

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

By Topic

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 |
| Affordable Housing | 9 |
| Disruption and Noise | 9 |
| District Plan provisions - General..... | 10 |
| District Plan provisions - Growth Cells..... | 10 |
| Ecology..... | 12 |
| Effects on existing home..... | 12 |
| General Support..... | 13 |
| Growth Cells - Disconnect within and between | 14 |
| Health - Dust | 15 |
| Historic Place Status..... | 15 |
| Infrastructure - General | 15 |
| Infrastructure - Stormwater..... | 16 |
| Infrastructure - Wastewater | 17 |
| Infrastructure - Water Supply | 18 |
| Infrastructure - Water Supply (Fire Fighting)..... | 20 |
| Infrastructure - Water Supply (Industrial) | 20 |
| Lack of Communication / Consultation..... | 21 |
| Land use change from Rural to Urban | 22 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Rates | 23 |
| Recognising and protecting Archaeological Sites | 23 |
| Schooling capacity..... | 24 |
| Support for additional retirement facilities..... | 24 |
| Traffic | 26 |
| Viewshafts and Vistas | 28 |

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the 28 submissions received and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered by submission topic. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by a topic (e.g. Traffic). If you would like to see all the submissions lodged by submitter on 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 Submitter”.

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 topic. The summary lists all of the submission points made on a particular topic by all the submitters.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular submitter 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 Submitter”.
- 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] Email: [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 |

Affordable Housing

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 17/7 | Oppose | How is Council providing for a growing population and suitable housing for those less financially able. | Oppose the proposal. |

Disruption and Noise

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 1/1 | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disruption and noise. ▪ Increased traffic. | T2 to revert to rural. |
| 16/5 | 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. | 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. |
| 19/3 | 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. |
| 28/3 | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ House damage from heavy machinery. ▪ Vibration, noise, and dust effects. | 1. Only build retirement village. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | <p>2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank.</p> <p>3. No access on Frontier Road.</p> |

District Plan provisions - General

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------|
| 12/5 | 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. |

District Plan provisions - Growth Cells

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 12/1 | 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. | <p>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).</p> <p>Objects to the uplift of the deferred status of the whole T2 area.</p> |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 12/11 | Oppose | Comments and noted objections to the proposed amendments to the District Plan. | Oppose. |
| 17/4 | 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. |
| 20/3 | 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> |
| 24/1 | 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. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 28/5 | 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. |

Ecology

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 12/6 | 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. |
| 16/2 | Oppose | Subdivision risks impact on the long-tailed bats. | <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> |

Effects on existing home

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 6/1 | Support in part | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not want to have to build or pay for a fence. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not to pay for fencing. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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"> 2. Retain views of Pirongia looking west. 3. Contractors to finish fencing. 4. Home get washed occasionally. |
| 21/3 | 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. |
| 28/4 | 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. |

General Support

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 22/1 | Support | Support the proposal as may want to use the public facilities. | Support decision as proposed. |
| 26/1 | Support | It will be an asset to Te Awamutu. | Like the plan change to proceed. |

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

Growth Cells - Disconnect within and between

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 12/2 | 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 | 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 existing residential land and proposed T2 development. | The proposal is inconsistent with the Te Awamutu Town Concept plan 2010, Waipa 2050 and the District Plan. |

Health - Dust

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 21/4 | 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. |

Historic Place Status

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------|
| 17/3 | Oppose | Property is registered as Historic Places 2, change in zoning has implications on ability to sell and its value. | Oppose the proposal. |

Infrastructure - General

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 15/2 | Oppose | Te Awamutu's infrastructure is not equipped to handle current subdivisions let alone proposed ones. | That the Council stick with original timeframe for development and work on appropriate planning first. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | Sun strike on Frontier Road is a serious issue. | |
| 16/6 | Oppose | Current infrastructure not sufficient to support the development. | 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. |
| 19/1 | 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. | Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision. |

