

# Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 13: Uplifting Deferred Zones by Submitter

April 2021

## Table of Contents

Reader’s Guide .....	4
How to read the summary:.....	4
How to make a further submission.....	5
Submitter Contact Details .....	6
3Ms of Cambridge GP Limited .....	10
Brian Perry Charitable Trust.....	13
Bushell, John & Sarah.....	13
Cambridge Motocross.....	14
Cambridge Motorcycle Club .....	14
Collinson, John .....	15
Coombes Farms Ltd, & Coombes, C & S .....	16
Dargaville, Susanne .....	18
Fire and Emergency New Zealand .....	18
Frontier Development Limited.....	20
Gaskell, Shaun .....	21
Hatwell, JL & Johnston, ML.....	21
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga .....	28
Hoebergen, VR & SP & Yeates, S.....	30
Kotare Properties Ltd .....	31
Maunsell, Geoff.....	38
McCarthy, Gregory.....	40
McKnight, Ashley .....	41

Mylchreest, Jim .....	41
Papamoa TA Limited Partnership .....	42
Sapwell, Margaret.....	46
Saywell, Gary & Adele .....	48
Sharman, John.....	48
Stockley, Loren.....	49
Storck, John B.....	49
Storck, Lorene .....	50
Summerset Villages (Cambridge) Limited.....	51
TA Projects Limited .....	57
Talbot, Raymond E .....	60
Talbot, Raymond E.....	61
Transpower New Zealand Ltd .....	63
Wise, Russell .....	66
Woods, Hayden.....	66

## **Reader's Guide**

This document is a summary of the 33 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 proposed plan change, then refer to “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 13: Uplifting Deferred Zones by Topic”.

Call for further submissions opens on **3 May 2021**. The closing date for making further submissions is **14 May 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. 1/3) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission. **EXAMPLE:**

Submission 1/3

1 is the submitter number

3 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 Plan Change 13: Uplifting Deferred Zones 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 Plan Change 13: Uplifting Deferred Zones 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 13 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/plan-change-13](http://www.waipadc.govt.nz/plan-change-13).

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 Waipā District Council. To assist you with this an address list of all submitters is included in this report.

### **Submissions can be:**

**Posted to:** Waipā District Council  
Private Bag 2402  
Te Awamutu 3840

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

**Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Cambridge Office  
23 Wilson Street  
Cambridge

**Emailed to:** [districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz)

## **Submitter Contact Details**

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
3Ms of Cambridge GP Limited	Mitchell Daysh Limited PO Box 1307 Hamilton 3240 Attn: Abbie Fowler	20
Brian Perry Charitable Trust	Private Bag 3091 Hamilton 3240 Attn: Jennifer Palmer	10
Bushell, John & Sarah	jb_86@live.com	9
Cambridge Motocross	C/- Jude Eades 891 Maungatautari Road RD 2 Cambridge 3494	3
Cambridge Motorcycle Club	PO Box 88 Cambridge 3450 Attn: Loren Stockley	32
Collinson, John	C/- Babbage Consultants PO Box 2027 Shortland Street Auckland 1140 Attn: Kerryanne Lewis	22

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Coombes Farms Ltd, & Coombes, C & S	C/- Bloxam Burnett & Olliver PO Box 9041 Hamilton Attn: Kathryn Drew	29
Dargaville, Susanne	sue.dargaville@xtra.co.nz	8
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	C/- Beca Limited PO Box 448 Hamilton 3240 Attn: Alec Duncan	7
Frontier Development Limited	PO Box 5254 Hamilton 3242 Attn: Lyall Green	17
Gaskell, Shaun	shaungaskell@gmail.com	4
Hatwell, JL & Johnston, ML	C/- Harkness Henry Private Bag 3077 Hamilton Attn: Charlotte Muggeridge	23
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	PO Box 13339 Tauranga 3141 Attn: Carolyn McAlley	16
Hoebergen, VR & SP; & Yeates, S	steveandv@orcon.net.nz	18

By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Kotare Properties Ltd	C/- Bloxam Burnett & Olliver PO Box 9041 Hamilton Attn: Kathryn Drew	19
Maunsell, Geoff	christinaw@4sight.co.nz Attn: Christina Walker	28
McCarthy, Gregory	greg@suttonmccarthy.co.nz	6
McKnight, Ashley	ashmcknight@gmail.com	5
Mylchreest, Jim	myl.family@xtra.co.nz	21
Papamoa TA Limited Partnership	C/- Harkness Henry Private Bag 3077 Hamilton Attn: Charlotte Muggeridge	26
Sapwell, Margaret	grim.sapwell@xtra.co.nz	14
Saywell, Gary & Adele	carl@mscivil.co.nz	24
Sharman, John	21 Lilac Close Cambridge 3434	2
Stockley, Loren	lorenstockley@hotmail.com	33
Storck, John B	johnsassy12@gmail.com	11
Storck, Lorene	lorene.john@gmail.com	12



By Surname	Submitter's Contact Details	Submission number
Summerset Villages (Cambridge) Limited	C/- Bentley & Co. Ltd PO Box 4492 Shortland Street Auckland 1141 Attn: Craig McGarr	13
TA Projects Limited	C/- Shearer Consulting PO Box 60-240 Titirangi 0644 Attn: Craig Shearer	30
Talbot, Raymond E	23 Hyatt Close Leamington Cambridge 3432	15
Talbot, Raymond E	23 Hyatt Close Leamington Cambridge 3432	27
Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Environment.Policy@transpower.co.nz Attn: Rebecca Eng	25
Wise, Russell	15 Hyatt Close Cambridge 3432	31
Woods, Hayden	1/232 Rewi Street Te Awamutu 3800	1

### **3Ms of Cambridge GP Limited**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
20/1	C2 / C3	Planning Maps	Support	3Ms strongly supports the intent of Proposed Plan Change 13 rezoning the C2 and C3 Growth Cells from Deferred Residential Zone to Residential Zone, and therefore seeks that the Planning Maps be amended to rezone the C2 and C3 Growth Cells as Residential Zone as proposed.	Rezone the C2 and C3 Growth Cells from Deferred Residential Zone to Residential Zone as proposed by Plan Change 13.
20/2	C2 / C3	Planning Maps	Support In Part	3Ms strongly supports the intent of Proposed Plan Change 13 rezoning the C2 and C3 Growth Cells from Deferred Residential Zone to Residential Zone, and therefore seeks that the Planning Maps be amended to rezone the C2 and C3 Growth Cells as Residential Zone as proposed.	Amend the Urban Limits of Cambridge to include the C2 and C3 Growth Cell as these growth cells are clearly anticipated to be developed for residential purposes and be within the Cambridge urban area.
20/3	C2 / C3		Support In Part	3Ms strongly encourages the Waipa District Council to continue the work (planning and construction) associated with enabling the development of the C1 and C2/C3 Growth Cells as the effect of this plan change (i.e. live zoning the area) may mean that there is an	No decision requested

