## Appendix A

**Summary of Submissions Received** 

## **DISTRICT PLAN**



Proposed Plan Change 7 -Rotokauri North Private Plan Change

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

## **Proposed Plan Change 7: Summary of Submissions**

Submission number	Submitter name(s)	Submi ssion point	Subject	Oppose / Support	Su	mmary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought
1	Gary Martin & Maree Leet	1.1	Medium Density	Oppose	2.	Concerned with potential effects on their property from proposed medium density housing.  Concerned that rezoning to medium density residential could lead to further future changes to enable even higher density.	1. Drafting opposed but no alternative provided.
		1.2	Amenity	Oppose	1.	Seeks amendments to the plan change to enhance and protect existing amenity of the area	<ol> <li>Seeks greater clarity on how subdivision objective 23.2.2 applies to enhancing and maintaining existing amenity.</li> <li>Seeks inclusion of a 25m setback from road (SH39) in the form of a greenbelt.</li> <li>Seeks retention and protection of existing significant/mature trees.</li> <li>Seeks clarity on the timing of development, and potential for deferral.</li> <li>Opposes potential for use of poor quality building cladding.</li> </ol>

2	Brian & Eleanor Robertson	2.1	General	Support	1.	Provides much needed affordable housing in the north-west and close to the	1.	Approve PC7.
3	Ministry of Education	3.1	General	Support	1.	Supports the proposed development in Rotokauri North as it will provide much needed housing for Hamilton.	1.	Seeks continued engagement with Council and the developer, particularly in relation to staging and timing of
					2.	The key elements of interest include the:		development.
						a) Approximately 137ha Medium Density Residential zone to enable up to 2000 residential units; and	2.	That walking and cycling connections are provided for to enable a co-ordinated approach in safely accessing all forms of housing and social infrastructure.
						b) Approximately 1 hectare of Business 6 zone for the development of a Neighbourhood Centre, which could		
						include small neighbourhood shops, cafes, or other similar activities.		
4	Sung Ho Jung & HA Rim Jung	4.1	General	Support	1.	Support PC7.	2.	Approve PC7.
5	Philip Laird	5.1	General	Support	1. 2.	Supports PC7 in its current form. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed including retention of:
					3.	RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity,		a) The extent of the Medium Density Residential zone & Business 6 zone;
						the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.		b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and
					4.	Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate		c) The PC7 specific provisions, including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and
						provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy		including requirements for affordable housing.

6	Chric Laird	6.1	Conoral	Support	7.	Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives. Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', is based on the Structure Plan, avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.	1	2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
6	Chris Laird	6.1	General	Support	3. 4.	Supports PC7 in its current form. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato. Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed including retention of:  a) The extent of the Medium Density Residential zone and Business 6 zone;  b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and  c) The PC7 specific provisions, including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.  2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.

						The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives. Applying PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', is based on the Structure Plan, avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.		
7	Lance & Karen Managh	7.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1.	Decline PC7; or
		7.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	2.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.  The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.  Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	2.	Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;  b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;  c) Cater for the demand generated within
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly		the wider transport network;  d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;

significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section	likely cost of the required roading
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section	
·	. •
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
· ·	
significant – the development should not	
go ahead without major upgrades to the	
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,	
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.	
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road	
indicated in the Structure Plan (and	
connections to the east by bridge	
underpasses) should be constructed to	
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.	
A connection should be made to the	
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new	
residents of the Structure Plan area to	
utilise public transport. Movement routes	
have not been proposed to be integrated	
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and	
existing and planned networks, and	
development of the Rotokauri North area	
is premature before these key transport	
connections have been constructed.	
7. The unmanaged wider transportation	
effects will have the potential to adversely	
impact on land values.	

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

Tina and Simon  8 Warnock 8.1 General Oppose 1. Decline PC7: or						mitigation measures addressing new demand.  14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.  15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.  16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.  17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
TO TANGETON TOTAL TOURIST TOUR	8	Tina and Simon Warnock	8.1	General	Oppose		1. Decline PC7; or

			1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	
			concerns are addressed.  2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 a	rea
			from Structure Plan), but approve	
			1. Removal of the Rotokauri North area from development subject to requiring	
8.2	Structure	Oppose	the Structure Plan will mean the developer to adhere to all existing Structure	ure
	Plan/Infrastru		development will not be integrated with Plan provisions, including:	
	cture/Transpo		the wider network of roads and other	
	rt		infrastructure and will create an inefficient   a) Requiring they construct the Rotoka	auri
			pattern of transportation and land use. Minor Arterial Road;	
			2. The impacts on the wider area have not   b) Provide an ITA that adequately asses	
			been adequately considered or addressed. impacts on the wider transport network a have that ITA peer reviewed;	and
			3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	
			not been undertaken to properly c) Cater for the demand generated within	the
			understand the impacts on the wider wider transport network;	
			transport network and community.	
			d) Requiring the developer to fund	
			4. The staging and sequencing intended for necessary road network upgrades a	and
			the current Structure Plan area requires additions;	
			that key arterial roads and intersections are	<b>.</b>
			built prior to development moving as far e) Provide a full economic assessment of north as the proposed Rotokauri North financial impact on the remainder of	
			north as the proposed Rotokauri North   financial impact on the remainder of area. This proposal will result in a poorly   Structure Plan area and including the lik	
			integrated arm of development that cost of the required roading upgrades.	СТУ
			significantly impacts on traffic in other	
			areas of the Structure Plan due to the	
			sequencing not being adhered to.	
			5. The traffic impacts on the southern section	
			of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
			significant – the development should not go	
			ahead without major upgrades to the full	

length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety,

noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.

					<ul> <li>15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.</li> <li>16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.</li> <li>17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.</li> </ul>	
9	Dennis Dove & Diane Godden	9.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	<ol> <li>Decline PC7; or</li> <li>Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area</li> </ol>
		9.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	1. Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;

2. The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.  3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.  4. The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development with a rea. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection of increased in the Structure Plan (and Connections to the east by bridge
The second secon

the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A	
connection should be made to the	
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new	
residents of the Structure Plan area to	
utilise public transport. Movement routes	
have not been proposed to be integrated	
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and	
existing and planned networks, and	
development of the Rotokauri North area is	
premature before these key transport	
connections have been constructed.	
Connections have been constructed.	
7. The unmanaged wider transportation	
effects will have the potential to adversely	
impact on land values.	
impact off failu values.	
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided	
by the applicant should be expanded to	
include the economic impact on ratepayers	
due to development being planned out of	
,	
sequence with the Structure Plan.	
9. The health and wellbeing of the community	
will be threatened by poor road safety,	
noise and vibration, and increased travel	
times.	
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and	
Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and	
Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.	
3.5.5.5.5.5.5.4,	
11. The development will no longer be required	
to integrate with other planned projects	

intended to make traffic move efficiently	
through the entire Rotokauri area or	
intended to create a cohesive urban	
pattern.	
pattern.	
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport	
Station may be undermined due to the	
current sequencing.	
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the	
existing performance of the road network,	
including sightlines from intersections and	
accessways, peak flows and flow	
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,	
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation	
measures addressing new demand.	
measures addressing new demand.	
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading	
infrastructure (including upgrades of	
existing) will keep up with development and	
be funded by the developer if out of	
sequence.	
Sequence:	
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within	
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide	
infrastructure in a way that is efficient and	
sustainable from a city-wide perspective	
and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing	
infrastructure to cater for the demand that	
the development will create.	
· · · · · ·	

						PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.  PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
10	Arie & Batami Pundak	10.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	<ol> <li>Decline PC7; or</li> <li>Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the</li> </ol>
		10.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose		Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.  The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.  Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;  b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;

4. The staging and sequencing intended for d) Requiring the developer to fund all
the current Structure Plan area requires necessary road network upgrades and
that key arterial roads and intersections are additions;
built prior to development moving as far
north as the proposed Rotokauri North e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
area. This proposal will result in a poorly   financial impact on the remainder of the
integrated arm of development that Structure Plan area and including the likely
significantly impacts on traffic in other cost of the required roading upgrades.
areas of the Structure Plan due to the
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not go
ahead without major upgrades to the full
length of Exelby Road, the intersection of
Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and
Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
Notokaan Noda down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to take
the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A
connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area is

premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
Connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community
will be threatened by poor road safety,
noise and vibration, and increased travel
times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and
Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and
Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required
to integrate with other planned projects
intended to make traffic move efficiently
through the entire Rotokauri area or
intended to create a cohesive urban
pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.

13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation
measures addressing new demand.
Theasares addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development and
be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide
infrastructure in a way that is efficient and
sustainable from a city-wide perspective
and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that
the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17 DC7 does not provide adequate transport
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area to
support the proposed development. The
proposal does not achieve a sustainable
expansion of the city and does not
represent coherent and integrated
development, because the transportation

11.2 Structure Oppose 1. 1.Removal of the Rotokauri North area development su development of the Structure Plan will mean the cture/Transpo development will not be integrated with	3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
Miranda Collinson  11.1 General Oppose 1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.  1. Decline PC7; or 2. Delete section 3 from Structure development su development su developer to adher plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo  1. Decline PC7; or 2. Delete section 3 from Structure development su development su development su developer to adher plan provisions, in development will not be integrated with	•
Miranda Collinson  11.1 General Oppose 1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed. 2. Delete section 3 from Structure development su development su development to adher plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo  11.2 Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo Plan provisions, incomplete provisions are addressed.  1. Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	•
11.2 Structure Oppose 1. 1.Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	riail), but approve the
infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.  2. The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.  3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.  4. The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North  Minor Arterial Roads  b) Provide an ITA impacts on the wider transport network and community.  c) Cater for the dewider transport network and community.  d) Requiring the necessary road additions;  e) Provide a full e financial impact Structure Plan area far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	abject to requiring the ere to all existing Structure cluding:  y construct the Rotokauri ed;  A that adequately assesses ider transport network and reviewed;

5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers

due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.

					<ul> <li>14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.</li> <li>15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.</li> <li>16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.</li> <li>17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North</li> </ul>
					boundaries have not been resolved.
12	Rob & Barbara Barris	12.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or
		12.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru	Oppose	<ol> <li>Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with</li> <li>Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the</li> </ol>

	cture/Transpo		the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
	rt		infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
			pattern of transportation and land use.	
				a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
		2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
			been adequately considered or addressed.	
				b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
		3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
			not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
			understand the impacts on the wider	•
			transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
				wider transport network;
		4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	•
			the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
			that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
			are built prior to development moving as	additions;
			far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
			area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
			integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
			significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
			areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
			sequencing not being adhered to.	
		5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
			of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
			significant – the development should not	
			go ahead without major upgrades to the	
			full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
			of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	
			Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,	
			and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.	

The envisaged north-south arterial road ndicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area
connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
cake the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes nave not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
utilise public transport. Movement routes nave not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
nave not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
·
s premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
mpact on land values.
The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
, ,,
nclude the economic impact on ratepayers
nclude the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of
nclude the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.  The health and wellbeing of the
due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.  The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor
due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.  The health and wellbeing of the
(

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
Sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is

					efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
13	NZ Transport Agency	13.1	Structure Plan	Support	<ul> <li>17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.</li> <li>1. Supports proposed Policy 3.6A.2.4d, proposed Objective 3.6A.2.5, and proposed</li> </ul>
		13.2	Structure Plan/Transpor t	Support with amendm ents	Policy 3.6A.2.5a.  1. Seeks a new policy to support Objective 3.6A.2.4(a) which addresses the minimisation of effects on SH 39 because PC7 is reliant on new and existing connections to SH 39.  Ensure any adverse transport effects of providing access to State Highway 39 to service subdivision and development are less than minor; in particular the following parts of the transport network as shown on Figure 2-8A Rotokauri North Structure Plan:

				2.	<ul> <li>New State Highway 39 and Collector Road 1 intersection;</li> <li>Existing State Highway 39 and Exelby Road intersection;</li> <li>Existing State Highway 39 and Burbush Road intersection; and</li> <li>The mid-block sections of State Highway 39 between these intersections.</li> </ul> Seeks a consequential amendment to Appendix 2, Figure 2-8A to indicate the location of the proposed SH 39 and Collector 1 intersection as this is not currently notated.
13.3	Structure Plan/Transpor t	Support with amendm ents	1. In the event that the proposed Qualifying Development under the Special Housing Areas legislation does not proceed in the PC7 area, the Transport Agency seeks an amendment to proposed Rule 3.6A.4.2d) to address the access requirements for the servicing of the Stage 1 development as it relates to State Highway 39. The Transport Agency's expectation is that this will operate as a roundabout to address potential safety effects arising from traffic entering and exiting the development.	1.	Seeks the following amendments to proposed Rule 3.6A.4.2 d):  d) Transport  i. Prior to the occupation of any new dwelling or unit, a roundabout shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the NZ Transport Agency's standards at the intersection of SH39 and Proposed Collector 1 (as shown on Figure 2-8A Rotokauri North Structure Plan).  ii. i. Prior to any development beyond Stage One occurring, an Integrated

	40.4		l <b>a</b> .		
	13.4	Structure	Support	1. To ensure that the development of the PC7	Transport Assessment (ITA) report
		Plan/Transpor	with	area provides opportunities for residents to	prepared by a suitably independent,
		t	amendm	utilise the wider cycling network, the Transport	experienced and qualified person shall be
			ents	Agency seeks an amendment to Rule 3.6A.4.2 d)	submitted with any resource consent
				requiring the provision of a cycling path to be	application for such development (as
				located within the PC7 area adjacent to the SH	required by Rule 25.14.4.3). The purpose
				39 road reserve (not within the SH 39 road	of the ITA is to identify the number of
				corridor). The cycle way should connect	lots/dwellings that can be developed
				between the SH 39/Proposed Collector 1	beyond Stage One, prior to the
				intersection and the State Highway 39/Burbush	construction of the strategic transport
				Road roundabout and include appropriate safe	corridors identified below.
				and convenient provision for cyclists crossing	
				Burbush Road (or Minor Arterial Road) and	Note: it is acknowledged that as a staged
				Collector Road 1. A consequential amendment	development the construction of the
				will be required to Appendix 2, Figure 2-8A to	strategic transport corridors may not
				provide an indicative location for this cycle way.	necessarily be required at the same time,
	13.5	Structure	Support	1. Supports use of an ITA to assess subsequent	therefore the "triggering" of specific
		Plan/Transpor	with	stages of development. Seeks amendment to	thresholds identified in the ITA may be
		l t	amendm	Rule 3.6A.4.2 d) to require consultation with	dependent on the sequence of staging.
			ents	the Transport Agency as part of preparation of	, , , , , , ,
				an ITA.	iii. ii. Once development has reached the
					threshold identified in the ITA report (as
					relevant to "triggering the necessary
					strategic transport corridor" any resource
					consents for further residential
					lots/dwellings shall include and provide
					for the following:
					io. die following.
					a. Extension of the primary east-west
					collector route (as shown in Appendix 2
					Figure 2-9B) from Stage One in an
					eastwards direction connecting to
					Burbush Road; and
					Dui busii Noau, aiiu

