

Further Submissions to Plan Change 13: Uplifting Deferred Zones

Further Submissions 1 – 8

May 2021

Submitter No:	Name of Submitter	Page No:
1	Ray Talbot	3 - 4
2	TA Projects Ltd	15 - 18
3	X Jiang and L Yang	19 - 21
4	Headlands Trust	22 - 25
5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	26 - 29
6	Kotare Properties Ltd	30 - 35
7	Gregory McCarthy	36 - 40
8	Benjamin Frost	41 - 44

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
 | Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in ALL sections of this form.
 Submissions close **5pm Friday, 14 May 2021**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details	
Full name of submitter:	Raymond E Talbot
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	██████████
Email address:	██████████
Postal address: <i>(required if no email address is provided)</i>	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act <i>(select one of the following):</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.
<input type="checkbox"/> I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
<p>My reason(s) are:</p> <p>The Water Supply and Fire Main pressure are essential for public safety. The Plan Change 13 does not include the provision of new trunk mains and water treatment plants as a pre-requirement to the Plan Change Approval.</p> <p>The testing of all elevated Fire Hydrant locations is required to unequivocally demonstrate that the existing water supply network meets the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. This testing needs to be carried out to the attached Appendix G -SNZ PAS 4509-2008.</p> <p>This testing then needs to be modelled in a verified network model with the proposed additional sub division cells included to demonstrate that the public safety has not been adversely affected.</p> <p>The Developers Contributions need to be re-evaluated to address any capital investments that are required to provide the legal Fire Main requirements. The existing \$65,000 per building plots need to be validated in an audited business case model as these contributions are potentially substantially inadequate. Current Waipā ratepayers cannot be penalised for any Council sub-division approvals that have not been accurately assessed. Detailed Engineering Requirements need a detailed cost estimate and an audited Financial Developer Contributions Report.</p>

3. Attendance at Council hearing
(a) I wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>OR</u> do not wish <input type="checkbox"/> to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>OR</u> No <input type="checkbox"/>

FS1



Waipā District Plan Plan Change Further Submission Form

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)

Signature of submitter: Raymond Edward Talbot

Dated 10-05-21

.....
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:				
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)
<i>Example</i> 20/1	Jo Smith	✓	✓	Retain current Plan provision on noise.
15/1	Talbot, Raymond E	✓	✓	<p>Test all elevated Fire Hydrants (above 55m RL) to Appendix G - SNZ PAS 4509-2008. (Copy attached)</p> <p>Model existing validated water supply mains network with calibration from Fire Hydrant Testing.</p> <p>Use calibrated model to measure effects of new sub-division cells to ensure no Public hazards from sub-standard fire main pressure.</p> <p>Provide cost estimates for Water Treatment Plants and Trunk Mains to provide a compliant Fire Main for existing residents and Future Plan Change Cells.</p> <p>Provide an Audited Developers Financial Contributions Report to inform of the actual contributions required to provide the Capital Infrastructure requirements for the Plan Change.</p>

Submissions must be received by **Waipā District Council**
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

SNZ PAS 4509:2008
FS1

Publicly Available Specification

New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice

Superseding SNZ PAS 4509:2003



SNZ PAS 4509:2008



APPENDIX G – TESTING OF FIRE HYDRANTS

G1 Purpose

The Fire Service Act allows the Fire Service, from time to time, as it considers necessary, to check firefighting water supplies for (among other things) volume and pressure, and to advise the WSA on their sufficiency or otherwise.

When water testing is conducted by the Fire Service, it also enables the Fire Service to gather information about the water volume and pressure of any water systems that may be necessary for the operation of fire protection systems.

The testing of fire hydrants by the Fire Service is to be in accordance with the Fire Service training note on *Flow testing of water mains and hydrant inspections*. This training note must be followed by Fire Service personnel involved in water testing. For other approved testers, its provisions are advisory.

Fire hydrants should be tested during daily peak demand periods. Fire hydrant testing must have the approval of the water supply authority as described in G3.

NOTE –

- (1) Attention is drawn to the need to meet other legislative (for example Health and Safety in Employment Act, Resource Management Act), and WSA requirements.
- (2) The release during testing of water from a hydrant that is discharged onto land or into water (for example, a stormwater drain) may require a consent from the regional council. Check with the local authority.
- (3) When carrying out fire hydrant tests, approved testers need to be aware that where large pressure reducing valves (PRVs) are installed, at low flows the running pressure will drop as expected. However, where large flows occur, the running pressure may rise then fall as the PRV attempts to maintain a set pressure. Similar results could be expected where reticulated supplies use manual or automatic booster pumps to maintain pressure at high flows.
- (4) Although the Fire Service tests fire hydrants to check firefighting water supplies, water supply authorities and other users operate fire hydrants for other purposes, such as removing air blocks.
- (5) A traffic management plan (TMP) should be approved by the road controlling authority (RCA) before conducting water testing on roadways.