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				expectation that there is infrastructure in place to enable residential developments. Such works include the C1 and C2/C3 roundabout on Cambridge Road, greenbelt crossings and securing any land required for public infrastructure (i.e. collector roads and stormwater swales) and constructing that infrastructure.	
20/4	C2 / C3	Planning Maps	Support In Part	3Ms seeks that these active reserve areas be removed from the Planning Maps as the subdivision consent that 3Ms obtained in 2020 that is referenced in the section 32 evaluation report has been surrendered and that reserve layout is not being progressed by 3Ms as part of its current subdivision application. For clarity, 3Ms seeks that that the entire extent of its property be zoned Residential Zone rather than a combination of Residential Zone and Reserves Zone, or such similar relief as is necessary to be consistent with 3Ms current subdivision consent application before Council, and any ongoing	Amend the Planning Maps to remove the areas proposed to be zoned "Active Reserve" on the 3Ms properties within the C2 Growth Cell (namely, Planning Map 4, Planning Map 23 and Planning Map 24). 3Ms seeks that that the entire extent of its property be zoned Residential Zone rather than a combination of Residential Zone and Reserves Zone.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				negotiations between Council and 3Ms regarding reserves.	
20/5	C7	Planning Maps	Support In Part	It appears that the C7 Growth Cell (area in red outline in the following figure) has been zoned Residential Zone as part of this plan change, with the annotation of "Structure Plan Area". The C7 Growth Cell is a "post-2035" Growth Cell (is currently zoned Deferred Zone) and is not currently subject to a Structure Plan. The Section 32 evaluation report sets out that the C7 growth cell remains unchanged as part of Proposed Plan Change 13 so zoning this Growth Cell as full Residential Zone may be an error.	3Ms seeks that this area be zoned Deferred Residential Zone, and the Structure Plan Area annotation be removed as per the existing situation.
20/6	C10	Appendix S1	Support In Part	Minor correction to the changes proposed in Appendix S1 - Future Growth Cells.	For the C10 Industrial Growth Cell, the final sentence in the table should read (amendments in red underline): The industrial area is covered by the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan while the Rural area of the growth cell is not covered by a structure plan and is currently <u>unserved</u> .

### **Brian Perry Charitable Trust**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
10/1	C2	Planning Maps	Support	Given the urgent need for affordable housing in Waipā, and in Cambridge in particular, we urge Council to support developers in improved zoning statuses. In our case, we are ready to go, to deliver much needed affordable housing to Cambridge, but need the uplifting of the deferred zone as soon as possible.	Uplift the deferred residential zone for Peake Road, C2

### **Bushell, John & Sarah**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
9/1	C4	Appendix S23	Support	My submission is for the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to the continued growth of Waipa and the growing pressure on house prices in the district which is affecting young families and will not ease without this step forward. Bringing this forward will also create jobs for locals and bring young family's to our great district	Bring forward the advancement of the C4 Plan

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				and support the recovery of Waipa as a whole.	

### **Cambridge Motocross**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
3/1	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Not supportive of the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to wider amenity issues	Delay the advancement of C4 for 7 years

### **Cambridge Motorcycle Club**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
32	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Not supportive of the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to wider amenity issues	Delay the advancement of C4 for 7 years

## Collinson, John

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
22/1	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Planning Maps	Support	The Submitter is currently investigating options to develop their property for residential housing, and supports PC13 as the proposed uplifting of the deferred zoning for the C2 Growth Cell looks to be the most efficient and effective means of supporting future residential development in this area. The new zoning will provide for much needed housing in Cambridge and will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The Submitter supports this change as they are currently investigating options to develop their property for residential housing, and the uplifting of this deferred zoning will support this.	That Waipa District Council approve PC13.
22/2	C2	Planning Maps	Support	There is already a Structure Plan in place for Growth Cells C1 – C3, and the proposed changes under PC13 will enable the Submitter to develop their land in a manner that is consistent with that existing Structure Plan.	That Waipa District Council approve PC13.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
22/3	C2	Planning Maps	Support	PC13 is proposing to update the planning maps for all pre-2035 Growth Cells so that there is consistency with the proposed uplifting of the deferred zones. This will include changing Growth Cell C2 to Residential Zone on the Planning Maps, as well as showing the areas to be vested in Council as reserve in C2 (under the recently approved subdivision consents) as Reserve Zone on the Planning Maps.	That Waipa District Council approve PC13.

### **Coombes Farms Ltd, & Coombes, C & S**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
29/1	Ngahinapouri	Planning Maps	Support In Part	Coombes, in principle, supports the PC13 approach to remove the deferred zoning from the pre-2035 growth cells as an approach to remedy a technical and legal issue with the current process of uplifting the Deferred Zones as outlined in Section 14 of the District Plan. In relation to Ngahinapouri this means that 18ha of land contained	Coombes seek that 18ha of the N3 growth cell is rezoned from deferred residential to residential and that the N2 growth cell is retained as a Deferred Large Lot Residential Zone. The balance of the N3 growth cell would also retain its Deferred Large Lot Residential Zone status.



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>within the N2 growth cell is proposed to be zoned Large Lot Residential, because it is a pre-2035 growth cell. The Coombes request that instead of uplifting the deferred status on the N2 growth cell that Council uplifts the deferred status across approximately 18ha of the N3 growth cell and subsequently retains the deferred status on the N2 growth cell. The reasoning for and justification for this land swap is set out in section 2 of this submission.</p>	
29/2	Ngahinapouri	Map 34	Support In Part	<p>Coombes request that the planning maps be amended to rezone a portion of the N3 growth cell to Large Lot Residential over the rezoning of the N2 growth cell.</p>	<p>Amend planning Map 34 so that the N2 growth cell zoned Deferred Large Lot Residential and that a portion of the N3 growth cell, as per the Land Swap Plan is rezoned Large Lot Residential.</p>

## Dargaville, Susanne

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
8/1	Reserves	Planning Maps	Oppose	I totally oppose the rezoning of the vested reserve areas within the Cambridge C2 Growth Cell as Reserves Zone.	To maintain all of the current green belts that exist and any of the public reserves, especially those areas of land that have been designated or gifted to the Council for public use from current and past citizens of Cambridge. These must remain as open green areas.
8/2	T1	Appendix S17	Oppose	Amend the Structure Plan for Growth Cell T1 to reflect the updated master plan is opposed	To maintain all of the current green belts that exist and any of the public reserves, especially those areas of land that have been designated or gifted to the Council for public use from current and past citizens of Cambridge. These must remain as open green areas.

## Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
7/1	Water Supply		Support In Part	The proposed changes for removing the ability to uplift any Deferred Zone via a Council resolution are supported by Fire and Emergency.	Fire and Emergency seeks ongoing collaboration with Council to ensure that water pressures in the district's urban areas are maintained in

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				The proposed process is considered to be an improved process given that a plan change process will be needed to uplift a deferred zone (allowing Fire and Emergency (and other key stakeholders) to lodge a submission).	accordance with the Code of Practice. For those large lot residential growth cells that will not be serviced by the Council reticulated water supply network, Fire and Emergency encourages Council to promote to landowners and developers (i.e. through the pre-application process) that early engagement should occur with Fire and Emergency as part of the resource consent process to discuss how best to achieve compliance with the Code of Practice.
7/2	Water Supply		Support In Part	It is considered that Section 15 does broadly contain appropriate controls (including cross-references to Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications) to ensure that firefighting water supply and suitable access for emergency vehicles will be adequately addressed at the time of subdivision and subsequent development of these growth areas. As such, Fire and Emergency agree in part with Council that the necessary detail relating to infrastructure provision will be adequately considered through a subdivision consent	Fire and Emergency seeks ongoing collaboration with Council to ensure that water pressures in the district's urban areas are maintained in accordance with the Code of Practice. For those large lot residential growth cells that will not be serviced by the Council reticulated water supply network, Fire and Emergency encourages Council to promote to landowners and developers (i.e. through the pre-application process) that early engagement should occur with Fire and Emergency as part of the resource consent process to

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				process. Fire and Emergency consider that removing the requirement for structure plans to be in place prior to the subdivision / development of these growth cells has the potential to result in poor urban outcomes, particularly in relation to servicing and infrastructure.	discuss how best to achieve compliance with the Code of Practice.