	13.6	Structure	Support	On the basis that the proposed	b. Construction of the north-south arterial corridor (as shown in Appendix 2 Figure 2-9B) that lies within the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area.  iv. A two-way cycle path shall be provided prior to the occupation of any new dwelling or unit and shall:  • Be located adjacent to the SH39 road reserve (not within the SH39 road corridor) connecting between the SH39/Proposed Collector 1 intersection and the SH39/Burbush Road (or Minor Arterial) roundabout; and • Include appropriate safe and convenient provision for cyclists crossing Burbush Road (or Minor Arterial Road) and Collector Road 1.  v. The ITA is to include evidence of consultation with the NZ Transport Agency and how any feedback from them has been addressed.  Seeks the following amendments to the
		Plan/Transpor t	with	amendments to Rule 3.6A.4.2 are adopted, additional assessment criteria are also	assessment criteria in 3.6A.4.3 b):

<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
	amendments	requested to provide for the assessment at each sub-stage of whether further upgrades are required to the Exelby Road/SH 39 intersection and the Te Kowhai Road/SH 39/Minor Arterial Road intersection. Additional assessment criteria are proposed to provide an opportunity for alternative cycle connections to be assessed in consultation with the relevant roading authorities.	iv. The extent to which additional traffic arising from development that is in noncompliance with Rule 3.6A.4.2 will adversely impact on the efficiency and safety of Exelby Road and Burbush Road and State Highway 39.  v. Mitigation works to ensure that development does not result in long term adverse effects on the efficiency, safety and functioning of the existing and planned transport network, including State Highway 39.  ix. Effects of additional traffic on the intersections identified below and any mitigation proposed to address those effects:  • Intersection of State Highway 39/Exelby Road; and • Intersection of State Highway 39/Te Kowhai Road/Minor Arterial Road intersection.  x. Whether there are alternative off-road active transport mode connection(s)
			Arterial Road intersection.  x. Whether there are alternative off-road

		13.7	Structure Plan/Figures	Support with amendm ents	<ol> <li>Does not support the additional collector access connection to SH 39 and seek that this be removed.</li> <li>Seeks amendment to Figure 2-8A to remove the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.</li> <li>Seeks amendment to Figure 2-8A to remove the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.</li> </ol>
					PPC7 to remove any provision for the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.
		13.8	City Wide	Support	<ol> <li>Supports proposed Rule 25.14.4.1 k)ii. and proposed assessment criteria 1.3.3 O1 a).</li> </ol>
14	Jennifer McKenzie & Ewen Drysdale	14.1	Transport	Oppose	<ol> <li>Exelby Road is unable to cope with extra/large volumes of traffic generated from PC7 without major roading upgrades.</li> <li>Exelby Road has dangerous intersections,</li> </ol>
					hazardous corners, and hills with no visibility.
		14.2	General	Oppose	<ol> <li>Proposed housing typology will result in devaluing of property and increase in crime.</li> <li>Increase policing in the Rotokauri North area to deal with crime.</li> </ol>
		14.3	General	Oppose	<ol> <li>Construction will generate noise, dust and traffic.</li> <li>No specific relief sought.</li> </ol>
		14.4	General	Oppose	<ol> <li>Pollution and removal of existing trees will contribute to global warming.</li> <li>No specific relief sought.</li> </ol>
		14.5	General	Oppose	1. Loss of 'ruralness' of area 2. No specific relief sought.
15	Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group	15.1	General	Support	<ol> <li>Supports recommendations within the Cultural Impact Assessment report prepared by the Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group.</li> <li>Approve PC7, subject to any further amendments necessary to reflect and provide for the recommendations in the Cultural Impact Assessment report prepared by the Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group.</li> </ol>
16	Peter & Kerry Santner	16.1	General	Oppose	<ol> <li>Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.</li> <li>Decline PC7; or</li> </ol>

					2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
	16.2	Structure	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	from Structure Plan), but approve the
		Plan/Infrastru		the Structure Plan will mean the	development subject to requiring the
		cture		development will not be integrated with	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				the wider network of roads and other	Plan provisions, including:
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient	, ,
				pattern of transportation and land use.	<ul> <li>a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;</li> </ul>
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	
				been adequately considered or addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
				understand the impacts on the wider	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
				transport network and community.	wider transport network;
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as	d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;
				far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

						provide infrastructure in a way that is		
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide		
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost		
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the		
						demand that the development will create.		
					16	PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan		
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),		
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.		
					17.	PC7 does not provide adequate transport		
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area		
						to support the proposed development.		
						The proposal does not achieve a		
						sustainable expansion of the city and does		
						not represent coherent and integrated		
						development, because the transportation		
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North		
						boundaries have not been resolved.		
17	Jianfeng Zhou	17.1	General	Support	1.	Supports PC7 in its current form.	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:
					2.	PC7 will promote sustainable management		
						of resources, achieve the purpose of the		a) The extent of the Medium Density
						RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.		Residential zone & Business 6 zone;
					3.	PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy		b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan;
						Statement Urban Development Capacity,		and
						the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,		
						and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o		c) The PC7 specific provisions, including
						Te Awa o Waikato.		its integrated subdivision, urban design,
								bulk and location rules package, and
					4.	Although 'out of sequence' for the		including requirements for affordable
						development of future urban zoned		housing

						greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate	
						provision for infrastructure ensuring	2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7
						alignment with Waikato Regional Policy	except where those changes are agreed to
						Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan	and supported by the applicant.
						and Hamilton urban growth documents.	
					5.	Accords with and will assist the Council in	
					٥.	carrying out its functions under the RMA.	
					6.	The applicant has undertaken ongoing	
						consultation with hapuu representatives.	
					7	Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather	
					/.	than relying on the default zone provisions	
						provides for 'affordable housing', avoids	
						ultra vires requirement for concept	
						plans/land development plans/master	
						plans, and achieves a better urban design	
						and amenity outcome.	
18	Qiong Yang	18.1	General	Support	1.	Supports PC7 in its current form.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:
					2.	PC7 will promote sustainable management	
						of resources, achieve the purpose of the	a) The extent of the Medium Residential
						RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.	zone & Business 6 zone;
					3	PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy	b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan;
					٥.	Statement Urban Development Capacity,	and
						the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,	33
						and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o	c) The PC7 specific provisions, including
						Te Awa o Waikato.	its integrated subdivision, urban design,
							bulk and location rules package, and
					4.	Although 'out of sequence' for the	including requirements for affordable
						development of future urban zoned	housing.