G2 Responsibility for testing and inspecting

To ensure operational effectiveness, the Fire Service needs to monitor the adequacy of the firefighting water supply and the condition of fire hydrants. The maintenance of fire hydrants is the responsibility of the water supply authority or for private fire hydrants, the owner. Effective liaison with the water supply authorities is necessary in all matters related to water supplies. To comply with this code of practice, water supply authorities must ensure that fire hydrants are tested in accordance with this Appendix.

By agreement, testing and inspection of fire hydrants may be carried out by any of the following:

- (a) New Zealand Fire Service;
- (b) Water supply authority;
- (c) Approved tester.

For the duration of any test, the water supply authority may have representatives present.

G3 Notifications

To minimise the risk of damage to a water system, a formal procedure for notification needs to be agreed between those carrying out the testing and the water supply authority. The procedure should include:

- (a) Notification by agreed means to the water supply authority of an intention to test (testing would normally be carried out at times of peak demand);
- (b) Notification to give an agreed period of notice;
- (c) Notification to specify all fire hydrants to be tested and the planned testing schedule;
- (d) Water supply authority to notify those conducting the test if the system is not under normal operational control;
- (e) Water supply authority to advise if there are reasons why the test should not be carried out as planned (for example, home haemodialysis, special commercial or industrial user);
- (f) Notification by agreed means to the appropriate authority of any intended disposal of water to drains;
- (g) Notification of results by agreed means to water supply authority; and
- (h) Statement to WSA whether or not the water supplies are sufficient for firefighting.

G4 Fire hydrant inspections

All fire hydrants must be inspected and flushed every five years by an approved tester. To achieve this, a progressive inspection programme must be agreed between the Fire Service and the WSA.

Fire hydrant inspections include:

- (a) A visual check to ensure the fire hydrant is marked correctly;
- (b) A visual check of the condition of the fire hydrant box and lid, including fitting;
- (c) Identification of any debris or soil build-up in the fire hydrant box that would affect the operation of the fire hydrant;
- (d) Fitting a standpipe and flowing water to check the unobstructed flow of water and operation of the fire hydrant valve spindle;
- (e) With a blank cap in the open outlet of the standpipe and when water is flowing, gradually shut off the valve on the head of the standpipe so that the standpipe is pressurised to the pressure in the mains and check the hydrant flange gasket for leakage;
- (f) Any faults or leaks are to be reported to the water supply authority;

- (g) Inspection date and results are to be recorded in a manner agreed between the Fire Service and the water supply authority. These results are to be available to all interested parties; and
- (h) Shut down the fire hydrant and before leaving the site, check that there is no leakage.

Private fire hydrants should be inspected in a similar manner.

G5 Single fire hydrant tests

G5.1

The Fire Service and the water supply authority are to consider all fire hydrants on a water supply system and jointly determine indexed or key fire hydrants. A key fire hydrant is one with flow characteristics that are representative of that part of the network.

The criteria to determine an indexed or key fire hydrant include:

- (a) A selected number of fire hydrants between isolating valves;
- (b) A selected number of fire hydrants on different pressure zones due to location or other agreed criteria;
- (c) Any fire hydrant considered by the Fire Service or water supply authority as an indexed or key fire hydrant;
- (d) Fire hydrants at high points of the reticulation, and any other locations where low supply pressures are to be expected due to conditions such as high industrial demand, pumping outage, reticulation valving, and so on.

NOTE –

- (1) It is important to identify fire hydrants that will experience the lowest supply pressure in order to assess the minimum allowable pressure of 100 kPa in any part of the reticulation.
- (2) Consideration should also be given to the pressure available to fire hydrants at high points in the reticulation when water is being drawn from lower levels, either from hydrants, by large industrial users, or at times of peak domestic demand.

Key fire hydrants must be tested to measure flow and pressure at least every five years. Where the flow and pressure from the fire hydrants under test does not meet the minimum values of section 5 and table J3, or the recorded calculated values, the WSA must be advised of the inadequacy.

Inspection date and test results are to be recorded in a manner agreed between the Fire Service and the water supply authority.

Where the necessary firefighting water is supplied by more than one fire hydrant, the capacity of a water main may be estimated as in G5.2.

G5.2 *Graph of pressure/flow characteristics of a hydrant supply*

G5.2.1

This method is suitable for single or multiple hydrant flow tests from single pipe or network systems on the same pressure zone.

A 1.85 semi-log graph is used for interpolating or extrapolating test results to establish expected pressure at a nominated flow. By using this type of graph, the pressure/flow characteristics of a hydrant supply can be represented by a straight line.

