

Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Private Plan Change 12: Structure Plan and Rezoning of Growth Cell T2 By Submitter

December 2020

Table of Contents

Reader’s Guide	4
How to read the summary:.....	4
How to make a further submission.....	5
Submitter Contact Details	6
Ashmore, Howard	9
Blackstock, Graeme.....	9
Chisholm, Christopher	10
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	10
Fonterra Limited	11
Frontier Developments Limited	12
Galloway, Joan and McNamara, Neil	16
Hatwell, John and Johnston, Mervyn.....	18
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	18
Houghton, Tony	19
Kay, Glennis.....	20
Kay, Peter	20
Kay, Vivienne.....	20
Keyte, Tony	21
Miller, Scott.....	21
Ministry of Education.....	21
Nicoll, Diane	22
Oak Ridge Holdings Ltd	23

O'Carroll, Lauren	25
Phillips, Nigel and Sharlene.....	25
Russo, Ron.....	27
Sinclair, Jane.....	27
Spiers, Don and Helen.....	28
Spiers, Rodney.....	28
Swarbrick, Richard & Diane.....	28
Underhill, Martine.....	29
Wheeler, Paul and Fraser, Rebecca	32
Wright, Elizabeth.....	32

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the 28 submissions received and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered in alphabetical order by the submitters surname or the name of the organisation. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by a specific submitter (e.g. Jo Smith). If you would like to see all the submissions lodged on a specific topic within the plan change, then refer to “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Private Plan Change 12: Structure Plan and Rezoning of Growth Cell T2 by Topic”.

Call for further submissions opens on 14 December 2020. The closing date for making further submissions is Friday, 15 January 2021. **No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 11/7) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission. **EXAMPLE:**

Submission 11/7

11 is the submitter number

7 is the submission point number

How to read the summary:

- This summary is ordered by submitter surname. The summary is ordered alphabetically by surname and/or name of the company or organisation. The summary lists all of the submission points made by the submitter.
- Where a submission has been lodged by two people with different surnames, it has been listed by the surname that is first in alphabetical order.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular Topic then you need to refer to the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Private Plan Change 12: Structure Plan and Rezoning of Growth Cell T2 by Topic”.
- For your information separate spell checks have been carried out on the Topic and Submitter reports. In the event of there being any discrepancy the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Private Plan Change 12: Structure Plan and Rezoning of Growth Cell T2 by Topic” will prevail.

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in Proposed Plan Change 12 greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices or Libraries at Cambridge and Te Awamutu as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange12.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipa District Council. To assist you with this an address list of all submitters is included in this report.

Submissions can be:

Posted to: Waipa District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840

Delivered to: Waipa District Council – Te Awamutu Office
101 Bank Street
Te Awamutu

Delivered to: Waipa District Council – Cambridge Office
23 Wilson Street
Cambridge

Emailed to: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Submitter Contact Details

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Ashmore, Howard	[REDACTED]	22
Blackstock, Graeme	[REDACTED]	17
Chisholm, Christopher	[REDACTED]	4
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	C/- Beca Limited Attn: Alec Duncan [REDACTED]	18
Fonterra Limited	C/- Mitchell Daysh Limited Attn: Abbie Fowler [REDACTED]	23
Frontier Developments Limited	Attn: Lyall Green and Steven Green [REDACTED]	12
Galloway, Joan and McNamara, Neil	[REDACTED]	16
Hatwell, John and Johnston, Mervyn	C/- Harkness Henry Attn: Charlotte Muggeridge [REDACTED]	24

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Attn: Carolyn McAlley [REDACTED]	14
Houghton, Tony	[REDACTED]	5
Kay, Glennis	[REDACTED]	27
Kay, Peter	[REDACTED]	26
Kay, Vivienne	[REDACTED]	25
Keyte, Tony	[REDACTED]	2
Miller, Scott	[REDACTED]	6
Ministry of Education	C/- Beca Limited Attn: Danielle Rogers [REDACTED]	13
Nicoll, Diane	[REDACTED]	28
Oak Ridge Holdings Ltd	Attn: Richard Coles and Andrew Pladgate [REDACTED]	20
O'Carroll, Lauren	[REDACTED]	10

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Phillips, Nigel and Sharlene	[REDACTED]	19
Russo, Ron	[REDACTED]	7
Sinclair, Jane	[REDACTED]	8
Spiers, Don and Helen	[REDACTED]	11
Spiers, Rodney	[REDACTED]	9
Swarbrick, Richard & Diane	[REDACTED]	1
Underhill, Martine	[REDACTED]	21
Wheeler, Paul and Fraser, Rebecca	[REDACTED]	15
Wright, Elizabeth	[REDACTED]	3

Ashmore, Howard

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
22/1	General Support	Support	Support the proposal as may want to use the public facilities.	Support decision as proposed.

