
Further Submission on Private Plan Change 7 Rotokauri North to the Hamilton City District Plan

To: Plan Change 7 Further Submissions
Freepost 172189
City Planning Unit
Hamilton City Council
Private Bag 3010
Hamilton 3240
districtplan@hcc.govt.nz

Introduction:

1. This is a further submission on Private Plan Change 7 Rotokauri North ("PPC 7") to the operative Hamilton City Council Operative District Plan ("HCDP") made by Green Seed Consultants Limited ("GSCL").
2. GSCL is the proponent of the private plan change request pursuant to clause 21 of the First Schedule to the RMA that has been notified as PPC 7.
3. GSCL made submission (Submissions #35) on the notified version of PPC 7.
4. This further submission is made on behalf of GSCL **IN SUPPORT OF** Submissions 2, 3 (in part), 4-6, 13 (in part), 15, 17-24, 35, 74-77 and 79.
5. This further submission is made on behalf of GSCL **IN OPPOSITION TO** Submissions 1, 7-10, 12, 13 (in part), 14, 16, 25-34, 36-73, 78, 80, insofar as those submissions oppose PPC 7 or seek that the text of PPC 7 be subject to substantive changes if it is approved, as outlined in the table attached as Attachment A.
6. The submissions which GSCL wishes to make a further submission on and the reasons for its further submission are outlined at paragraphs 9 and 11 below.

Interest in the Submission:

7. In accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 8(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA" or "Act") GSCL has an interest in PPC 7 that is greater than the interest that the general public has, in that GSCL has an interest in land within the area of PPC 7.
8. GSCL could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this further submission.

Reasons for supporting the primary submissions supported by GSCL:

9. GSCL **SUPPORTS** the further submissions identified in paragraph 4 above on the basis that approving PPC 7 in its current form, as sought by these submitters, represents the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA and is consistent with and promotes the purpose of the RMA insofar as PPC 7 will:
- (a) Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community in the Waikato region and meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.
- (b) Appropriately give effect to higher order planning documents, including the objectives of the Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato (the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River).
- (c) Appropriately address cultural matters. In this regard, the applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation (and been an active participant at meetings with) the Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group which is made up of mandated representatives from each of the Waikato-Tainui hapuu within the vicinity of the project, they being: Ngaati Mahanga, Ngaati Hauaa, Ngaati Tamaiunapo, Ngaati Wairere, Ngaati Reko - Waikeri Marae and Te Uri o Mahanga. The ongoing relationship has resulted in the preparation of a Cultural Impact Assessment which identifies key area and associated principles for issues relating to the management of natural and physical resources. The CIA has been agreed with the TWWG to be a "living document" so that it can be updated throughout the process to address any additional matters that may arise.
10. Other specific reasons are outlined in Attachment A.

Reasons for opposing the primary submissions opposed by GSCL:

11. GSCL **OPPOSES** the submissions identified in paragraph 5 and Attachment A, for the following reasons:
- (a) The relief sought is contrary to the primary submissions that GSCL supports, GSCL does not support any changes being made to the PPC 7 as proposed, except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the PPC 7 applicant.
- (b) The PPC includes adequate provision for infrastructure to service development is made through key infrastructure rules and assessments, to mitigate potential effects of the development.

Reasons for Neutral further submissions

12. Several neutral submissions have been identified in Attachment A for relief sought which is generally considered to be areas of neither agreement or disagreement, but in recognition that these processes and/or relief sought are more appropriate to be dealt with outside of the PC7 process.

Request to be heard in Support of Further Submission:

13. GSCL wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
14. GSCL will consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others make a similar submission.

Renee Fraser-Smith (authorised agent)
For Green Seed Consultants Ltd
c/- Tollemache Consultants Ltd
PO Box 52015, Kingsland, Auckland

renee@tollemache.co

027 238 2937

Proposed Plan Change 7: Further Submissions (Green Seed Consultants Limited)