Infrastructure - Stormwater

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 12/8 | Oppose | Concerns around infrastructure provision, specifically: <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 matters identified should be addressed by the applicant. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | |
| 19/5 | 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. |

Infrastructure - Wastewater

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 20/1 | Oppose | <p>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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | activity. The Stage 1 T2 area should be capped at 203 dwellings as per PC12 request. |

Infrastructure - Water Supply

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1/4 | Oppose | Insufficient water. | T2 to revert to rural. |
| 12/9 | Oppose | Concerns around infrastructure provision, specifically: <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. |
| 15/1 | 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. |
| 17/6 | Oppose | Concerns around adequate water supply. | Oppose the proposal. |
| 19/2 | 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. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 20/2 | 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 Stage 1 T2 area should be capped at 203 dwellings as per PC12 request. |
| 21/5 | 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. |
| 28/1 | 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. |

Infrastructure - Water Supply (Fire Fighting)

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

Infrastructure - Water Supply (Industrial)

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 23/2 | 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. |

Lack of Communication / Consultation

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 17/2 | Oppose | Apart from the developer, there are 2 other residences in the zone. Council has made no effort to liaise. | Oppose the proposal. |
| 16/3 | 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. | <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> |
| 16/4 | 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> |

Land use change from Rural to Urban

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1/2 | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No case made out for further urban growth. ▪ Loss of farming land. | T2 to revert to rural. |
| 5/1 | Oppose | Slow and stop Waipa towns to be subject of urban sprawl. | Oppose the proposal to rezone the site to residential. |
| 8/1 | 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. |
| 15/3 | 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. |
| 16/1 | 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. |
| 17/1 | Oppose | Purchased property thinking the site would not be developed until 2035. Would not have purchased the property if had known. | Oppose the proposal. |

Rates

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1/5 | Oppose | Hidden subsidies paid by ratepayers. | T2 to revert to rural. |

Recognising and protecting Archaeological Sites

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 14/1 | 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 | 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 development could result in adverse effects on historic heritage. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 layout in the immediate surrounds that takes into account the desirability of retaining open space to the east of Isla Bank. 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 |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | <p>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> |

Schooling capacity

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 13/1 | 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 residential development to understand the impact on the school network. |

Support for additional retirement facilities

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

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 25/1 | Support | Increase in 70+ residents requires an increase in these developments. | Support. |
| 2/1 | 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. |
| 10/1 | 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. |
| 7/1 | 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. |
| 11/1 | Support | Te Awamutu needs another retirement Village. Frontier Road is a good location. | Support. |
| 9/1 | Support | New retirement village will help alleviate the current waiting list on existing facilities and will be a valuable asset to the community. | Support. |
| 21/1 | 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. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | 4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed. |
| 3/1 | Support | Support the retirement village as proposed. There is high demand for a facility. | Support decision as proposed. |

Traffic

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1/3 | 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. |
| 5/2 | Oppose | Slow and stop Waipa towns to be subject of urban sprawl. | Oppose the proposal to rezone the site to residential |
| 12/10 | 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 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. | The matters identified should be addressed by the applicant. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <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. | |
| 17/5 | Oppose | Concerns around increase in traffic generation. Questions around whether a bypass is required in this area. | Oppose the proposal. |
| 19/4 | 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. ▪ Water runoff increase. | Do not oppose the retirement village, it is just the residential subdivision. |
| 21/2 | 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. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>3. Do not build up sections along Frontier Road (Lots 1 to 14) that may cause water flow to houses across the street.</p> <p>4. Covenants that only single storey buildings can be constructed.</p> |
| 23/1 | 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. |
| 28/2 | Oppose | Road dangerous enough especially with sunstrike. | <p>1. Only build retirement village.</p> <p>2. Sections should be at least 700m2 and have a water tank.</p> <p>3. No access on Frontier Road.</p> |

Viewshafts and Vistas

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 12/4 | 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. |

| Submission point | Support / Oppose / In Part | My submission is (summary): | Decision requested |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 12/7 | 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. |
| 21/6 | 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. |