### **Frontier Development Limited**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
17/1	T1	Appendix S17	Support In Part	Frontier Estates agrees to the updating of Appendix S17, however wishes to have the current Master Plan submitted under the latest resource consents LU/0012/19.01 and SP/0171/20 to be incorporated in lieu of the suggested plan.	Frontier Estates would like to have the current Master Plan (attached for reference) submitted under the latest resource consents LU/0012/19.01 and SP/0171/20 to be incorporated with this plan change.

### **Gaskell, Shaun**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
4/1	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	My submission is against the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to the wider amenity effects, and in particular the negative effects the plan change will have to the Cambridge Motocross track.	Delay the advancement of C4 for 7 years

### **Hatwell, JL & Johnston, ML**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
23/1	T11	Rule 2.4.1.3(i)	Support In Part	Since June 2020, the Submitters have invested substantially towards progressing the design of the development of this site. This has involved engaging a number of specialists to prepare reports and plans to support a combined land use and subdivision consent application based on the principles of the Boffa Miskell structure plan documents. It has also involved having two pre-application meetings with Council regarding the progression of the design for	The proposed wording for Rule 2.4.1.3(i) be amended to include an additional activity, <u>2.4.1.3(i)(d) – early childcare education services.</u>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				development of the site. As a result of this progression of design, the structure plan proposed to be included for T11 as well as a number of changes to the text within the ODP, as part of PC13, is superseded or needs to be amended to reflect the current design.	
23/2	T11	Rule 2.4.2.54	Support In Part	In terms of Rule 2.4.2.54(e), the Submitters intend to develop this area in a community market style, as opposed to the corner shops format anticipated under this standard. As such, this standard is sought to be removed in its entirety.	The proposed wording for Rule 2.4.2.54 be amended as follows (strikethrough representing deleted text and underline representing added text): o <del>(e) — All new commercial buildings shall be constructed on the road boundary of the site.</del>
23/3	T11	Rule 2.4.2.54	Support In Part	In terms of Rule 2.4.2.54(e), the addition of “visually” provides greater clarity about the outcomes sought, as permeable can have implications with regards to stormwater management. Having glazing that is visually permeable to that degree is not appropriate for an early childcare education services facility.	The proposed wording for Rule 2.4.2.54 be amended as follows (strikethrough representing deleted text and underline representing added text): (h) – All buildings fronting a road or reserve <u>excluding those intended for use by a business established in accordance with Rule 2.4.1.3(i)(d) above for early childcare education services</u> shall have an active frontage, incorporating 70% <u>visually</u>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
					permeable, glazed show frontage at ground floor. Active frontages shall also include wide double doorways to allow for easy pedestrian access.
23/4	T11	Appendix S25.1	Support In Part	Since June 2020, the Submitters have invested substantially towards progressing the design of the development of this site. This has involved engaging a number of specialists to prepare reports and plans to support a combined land use and subdivision consent application based on the principles of the Boffa Miskell structure plan documents. It has also involved having two pre-application meetings with Council regarding the progression of the design for development of the site. As a result of this progression of design, the structure plan proposed to be included for T11 as well as a number of changes to the text within the ODP, as part of PC13, is superseded or needs to be amended to reflect the current design. This plan reflects the substantial investment of both time and money that has been made by the Submitters to	That the plan provided under S25.1 – Te Awamutu T11 Growth Cell Structure Plan be amended to align with the attached plan.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				progresses and further developing the design for this growth cell, based on the input received from a number of specialists and the outcomes of the two pre-application meetings with Council.	
23/5	T11	Appendix S25.6.3	Support In Part	Since June 2020, the Submitters have invested substantially towards progressing the design of the development of this site. This has involved engaging a number of specialists to prepare reports and plans to support a combined land use and subdivision consent application based on the principles of the Boffa Miskell structure plan documents. It has also involved having two pre-application meetings with Council regarding the progression of the design for development of the site. As a result of this progression of design, the structure plan proposed to be included for T11 as well as a number of changes to the text within the ODP, as part of PC13, is superseded or needs to be amended to reflect the current design. This plan reflects the substantial investment	That the proposed wording for S25.6.3 be amended as follows: The Structure Plan will have a <del>20m</del> <u>25m</u> green boulevard / tree framed collector road through the sites which become the main spine road for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. The <u>18m to 16m</u> local roads accommodate pedestrian facilities on one side and the option for stormwater conveyance ( <u>which could include raingardens or through a vegetated swale down the other side</u> ).



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				of both time and money that has been made by the Submitters to progresses and further developing the design for this growth cell, based on the input received from a number of specialists and the outcomes of the two pre-application meetings with Council.	
23/6	T11	Appendix S25.6	Support In Part	Since June 2020, the Submitters have invested substantially towards progressing the design of the development of this site. This has involved engaging a number of specialists to prepare reports and plans to support a combined land use and subdivision consent application based on the principles of the Boffa Miskell structure plan documents. It has also involved having two pre-application meetings with Council regarding the progression of the design for development of the site. As a result of this progression of design, the structure plan proposed to be included for T11 as well as a number of changes to the text within the ODP, as part of PC13, is superseded or needs to be amended to reflect	That the example image for the typical 18m street be amended to align with the above wording (i.e. have a heading of 18m-16m Local Road, removing reference on the Plan View to the width, 7m, for the carriageway, and amending the Section View to have an overall road width of 18m-16m).

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				the current design. This plan reflects the substantial investment of both time and money that has been made by the Submitters to progresses and further developing the design for this growth cell, based on the input received from a number of specialists and the outcomes of the two pre-application meetings with Council.	
23/7	T11	Appendix S25.7.4	Support In Part	The Submitters believe that the bulk and location and residential amenity controls already provided for within existing provisions of Section 2 – Residential Zone of the ODP are appropriate for providing a suitable level of residential character and amenity. This is evidenced by these standards setting an appropriate level of residential character and amenity within similar residential developments elsewhere within land located within existing Residential Zone areas. The Submitters believe that the future development of this part of the growth cell should be supported by design guidelines that	That the proposed wording for S25.7 – Built Form be amended as follows: <del>S25.7.4 – The Design Guidelines provide a framework which will lead to positive outcomes for the landowners and the wider community. This encourages original design which considers the unique opportunities of the site and development areas.</del>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				reflect the advances that have been made in the design and associated specialist reports by the developer for this part of the growth cell. This can be achieved through the provision of a revised set of design guidelines as part of the resource consent process to develop the Submitters land holding.	
23/8	T11	Appendix S25.9	Support In Part	The Submitters believe that the bulk and location and residential amenity controls already provided for within existing provisions of Section 2 – Residential Zone of the ODP are appropriate for providing a suitable level of residential character and amenity. This is evidenced by these standards setting an appropriate level of residential character and amenity within similar residential developments elsewhere within land located within existing Residential Zone areas. The Submitters believe that the future development of this part of the growth cell should be supported by design guidelines that	That the proposed wording for S25.9 – Supporting Documents be amended as follows: <del>(b) Te Awamutu T11 Growth Cell Design Guidelines, prepared by Boffa Miskell, dated 25 June 2020, (Council document number 10411038).</del>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				reflect the advances that have been made in the design and associated specialist reports by the developer for this part of the growth cell. This can be achieved through the provision of a revised set of design guidelines as part of the resource consent process to develop the Submitters land holding. This aligns with the above request to remove reference to the design guidelines.	