					5.	greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Accords with and will assist the Council in	2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
					6.	carrying out its functions under the RMA.  The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.	
					7.	Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.	
19	Lily Investments 372 Exelby Road	19.1	General	Support		Supports PC7 in its current form.  PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:     a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;
					3.	PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	<ul> <li>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</li> <li>c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</li> </ul>

					5.	Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.  The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.  Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design		2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
20	Lily Investments	20.1	General	Support	1.	and amenity outcome.  Supports PC7 in its current form.	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed,
	265				2.	PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.  PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.		including retention of:  a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;  b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and  c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk

						Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.		and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.  2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
					6.	The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.  7. Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.		
21	Green Seed Holdings Ltd 350 Exelby Road	21.1	General	Support	2.	Supports PC7 in its current form.  PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.  PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:  a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;  b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and

					5.	and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.  Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.  The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.  Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.		c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.  2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
22	Green seed	22.1	General	Support	1.	Supports PC7 in its current form.	1.	1, , ,
	Holding Ltd 335 Te Kowhai Road				2.	PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.		including retention of:  a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;

					4.	PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.  Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.  The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.  Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.		b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and  c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.  2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
23	River Garden NZ Ltd	23.1	General	Support	1.	Supports PC7 in its current form.	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:

2. PC7 will promote sustainable management	a) The extent of the Medium Residential
of resources, achieve the purpose of the	zone & Business 6 zone;
RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.	
,	b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan;
3. PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy	and
Statement Urban Development Capacity,	
the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,	c) The PC7 specific provisions including its
and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o	integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk
Te Awa o Waikato.	and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.
4. Although 'out of sequence' for the	requirements for affordable floading.
development of future urban zoned	2. Opposes any changes being made to
greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate	PC7 except where those changes are
provision for infrastructure ensuring	agreed to and supported by the
alignment with Waikato Regional Policy	applicant.
Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan	•
and Hamilton urban growth documents.	
5. Accords with and will assist the Council in	
carrying out its functions under the RMA.	
6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing	
consultation with hapuu representatives.	
7 Applying proposed DC7 provisions rather	
7. Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions	
provides for 'affordable housing', avoids	
ultra vires requirement for concept	
plans/land development plans/master	
plans, and achieves a better urban design	
and amenity outcome.	
and amenity outcome.	

24	Charles Ma	24.1	General	Support	1.	Supports PC7 in its current form.	1.	Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:
					2.	PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.		a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;
					3.	PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity,		b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan;
						the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.		c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including
					4.	Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned		requirements for affordable housing.
						greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.		2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
					5.	Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.		
					6.	The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.		
					7.	Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master		

						plans, and achieves a better urban design	
						and amenity outcome.	
						and amenity cateomer	
25	Kay & Mark	25.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Moroney					concerns are addressed.	
		25.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture/Transpo			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
			rt			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
							wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
						sequencing not being adhered to.	
					5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
						of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	

significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
·
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
9. The Feenemia Impact Assessment provided
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.

9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
mercused traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
arban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development

					and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.	
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.	
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
26	Tania Browning	26.1	General	Oppose	<ol> <li>Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.</li> <li>Decline PC7; or</li> </ol>	
		26.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	<ol> <li>Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.</li> <li>Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 from Structure Plan), but approve development subject to requiring developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:</li> </ol>	the the

2. The impacts on the wider area have not a) Requiring they construct the Rotokau
been adequately considered or addressed. Minor Arterial Road;
3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has b) Provide an ITA that adequately assessed
not been undertaken to properly impacts on the wider transport network an
understand the impacts on the wider have that ITA peer reviewed; transport network and community.
c) Cater for the demand generated within th
4. The staging and sequencing intended for wider transport network;
the current Structure Plan area requires
that key arterial roads and intersections d) Requiring the developer to fund a
are built prior to development moving as necessary road network upgrades an
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North additions;
area. This proposal will result in a poorly
integrated arm of development that  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the Structure Plan area and including the likely
sequencing not being adhered to.  sequencing not being adhered to.  cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being aunered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.

A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
 projecto intended to make tramomove

efficiently through the entire Rotokauri	
area or intended to create a cohesive	
urban pattern.	
disan pattern.	
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport	
Station may be undermined due to the	
current sequencing.	
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the	
existing performance of the road network,	
including sightlines from intersections and	
accessways, peak flows and flow	
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,	
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and	
mitigation measures addressing new	
demand.	
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading	
infrastructure (including upgrades of	
existing) will keep up with development	
and be funded by the developer if out of	
sequence.	
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within	
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to	
provide infrastructure in a way that is	
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
demand that the development will create.	
ass.ia tilat tila developiitetti tili oledet	

	1	1	1	I	T	2021	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
27	Judith Browning	27.1	General	Oppose	1.		1. Decline PC7; or
-	Judicii Browning		Cerrerai	Оррозс		concerns are addressed.	1. Decime 1 67, 61
		27.2	Structure	Oppose	1	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru	Оррозс		the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture/Transpo			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
			rt			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	rian provisions, merdanig.
						pattern or transportation and land use.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
					۷.	been adequately considered or addressed.	Willor Arterial Road,
						been adequately considered of addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					2	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
					٥.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	nave that TIA peer reviewed,
						•	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						transport network and community.	wider transport network;
						The staging and sequencing interded for	wider transport network,
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	
						that key arterial roads and intersections	

	are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.  6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road. A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
--	--

7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and

accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
, e
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
3.0.2.7 6/, 3.0.2.3 6/, 3.0.2.3, 3.0.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area
to support the proposed development.
The proposal does not achieve a
sustainable expansion of the city and does
not represent coherent and integrated
development, because the transportation
effects beyond the Rotokauri North
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
boundaries have not been resolved.

28	Ann Harvey	28.1	General	Oppose	1.	, , , ,	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		28.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture/Transpo			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
			rt			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	Plan provisions, including:
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
						sequencing not being adhered to.	
					5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
						of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
						significant – the development should not	
						go ahead without major upgrades to the	
						full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	

of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor

road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.	
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.	
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.	
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.	
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.	
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.	
	increased travel times.  10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.  11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.  12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.  13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.  14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of

					the profession of the professi	the proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to ovide infrastructure in a way that is ficient and sustainable from a city-wide expective and seeks to avoid the full cost providing infrastructure to cater for the emand that the development will create.  27 is contrary to the Structure Plan ovisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.  27 does not provide adequate transport etwork capacity outside of the PC7 area support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a stainable expansion of the city and does of trepresent coherent and integrated evelopment, because the transportation fects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
29	Shane & Antonia Withey	29.1	General	Oppose	1. Op	opose PC7 in its entirety unless specific oncerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		29.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	1. Re the de the inf par	emoval of the Rotokauri North area from e Structure Plan will mean the evelopment will not be integrated with e wider network of roads and other frastructure and will create an inefficient attern of transportation and land use. he impacts on the wider area have not een adequately considered or addressed.	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;

3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
not been undertaken to properly impacts on the wider transport network and
understand the impacts on the wider have that ITA peer reviewed;
transport network and community.
c) Cater for the demand generated within the
4. The staging and sequencing intended for wider transport network;
the current Structure Plan area requires
that key arterial roads and intersections d) Requiring the developer to fund al
are built prior to development moving as necessary road network upgrades and
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North   additions;
area. This proposal will result in a poorly
integrated arm of development that  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other financial impact on the remainder of the
areas of the Structure Plan due to the Structure Plan area and including the likely
sequencing not being adhered to. cost of the required roading upgrades.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to

utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
αι ναι γαιτείτι.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.

						PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
30	Nilesh Kumar & Raksha Singh	30.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
	Naksha shigh	30.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	2.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.  The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;  b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that	<ul><li>d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;</li><li>e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the</li></ul>

significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.  6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
31	Shane & Virginia Henderson	31.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

31.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the
	cture/Transpo			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
	rt			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
				pattern of transportation and land use.	
					a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
				been adequately considered or addressed.	
					b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
				not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider	have that ITA peer reviewed;
				transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
				transport network and community.	wider transport network;
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
				the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
				that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
				are built prior to development moving as	additions;
				far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the
				significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
				areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
				sequencing not being adhered to.	cost of the required roading approach.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
			٦.	of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
				significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the	
				full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
				of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

						provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
32	Peter & Christine Frampton	32.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		32.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture/Transpo rt	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:  a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	Minor Arterial Road;
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund al
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	<del></del>	1	1	ı	1		<del></del>
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
33	Bruce & Robyn	33.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Whittaker					concerns are addressed.	
		33.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture/Transpo			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
			rt			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
						•	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	,
						,	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	,
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						transport nection and community.	wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	The state of the s
					''	the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	333.03113,
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						significantly impacts on traine in other	cost of the required roading upgrades.
							cost of the required roading apgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
34	Richard Ruske	34.1	General	Support	Supports PC7 and its intention to deliver residential development in the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area.      Approve PC7 with amendments.

34.2	Structure Plan	Support		<ol> <li>Supports rezoning of Rotokauri North Structure Plan area from Future Urban to Medium Residential.</li> <li>Supports insertion of the RNSP into the ODP.</li> </ol>		1. Seeks to rezone the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area to a combination of Medium Density Residential and Business Zone 6 (Neighbourhood Centre).
				3. The MDRZ provisions proposed in the RNSP are supported.		
34.3	Future reserve	Neutral	1.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1.	Seeks clarity on the interface of the proposed zoning and whether PC7 enables or precludes this future reserve area.
34.4	Community Focal Point	Neutral	1.	PC7 does not identify the community focal point shown in the Rotokauri Structure Plan resulting in uncertainty of where key community facilities will be provided.	1.	Seeks clarity on the potential delivery mechanism of the community focal point.
34.5	Transport infrastructure	Oppose	1.	The Rotokauri Structure Plan currently shows a collector road which links the minor arterial road east of the site through the PC7 site, to 121 Burbush Road. This collector road is not provided for and results in uncertainty for delivery of transport and key infrastructure.	1.	Seeks the collector road shown in the Rotokauri Structure Plan to be provided as it provides key linkages to network infrastructure.
34.6	Three water Infrastructure	Neutral	1.	There is a lack of clarity as to how PC7 provides for connectivity of infrastructure to adjacent and/or upstream land, such as the subject site.	1.	Seeks clarity on how PC7 provides for connectivity of infrastructure to adjacent and/or upstream land

					3.	There is insufficient information to determine if upsizing of infrastructure will cater for wider network growth.  Concerned that the Far Western Interceptor's capacity will be reached and the implications of that for growth, including the need for significant expenditure to enable capacity for growth in addition to PC7.	Seeks a more detailed understanding of catchment wide servicing to enable residential development beyond the boundaries of the PC7 area.
35	Green Seed Consultants Ltd	35.1	General	Support		Supports PC7 in its current form.  PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.	<ul><li>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including:</li><li>a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone &amp; Business 6 zone;</li></ul>
						PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and c) The PC7 specific provisions within the private plan change including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for
						Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.  The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.	affordable housing.  2. Any other consequential changes necessary to satisfy the relief sought by the submitter.
					6.	Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate	3. Seeks to amend PC7 to incorporate a rear lane vehicle access duplex acceptable solution typology in the permitted activity standards, rules and

					7.	provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.  Applying proposed PC7 provisions rather than relying on the default zone provisions provides for 'affordable housing', avoids ultra vires requirement for concept plans/land development plans/master plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.  Design testing undertaken by the applicant has identified that the permitted activity provisions for duplex dwellings require amendment to allow alternative forms of design.		design which require amendment to Rule 4.7.12 and the Rotokauri North Acceptable Solutions Code contained in 4.14.  4. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.
		35.2	Residential	Support with amendm ents	1.	Seeks amendment to incorporate a rear lane vehicle access duplex acceptable solution typology in rule 4.7.12 and 4.14 Rotokauri North Acceptable Solutions Code (for duplexes).	1.	Seeks the amendment of PPC7 to incorporate a rear lane vehicle access duplex acceptable solution typology in the permitted activity standards, rules and design which require amendment to Rule 4.7.12 and the Rotokauri North Acceptable Solutions Code (for duplex dwellings) contained in 4.14.
36	Bo Ram Yu	36.1	General	Supports with amendm ents	2.	Concerned that proposal will result in his property being blocked off from direct access to SH 39. PC7 should be consistent with the Rotokauri Structure Plan regarding future access of SH39.	1. 2.	Allow future vehicle access from SH39; or Seeks PC7 include the requirement for a local road to be developed to provide access to 301 Te Kowhai Road from adjoining lots.

					2	Requests a local road be developed to	
					ا ع.	provide access other than from SH 39.	
27	Day i'd and Cathy	27.4	Cananal	0	1	•	1 Dealine DC7: au
37	David and Cathy	37.1	General	Oppose	1.	, , ,	1. Decline PC7; or
	Dewes					concerns are addressed.	
							2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
		37.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	development subject to requiring the
			cture/			development will not be integrated with	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
			Transport			the wider network of roads and other	Plan provisions, including:
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	
						pattern of transportation and land use.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
							Minor Arterial Road;
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	
						been adequately considered or addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
							impacts on the wider transport network and
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						not been undertaken to properly	•
						understand the impacts on the wider	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						transport network and community.	wider transport network;
							,
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						the current Structure Plan area requires	necessary road network upgrades and
						that key arterial roads and intersections	additions;
						are built prior to development moving as	
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	financial impact on the remainder of the
						integrated arm of development that	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	cost of the required roading upgrades.
						areas of the Structure Plan due to the	assi of the required rodding approach
						sequencing not being adhered to.	
						sequencing not being aunered to.	
					5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
						of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
					1	or Encloy House and its side rodus will be	

significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
Sequence with the Structure Fight.

9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
moreasea traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
disan pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development

						and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.	
					15	The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.	
					16	PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
				_		boundaries have not been resolved.	
38	Callum & Catherine Thorley	38.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		38.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:

2. The impacts on the wider area have not a) Requiring they construct the Rotokaur
been adequately considered or addressed. Minor Arterial Road;
3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesse
not been undertaken to properly impacts on the wider transport network and understand the impacts on the wider have that ITA peer reviewed;
transport network and community.
c) Cater for the demand generated within the
4. The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires wider transport network;
that key arterial roads and intersections d) Requiring the developer to fund a
are built prior to development moving as necessary road network upgrades and
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North additions;
area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other financial impact on the remainder of the
areas of the Structure Plan due to the Structure Plan area and including the likely
sequencing not being adhered to. cost of the required roading upgrades.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.

A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The beath and well being of the
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will be longer be
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move

efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
arban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.

	T		1	1	1		1
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
39	Gerard Guzzo	39.1	General	Oppose	1	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Gerara Gazzo	33.1	General	Оррозс	1.	concerns are addressed.	1. Decime 1 c7, or
		39.2	Structure	Oppose	1	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
		39.2	Plan/Infrastru	Oppose	1.	the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			-				development subject to requiring the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
							wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	
						that key arterial roads and intersections	
	1	l	_1	l	1		

|--|

7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Folicies 5.5.44°-u, 1.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
including signalines from intersections and

accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
, e
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
3.0.2.7 6/, 3.0.2.3 6/, 3.0.2.3, 3.0.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area
to support the proposed development.
The proposal does not achieve a
sustainable expansion of the city and does
not represent coherent and integrated
development, because the transportation
effects beyond the Rotokauri North
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
boundaries have not been resolved.