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
1	Gary Martin & Maree Leet	1.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Drafting opposed but no alternative provided. 	Oppose	The land has been earmarked for future growth. The Section 32 analysis has provided sufficient justification as to the alternatives and reasons why the medium density zone is the most appropriate. Seeking higher density zoning than provided for in PC7 will require resource consent and/or a further plan change, which the submitter will be able to participate in as appropriate.
		1.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks amendments to the plan change to enhance and protect existing amenity of the area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks greater clarity on how subdivision objective 23.2.2 applies to enhancing and maintaining existing amenity. Seeks inclusion of a 25m setback from road (SH39) in the form of a greenbelt. Seeks retention and protection of existing significant/mature trees. Seeks clarity on the timing of development, and potential for deferral. Opposes potential for use of poor quality building cladding. 	Oppose	The land has been earmarked for future growth. The existing environment is rural, as such the current existing environment will change and has always been anticipated to change to an urban environment through the Hamilton City Council and Waikato Regional Council planning documents. It is not appropriate to maintain the existing rural character or amenities.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
3	Ministry of Education	3.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposed development in Rotokauri North as it will provide much needed housing for Hamilton. The key elements of interest include the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 137ha Medium Density Residential zone to enable up to 2000 residential units; and 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks continued engagement with Council and the developer, particularly in relation to staging and timing of development. That walking and cycling connections are provided for to enable a co-ordinated approach in safely accessing all forms of housing and social infrastructure. 	Support in part	Support the submission in so far as it supports PC7 and that the current provisions of PC7 (combined with the operative provisions of the HCC DP) will enable the appropriate co-ordination of walking and cycling connections.
13	NZ Transport Agency	13.1	1. Supports proposed Policy 3.6A.2.4d, proposed Objective 3.6A.2.5, and proposed Policy 3.6A.2.5a.	No specific relief sought	Support	Support Submission as it aligns with PC7.
		13.2	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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks insertion of a new policy to support Objective 3.6A.2.4: <u>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</u> 	Support in part Oppose in part	The effects on the state highway network from any new intersection can be adequately addressed by existing Hamilton City District Plan methods (objectives, policies and rules) as the creation of any new roads triggers a restricted discretionary activity resource consent under Rule 25.14.3.

Original Submission				Further Submission		
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
				<p><u>Figure 2-8A Rotokauri North Structure Plan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New State Highway 39 and Collector Road 1 intersection;</u> • <u>Existing State Highway 39 and Exelby Road intersection;</u> • <u>Existing State Highway 39 and Burbush Road intersection; and</u> • <u>The mid-block sections of State Highway 39 between these intersections.</u> <p>2. 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.</p>		<p>Furthermore, the PC7 provisions require further ITA's (in conjunction with the existing District Plan provisions in 25.14.3 and 25.14.4.3). These methods will ensure that effects on the State Highway network are appropriately managed.</p> <p>Combined, the PC7 provisions and existing District Plan methods are considered suitable to address the concerns of the submitter, without the need for inclusion of the additional policy proposed by the submitter.</p>
		13.3	<p>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</p>	<p>1. Seeks the following amendments to proposed Rule 3.6A.4.2 d):</p> <p>d) Transport</p> <p>i. <u>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).</u></p>	Oppose	<p>With respect to the new (i):</p> <p>It is inappropriate for a planning rule to refer to the NZTA standards which the Territorial Authority has no jurisdiction over or to assess or approve. This is a third-party arrangement and is addressed by s176 of the RMA.</p> <p>The identified Stage 1 area may require a roundabout (regardless of timing) to accommodate full build out of the PC7</p>

Original Submission				Further Submission		
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			<p>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.</p>	<p>...</p> <p><u>iv. A two-way cycle path shall be provided prior to the occupation of any new dwelling or unit and shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>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</u> • <u>Include appropriate safe and convenient provision for cyclists crossing Burbush Road (or Minor Arterial Road) and Collector Road 1.</u> <p><u>v. The ITA is to include evidence of consultation with the NZ Transport Agency and how any feedback from them has been addressed.</u></p>		<p>area, however this would be for full build out. As such it is not appropriate to limit the occupation of dwellings.</p> <p>With respect to the new (iv):</p> <p>It is unreasonable for Waka Kotahi to require a cycleway but at the same time require it not be Waka Kotahi infrastructure.</p> <p>Adherence to this would require works over land which is not owned by the plan change applicant and a such the applicant would have no way of implementing this rule. It does not meet any section 32 justification for being an efficient or appropriate way of achieving relevant objectives and policies from the District Plan. It is not uncommon for large developments to stage infrastructure to match development stages which is the intent with the development of Rotokauri North.</p> <p>With respect to the new (v):</p> <p>This is already a requirement under the District Plan for ITA's. This does not need to be repeated in Chapter 3.</p>