### **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
16/1	Archaeological		Support In Part	HNZPT supports in part only Plan Change 13 as there is a possibility that the proposed activity could have adverse effects on historic heritage, in particular archaeology both recorded and unrecorded, cultural values and other historic heritage as identified in the archaeological report. The proposal will result in earthworks at the time	HNZPT seeks, with regard the other structure plan locations, that these areas are assessed by archaeologists to confirm or otherwise the presence of archaeology and that they make recommendations as to appropriate management methods. It may be that the Structure Plans and related provisions have to be revised

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				of development, which has the potential to damage the finite archaeological resource both recorded and unrecorded, the cultural resource and historic heritage.	depending on the outcome of this work.
16/2	Cultural		Support In Part	HNZPT supports in part only Plan Change 13 as there is a possibility that the proposed activity could have adverse effects on historic heritage, in particular archaeology both recorded and unrecorded, cultural values and other historic heritage as identified in the archaeological report. The proposal will result in earthworks at the time of development, which has the potential to damage the finite archaeological resource both recorded and unrecorded, the cultural resource and historic heritage.	HNZPT seeks that a Cultural Impact Assessment is undertaken, and this information used to inform the Structure Plans and related provisions. It may be that the structure plans and related provisions must be revised depending on the outcome of this work.
16/3	C4	Appendix S23	Support In Part	The proposed structure plan (C4) includes New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) recorded archaeological sites and has the potential for other unrecorded archaeology. While	HNZPT seeks that the archaeological assessment for Growth Cell C4 is revised by archaeological experts that are experienced with this archaeological landscape and site types so that the nature of the

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				HNZPT considers the archaeological advice that has been obtained is inadequate as it does not provide an adequate assessment of the archaeological resource. It is not clear from this application if the archaeological advice has been used to inform the structure plan.	archaeological resource can be correctly ascertained and the potential of the effects of proposed development correctly ascertained. It may be that the Structure Plan and related provisions must be revised depending on the outcome of this work.

### **Hoebergen, VR & SP & Yeates, S**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
18/1	T11	Appendix S25	Support In Part	Oppose a pathway that cuts through 1093 Park Road. This effects our land use and access for stock.	Pathway to be moved to along boundary.
18/2	T11	Appendix S25	Support In Part	Oppose a pathway along Mangaohoi Stream as there is one in Park Rod already and this new purposed path is in direct flooding area which will cause a lot of cost to maintain.	No decision requested

## Kotare Properties Ltd

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
19/1	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Appendix S23	Support	Kotare supports the removal of the deferred zoning from the pre-2035 growth cells and specifically the deferred residential zoning from the C4 growth cell in Cambridge.	Kotare support the removal of the deferred zoning from the pre-2035 growth cells.
19/2	C4	Planning Maps	Support	Kotare supports the removal of the deferred zoning from the pre-2035 growth cells and specifically the deferred residential zoning from the C4 growth cell in Cambridge.	Kotare support the zoning change demonstrated on the planning maps as it relates to the C4 growth cell, specifically Maps 23 and 26.
19/3	Urban Limits	Planning Maps	Support In Part	The urban limits are provided on the planning maps and link directly to the strategic outcomes (1.1.33(c)) and an objective and policy in Section 1 of the Waipa District Plan that relate to settlement patterns (objective 1.3.1 and policy 1.3.1.2). Section 1.1.19 of the District Plan also records that the plan gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement by, amongst other things, setting urban limits. The key message in the strategic outcome, the objective and the policy is consequently to provide for a consolidated settlement pattern	Kotare is of the opinion that as part of the zoning change, Council should also be undertaking a consequential change to the Urban Limit boundaries noted on the planning maps.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				by ensuring that new urban activities are focused within the urban limits (Policy 1.3.1.2). The rezoning enabled by PC13 signals that the land is to be developed, yet the development of such could be perceived to be contrary to those objectives and policies because the urban limits do not include the growth cells. We believe that this is an unintended consequence and one which could be rectified through a consequential amendment to the urban limits on the planning maps.	
19/4	C4	Appendix S23.1	Support in Part	PC13 provides for the inclusion of the endorsed C4 Structure Plan to be included as an Appendix to the District Plan (Appendix S23). Kotare, in principle, supports the inclusion of the C4 Structure Plan, however seeks that it is updated/amended to the version prepared by Kotare which is attached to this submission titled C4 Structure Plan – Proposed Alterations for PC13. Kotare has advanced its subdivision design for their land to the point whereby the key roading	Amend the C4 Structure Plan in Appendix 23 to the C4 Structure Plan – Proposed Alterations for PC13 attached to this submission.



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>connection to and from Silverwood Lane and the connections to the land to the north and south of the Kotare land have been defined. Those connections differ slightly from that provided for in the C4 Structure Plan (notified in PC13) because it effectively flips the collector road and its connection point to a position further east. The lot arrangement and the location of compact housing relative to Silverwood Lane is also sought to be amended. Pedestrian connections to the internal roading network from both Silverwood Lane and Cambridge Road. The main benefits of the Amended Structure Plan are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Amended Structure Plan provides for an increased separation between the new Cambridge Road/Lamb Street/Kaipaki Road roundabout and the internal roundabout, which has safety, efficiency and land use benefits.</li> <li>2. The Amended Structure Plan provides for a clear linear collector</li> </ol>	

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>road connection to the land to the north and also to the recreational reserve, without the need to zig zag through the development. This better achieves the function of a collector road.</p> <p>3. The Amended Structure Plan provides for increased pedestrian connections between the Kotare land and Cambridge Road/Silverwood Lane to improve connectivity.</p> <p>4. The amendment to the north-south alignment for one of the roads linking the two east-west road provides supports the intent of aligning roads and paths with vistas and connection to the gully edge reserve (S23.3.4).</p> <p>5. The extent of the compact housing area policy area overlay has been reduced so that it does not connect to Silverwood Lane to enable standard residential development in that location as such interfaces better with the form and function of Silverwood Lane.</p>	

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
19/5	C4	Appendix S23.3	Support In Part	Amend reference in the wording of section 23.3.1 to a "Proposed Structure Plan". The Structure Plan, once incorporated into the District Plan will no longer be 'proposed'.	Amend S23.3.2 to read as follows: S23.3.1 Taking account of the technical assessments undertaken, and the feedback received through community engagement, the following general design principles underpin the <del>proposed</del> Structure Plan.
19/6	C4	Appendix S23.3.5	Support In Part	The use of swales is only one stormwater management tool. Other alternatives are available. By the Structure Plan being specific potentially excludes the use of these alternatives.	Amend S23.3.5 to remove reference to swales as the preferred treatment method. Suggested alternative wording is as follows: S23.3.5 Stormwater management concepts prioritise on site disposal, with the conveyance and treatment of storm events via swales integrated into the streetscape design and discharge to the gully via strategically located and ecologically friendly treatment trains. Buffer planting to the Cambridge Road frontage will reduce the visibility of the major arterial road and industrial activities to the north, minimising the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.
19/7	C4	Appendix S23.4.4	Support In Part	This section of the Structure Plan identifies that the gully reserve will anchor two neighbourhood	Update the language in S23.4.4, and if necessary amend the Structure Plan, to reflect what Council wants to