Step 1

In addition to the static pressure, two or preferably more readings of flow against pressure are recorded in the table at the bottom of the graph. The pressure is usually recorded in kPa, and the flow may be recorded in any convenient units (normally L/min or L/sec). These should include a static or no-flow pressure recording. The higher the test flows, the more accurate will be the graph.

Step 2

Plot these recorded values on the graph with the pressure recorded on the y-axis and the flow on the x-axis.

The x-axis points are established by selecting a suitable divisor and applying this to the recorded flow values. The divisor should be selected to enable the desired flow/pressure point to appear in the graph.

NOTE – For example, if the required flow is 8,400 L/min (140 L/sec) and the x-axis is numbered to 15, then a suitable divisor would be 10; 8,400 L/min (140 L/sec) would be represented by 14 along the x-axis.

By selecting a suitable value for the divisor, the graph is suitable for all flows.

Step 3

Draw a line-of-best-fit through the recorded points and extend it to the x-axis. This line is the characteristic line for that particular pipe or network and represents a good approximation of residual pressure for any assumed flow.

NOTE – For example, 8,400 L/min (140 L/sec) plotted on a graph numbered as in the above note would be represented by 14 on the x-axis. A vertical line from this point would intersect the characteristic line at the expected residual pressure for this flow.

G5.2.2 *Generating the 1.85 graph*

A 1.85 graph can be constructed manually by establishing a series of 15 values (in the case of the example in G5.2.1) from a base measurement to the exponent of 1.85.

Step 1

Select a base measurement for the desired size of the graph. A base measurement of 1.0 mm will produce a graph to 15 which is approximately 150 mm wide; a base measurement of 1.5 mm will produce a graph approximately 300 mm wide.

In the case of a 1 mm base measurement, the x-axis numbers will be the 1 – 15 series. In the case of a base of 1.5 mm, the numbers will be represented by the series: 1.5, 3.0, 4.5, 6.0, and so on for 15 values.

Step 2

Construct a series of columns to the 1.85 exponent values measured from the zero point.

The rows representing the pressure values are linear.

NOTE – A good approximation of the above can be computer-generated by a spreadsheet program by entering a column width established from the exponential figures after subtracting the preceding value in each case. The column dimensions are displayed in the number of standard characters able to be accommodated in the column width which is slightly inaccurate in linear dimension.

The figures below in table G1 indicate the values for a graph based on 1.0 mm, see figure G1.

Table G1 – Values indicative of a graph on a linear scale

Linear scale	Exponential value of linear values = linear values to 1.85 power	Column width = exponential value – preceding value
1	1	1
2	3.61	2.61
3	7.63	4.03
4	13.00	5.36
5	19.64	6.64
6	27.52	7.88
7	36.60	9.08
8	46.85	10.25
9	58.26	11.41
10	70.79	12.54
11	84.45	13.65
12	99.19	14.75
13	115.03	15.83
14	131.93	16.90
15	149.89	17.96




Figure G1 – Example of pressure/flow characteristic of a hydrant supply

G6 Comprehensive flow testing

Where the necessary firefighting water is supplied by more than one fire hydrant, a comprehensive flow test should be carried out.

NOTE – Refer to the New Zealand Fire Service training note on flow testing of water mains and hydrant inspections.

G7 Recording of test results

The results of the tests must be recorded in an appropriate manner agreeable to all parties involved.

The minimum details to be recorded are:

- (a) Date;
- (b) Time;
- (c) Location/address/identifier, of both the flowing hydrant(s) and the pressure hydrant;
- (d) Measured flow (L/s);
- (e) Static pressure: (kPa);
- (f) Running pressure (kPa);
- (g) Diameter of water main (mm);
- (h) Vertical height difference (approximate) between the flow and pressure hydrants.

From these details it is possible to calculate water mains capacity as indicated in G6.

G8 Computer modelling of water supplies

Where a computer modelling system has been assessed as accurate against ground tests, the Fire Service may accept the outputs from such modelling in place of testing of certain fire hydrants. This should not replace the testing of key fire hydrants.

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm Friday, 14 May 2021**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter:	TA Projects Limited
Contact name if different from above:	Craig Shearer
Contact phone number(s)	██████████
Email address:	
Postal address: <i>(required if no email address is provided)</i>	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act *(select one of the following):*

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.

I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.

My reason(s) are: TA projects owns land subject of the Plan Change

3. Attendance at Council hearing

(a) I wish OR do not wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.