Blackstock, Graeme

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
17/1	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Oppose	Purchased property thinking the site would not be developed until 2035. Would not have purchased the property if had known.	Oppose the proposal.
17/2	Lack of Communication / Consultation	Oppose	Apart from the developer, there are 2 other residences in the zone. Council has made no effort to liaise.	Oppose the proposal.
17/3	Historic Place Status	Oppose	Property is registered as Historic Places 2, change in zoning has implications on ability to sell and its value.	Oppose the proposal.
17/4	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	Dwelling sites available prior to 2035 have the potential to accommodate growth in excess of the 2050 plan. Question whether there is a need for Council to approve bringing the development of T2 forward, or is the issue to do with Council planning.	Oppose the proposal.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
17/5	Traffic	Oppose	Concerns around increase in traffic generation. Questions around whether a bypass is required in this area.	Oppose the proposal.
17/6	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Concerns around adequate water supply.	Oppose the proposal.
17/7	Affordable Housing	Oppose	How is Council providing for a growing population and suitable housing for those less financially able.	Oppose the proposal.

Chisholm, Christopher

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
4/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Support the retirement village. Prefer to stay in Te Awamutu at a retirement village.	Approve of the proposed plan change.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
18/1	Infrastructure - Water Supply (Fire Fighting)	Support in part	Concerns around adequate water pressure through the development and existing pressure issues across the district.	Plan change to be amended to include a rule provision that requires adequate water supply is provided to the

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			Concerns regarding water supply network not being able to achieve FW3 which is a requirement for the proposed retirement village and all other structures characterised by a fire hazard category.	development prior to construction of any structures. Adequate to mean in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications.

Fonterra Limited

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
23/1	Traffic	Support	Support PC12 subject to further assessment on the impacts on the wider transportation network. Concerns around the assumptions in the Applicant's Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) around direction for traffic leaving the Growth Cell. Concerns around increased traffic outside Fonterra's Te Awamutu site.	Requests the Applicant amend the ITA to address the concerns raised, and hold a meeting with the Applicant and Council to discuss the points raised and/or include a rule in the plan requiring a Broad ITA that considers the impacts of the proposed development on the wider transportation network.
23/2	Infrastructure - Water Supply (Industrial)	Support	Concerns around the release of T2 Growth Cell ahead of timeframe and what that means for the continued availability of water supplied by Council to Fonterra's Te Awamutu site.	Provide further information to satisfy concerns. Hold a meeting with Applicant and Council to discuss concerns.