40	Peter & Julie Caddingan	40.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
	cadamgan	40.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
						·	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider	impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
					5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	

of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor

road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.	
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.	
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.	
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.	
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.	
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.	

					<ul> <li>15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.</li> <li>16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.</li> <li>17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.</li> </ul>
41	Josh & Michaela Gill	41.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or
		41.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	<ol> <li>Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.</li> <li>The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.</li> <li>Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:         <ul> <li>Requiring they construct the Rotokaur Minor Arterial Road;</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesse
not been undertaken to properly impacts on the wider transport network and
understand the impacts on the wider have that ITA peer reviewed;
transport network and community.
c) Cater for the demand generated within the
4. The staging and sequencing intended for wider transport network;
the current Structure Plan area requires
that key arterial roads and intersections d) Requiring the developer to fund a
are built prior to development moving as necessary road network upgrades and
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North additions;
area. This proposal will result in a poorly
integrated arm of development that  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other financial impact on the remainder of the
areas of the Structure Plan due to the Structure Plan area and including the likely
sequencing not being adhered to. cost of the required roading upgrades.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to

utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated
with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
Sequence with the Structure Hun.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
and Policies 5.5.4a-u, 1.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.

	1	1	T	l			
					17.	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
42	Stuart Barris	42.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		42.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						·	wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						· ·	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly	necessary road network upgrades and additions;  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the

significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.  5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
43	K E Benson	43.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

43.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the
				the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	Plan provisions, including:
					a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
				been adequately considered or addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
			J.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
				understand the impacts on the wider	· ·
				transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
			4.		
				the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
				that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as	necessary road network upgrades and additions;
				far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	additions,
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
				integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
				significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
				areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	cost of the required roading upgrades.
				sequencing not being adhered to.	
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
				of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
				significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the	
				full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
				of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
44	Jo Stirling	44.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		44.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
					1	been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	1		1	1	1		<del> </del>
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
45	Glenn Stirling	45.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		45.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	·
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	·
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
							cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
46	Julie Caddigan	46.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

1	46	.2 Structure	Oppose	1	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
		Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
		cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
		ceare			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
					infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
					pattern of transportation and land use.	Train provisions, including.
					pattern of transportation and fand use.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
				2	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
				۷.	been adequately considered or addressed.	Willion Arterial Roda,
					been adequately considered of addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
				3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
				٦.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
					understand the impacts on the wider	nave that in peer reviewed,
					transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
					transport network and community.	wider transport network;
				4	The staging and sequencing intended for	wider transport network,
					the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
					that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
					are built prior to development moving as	additions;
					far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	additions,
					area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
					integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
					significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
					areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
					sequencing not being adhered to.	cost of the required rodding approach
					sequenting not being deficied to:	
				5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
					of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
					significant – the development should not	
					go ahead without major upgrades to the	
					full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
					of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	
		L		1		

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

			1	1	1		T
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
47	Meena Powell	47.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		47.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and
increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
una i oncies sista a, i.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

i i
· ·
S
!
!
!
1. Decline PC7; or
2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
from Structure Plan), but approve the
development subject to requiring the
developer to adhere to all existing Structure
Plan provisions, including:
!
a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
Minor Arterial Road;
I.
b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
impacts on the wider transport network and
have that ITA peer reviewed;
!
c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
1
d) Requiring the developer to fund all
necessary road network upgrades and
additions;
n
financial impact on the remainder of the
Structure Plan area and including the likely
cost of the required roading upgrades.
1 1

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
49	Juanita Martin	49.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

49.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	Plan provisions, including:
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;
				understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

						and the terferance of the annual terms of the second terms.	
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
50	Jo Austin	50.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		50.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within t wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades a
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of t
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of t
significantly impacts on traffic in other Structure Plan area and including the like
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

ls and
area
port
n
ersely
ovided
to
payers
out of
or
3.2
.3.4
ned
ve uri
:
ive

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

			1		1		1
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
51	Noelle Bryant	51.1	General	Oppose	1.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		51.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
							cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
52	Zachary Pulman- Gaby	52.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

52.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the
				the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	<ul><li>b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;</li><li>c) Cater for the demand generated within the</li></ul>
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires	wider transport network; d) Requiring the developer to fund all
				that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly	necessary road network upgrades and additions;  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
				integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

				1			
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
53	Lisa Pullman	53.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		53.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

			1		1		<del> </del>
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
54	Julie Caddigan	54.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		54.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	·
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						, , ,	cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development. The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
55	Susan Rothery	55.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

55.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the
				the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient	developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
			2.	pattern of transportation and land use.  The impacts on the wider area have not	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
				been adequately considered or addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider	impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;
				transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

			1		1		T
					1	provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
56	Paul Rothery	56.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		56.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund al
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other Structure Plan area and including the likely areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
6.40
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	1		1	1	1		
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
57	Natalie & Dion	57.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Ward-Allen					concerns are addressed.	
		57.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	·
						,	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	•
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4	The staging and sequencing intended for	
					*.	the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	additions,
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						significantly impacts on traine in other	cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
58	Jennifer McKenzie	58.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

58.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the
				the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	<ul><li>b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;</li><li>c) Cater for the demand generated within the</li></ul>
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	wider transport network;  d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

							T
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
59	Ewen Drysdale	59.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		59.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	1	1	T	1			
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
60	Barry Heerdegen	60.1	General	Oppose	1.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		60.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
61	Dianne Heerdegen	61.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

	61.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
		Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
		cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
					the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
					infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
					pattern of transportation and land use.	-
						a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
				2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
					been adequately considered or addressed.	·
						b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
				3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
					not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
					understand the impacts on the wider	
					transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						wider transport network;
				4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
					the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
					that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
					are built prior to development moving as	additions;
					far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
					area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
					integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
					significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
					areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
					sequencing not being adhered to.	
				_		
				5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
					of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
					significant – the development should not	
					go ahead without major upgrades to the	
					full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
					of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

				T			T
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
62	Rebecca Miles	62.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		62.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	1	<u> </u>			1		
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
63	Pae Henry	63.1	General	Oppose	1.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		63.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
							cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
64	Hiipora (Sybil) Nelson	64.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.  1. Decline PC7; or

64.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with the wider network of roads and other	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	Plan provisions, including:
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	<ul><li>b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;</li><li>c) Cater for the demand generated within the</li></ul>
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	wider transport network;  d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;  e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

				1	1		
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
65	Jo & Chris Miles	65.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		65.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

	1		1		1		1
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
66	Lana Miles	66.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
						concerns are addressed.	
		66.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
						, , ,	cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
67	Jane & Dave Sole	67.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