(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Yes OR No

4. Signature of submitter *(note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)*

Signature of submitter: Craig Shearer, for TA Projects Limited Dated 11 May 2021
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipā District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:					
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
<u>Example</u> 20/1	Jo Smith	✓	✓	It is important for people's health and well-being that there are rules in the Plan to control noise.	Retain current Plan provision on noise.
7/2	Fire and Emergency NZ		Oppose in part	<p>TA Projects does not support Fire and Emergency's suggestion that structure plans be required prior to the subdivision/development of growth cells which they believe have the potential to result in poor urban outcomes, particularly in relation to servicing and infrastructure.</p> <p>Resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary activity is required (provided the performance rules are complied with) to subdivide and develop residential land. One of the performance rules (15.4.2.18) is that "all lots in a subdivision s in a development in the Residential, Commercial and Industrial Zones within the urban limits shall be connected to the following Council infrastructure services: (a) Wastewater reticulation and treatment; and (b) Water supply for domestic, or industrial, or commercial activity; and (c) Water supply for firefighting purposes".</p>	Retain the current proposed provisions

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

1/1	Hayden Woods		Oppose in part	<p>These rules are supported by policy direction in the plan.</p> <p>TA Project does not support the submitter's opposition to uplifting of the Deferred zones which he states will "remove regulatory control and oversight for the representatives". He objects to the removal of the Deferred Zone from the pre-2035 Growth Cells.</p> <p>TA opposes his submission because firstly the district plan review process is one controlled by the Council, as is the resource consent process which must precede subdivision and development. There will be adequate control by Council once the Plan Change is approved.</p>	Decline that part of the submission relating to the pre-2035 Growth Cells.
-----	--------------	--	----------------	--	--

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
 | Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
 Submissions close 5pm Friday, 14 May 2021

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details	
Full name of submitter:	Xiaofeng Jiang & Liping Yang
Contact name if different from above:	Russell Baikie
Contact phone number(s)	[REDACTED]
Email address:	[REDACTED]
Postal address: (required if no email address is provided)	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
My reason(s) are: The submitters are owners of land at 1835 Cambridge Road and are materially affected by Proposed Plan Change 13	

3. Attendance at Council hearing	
(a) I wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>OR</u> do not wish <input type="checkbox"/>	to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>OR</u> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)	
Russell Baikie on behalf of Felix Jiang and Liping Yang	
Signature of submitter: _____ (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)	Dated 12/5/21 _____

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
 by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipā District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: <i>(Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)</i>	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
20/1	3Ms of Cambridge GP Ltd	✓	✓	An approved structure plan forms part of the District Plan and the land is available for development	Approve the residential zoning of C2 growth cell
20/2	3Ms of Cambridge GP Ltd	✓		The live zoning of the land should include consequential inclusion within the urban limits	Amend the District Plan
20/3	3Ms of Cambridge GP Ltd	✓		Inclusion of key infrastructure provision by Council consistent with the structure plan underpins rezoning and timely and orderly development of land	Approve the Plan Change

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

20/4	3Ms of Cambridge GP Ltd	✓	It is premature to show open space or reserve zoning of the land in the manner indicated until such time that the land is vested or required. An underlying residential zone is sufficient.	Remove reserve zoning from Map 24
------	-------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

Waipā District Plan Plan Change Further Submission Form

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm Friday, 14 May 2021**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter:	Headlands Trust
Contact name if different from above:	Jane Yates
Contact phone number(s)	[REDACTED]
Email address:	[REDACTED]
Postal address: (required if no email address is provided)	[REDACTED]

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.

I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.

My reason(s) are: Headlands Trust is a significant landowner within the T6 Zone and will be directly affected by the outcome of this plan.

3. Attendance at Council hearing

(a) I wish OR do not wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.

(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Yes OR No

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)

Signature of submitter: Jane Yates  Dated: 11th May 2021

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipā District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:			
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose
Reason: (Tell us <i>WHY</i> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)		I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:	
21/1	Jim Mylchreest	✓	✓
<p>Headlands Trust supports Jim Mylchreest's submission regarding the specifications and location of the roads that run through the middle of the T6 Zone and through our property.</p> <p>Our reasons for this are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main collector road shown, is located on the side of a steep hill in our property. And I understand this is the case further North of our property also. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. We believe the road would be better located along the lower eastern side of the hill following the line of the valley. b. This would make it more cost effective to construct and maintain. c. It would also be safer and more aesthetically pleasing for both users and residents as the properties would be at the level or above the road rather than down steep driveways. 2. The plan shows a parking lane to the left of a cycle lane on the collector road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. We believe there is no need for a parking lane in a Large Lot Residential area as no one parks on the side of these roads. There is always plenty of off-street parking on each property, or on the grass 		<p>Headlands Trust seeks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To have the T6 Collector road relocated to follow the valley to the east of where it is shown where possible. 2. To have the parking lane removed from the T6 Collector road. 3. To reduce the formed footpaths to only one side of all roads within the T6 zone to maintain the rural feel. 4. To reduce the width of the collector road to reflect the removal of one of the footpaths and the parking lane as above. 5. To reduce the number of streetlights used within the T6 zone to street corners only. 	