Frontier Developments Limited

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
12/1	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	The plan change request has not met the test as per 14.4.1.10(d)(i) of the District Plan in relation to open growth cells. Noting T1 growth cell is open and development ready but not anticipated to be completed within the next three years due to anticipated growth in Te Awamutu.	Requests that further analysis of open cells and their development ready status is provided in order for Council to be able to sufficiently determine 14.4.1.10(d)(iii). Objects to the uplift of the deferred status of the whole T2 area.
12/2	Growth cells - Disconnect within and between	Oppose	The proposal and supporting documentation has focused on the southern half of T2 and there is a lack of information and supporting documentation for the northern half of the site. The northern half is held in multiple landowners without a clear direction which may result in piece-meal development with little cohesion.	The northern half of the T2 growth cell should remain deferred residential.
12/3	Growth cells - Disconnect within and between	Oppose	The proposal to develop the southern half of T2 initially is disjointed with the surrounding environment as the adjoining T1 growth cell is developing from the north off Pirongia Road. This will lead to a disconnect from the southern T2 growth cell with the remaining Te Awamutu town and a void of empty T1 land between the	The proposal is inconsistent with the Te Awamutu Town Concept plan 2010, Waipa 2050 and the District Plan.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			existing residential land and proposed T2 development.	
12/4	Viewshafts and Vistas	Oppose	The proposed structure plan is lacking of, and does not provide satisfactory cognisance of east-west vistas. East-west vista will be hindered with the bulk retirement village development.	The proposal is inconsistent with the Te Awamutu Town Concept plan 2010, Waipa 2050 and the District Plan.
12/5	District Plan provisions - General	Oppose	Layout of the subdivision does not comply with the District Plan rules. Objects to the proposed layout with respect to direct access to collector roads, and frontage to reserves.	Object.
12/6	Ecology	Oppose	The ecology report in the application notes the presence of bats and lizards.	Efforts should be made, prior to any earthworks, to protect bat and lizard habitats.
12/7	Viewshafts and Vistas	Oppose	Landscape and visual assessment does not take into account adverse effects associated with a disconnected development from the existing residential area. Does not consider effects from future residents of T2 looking outward or the interface between T1 and T2.	Requests further consideration of viewshaft, vistas, and visual experiences for future T2 residents and the interface between T1 and T2.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
12/8	Infrastructure - Stormwater	Oppose	<p>Concerns around infrastructure provision, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater design calculations and accommodating stormwater events beyond the 10yr design leading to potential effects downstream. Does not reflect the new NES for Freshwater Regulations 2020. The infrastructure report states that T2 will have a pump station discharging into Stage 3 of T1, but has not been incorporated into the design of T1. An alternative provision is required. 	The matters identified should be addressed by the applicant.
12/9	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	<p>Concerns around infrastructure provision, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The booster pump required to provide water supply should be provided ahead of development. Objects to any DCs that may be placed on T1 as a result of these upgrades. 	The matters identified should be addressed by the applicant.
12/10	Traffic	Oppose	<p>Concerns around infrastructure provision, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will result in changing Frontier and Pirongia Roads to 	The matters identified should be addressed by the applicant.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			<p>collector roads. These road upgrades should be undertaken before development of T2. Cycle lanes do not connect with existing cycle lanes. A 3.5m land width is not sufficient for a shared cycle and vehicle lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The western boundary pedestrian link is within private land. Public corridor should be formed to provide this function and not be used for stormwater swales. ▪ Proposed layout requires vehicle crossings to Frontier Road. Traffic safety issues with this. T1 does not have any sections directly accessing Frontier or Pirongia Roads. ▪ WDC roading requirements not being maintained. 	
12/11	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	Comments and noted objections to the proposed amendments to the District Plan.	Oppose .

Galloway, Joan and McNamara, Neil

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
16/1	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Oppose	Proposed subdivision fails to meet Councils objective to protect and enhance the rural backdrop and natural landscape features of Te Awamutu. Purchase of the property was based on the knowledge that the rural outlook would not be affected until at least 2035.	Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy. Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.
16/2	Ecology	Oppose	Subdivision risks impact on the long-tailed bats.	Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy. Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.
16/3	Lack of Communication / Consultation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns with communication from the Applicant. The initial proposal changed to a residential subdivision with little communication. ▪ Proposal is a significant deviation from the Council’s strategic growth strategy and should involve wider consultation. 	Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy. Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
16/4	Lack of Communication / Consultation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding the right to quiet enjoyment of property, particularly from vibration effects from heavy machinery, noise pollution, dust and dirt, and light pollution not currently seen in the rural area. ▪ Current infrastructure not sufficient to support the development. 	<p>Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.</p>
16/5	Disruption and Noise	Oppose	Concerns regarding the right to quiet enjoyment of property, particularly from vibration effects from heavy machinery, noise pollution, dust and dirt, and light pollution not currently seen in the rural area.	<p>Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.</p>
16/6	Infrastructure - General	Oppose	Current infrastructure not sufficient to support the development.	<p>Rezoning to residential remain deferred to 2030-2050 as per the District Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Alternatively, consent is given to develop the 9.5ha retirement village only, with the remainder of the property to be retained as rural.</p>

Hatwell, John and Johnston, Mervyn

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
24/1	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	Oppose PC12 on the basis the Applicant has incorrectly interpreted Rule 14.4.1.10 of the District Plan and not proven that there is less than three years supply of land that is development ready.	Council does not approve the changes sought.

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
14/1	Recognising and protecting Archaeological Sites	Support in Part	Proposal will result in earthworks, which in the event of unrecorded archaeology being present has the potential to damage the finite archaeological resource.	Prior to a decision being made, an archaeological assessment relating to Stage 2 is further updated to include the author's opinion on the effects of the proposed works on archaeological values and if a walkover is required to form this opinion
14/2	Recognising and protecting Archaeological Sites	Support in Part	Lack of specific provisions relating to the protection of the house and setting known as Isla Bank, a HNZPT listed Category 2 historic place, and Waipa District Council scheduled heritage item Category B. At the time of subdivision and further	1. Requests the Applicant to undertake an amendment of the structure plan to show a revised development layout that includes the retention in one lot of; Isla Bank and the associated gardens, driveway and entrance, and also shows development