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				reserves. The Structure Plan shows three reserves, two north of Silverwood Lane and one south. This paragraph should be updated to reflect the desired outcome that Council wants to achieve in terms of the number of reserves i.e. two or three. If it is also only two then the Structure Plan should be amended to reflect Council's preference in terms of reserve locations. One of the reserves located north of Silverwood Lane is also not subject to any adjoining higher forms of density as recorded in this paragraph.	achieve in terms number and location of reserves.
19/8	C4	Appendix S23.5.3	Support In Part	This paragraph states that "the Structure Plan identifies the preferred layout". As noted in the submissions above, Kotare's submission is that the Structure Plan is amended to provide for an alternative roading alignment, recognising that there are multiple ways to achieve the outcomes sought from a roading/connectivity perspective. If Kotare's the Kotare Structure Plan is not incorporated into Appendix S23, Kotare seek that	If the Kotare Structure Plan is not adopted, amend paragraph S23.5.3 to read as follows: S23.5.3 Internally, new roads will be required. The Structure Plan identifies <del>the preferred</del> <u>a conceptual</u> layout, taking account of engineering requirements and the achievement of high degrees of permeability and connectivity....

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				this paragraph is amended to refer to a 'conceptual layout' over a 'preferred layout'. This provides flexibility for the effectiveness and appropriateness of the change to be considered at the time of consenting without being a hard and fast requirement.	
19/9	C4	Appendix 23.6.3	Support In Part	The land ownership arrangement within the growth cell and its subsequent development will necessitated the need for a third stormwater collection point to the gully. Without that connection the development potential of the Kotare land will not be realised. Kotare are specifically proposing that the reserve that sits within their land also caters for stormwater and has an overflow down into the gully system. Kotare is unable to design their development to connect to the northern outlet within the Maunsell landholding. The paragraph of the report should accordingly be updated to provide for that third connection.	Amend 23.6.3 to read as follows: S23.6.3 Significant storm events will result in flows towards the gully. <del>Two</del> <u>Three</u> points of collection are proposed, one within the unformed Silverwood Lane corridor and <del>one</del> <u>two</u> towards the north of the <del>Structure plan area</del> <u>Silverwood Lane</u> . <del>Both</del> <u>All</u> points of collection will require careful design to address the change in elevation and slope towards the gully floor and incorporate sufficient treatment to ensure that contaminants do not reach the stream and that discharge volumes do not result in erosion or scour of the gully floor. Maximising the opportunity for soakage as part of the overall network will reduce the operational requirements of the treatment and discharge devices.

**Maunsell, Geoff**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
28/1	C4	Appendix S23	Support In Part	<p>Whilst we support in principal the uplifting of the deferred zoning we wish to see an alteration to the C4 Structure Plan. Specifically we would like to see a second entrance provided off Cambridge Road. Currently the C4 Structure Plan provides a single entrance via Silverwood Lane. The reasons for a second entrance are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would avoid 'land locking' the northern part of the C4 growth cell due to the right of ways that currently exist.</li> <li>- It would provide resilience in the transport network.</li> <li>- There is no traffic safety or functional reason not to include a second entrance. A second entrance providing access to the north will improve accessibility to this area and reduce travel times and costs. It is also recommended Council consider reducing this section of Cambridge Road to 60km/hr following development of this part of C4 growth cell. Technical</li> </ul>	<p>An alternation to the C4 Structure Plan providing an additional access from Cambridge Road to the northern portion of the C4 growth cell.</p>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>input has been received from Tara Hills of Direction Traffic Design and is attached to this submission to support this. Whilst the C4 Structure Plan has been endorsed by Council to our knowledge this has not been tested through a hearing process and Council have not provided an evidential basis for their rejection of the suggestion of a second entrance, which was made by Mr Maunsell in response to the feedback sought on the draft structure plan. It is noted the Transportation Assessment prepared by Gray Matter provided comments in respect to an additional access to the north. These comments have been addressed in Ms Hills report.</p>	

**McCarthy, Gregory**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
6/1	C4	Planning Maps	Support	I support the proposed changes to the District Plan contained in PC13 and in particular: - rezoning of the Cambridge C4 Growth Cell to its live zoning (Residential); - removing the deferred zone from the pre-2035 Growth Cells on the District Planning Maps; and - incorporation of the Cambridge C4 Structure Plan into the District Plan appendices.	Council approve the Plan Change as notified
6/2	C4	Appendix S23	Support	I support the proposed changes to the District Plan contained in PC13 and in particular: - rezoning of the Cambridge C4 Growth Cell to its live zoning (Residential); - removing the deferred zone from the pre-2035 Growth Cells on the District Planning Maps; and - incorporation of the Cambridge C4 Structure Plan into the District Plan appendices.	Council approve the Plan Change as notified



### McKnight, Ashley

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
5/1	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	My submission is against the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to the wider amenity effects, and in particular the negative effects the plan change will have to the Cambridge Motocross track. Myself and my family have enjoyed this track for many years, there is a lot of history here. Let us see out our consent!	Delay the advancement of C4 for 7 years

### Mylchreest, Jim

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
21/1	T6	Appendix S24	Support In Part	I support the general intent of the Plan Change 13 but am concerned about the details regarding collector road standards and bulk and location requirements. The requirement for the 25m wide collector road appears to be excessive and out of context with large lots residential zones within the	I seek: a) reduce the standards of the collector road to the same as other roads within the district and in particular large lot residential zones; and b) have the same bulk and location requirements as contained in the current District Plan.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>Waipa district. The expectations of people living in a semi rural environment is not to have lighting or amenity planting within the road reserve. It is an unnecessary cost both in capital and ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>The proposed alignment of the collector road also does not follow a logical alignment when considering the contours of the land. The additional requirements regarding building placement, street frontages and building setbacks will add unnecessary costs and site development restrictions at a time when housing affordability is a national issue.</p>	

### **Papamoa TA Limited Partnership**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
26/1	T6	Appendix S24	Support In Part	The layout of the structure plan as it relates to 164 St Leger Road has several features that the Submitter believes are not practical for future	As such, the Submitter requests that the structure plan for the T6 growth cell as it relates to 164 St Leger Road be amended to:

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>development for the site. This includes the position and extent of stormwater reserve (other than that within 23m from the banks of the streams within the site) as well as indicative locations / configurations of the 18m local roads. Changes to the layout of the development of 164 St Leger Road as they relate to the stormwater reserve would then have a knock-on effect to the layout of the roads within the structure plan for this site. Any change to the layout of the stormwater reserve and roads within this property should also be influenced by best practice urban design principles to ensure that these features are not designed in isolation based on specialist input. The urban design influence on the layout should include consideration of Community Protection Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principals, to ensure that quality residential amenity and safety in design outcomes are achieved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the two 18m local roads;</li> <li>• Remove the stormwater reserve area north of the stream that runs east/west through the property that is located beyond the 23m buffer of the stream; and</li> <li>• Upon removal of the local roads and stormwater reserve area, an overlay should be added to the plan that identifies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Any application for resource consent to develop the property is subject to stormwater management calculations and design in relation to demand for additional stormwater reserve/s, transportation assessment for road layout, and urban design for overall development layout.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
26/2	T6	Section 15	Support In Part	<p>The Submitters seeks to address the underlying issues for subdivision in the Large Lot Residential Zone. The zoning for T6 as shown in the T6 Growth Cell Structure Plan hinders the ability for clear differences between the Rural Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone and arguably does not represent an efficient use of land. Compliance with an average net lot area is currently required for subdivision within the Large Lot Residential Zone under Rule 15.4.2.1(j)(i) and (ii). When considering an appropriate density of development in the above context, it would seem that requiring an average net lot area greater than the minimum net lot area (2,500m<sup>2</sup>) is an inefficient use of prime peri-urban land. When considering the desired outcomes for this zone in relation to lower-density residential amenity, the equivalent subdivision standards for the Rural Zone are worth noting. The Rural Zone anticipates an even greater sense of space and openness, yet the</p>	<p>To remove the requirement for an average lot area for subdivision of properties within the Large Lot Residential Zone, i.e. delete both Rules 15.4.2.1(j)(i) and 15.4.2.1(j)(ii). The Submitter seeks this is applied to the subdivision rule within the T6 growth cell, as a minimum, i.e. they would not object to this being amended to apply universally to the Large Lot Residential Zone across the District.</p>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>smallest lot size for the Rural Zone is 2,500m<sup>2</sup> (Rule 15.4.2.1(r)). There is no requirement for an average lot area for that or any of the other non-site specific subdivision standards in the Rural Zone. As such, it cannot be considered that the requirement to comply with an average net lot area is necessary to achieve the outcomes for space and openness within the Large Lot Residential Zone if it is not also applicable to a zone that is associated with an even greater expectation for a sense of space and openness. Additional land area is not necessary to ensure development of the future lots can accommodate onsite services, namely wastewater management and disposal and stormwater management and disposal. It is common for an on-site wastewater management and disposal system designed to accommodate a four bedroom household unit to achieve compliant outputs on an approximately 900m<sup>2</sup> property.</p>	

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				Allowing for disposal and management of stormwater to occur without interference with that of wastewater still requires an area of less than 2,500m <sup>2</sup> .	

### **Sapwell, Margaret**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
14/1	C4	Section 14	Support	With the increase of people wishing to move to Cambridge and industry also wanting to relocate to Cambridge, the need for land to be released for development in a timely manner is important and this plan change appears to address that need. The Structure Plan for C4 shows the re-design of the intersection of Cambridge Road, Kaipaki Road, Lamb Street which will, hopefully make it a safer intersection.	I ask the Council to support the Plan Change 13 - Uplifting of Deferred Zones, add the Structure Plan for C4 and uplift the pre-2035 Deferred Zones.
14/2	C4	Appendix S23	Support	With the increase of people wishing to move to Cambridge and industry also wanting to relocate to Cambridge, the need for land to be	I ask the Council to support the Plan Change 13 - Uplifting of Deferred Zones, add the Structure Plan for C4

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				released for development in a timely manner is important and this plan change appears to address that need. The Structure Plan for C4 shows the re-design of the intersection of Cambridge Road, Kaipaki Road, Lamb Street which will, hopefully make it a safer intersection.	and uplift the pre-2035 Deferred Zones.
14/3	C4	Planning Maps	Support	With the increase of people wishing to move to Cambridge and industry also wanting to relocate to Cambridge, the need for land to be released for development in a timely manner is important and this plan change appears to address that need. The Structure Plan for C4 shows the re-design of the intersection of Cambridge Road, Kaipaki Road, Lamb Street which will, hopefully make it a safer intersection.	I ask the Council to support the Plan Change 13 - Uplifting of Deferred Zones, add the Structure Plan for C4 and uplift the pre-2035 Deferred Zones.

### Saywell, Gary & Adele

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
24/1	P1 & P3	Planning Maps	Support	We submit that the Plan Change 13 proceed as notified, with inclusion of the Pukeatua P1 and P3 Growth Cells.	No decision requested

### Sharman, John

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
2/1	Traffic & Schooling		Support In Part	Nothing in the proposal takes into account the resultant increase in schooling demands, traffic impact on the CBD of Cambridge in particular, or for that matter Te Awamutu (TA), and the access to nearby main roads. Cambridge already is suffering from the traffic increase and demands for parking in the CBD that has developed in the last two years. Queen St Cambridge is now often choked with 44 tonne double trucks and other out-of-town vehicles. There should be no increase in housing without constructing a	There should be an immediate review of the plan in terms of the impact of new traffic and the noise and pollution caused, and to consider a bypass as one mitigation. The character of Cambridge must be preserved for the future and planning must have this as the centre of the plan. The same goes for TA.



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				bypass from the outskirts of Leamington (say, Kaipaki Rd) to Cambridge Rd West (to Hamilton) or to the Expressway. A review of the impact of adding the planned housing for the two towns most affected.	

### **Stockley, Loren**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
33	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Against the advancement of the C4 Plan Change due to wider amenity issues	Delay the advancement of C4 for 7 years

### **Storck, John B**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
11/1	C4	Appendix S23	Support	The change proposed will allow that portion of the Town Belt currently occupied by the CMC motorcycle club to be returned to the people of Cambridge in accord with the	An early ratification of Zone Change of C4 to enable development of additional amenities for residents of Cambridge

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				"Cambridge Town Belt Reserve Management Plan (2012)". It is noted that the 'Town Belt' is reserve land, held in trust for the benefit and enjoyment of the Cambridge residents. This area is capable of being developed into an attractive asset to the community with potential for multiple sports groups and members of the public. Opportunity for walking, running, biking, archery could almost immediately be provided. The plan change will also allow an extension of the existing Wetlands Walkway to connect with the proposed walkways of the C4 development.	

### **Storck, Lorene**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
12/1	C4	Appendix S23	Support	I support the Zone Change which will enable walking tracks to be linked with the C4 development through to the existing track on Rowling Place and the current town	I support the Plan Change 13 uplifting deferred zones to enable the C4 initiative to go ahead as soon as possible.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				belt tracks on Lamb Street and further afield. This will also enable the land current used as a racing track to be better utilised for the passive recreational use of the people of Cambridge.	