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

	<p>verge for the rare times that someone should need to pull over.</p> <p>b. A parking lane would add to both the construction and maintenance cost and waste valuable land that could otherwise be used for residential homes.</p>	
	<p>3. The plan shows footpaths on both sides of the main collector road.</p> <p>a. We believe that this is unnecessary and reduces the rural feel of the street.</p> <p>b. Many people prefer to walk on a grass verge as opposed to a footpath when walking their dogs or running etc in a rural setting.</p>	
	<p>4. The plan shows street lighting on both the local and collector roads.</p> <p>a. We believe street lighting is a pollutant of the night sky in a rural setting and should be kept to a minimum and only used on street corners.</p> <p>b. Excessive street lighting adds yet another cost of installation, maintenance and unnecessary use and cost of power.</p>	

Waipā District Council – Proposed Plan Change 13 Further Submission on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on publicly notified proposed policy statement or plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council

Further Submission on: Proposed Plan Change 13 – Uplifting Deferred Zones

Name of organisation: Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Address for service: C/- Beca Limited

██████████
██████████

Attention: Alec Duncan

Phone:

██████████

Email:

████████████████████

This is a further submission on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Fire and Emergency) in support of submissions on Proposed Plan Change 13 – Uplifting Deferred Zones.

Fire and Emergency is a party who has an interest in Proposed Plan Change 13 – Uplifting Deferred Zones that is greater than the interest the general public has, and also represents a relevant aspect of the public interest. This is for the following reasons:

- The role of Fire and Emergency prescribed in legislation includes promoting fire safety and fire prevention, and extinguishing fires. Proposed Plan Change 13 has the potential to impact on this in terms of provision of (or lack of) infrastructure required to enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic wellbeing, and for their health and safety with regard to fire safety, fire prevention and fire extinction.
- It is essential that Fire and Emergency is able to meet its responsibility of providing an efficient and effective emergency service to all New Zealanders, so as to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of fire and other emergencies (as required by the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017).

Fire and Emergency's further submission

Fire and Emergency's support of a submission made by Submitter 15 including the reasons for support are identified in the table included in Appendix A (attached).

Fire and Emergency wish to be heard in support of their submission.

If others make a similar submission, Fire and Emergency will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.



.....

(Signature of person authorised to
sign on behalf of Fire and
Emergency New Zealand)

13/05/2021

.....

Appendix A - Further submission on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Submitter	Submission point and reason/s	Fire and Emergency position	Fire and Emergency reason/s
<p>Submitter 15 – Raymond Edward Talbot</p>	<p>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 existing firefighting supply is likely to be non-compliant. The addition of 600 houses will probably create a major hazard.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Fire and Emergency supports the submission made by Submitter 15 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire and Emergency identified in their original submission that Waipā District Council have issues at a district-wide level in relation to reticulated water pressure. • Fire and Emergency recognise that some of the growth cells (i.e. C6) will not be serviced by Council reticulation networks for water supply, however, those that are (i.e. C4) will need to be adequately serviced. This includes reticulated water supply, roading and property access in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice) and the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications. • Given the significant growth the Waipā District is experiencing, the proposed growth cells that are intended to be connected to the reticulated network will put greater pressure on the already strained network. Inadequate water pressure that does not meet the requirements set out in the Code of Practice poses a significant risk to the health, safety and wellbeing of people in the Waipā community and to the ability for Fire and Emergency to effectively fight a fire, when fire occurs in an urban environment. <p>Fire and Emergency agree that fire hydrant testing should be undertaken by Council for fire hydrants in the reticulated areas that will be impacted by the new growth cells. This will assist in determining what upgrades are needed across the district, prior to development commencing.</p>

	<p>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.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Fire and Emergency supports the submission made by Submitter 15 for the reasons set out above.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency agree that fire hydrant testing of the existing network is required in order for Council to be able to come to a determination in terms of actual and potential effects on the three waters network (and in particular, water supply).</p>
--	--	----------------	--

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm Friday, 14 May 2021**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details	
Full name of submitter:	Kotare Properties Ltd
Contact name if different from above:	Kathryn Drew (Agent)
Contact phone number(s)	██████████
Email address:	██████████
Postal address: <i>(required if no email address is provided)</i>	C/- Bloxam Burnett & Olliver

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act <i>(select one of the following):</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
My reason(s) are:	
Kotare Properties Ltd (Kotare) has an interest in PC13 greater than the general public because they own and have sale and purchase agreements to buy land that is affected by the plan change. Specifically, Kotare are invested in the C4 Growth Cell in Cambridge.	