67.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
07.2	Plan/Infrastru	Оррозс		the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
	cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
	0:01.0			the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
				infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
				pattern of transportation and land use.	Tian provisions, melaanig.
				pattern of transportation and land use.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
			2	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
				been adequately considered or addressed.	Willion Alternat Road,
				been adequately considered of addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
			٥.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
				understand the impacts on the wider	nave that in the peer reviewed)
				transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
				transport network and community.	wider transport network;
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	The control of the co
				the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
				that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
				are built prior to development moving as	additions;
				far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	,
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
				integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
				significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
				areas of the Structure Plan due to the	cost of the required roading upgrades.
				sequencing not being adhered to.	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 -
				, 3 3 1 1 1 1	
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section	
				of Exelby Road and its side roads will be	
				significant – the development should not	
				go ahead without major upgrades to the	
				full length of Exelby Road, the intersection	
				of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	
	1	l		o. E. C	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

	1		1	ı			
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
68	Martin & Amanda	68.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Verhoeven			_		concerns are addressed.	
		68.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	a) Dequiring they construct the Detakauri
					2	The impacts on the wider area have not	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri     Minor Arterial Road;
					۷.	The impacts on the wider area have not	ivillioi Arteriai Roau,
						been adequately considered or addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					2	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
					٥.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
		<u> </u>			<u> </u>	not been undertaken to properly	nave that ITA peer reviewed,

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

		1	1	1	1		
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
69	Murray & Sharyn	69.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific	1. Decline PC7; or
	Stewart					concerns are addressed.	
		69.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	
						transport network and community.	c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely
							cost of the required roading upgrades.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide infrastructure in a way that is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost of providing infrastructure to cater for the demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b), 3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport network capacity outside of the PC7 area to support the proposed development.  The proposal does not achieve a sustainable expansion of the city and does not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.
70	Larissa Underhill	70.1	General	Oppose	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.      Decline PC7; or

70.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru cture	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from the Structure Plan will mean the development will not be integrated with	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the
				the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.	developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
			2.	The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;
			3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.	<ul><li>b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;</li><li>c) Cater for the demand generated within the</li></ul>
			4.	The staging and sequencing intended for the current Structure Plan area requires that key arterial roads and intersections are built prior to development moving as far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	wider transport network;  d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;
				area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the financial impact on the remainder of the Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
			5.	The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and	

Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.

10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and mitigation measures addressing new demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading infrastructure (including upgrades of existing) will keep up with development and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to

				1			<del> </del>
						provide infrastructure in a way that is	
						efficient and sustainable from a city-wide	
						perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost	
						of providing infrastructure to cater for the	
						demand that the development will create.	
					16	. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan	
						provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),	
						3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.	
					17	. PC7 does not provide adequate transport	
						network capacity outside of the PC7 area	
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
_						boundaries have not been resolved.	
71	Shane Cowling	71.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		71.2	Structure	Oppose	1.	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
			Plan/Infrastru			the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
						the wider network of roads and other	developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	
							a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2.	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
						been adequately considered or addressed.	
							b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					3.	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
						not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;

understand the impacts on the wider
transport network and community.  c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;
4. The staging and sequencing intended for
the current Structure Plan area requires d) Requiring the developer to fund all
that key arterial roads and intersections necessary road network upgrades and
are built prior to development moving as additions;
far north as the proposed Rotokauri North
area. This proposal will result in a poorly e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
integrated arm of development that financial impact on the remainder of the
significantly impacts on traffic in other  Structure Plan area and including the likely
areas of the Structure Plan due to the cost of the required roading upgrades.
sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section
of Exelby Road and its side roads will be
significant – the development should not
go ahead without major upgrades to the
full length of Exelby Road, the intersection
of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and
Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection,
and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road
indicated in the Structure Plan (and
connections to the east by bridge
underpasses) should be constructed to
take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.
A connection should be made to the
Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new
residents of the Structure Plan area to
utilise public transport. Movement routes
have not been proposed to be integrated

with the surrounding neighbourhoods and
existing and planned networks, and
development of the Rotokauri North area
is premature before these key transport
connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation
effects will have the potential to adversely
impact on land values.
8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided
by the applicant should be expanded to
include the economic impact on ratepayers
due to development being planned out of
sequence with the Structure Plan.
O The health and all like to a fall a
9. The health and wellbeing of the
community will be threatened by poor
road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
increased traver times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2
and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4
and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be
required to integrate with other planned
projects intended to make traffic move
efficiently through the entire Rotokauri
area or intended to create a cohesive
urban pattern.

12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport
Station may be undermined due to the
current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the
existing performance of the road network,
including sightlines from intersections and
accessways, peak flows and flow
proportions, actual vehicle speeds,
pedestrian and cyclist safety, and
mitigation measures addressing new
demand.
14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
infrastructure (including upgrades of
existing) will keep up with development
and be funded by the developer if out of
sequence.
15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
provide infrastructure in a way that is
efficient and sustainable from a city-wide
perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
of providing infrastructure to cater for the
demand that the development will create.
16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
network capacity outside of the PC7 area

			1	T			1
						to support the proposed development.	
						The proposal does not achieve a	
						sustainable expansion of the city and does	
						not represent coherent and integrated	
						development, because the transportation	
						effects beyond the Rotokauri North	
						boundaries have not been resolved.	
72	Kaya MacMillan	72.1	General	Oppose	1.	Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		72.2	Structure	Oppose	1	Removal of the Rotokauri North area from	2. Delete section 3.6d (exemption of PC7 area
		72.2	Plan/Infrastru	Оррозс	1.	the Structure Plan will mean the	from Structure Plan), but approve the
			cture			development will not be integrated with	development subject to requiring the
			cture			the wider network of roads and other	development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure
						infrastructure and will create an inefficient	Plan provisions, including:
						pattern of transportation and land use.	Train provisions, including.
						pattern or transportation and land use.	a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri
					2	The impacts on the wider area have not	Minor Arterial Road;
					۷.	been adequately considered or addressed.	Willor Arterial Road,
						been adequately considered of addressed.	b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses
					2	Adequate integrated traffic modelling has	impacts on the wider transport network and
					٥.	not been undertaken to properly	have that ITA peer reviewed;
						understand the impacts on the wider	nave that ITA peer reviewed,
						·	c) Cater for the demand generated within the
						transport network and community.	wider transport network;
					4.	The staging and sequencing intended for	
						the current Structure Plan area requires	d) Requiring the developer to fund all
						that key arterial roads and intersections	necessary road network upgrades and
						are built prior to development moving as	additions;
						far north as the proposed Rotokauri North	
						area. This proposal will result in a poorly	e) Provide a full economic assessment of the
						integrated arm of development that	financial impact on the remainder of the
						significantly impacts on traffic in other	Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.
				l	<u> </u>		cost of the required roading appraises.

areas of the Structure Plan due to the sequencing not being adhered to.
5. The traffic impacts on the southern section of Exelby Road and its side roads will be significant – the development should not go ahead without major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection of Exelby Road and Rotokauri Road, and Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.
6. The envisaged north-south arterial road indicated in the Structure Plan (and connections to the east by bridge underpasses) should be constructed to take the traffic off southern Exelby Road.  A connection should be made to the Rotokauri Transport Station to enable new residents of the Structure Plan area to utilise public transport. Movement routes have not been proposed to be integrated with the surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned networks, and development of the Rotokauri North area is premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.
7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.