### **Summerset Villages (Cambridge) Limited**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
13/1	Cambridge North	Map 24	Support In Part	Summerset is supportive of the Plan Change in so far as the Cambridge North Deferred Residential zone, within the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area Plan Change area, is amended to a live Residential zone. Summerset is concerned that the changes proposed by Plan Change 13 suitably incorporate all of the consequential amendments that are necessary to the Cambridge North Structure Plan (and Design Guidelines), and the Residential zone provisions, where reference to the deferred zone continues to be	That the replacement of the Cambridge North Deferred Residential zone with a live Residential zoning be confirmed.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				made. Further to this, Summerset consider it appropriate and opportune while undertaking the amendments to the deferred zone provisions, including those referenced in the Cambridge North Structure Plan, for the Structure Plan provisions (and the underlying zoning maps) to be corrected and updated for consistency.	
13/2	Cambridge North	Appendix S2	Support In Part	Summerset is supportive of the Plan Change in so far as the Cambridge North Deferred Residential zone, within the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area Plan Change area, is amended to a live Residential zone. Summerset is concerned that the changes proposed by Plan Change 13 suitably incorporate all of the consequential amendments that are necessary to the Cambridge North Structure Plan (and Design Guidelines), and the Residential zone provisions, where reference to the deferred zone continues to be made. Further to this, Summerset consider it appropriate and opportune while undertaking the	That Appendix S2 – Cambridge North Structure Plan and Design Guidelines be amended to reflect the live zoning. In particular, amend section S2.6 and S2.7 and related figures and tables.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				amendments to the deferred zone provisions, including those referenced in the Cambridge North Structure Plan, for the Structure Plan provisions (and the underlying zoning maps) to be corrected and updated for consistency.	
13/3	Cambridge North	Section 2	Support In Part	Summerset is supportive of the Plan Change in so far as the Cambridge North Deferred Residential zone, within the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area Plan Change area, is amended to a live Residential zone. Summerset is concerned that the changes proposed by Plan Change 13 suitably incorporate all of the consequential amendments that are necessary to the Cambridge North Structure Plan (and Design Guidelines), and the Residential zone provisions, where reference to the deferred zone continues to be made. Further to this, Summerset consider it appropriate and opportune while undertaking the amendments to the deferred zone provisions, including those referenced in the Cambridge North	Amend the Residential zone provisions to delete all references to matters pertaining to a deferred zone, where such a zone is to be uplifted. For example, section 2.1.7.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				Structure Plan, for the Structure Plan provisions (and the underlying zoning maps) to be corrected and updated for consistency.	
13/4	Cambridge North	Map 24	Support In Part	Summerset is supportive of the Plan Change in so far as the Cambridge North Deferred Residential zone, within the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area Plan Change area, is amended to a live Residential zone. Summerset is concerned that the changes proposed by Plan Change 13 suitably incorporate all of the consequential amendments that are necessary to the Cambridge North Structure Plan (and Design Guidelines), and the Residential zone provisions, where reference to the deferred zone continues to be made. Further to this, Summerset consider it appropriate and opportune while undertaking the amendments to the deferred zone provisions, including those referenced in the Cambridge North Structure Plan, for the Structure Plan provisions (and the underlying	Amend Map 24 to delete the Road Noise Effects Area as it relates to the Summerset land located within the Deferred Residential zone land, and reminder of Map 24 as it relates to land fronting Laurent/Victoria Road.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				zoning maps) to be corrected and updated for consistency.	
13/5	Cambridge North	Appendix S2	Support In Part	SP/0100/19 - This consent specifically acknowledges that the indicative local roading layout, together with the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway, are not required to be provided as part of any future development. Therefore, for consistency, it is appropriate that the Cambridge North Structure Plan, as well as the Policy Area and Zone maps (Map 24), be amended to remove the indicative local road layout from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).	Amend the Cambridge North Structure Plan to remove the indicative local road layout from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).
13/6	Cambridge North	Map 24	Support In Part	SP/0100/19 - This consent specifically acknowledges that the indicative local roading layout, together with the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway, are not required to be provided as part of any future development. Therefore, for consistency, it is appropriate	Amend Map 24 to remove the indicative local road layout from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				that the Cambridge North Structure Plan, as well as the Policy Area and Zone maps (Map 24), be amended to remove the indicative local road layout from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).	
13/7	Cambridge North	Appendix S2	Support In Part	SP/0100/19 - This consent specifically acknowledges that the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway, are not required to be provided as part of any future development. Therefore, for consistency, it is appropriate that the Cambridge North Structure Plan, as well as the Policy Area and Zone maps (Map 24), be amended to remove the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).	Amend the Cambridge North Structure Plan to remove the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway located from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).
13/8	Cambridge North	Map 24	Support In Part	SP/0100/19 - This consent specifically acknowledges that the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway, are	Amend Map 24 to remove the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway located from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				not required to be provided as part of any future development. Therefore, for consistency, it is appropriate that the Cambridge North Structure Plan, as well as the Policy Area and Zone maps (Map 24), be amended to remove the extent of reserve zone and indicative walkway/cycleway from 60 and 80 Laurent Road, as well as from 100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).	100 and 102 Laurent Road (to the extent that it is shown).

### **TA Projects Limited**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
30/1	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Section 14	Support	This submission seeks to reduce the process currently needed to enable land holdings to convert land from the “deferred” status to an operative residential status, with Council still managing all actual and potential adverse effects through the resource consent process. To achieve that end, this submission supports the uplifting of the	Amend Section 14 – Deferred Zone as proposed in PC 13 to ensure the properties in the “Te Awamutu Residential Growth Cells – anticipated now to 2035” are removed from the Deferred Zone in the Operative District Plan and instead are moved into the land zoned “Residential”.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				"deferred" designation of land currently proposed to be development up until 2035, and specifically the land in the T3 cell in Te Awamutu.	
30/2	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Section 14	Support	This submission seeks to reduce the process currently needed to enable land holdings to convert land from the "deferred" status to an operative residential status, with Council still managing all actual and potential adverse effects through the resource consent process. To achieve that end, this submission supports the uplifting of the "deferred" designation of land currently proposed to be development up until 2035, and specifically the land in the T3 cell in Te Awamutu.	Amend Section 14 – Deferred Zone as proposed in PC 13 to require a plan change process as a pre-requisite for re-zoning post-2035 deferred land into an operative zoning.
30/3	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Appendix S1	Support In Part	This submission seeks to reduce the process currently needed to enable land holdings to convert land from the "deferred" status to an operative residential status, with Council still managing all actual and potential adverse effects through the resource consent process.	Amend Appendix S1.1.1 as proposed in PC 13 as follows: <u>Pre-2035 Growth Cells have been zoned according to the intended future land use, while Post-2035 Growth Cells, and most have been included within a Deferred Zone in this District Plan to indicate the</u>

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				To achieve that end, this submission supports the uplifting of the "deferred" designation of land currently proposed to be development up until 2035, and specifically the land in the T3 cell in Te Awamutu.	<u>intended future land use and to ensure that the future use of these Post 2035 Growth Cells is not compromised by present day development.</u>
30/4	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Appendix S1	Support In Part	This submission seeks to reduce the process currently needed to enable land holdings to convert land from the "deferred" status to an operative residential status, with Council still managing all actual and potential adverse effects through the resource consent process. To achieve that end, this submission supports the uplifting of the "deferred" designation of land currently proposed to be development up until 2035, and specifically the land in the T3 cell in Te Awamutu.	Amend the table on pages 28,29, Te Awamutu Residential Growth Cells – anticipated now to 2035 as proposed in PC13.
30/5	T3	Map 37	Support In Part	This submission seeks to reduce the process currently needed to enable land holdings to convert land from the "deferred" status to an operative residential status, with Council still managing all actual and	Amend Maps 37 – Te Awamutu/Kihikihi Overview and 39 - Te Awamutu East, by deleting the "Structure Plan" designation from Cell T3 at 836 Bond Road, Te Awamutu. There may be similar

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				potential adverse effects through the resource consent process. To achieve that end, this submission supports the uplifting of the "deferred" designation of land currently proposed to be development up until 2035, and specifically the land in the T3 cell in Te Awamutu.	designations to be removed from other cells in the Te Awamutu area to align with PC13.