3. Attendance at Council hearing	
(a) I wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>OR</u> do not wish <input type="checkbox"/>	to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>OR</u> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. Signature of submitter <i>(note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)</i>	
Signature of submitter:..... Dated	
<i>(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)</i>	

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:				
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)
3/1	Cambridge Motocross	✓	✓	<p>The Cambridge Motorcycle Club holds a resource consent to operate motocross events within the Cambridge town belt land to the east of the C4 growth cell. That consent was granted in September 2016 (LU/0146/16) and has condition (conditions 7 and 8) that provides for a ten year duration, unless a plan change for residential development on the adjoining C4 growth cell becomes operative, at any time after 2021. At such time that consent will lapse. Approval of PC13 will result in that consent lapsing. Whilst Kotare are sympathetic to the impact PC13 will have on the Cambridge Motorcycle Club, Kotare opposes their submission for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cambridge Motorcycle Club has known that their activities will be impacted by growth in the C4 growth cell and were given a clear message through that consenting process that they needed to be looking and investing in alternative sites. They have also had the benefit of exercising their consent since 2016 and including the 2021 season, as the plan change is not operative before the 1 April 2021, which was the timeframe guaranteed to the club when the consent was issued. 2. If the land is not rezoned as part of PC13, this creates a burden on private developers to undertake their own plan changes, which will further delay housing provision within Cambridge and result in increased costs that will need to be passed on to purchasers. 3. Not rezoning C4 as part of PC13 would be inconsistent with the intent of PC13 which is to rezone all pre-2035 growth cells identified in Waipa 2050. 4. Cambridge is expected to need over 200 houses a year to cater for the growth of Cambridge to 2050. C4, as an
				<p>I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council: Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.</p>

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council

by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

				<p>alternative and in addition to C2 and C3 land is required to cater for this growth.</p> <p>5. Kotare have made significant investments in land within C4, and the technical reporting required for consenting, for the purpose of developing it this construction season (2021-2022) with the intent of having titles available in mid 2022. This investment has been made on the understanding that the land would be rezoned by Council as part of PC13.</p>					
4/1	Gaskell, Shaun		✓	<p>See commentary to submission 3/1 for the reasons why Kotare oppose this submission. In addition, it is unclear what the “wider amenity effects” are that this submitter is concerned with. The C4 Growth Cell development will be subject to a Structure Plan that provides for a high level of amenity through the provision of public spaces, pedestrian connections and through the location and alignment of the built form.</p>					<p>Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.</p>
5/1	McKnight, Ashley		✓	<p>See commentary to submissions 3/1 and 4/1 for the reasons why Kotare oppose this submission.</p>					<p>Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.</p>
6/1 and 6/2	McCarthy, Gregory		✓	<p>These submissions are supported because they support the rezoning of the C4 growth cell, removing its deferred zoning and incorporation of the Cambridge C4 Structure Plan in the District Plan appendices, as sought in the Kotare submission.</p>					<p>Kotare support the rezoning of the C4 growth cell from deferred Residential to Residential and the inclusion of the C4 growth cell structure plan (Appendix 23), subject to amendments being made to the Structure Plan as sought in submission point 19/4. Kotare seeks that Council accept this submission.</p>
9/1	Bushell, John and Sarah		✓	<p>This submission is supported because it supports the rezoning of the C4 growth cell and introduction of Appendix 23 in the District Plan provided for by PC13, which is consistent with Kotare’s original submission points (19/1, 19/2 and 19/4).</p>					<p>Kotare support the rezoning of the C4 growth cell from deferred Residential to Residential and the inclusion of the C4 growth cell structure plan (Appendix 23), subject to amendments being made to the Structure Plan as sought in submission point 19/4. Kotare seeks that Council accept this submission.</p>