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			development could result in adverse effects on historic heritage.	<p>layout in the immediate surrounds that takes into account the desirability of retaining open space to the east of Isla Bank.</p> <p>2. Seeks that the “proposed District plan Amendments” are amended at S23.4 Design Measures, to include the recommendation from the Boffa Miskell report as follows; "Design integration of the boundary treatment with the retention of the entrance gates associated with heritage item property (Isla Bank Villa)".</p> <p>3. Seeks that the Waipa District Plan Heritage Schedule is amended to reflect the full extent of the setting of the Historic Place Isla Bank.</p>

Houghton, Tony

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
5/1	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Oppose	Slow and stop Waipa towns to be subject of urban sprawl.	Oppose the proposal to rezone the site to residential.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
5/2	Traffic	Oppose	Slow and stop Waipa towns to be subject of urban sprawl.	Oppose the proposal to rezone the site to residential.

Kay, Glennis

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
27/1	General Support	Support	Development is beneficial to community.	Proceed.

Kay, Peter

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
26/1	General Support	Support	It will be an asset to Te Awamutu.	Like the plan change to proceed.

Kay, Vivienne

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
25/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Increase in 70+ residents requires an increase in these developments.	Support.

Keyte, Tony

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
2/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Te Awamutu is significantly lacking in retirement villages with little option for elderly residents in the area.	Approve the bringing forward of Plan Change 12 and retirement village.

Miller, Scott

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
6/1	Effects on existing home	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Do not want to have to build or pay for a fence.▪ Have nice views of Pirongia and doesn't want to be obstructed▪ Home gets covered in dust from construction	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Not to pay for fencing.2. Retain views of Pirongia looking west.3. Contractors to finish fencing.4. Home get washed occasionally.

Ministry of Education

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
13/1	Schooling capacity	Not Stated	Concerns that increase in residential activity may have implications on schooling capacity in the area.	Requests that Council and the developer continue to engage with the Ministry with respect to the staging and timing of the

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				residential development to understand the impact on the school network.

Nicoll, Diane

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
28/1	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Water supply issues, always in water restrictions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only build retirement village. 2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank. 3. No access on Frontier Road.
28/2	Traffic	Oppose	Road dangerous enough especially with sunstrike.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only build retirement village. 2. Sections should be at least 700m² and have a water tank. 3. No access on Frontier Road.
28/3	Disruption and Noise	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ House damage from heavy machinery. ▪ Vibration, noise, and dust effects 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only build retirement village. 2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank. 3. No access on Frontier Road.
28/4	Effects on existing home	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ House damage from heavy machinery. ▪ Vibration, noise, and dust effects. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only build retirement village. 2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				3. No access on Frontier Road.
28/5	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	Bringing rezoning forward and infrastructure concerns.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only build retirement village. 2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank. 3. No access on Frontier Road.

Oak Ridge Holdings Ltd

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
20/1	Infrastructure - Wastewater	Oppose	Opposes the uplift of T2 Growth Cell due to concerns around reduced level of service in Council's water and wastewater reticulation with respect to undeveloped zoned urban land or land planned for urban growth between now and 2035.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council do not rezone land to residential until it is demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the water or wastewater network supply to planned urban growth areas in Te Awamutu, or mitigation measures are proposed and confirmed to avoid or reduce these network effects to an acceptable level. 2. Council include a rule in the District Plan that provides for the extent of the Stage 1 - T2 Growth Cell area to be developed but classifies other stages in advance of 2035 a non-complying or prohibited activity. The

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				Stage 1 T2 area should be capped at 203 dwellings as per PC12 request.
20/2	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Opposes the uplift of T2 Growth Cell due to concerns around reduced level of service in Council's water and wastewater reticulation with respect to undeveloped zoned urban land or land planned for urban growth between now and 2035.	<p>1. Council do not rezone land to residential until it is demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the water or wastewater network supply to planned urban growth areas in Te Awamutu, or mitigation measures are proposed and confirmed to avoid or reduce these network effects to an acceptable level.</p> <p>2. Council include a rule in the District Plan that provides for the extent of the Stage 1 - T2 Growth Cell area to be developed but classifies other stages in advance of 2035 a non-complying or prohibited activity. The Stage 1 T2 area should be capped at 203 dwellings as per PC12 request.</p>
20/3	District Plan provisions - Growth Cells	Oppose	Opposes the uplift of T2 Growth Cell due to concerns around reduced level of service in Council's water and wastewater reticulation with respect to undeveloped zoned urban land. or land planned for urban growth between now and 2035.	<p>1. Council do not rezone land to residential until it is demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the water or wastewater network supply to planned urban growth areas in Te Awamutu, or mitigation measures are proposed and confirmed to avoid or reduce these network effects to an acceptable level.</p>

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				2. Council include a rule in the District Plan that provides for the extent of the Stage 1 - T2 Growth Cell area to be developed but classifies other stages in advance of 2035 a non-complying or prohibited activity. The Stage 1 T2 area should be capped at 203 dwellings as per PC12 request.