8. The Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant should be expanded to include the economic impact on ratepayers due to development being planned out of sequence with the Structure Plan.
9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.
10. PC7 is inconsistent with Objective 3.3.2 and Policies 3.3.2a-d and Objective 3.3.4 and Policies 3.3.4a-d, f.
11. The development will no longer be required to integrate with other planned projects intended to make traffic move efficiently through the entire Rotokauri area or intended to create a cohesive urban pattern.
12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.
13. An updated ITA is sought that assesses the existing performance of the road network, including sightlines from intersections and accessways, peak flows and flow proportions, actual vehicle speeds, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and

					mitigation measures addressing new
					demand.
					14. The Structure Plan intends that roading
					infrastructure (including upgrades of
					existing) will keep up with development
					and be funded by the developer if out of sequence.
					15. The proposed upgrades of roading within
					the PC7 area will not be sufficient to
					provide infrastructure in a way that is
					efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective and seeks to avoid the full cost
					of providing infrastructure to cater for the
					demand that the development will create.
					16. PC7 is contrary to the Structure Plan
					provisions in 3.6, including 3.6.2.6 b),
					3.6.2.7 b), 3.6.2.9 b), 3.6.2.3, 3.6.3.2.
					17. PC7 does not provide adequate transport
					network capacity outside of the PC7 area
					to support the proposed development.
					The proposal does not achieve a
					sustainable expansion of the city and does
					not represent coherent and integrated development, because the transportation
					effects beyond the Rotokauri North
					boundaries have not been resolved.
73	Stuart & Sue	73.1	General	Oppose	Opposed to zoning change to Medium     Decline PC7.
	McFarlane				Density Residential.

					2 DC7 will develve assuration properties
					2. PC7 will devalue surrounding properties.
					Impacts of noise and dust pollution during development.
					4. Cheaper housing attracts crime.
74	Keith & Jennifer Patterson	74.1	General	Support	<ol> <li>Supports rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential.</li> <li>Approve PC7.</li> </ol>
					2. Increasing difficulty with maintaining land as rural.
					3. PC7 presents an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment before it becomes more fragmented with lifestyle properties.
					4. Affordable housing will benefit the city.
					5. Ideal proximity to employment and Waikato Expressway.
75	Perkins Family Trust (E Robertson, J	75.1	General		<ol> <li>Support rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential.</li> <li>Approve PC7.</li> </ol>
	Marsh & J Patterson)				2. Affordable housing will benefit the city.
	,				3. Ideal proximity to employment and Waikato Expressway.
					4. Farming no longer viable use of the land within the PC7 area.

					5.	PC7 presents an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment before further fragmentation occurs.		
76	Douglas & Jillian Marsh	76.1	General	Support	1.	Support rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential and PC7 concept subject to little or no cost borne by ratepayers of Hamilton and the Council plays a significant role in the on-going process.	1.	Approve PC7.
77	Hamish & Claire Marsh	77.1	General	Support	1.	Support rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential and PC7 concept subject to little or no cost borne by ratepayers of Hamilton and the Council has some control.	1.	Approve PC7.
78 (LATE)	Lorraine van Asbeck	78.1	Transportatio n	Oppose	1.	Concentrated suburban traffic entering directly onto a busy Highway is unsafe and unnecessary, traffic exiting the subdivision could be split to access SH 39, SH 1 and Hamilton City via Exelby and Burbush Roads.	2.	Seeks no direct access onto Te Kowhai Road/SH 39 from the proposed Rotokauri North Subdivision.
					2.	Opposes the Collector Road 1/SH39 intersection – give way sign or future roundabout.		
					3.	A give way sign at the Collector Road 1/SH 39 intersection will make it difficult to access my property and create safety issues. A pull off area would need to be provided, clear of left hand turning traffic from the subdivision.		

					<ol> <li>A roundabout at the Collector Road 1/SH 39 intersection will compromise access to properties 336 and 338 Te Kowhai Road.</li> <li>Increased water run-off from road will increase flooding at front of properties.</li> <li>Increase in noise.</li> <li>Proposed roundabout at the boundary of subdivided land with resultant loss of rural view and lifestyle, noise disturbance and unwanted water runoff, will devalue adjoining private properties.</li> </ol>
79 (LATE)	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	79.1	General	Support	<ol> <li>Supports a co-ordinated, co-operative and collaborative approach.</li> <li>Approve the Rotokauri North Private Pl Change 7, subject to any further amendments the Panel may consider</li> </ol>
	·	79.2	General	Support	1. Supports the objectives and strategies of Te Ture Whaimana through mitigation recommendations contained within the Cultural Impact Assessment.  necessary to reflect and provide for the recommendations of the CIA Report.
		79.3	General	Support	1. Supports that the objectives have been achieved for Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao – Waikato Tainui Environmental Plan through acceptance and mitigation recommendations in the Cultural Impact Assessment.
80 (LATE)	Waikato Regional Council	80.1	General	Support	<ol> <li>Generally supports rezoning the PC7 area, and the creation of a medium-density residential zone.</li> <li>Approve with requested amendments.</li> </ol>

T				_	To Time Milesiane and Tribert and Alexander		
				2.	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato		
					must be given effect to through PC7.		
	80.2	Hydrology	Support with amendm ents	1.	The stormwater design goal for the subject area should be to achieve and demonstrate 'hydraulic neutrality' in a preversus post built scenario. There is no clear information on pre and post development with regard to 'hydraulic neutrality' and potential downstream impacts, including possible backflow impacts on adjacent WRC land drainage assets.  Protecting existing aquatic values in the wider Rotokauri development area will be	2.	Seeks the addition of an objective and policy to highlight issues of the catchment and the need to maintain the current hydrology to protect the existing aquatic values.  Seeks further clarity on how hydraulic neutrality is to be achieved post development.
					dependent on maintaining the existing hydrology (frequency, magnitude, duration and direction of flows) of the broader drainage network.		
				3.	Attenuating and off line percolation of runoff flows from impervious surfaces (through suitably sized, sensitive stormwater design) should be a top priority to minimise the change (frequency, magnitude, duration of peak flows) in existing hydrology as such changes can impact on various life-history aspects (e.g. spawning, migration) of these aquatic organisms.		
	80.3	Biosecurity	Support with	1.	To ensure that there is no unintended infestation of the site, provisions to control	1.	Seeks provisions in the plan change which includes assessment criteria for

		amendm ents		pest plans should be included in the plan change.		earthworks and fill activities to allow the consideration of effects on pest and disease management.
80.4	Transport	Support	1.	Acknowledges there are currently limited public transport services available to PC7 area.	1.	No specific relief sought.
			2.	Supports the measures included in the Integrated Traffic Assessment (Table 13-1) particularly the upgrade of intersections along SH39 and the roundabout between SH39 and Te Kowhai Road		
			3.	Support the consideration of public transport service after 1000 dwellings constructed (Table 13-1).		
80.5	Transport	Support with amendm ents	1.	Generally, the ITA assumes a status quo split of transport modes and does not have sufficient accommodation for walking and cycling.	1.	Seeks clarification on how walking & cycling are being handled throughout the development particularly at intersections and connections outside the PC7 area.
			2.	It would be useful to include consideration of how students will travel to schools.	2.	Seeks consideration of if the level of walking and cycling provision is sufficient to cater for increased mode shift to active modes in the future.
80.6	Climate change and hazards - Infrastructure	Support with amendm ents	1.	The information supporting the plan change does not provide clear information relating to the climate change scenarios used as part of all assessments (flooding and stormwater, catchment management). There has been no input from local and	1.	Seeks clarification on climate change scenarios used as part of assessments for flooding, stormwater and catchment management.

		group CDEM on the proposed development areas and impact on emergency management.	