11/1	Storck, John B	✓	<p>Kotare opposes this submission because it is factually incorrect. PC13 does not and will not provide for residential development of the town belt occupied by the Cambridge Motorcycle Club. That land is zoned Reserve and is not proposed to be changed as part of PC13. PC13 will however affect the Cambridge Motorcycle Club consent as set out in the commentary to submission 3/1 above. The land occupied by the Cambridge Motorcycle Club will consequently be available for the future enjoyment of Cambridge residents, as it is today, and as the submitter notes could be turned into an attractive asset.</p>	<p>Kotare requests that Council reject this submission.</p>
12/1	Storck, Lorene	✓	<p>Kotare supports this submission, and concurs that the development of the growth cell, consistent with the Structure Plan, will provide for walking and cycling opportunities and the linkage of that network to an existing bridal path network off Rowling Street.</p>	<p>Kotare requests that Council support this submission as it supports the rezoning of the C4 Growth Cell.</p>
14/1, 14/2 and 14/3	Sapwell, Margaret	✓	<p>These submissions are supported because they support the rezoning of the C4 growth cell, removing its deferred zoning and incorporation of the Cambridge C4 Structure Plan in the District Plan appendices, as sought in the Kotare submission.</p>	<p>Kotare support the rezoning of the C4 growth cell from deferred Residential to Residential and the inclusion of the C4 growth cell structure plan (Appendix 23), subject to amendments being made to the Structure Plan as sought in submission point 19/4. Kotare seeks that Council accept this submission.</p>
16/1 and 16/2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	✓	<p>It is correct that the rezoning provided for by PC13 will enable the subsequent development of the growth cells, which has the ability thereafter to affect the cultural resource, historic heritage, in particular archaeology of both recorded and unrecorded sites, the cultural resource. Whilst the plan change enables development, such development still requires consenting under both the District Plan (i.e. subdivision) and if necessary through the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. It is through those consenting processes that further investigation and if necessary Cultural Impact Assessments can and will be undertaken to inform the development outcome and ensure that appropriate management methods, or avoidance of sites of significance. That being said, the</p>	<p>Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential as part of the PC13.</p>

				Structure Plans that have been endorsed by Council, including the C4 Structure Plan, have been supported by such information/assessment and are thus informed by that information.	
16/3	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	✓	✓	This submission point is unfairly prejudicing the authors of the archaeological assessment (Clough & Associates), their experience and thus their ability to assess the effects of features within this archaeological landscape. Kotare believe that PC13 is not the appropriate forum for raising these concerns.	Kotare requests that Council reject this submission as the PC13 submission period is not the right forum for raising these concerns.
20/2	3MS of Cambridge GP Limited	✓		This submission point by 3Ms of Cambridge GP Limited supports the submission point (19/3) that Kotare has made in relation to ensuring that PC13 also provides for the consequential changes to the urban limit boundaries noted on the planning maps. These growth cells are clearly anticipated to be developed, so an amendment of the urban limits would ensure that their development is consistent with 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).	Kotare seeks that Council accept this submission and consequently amend the urban limits, as shown on the planning maps, to include the residential growth cells that are being rezoned as part of PC13 (i.e. C2, C3 and C4).
27/1, 27/2 and 27/3	Talbot, Raymond E	✓		Kotare oppose this submission point on the basis that the appropriate time to consider and address the effects on vegetation/site suitability and topographical differences is through the consenting phases for the eventual development. The Structure Plan provides the framework for development, but it is the subsequent consenting processes where these details and resulting effects are further considered.	Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.
32	Cambridge Motorcycle Club	✓		See commentary to submission 3/1 for the reasons why Kotare oppose this submission.	Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.
33	Stockley, Loren	✓		See commentary to submission 3/1 for the reasons why Kotare oppose this submission.	Kotare requests that Council reject this submission and rezones the C4 Growth Cell to residential.



Waipā District Plan Plan Change Further Submission Form

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close 5pm Friday, 14 May 2021

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter: GREGORY JUDE McCARTHY

Contact name if different from above:

Contact phone number(s):

Email address:

Postal address: *(required if no email address is provided)*

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.

I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.

My reason(s) are:
I own land within the C4 GROWTH CELL

3. Attendance at Council hearing

(a) I wish OR do not wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.

(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
Yes OR No

4. Signature of submitter *(note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)*

Signature of submitter: Dated 14/5/21
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Friday, 14 May 2021

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipā District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:					
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council: Retain current Plan provision on noise.
Example 20/1	Jo Smith	✓	✓	It is important for people's health and well-being that there are rules in the Plan to control noise.	
19/4	KOTARE PROPERTIES LTD		✓	SEE ATTACHED	RETAIN CURRENT PLAN CHANGE 13
19/8	KOTARE PROPERTIES LTD		✓	SEE ATTACHED	RETAIN CURRENT PLAN CHANGE 13 WORDING

In the initial submissions round, Submission #19 made by Kotare Properties Limited (“KPL”) has supported in part the inclusion of the Council endorsed C4 Structure Plan to be included as an Appendix to the District Plan (Appendix S23) but additionally:

- a) Seeks a change to this Structure Plan, being a change to the location of the collector road in the northern segment of C4 and to the location of the collector road intersection roundabout with Silverwood Lane - to that contained in a proposed alteration drawing (Submission Point 19/4); or
- b) If this change to the Structure Plan is not made, KPL seeks an amendment to paragraph S23.5.3 whereby the wording “*The Structure Plan identifies the preferred layout, ...*” is changed to “*The Structure Plan identifies a conceptual layout, ...*” (Submission Point 19/8).