O'Carroll, Lauren

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
10/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Impressed with the Sanderson Estate in Tamahere, the Mount and Wanaka. It will enhance Te Awamutu and required for the aging population.	Go ahead with the proposal.

Phillips, Nigel and Sharlene

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
19/1	Infrastructure - General	Oppose	Oppose the development. Bought their property 2 years ago and were told	Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			development on the site would not occur until 2035. Specific Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure not in place to support what is already there, let alone another big development. 	
19/2	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Oppose the development. Bought their property 2 years ago and were told development on the site would not occur until 2035. Specific Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water supply. 	Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision.
19/3	Disruption and Noise	Oppose	Oppose the development. Bought their property 2 years ago and were told development on the site would not occur until 2035. Specific Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction work for years. ▪ Traffic increase. 	Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision.
19/4	Traffic	Oppose	Oppose the development. Bought their property 2 years ago and were told development on the site would not occur until 2035. Specific Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure not in place to support what is already there, let alone another big development. ▪ Traffic increase. 	Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water runoff increase. 	
19/5	Infrastructure - Stormwater	Oppose	<p>Oppose the development. Bought their property 2 years ago and were told development on the site would not occur until 2035. Specific Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water runoff increase 	Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision.

Russo, Ron

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
7/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Of retirement age, looking for suitable living in Te Awamutu. The proposed retirement village is attractive.	Approve the plan change and the retirement village

Sinclair, Jane

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
8/1	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Support in part	Proposed retirement village and residential subdivision compromise elite soils. Contrary to advice received in relation to own development plans.	Why Sanderson can subdivide, when refused.

Spiers, Don and Helen

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
11/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Te Awamutu needs another retirement Village. Frontier Road is a good location.	Support.

Spiers, Rodney

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
9/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	New retirement village will help alleviate the current waiting list on existing facilities and will be a valuable asset to the community.	Support.

Swarbrick, Richard & Diane

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
1/1	Disruption and Noise	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Disruption and noise.▪ Increased traffic.	T2 to revert to rural.
1/2	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ No case made out for further urban growth.▪ Loss of farming land.	T2 to revert to rural.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
1/3	Traffic	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No case made out for further urban growth. ▪ Increased traffic. ▪ Yet more stress on infrastructure particularly east Alexandra St. 	T2 to revert to rural.
1/4	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Insufficient water.	T2 to revert to rural.
1/5	Rates	Oppose	Hidden subsidies paid by ratepayers.	T2 to revert to rural.

Underhill, Martine

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
21/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support in part	Support the retirement village, but oppose the residential development.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
21/2	Traffic	Support in part	Sun strike on Frontier Road is dangerous, the proposed entrance at the top of Frontier Road is a hazard.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.
21/3	Effects on existing home	Support in part	Building the site up will create further runoff into the garage and 20 Frontier Road causing an unhealthy home.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.
21/4	Health - Dust	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health effects from dust. ▪ Water supply effects. ▪ Effects on views to Pirongia. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
21/5	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Support in part	Water supply effects.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.
21/6	Viewshafts and Vistas	Support in part	Effects on views to Pirongia.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move entrance to the site as per submission attachment (further west). 2. Defer residential subdivision until 2035. 3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street. 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.

Wheeler, Paul and Fraser, Rebecca

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
15/1	Infrastructure - Water Supply	Oppose	Te Awamutu's infrastructure is not equipped to handle current subdivisions let alone proposed ones. Water or lack of is already inadequate and have severe water restrictions.	That the Council stick with original timeframe for development and work on appropriate planning first.
15/2	Infrastructure - General	Oppose	Te Awamutu's infrastructure is not equipped to handle current subdivisions let alone proposed ones. Sun strike on Frontier Road is a serious issue.	That the Council stick with original timeframe for development and work on appropriate planning first.
15/3	Land use change from Rural to Urban	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small sections in a semi-rural area. ▪ Removal of bush and trees. 	That the Council stick with original timeframe for development and work on appropriate planning first.

Wright, Elizabeth

Submission point	Topic	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
3/1	Support for additional retirement facilities	Support	Support the retirement village as proposed. There is high demand for a facility.	Support decision as proposed.