping	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks Flood Hazard mapping to sit outside of the District Plan as a non-statutory layer due to their dynamic and changing nature; locating the mapping outside of the plan allows for it to be updated with the most current information and thereby reducing additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and developers.	<i>Remove natural hazard flooding overlay(s) from the District Plan statutory maps and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps.</i>
15.	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Adaptive planning approach to manage natural hazard risks	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks a definition be created to understand what an “adaptive planning approach” entails.	<i>Define “adaptive planning approach”.</i>
Subdivision					
16.	Subdivision	SUB-S1 Minimum allotment sizes (excluding access legs)	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora seeks that the minimum vacant allotment sizes reflect the relief sought within the General Residential zone. In addition, Kāinga Ora does not consider that no	<i>Amend SUB-S1 as follows.</i> SUB-S1 Minimum allotment sizes (excluding access legs)

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought		
				minimum net site area should only apply to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a multi-unit development for which resource consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units). Kāinga Ora also seeks that non-compliance of this standard is a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	<div>General residential zone</div> <div><div>5. Allotments must have a minimum net site area of:<div><div>a. 6400m², or</div><div>b. 4300m² if reticulated water supply and wastewater services are available outside of Mangawhai.</div></div></div><div>6. Except that no minimum net site area requirement applies to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a multi-unit development for which resource consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units).</div></div> <div>10. Activity status when compliance not achieved: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</div>		
Earthworks							
17.	Earthworks	EW-S1 Maximum earthworks thresholds	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the threshold for earthworks volume of 200m ³ is too low, even more so when compared to the permitted earthworks area amount of 2,500m ² . Earthworks at this scale	<div>Amend EW-S1 as follows:</div> <div>...</div> <table><tr><td>General residential zone, Commercial</td><td>Volume = 200m³ Area = 2,500m²</td></tr></table>	General residential zone, Commercial	Volume = 200m³ Area = 2,500m ²
General residential zone, Commercial	Volume = 200m³ Area = 2,500m ²						

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				can easily be managed through appropriate standards including requirements for sediment and erosion control. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks that the volume threshold is deleted.	zone, Natural open space zone
Noise					
18.	Noise	NOISE-R13 Noise from State Highways and Rail Corridor (new buildings)	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora seeks that the NOISE-R13 only applies to those areas of the State Highway Noise Control Boundary where the posted speed limit is 70km/hr and above. Kāinga Ora does not consider that the noise levels along SH12 at lower speeds would cause adverse effects that warrant the level of mitigation required within this rule.	<i>That the State Highway or Rail Corridor Noise Control Boundary is amended on the planning maps to only include those parts of the State Highway with a posted speed limit of 70km/hr or above.</i>
General Residential Zone					
19.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-O4 Housing form and density	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective as notified.	<i>Retain GRZ-O4 – Housing form and density as notified.</i>
20.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-P1 Range of housing types and sizes	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy as notified.	<i>Retain GRZ-P1 – Range of housing types and sizes as notified.</i>
21.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-P2 Neighbourhood character and streetscape	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy; however, this policy does not align with objective GRZ-O5 which refers to “...a good level of design...”.	<i>Amend GRZ-P2 – Neighbourhood character and streetscape as follows:</i>

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				As such, Kāinga Ora seek an amendment to ensure consistency of design quality across the objectives and policies of the zone.	“Ensure that <u>a good level of design quality regarding high-quality</u> urban neighbourhood character and amenity is achieved by managing the design, bulk and scale of new buildings through...”
22.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-R3 Residential units	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule, particularly where no more than two residential units are permitted to occupy a site. However, to support the objectives and policies related to providing sufficient housing supply in Kaipara, Kāinga Ora seeks that there is no density limit for sites both within Dargaville and an increase in density for allotments outside Dargaville which are connected to a reticulated wastewater system.	<p><i>Amend GRZ-R3 – Residential units as follows:</i></p> <p>2. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No more than two residential units occupy the site; b. Residential units not connected to a reticulated wastewater system shall not exceed one per 2,000m² of net site area; c. Outside Dargaville, residential units connected to a reticulated wastewater system shall not exceed one residential unit per <u>400m²</u>600m² of net site area; and d. In Dargaville, residential units connected to a reticulated wastewater system <u>are not subject to a minimum net site area. shall not exceed one residential unit per 400m² of net site area.</u>
23.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-R7 Supported residential care	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule, however, seeks an amendment to increase the number of visitors	<i>Amend GRZ-R7 – Supported residential care and boarding houses as follows:</i>

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought			
		and boarding houses		per night accommodated per site from six to ten visitors. This provides for flexibility for such activities to allow for more than one family unit to be housed at one time.	<div>1. Activity status: Permitted</div> <div>Where:</div> <div><div>a. Residential accommodation and ancillary support services are provided for people who do not form a single household; and</div><div>b. No more than ten six visitors per night are accommodated per site.</div></div>			
24.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-S4 Building setbacks from side and rear boundaries	Oppose in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this standard, however, seeks an amendment that reduces the setback from side boundaries to 1m. This will provide for design flexibility whilst ensuring buildings are sufficiently setback to maintain the residential amenity of adjacent sites.	<div>Amend GRZ-S4 - Building setbacks from side and rear boundaries as follows:</div> <div><div>1. Buildings, accessory buildings, and structures shall be setback a minimum of 1m1.5m from any side boundary and 1.50m from any or rear boundary.</div></div>			
25.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-S7 Outdoor living space	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks an amendment to the minimum area to 20m ² to reflect the need to provide for a range of housing types and further enable redevelopment on sites.	<div>Amend GRZ-S7 4. as follows:</div> <div>4. The outdoor living space shall have the minimum area and dimension in this table:</div> <table><tr><th>Residential unit type</th><th>Minimum Area</th><th>Minimum Dimension</th></tr></table>	Residential unit type	Minimum Area	Minimum Dimension
Residential unit type	Minimum Area	Minimum Dimension						

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought		
					All residential units except specified below	50m² 20m²	4m
					Minor residential unit	20m ²	4m
					Multi-unit developments - ground floor levels	20m ²	4m
					Residential units wholly above ground floor level	8m ² balcony	1.5m balcony
					Retirement villages subject to GRZ-R17	-	-
26.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-S10 Building setbacks from rail corridors	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the building setback from rail corridors should be managed by way of a designation initiated by the relevant Requiring Authority, rather than as a district plan standard.	Delete GRZ-S10.		
27.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-MAT1 Residential development	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the wording of the matters of discretion to recognise the anticipated outcome. Kāinga Ora also considers that it is more appropriate to assess buildings	Amend GRZ-MAT1. as follows: 1. Planned Residential character and amenity; 2. Design, scale, and layout of buildings and outdoor living courts in relation to the adjoining properties and the street neighbourhood character ;		

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				and outdoor living courts in relation to the immediate surrounding area i.e. adjoining properties and the street, rather than the wider neighbourhood character.	...
28.	General Residential Zone	GRZ-MAT2 Activities	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks to amend the wording of the matters of discretion to recognise the anticipated outcome.	<i>Amend GRZ-MAT2. as follows:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Planned Residential character and amenity. ...