I submit:

1. The purpose and scope of Plan Change 13 is to uplift the zoning of the C4 Growth Cell. This attempt to amend the recently completed and Council endorsed Structure Plan is well outside the scope of Plan Change 13 and should not be agreed to.
2. The existing Structure Plan was endorsed by Council in September 2020 following an extensive (more than two-year) process that included detailed engagement with Council’s professional planning advisors and extensive formal public consultation and feedback with affected landowners. This process and its outcomes have been relied on by affected landowners. It would be inappropriate for ad-hoc amendments to now be made to the completed and endorsed Structure Plan without having fully considered the implication of the proposed changes on the entire C4 Growth Cell and all affected landowners; and without consulting with these landowners.
3. While KPL list a number of claimed benefits that would result from their proposed change to the Structure Plan, including improved utilization of its own land, there is no mention or recognition in their submission of (i) the increased land requirement associated with relocating the proposed realignment of Lamb Street; (ii) the consequential reduction of land area available for housing; and/or (iii) the potential impact of a larger amount of my land being severed and located to the west of this proposed road realignment.

The size of this impact can be seen on KPL’s proposed drawing, where the area shaded pink is approximately the currently affected area in the existing Structure Plan, whereas under KPL’s proposal, the affected area would additionally include the orange strip of land to its immediate right plus the additional area of land occupied by the relocated road. This impact is significant by any measure.

4. The existing Structure Plan is considerably more than a “conceptual layout”. It is in fact the currently preferred layout as correctly recorded in Plan Change 13. While it may be that this layout is amended in the future in order to achieve improved planning, environmental, infrastructure, traffic management and other outcomes,

such amendments should be developed in consultation with all affected landowners via a different process than Plan Change 13. Rule 15.4.2.69 of the Waipa District Plan provides a Discretionary Activity resource consent application process to allow any aspects of a proposal that are not in 'general accordance' with a Structure Plan to be considered on their merits.

5. The implications of this ad-hoc proposal also overlap with issues associated with Councils draft Development Contribution policy which I have submitted on previously. The significance of the above issues will also depend on whether the draft Development Contribution policy is amended to ensure that landowners are fully and fairly compensated for land acquired for infrastructure, such as roads.

The Solution or Relief sought:

1. The request in Submission Point 19/4 to change the Structure Plan should be declined.
2. The request in Submission Point 19/8 to amend the wording of paragraph S23.5.3 should be declined.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm Friday, 14 May 2021**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details	
Full name of submitter:	Benjamin Jay Frost
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	██████████
Email address:	
Postal address: <i>(required if no email address is provided)</i>	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act <i>(select one of the following):</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
My reason(s) are: I own a property (29 Reid Road, Ngahinapouri) which is within the N3 growth area sought by a submitter to be uplifted before N2.

3. Attendance at Council hearing
(a) I wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing. Yes

4. Signature of submitter <i>(note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)</i>
Signature of submitter: Benjamin Jay Frost..... Dated 12 / 05 / 2021..... <i>(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)</i>

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:					
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
29/1	Coombes Farms Ltd, & Coombes, C & C	✓	✓	<p>The submission is out of scope as it seeks to uplift the deferred status of N3 which is not identified in Proposed Plan Change 13.</p> <p>Consultation has only recently closed on the town concept plan which encompasses N3 growth cell. As far as I am aware no decision has been made on whether a particular option will be adopted. As I understand, the reason N3 is to be developed last is due to the complexity/issues with upgrading SH39/Reid Road intersection and potential future expansion of Ngahinapouri School. As such it allows greater flexibility to develop a street network and village centre that is not constrained by previous portions of development. Regardless, the town concept plan focuses on the future form of the settlement and not a significant change to the timing of land release for the various growth cells.</p> <p>Our Family moved in to 29 Reid Road in September 2019 with the knowledge that the growth area of N3, which surrounds us, was going to be the last area developed – likely to be post 2035. Like other parties we made investment and financial decisions on the basis of the timing of growth cell releases in Ngahinapouri, and felt we could rely on the timing of the growth cells as per the Waipa District Plan and the Waipa 2050 District Growth Strategy. Irrespective of the scope issue in this further submission, I consider that Council should retain the existing timing of growth cells and not introduce such significant changes through a plan change that focuses on another issue.</p>	Retain N2 as the area to be uplifted through Proposed Plan Change 13

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:					
Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
29/2	Coombes Farms Ltd, & Coombes, C & C	✓	✓	The submission is out of scope as it seeks to uplift the deferred status of N3 which is not identified in Proposed Plan Change 13. See further rationale for 29/1.	Retain N2 as the area to be uplifted through Proposed Plan Change 13