### **Talbot, Raymond E**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
15/1	Water Supply		Oppose	The water pressure within Cambridge Park (Hyatt Close) has been observed to be variable and frequently low pressure. Section 6.6 of the above Technical Report does not provide any fire hydrant test information. The results of the C4 model are inadequate to demonstrate that the existing municipal water supply network complies with the SNZ PA5 4509:2008 (NZ Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice). The	I seek the provision of fire hydrant testing for the fire hydrants in Hyatt Close, which are amongst the most elevated in supply network (60.0m RL).

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				existing firefighting supply is likely to be non-compliant. The addition of 600 houses will probably create a major hazard.	
15/2	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	The modelling and summarisation in the three waters report does not establish the existing network. No testing of pressures has been provided or referred to. The inability to provide fire main pressure could lead to loss of life.	The assessment and determination of the C4 Cell cannot be made until the existing network has been tested.

### **Talbot, Raymond E**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
27/1	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Removal of Mature Native Trees and no consideration of massive ground level differential. The attached four pages indicate the existing surface level difference of 21 metres (63m RL to 42m RL). The supporting technical reports do not address this major level differential. The C4 Structure Plan indicates proposed residential development in this location. In addition the	Before considering the proposed plan change, a detailed assessment of the 21m level differential is essential. Without this assessment, residential area cannot be established. Requirements for bulk earthworks and/or retaining walls is required.

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				Ecological Impacts Report does not consider any protected species.	
27/2	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Removal of Mature Native Trees and no consideration of massive ground level differential. The attached four pages indicate the existing surface level difference of 21 metres (63m RL to 42m RL). The supporting technical reports do not address this major level differential. The C4 Structure Plan indicates proposed residential development in this location. In addition the Ecological Impacts Report does not consider any protected species.	I seek a revised C4 Structure Plan that incorporates the proposed solution for addressing the 21m level difference.
27/3	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	Removal of Mature Native Trees and no consideration of massive ground level differential. The attached four pages indicate the existing surface level difference of 21 metres (63m RL to 42m RL). The supporting technical reports do not address this major level differential. The C4 Structure Plan indicates proposed residential development in this location. In addition the Ecological Impacts Report does not consider any protected species.	The Ecological Report needs to include tree species survey to establish Translocation Proposals.

**Transpower New Zealand Ltd**

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
25/1	C3	Section 11	Support	<p>Within Growth Cell C3, under PPC13 the land in the Residential Deferred Zone would become Residential Zone and the existing Cambridge C1 and C2/C3 Structure Plan would come into force in full (i.e. without staging). In terms of the relevance of PPC13 to Transpower, the existing Otahuhu-Whakamaru A, B and C 220kV transmission lines traverse the adjoining St Peters School Zone and are within 11m of the Residential Deferred Zone which is subject to PPC13. As such, while the lines themselves are outside the plan change area, the Operative District Plan National Grid provisions would apply to land within the Residential Zone land subject to PPC13. This is supported. Transpower understands from a conversation with Council the existing St Peters School Zone would continue to apply and is not part of PPC13. While Transpower has no specific concerns with this approach, as previously conveyed</p>	No decision requested

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				<p>to Council in its submission on PPC7, in the process of reviewing PPC13 it has come to Transpower's attention that despite National Grid assets traversing the St Peters School Zone and being identified on District Plan Policy Map 4, there are no methods contained within the St Peters School Zone (Section 11) that give effect to the relevant operative objectives and policies in Section 15 regarding the National Grid. Specifically, there are no rules that manage subdivision, use and development within the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor in that zone, other than by reference to the mandatory New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001). Transpower understands that PPC13 does not amend Section 11 or the St Peters School Zone and as such any submission on the substance of that chapter would not be within the scope of the current Plan Change. Transpower instead wishes to raise this matter with the Council for</p>	



Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				further discussion in terms of its obligation to give full effect to the NPSET.	
25/2	C4	Appendix S23	Support In Part	<p>Within Growth Cell C4, under PPC13 the deferred status will be uplifted, and the cell will be zoned Residential. PPC13 incorporates the council endorsed structure plan for C4 into the District Plan. In terms of the relevance to Transpower, while there are no existing National Grid assets within the cell itself, the Otahuhu-Whakamaru A 220kV line is on the boundary of the zone and the National Grid corridor provisions within the District Plan would apply to a discrete area of the residential zoned land within PPC13.</p>	<p>Amend the Appendix S23 – Cambridge C4 Growth Cell Structure Plan map to identify the National Grid lines; And Insert a reference to the National Grid after paragraph S23.2.4 as follows: <u>The National Grid high voltage transmission lines traverse land adjoining C4 Growth Cell. Provisions within the District Plan relating to the National Grid will apply to parts of land within C4 Growth Cell.</u></p>
25/3	K1	Planning Maps	Support	<p>Within Growth Cell K1, under PPC13 the deferred status will be uplifted, and the cell be zoned Large Lot Residential. In terms of the relevance to Transpower, the existing Arapuni-Hamilton A and B 110kV lines traverse the cell area.</p>	No decision requested

## Wise, Russell

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
31	C4	Appendix S23	Oppose	The removal of trees along the bank especially by Cambridge Road. Can you prove no native species live in these trees (i.e. Birds, bats etc). How can housing be established on a very steep gully? What about retaining walls etc there is no indication.	No decision requested

## Woods, Hayden

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
1/1	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Section 14	Oppose	I OBJECT to the removal of the reference to uplifting Deferred Zones by Council resolution. To do so in my opinion removes regulatory control and oversight from the representatives of the people (Elected Council) in providing governance over Council Staff. To allow this to occur highlights a breakdown of democracy, where Council Staff will have control over Elected Council, and thus removing	No decision requested

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				any right for the people to OBJECT. There needs to be control and oversight over Council Staff from Elected Council, to forego that right then begs the question to what purpose does Elected Council exist or serve, on behalf of the people – would there be any future need for Elected Council.	
1/2	Structure Plan	Appendix S1	Oppose	Ok	Delete the structure plans for Ohaupo, Bruntwood, and Te Awamutu South as these areas have been developed and the structure plans are no longer required
1/3	Structure Plan	Appendix S17	Oppose	Ok	Amend the structure plan for growth cell T1 to reflect the updated masterplan
1/4	Structure Plan	Appendix S23, Appendix S24, Appendix S23	Oppose	Ok	Add the Te Awamutu T6 Structure Plan, Te Awamutu T11 Structure Plan and Cambridge C4 Structure Plan
1/5	Uplift of Deferred Zone	Planning Maps	Oppose	I OBJECT to the removal of the Deferred Zone from the pre-2035 Growth Cells. There needs to remain regulatory control and oversight over Council Staff to ensure that the best interests of the people, is preserved under our	No decision requested

Submission point	Topic	Plan Change Reference / District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	My submission is (summary):	Decision requested
				democratic system and that they are still consulted over such issues and are given their sovereign right to OBJECT.	
1/6	Reserves	Planning Maps	Support In Part	Ok	Rezone the vested reserve areas within the Cambridge C2 Growth Cell as Reserves Zone