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
		13.4	1. To ensure that the development of the PC7 area provides opportunities for residents to utilise the wider cycling network, the Transport Agency seeks an amendment to Rule 3.6A.4.2 d) requiring the provision of a cycling path to be located within the PC7 area adjacent to the SH 39 road reserve (not within the SH 39 road corridor). The cycle way should connect between the SH 39/Proposed Collector 1 intersection and the State Highway 39/Burbush Road roundabout and include appropriate safe and convenient provision for cyclists crossing Burbush Road (or Minor Arterial Road) and			Furthermore, the applicant has been advised that Waka Kotahi have obtained a designation for SH39. This provides Waka Kotahi with the necessary assurance that all works will require approvals under s176 of the RMA. This function does not need to be duplicated in determining PC7.
					As for 13.3 above	As for 13.3 above.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			Collector Road 1. A consequential amendment will be required to Appendix 2, Figure 2-8A to provide an indicative location for this cycle way.			
		13.5	1. Supports use of an ITA to assess subsequent stages of development. Seeks amendment to Rule 3.6A.4.2 d) to require consultation with the Transport Agency as part of preparation of an ITA.		As for 13.3 above	As for 13.3 above.
		13.6	1. On the basis that the proposed amendments to Rule 3.6A.4.2 are adopted, additional assessment criteria are also 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	1. Seeks the following amendments to the assessment criteria in 3.6A.4.3 b): 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 <u>State Highway 39</u> . 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, <u>including State Highway 39</u> .	Oppose	As this relief is linked to the above sought relief, the above comments are relevant.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			with the relevant roading authorities.	<p>ix. <u>Effects of additional traffic on the intersections identified below and any mitigation proposed to address those effects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intersection of State Highway 39/Exelby Road; and</u> • <u>Intersection of State Highway 39/Te Kowhai Road/Minor Arterial Road intersection.</u> <p>x. Whether there are alternative off-road active transport mode connection(s) which can provide an accessible and safe connection to the wider walking and cycling network.</p>		
		13.7	1. Does not support the additional collector access connection to SH 39 and seeks that this be removed.	<p>1. Seeks amendment to Figure 2-8A to remove the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.</p> <p>2. Seeks any consequential amendments to PPC7 to remove any provision for the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.</p>	Neutral	<p>The applicant considers that implementation of the relief sought by Waka Kotahi would have further consequential amendments to the Structure Plan layout which have not been identified by the submitter but are likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the collector road in full. It is pointless only deleting the intersection and terminating the road at a cul-de sac. • Likely need to include a new east-west connection for key movement though Rotokauri North.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other changes to the roading network not identified.
14	Jennifer McKenzie & Ewen Drysdale	14.1	<p>1. Exelby Road is unable to cope with extra/large volumes of traffic generated from PC7 without major roading upgrades.</p> <p>1. Exelby Road has dangerous intersections, hazardous corners, and hills with no visibility.</p>	1. Seeks requirement for Exelby Road upgrade.	Oppose	Refer to comments for submissions 7- 10, 12, 16, 25-33, 37-72.
		14.2	Proposed housing typology will result in devaluing of property and increase in crime.	2. Increase policing in the Rotokauri North area to deal with crime.	Oppose	This is not an RMA issue.
		14.3	2. Construction will generate noise, dust and traffic.	3. No specific relief sought.	Oppose	Construction noise, dust and traffic are controlled by existing District Plan rules.
		14.4	1. Pollution and removal of existing trees will contribute to global warming.	1. No specific relief sought.	Oppose	Removal of trees which are not scheduled is permitted by the existing District Plan rules.
		14.5	1. Loss of 'ruralness' of area	1. No specific relief sought.	Oppose	The land has been earmarked for future growth. The existing environment is rural, as such the current existing environment will change and has always been anticipated to change to an urban environment through the Hamilton City Council and Waikato Regional Council planning documents. It is not appropriate

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
						to maintain the existing rural character or amenities.
15	Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group	15.1	1. Supports recommendations within the Cultural Impact Assessment report prepared by the Rotokauri North Tangata Whenua Working Group.	1. 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.	Support	The applicant is committed to its continued engagement with the TWWG and the outcomes reflected in the CIA.
34	Richard Ruske	34.1	1. Supports PC7 and its intention to deliver residential development in the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area.	1. Approve PC7 with amendments.	Support in part Oppose in part	Support relief to approve PC7, however, amendments sought by submitter conflict with the primary submissions of GSCL as detail below.
		34.2	1. Supports rezoning of Rotokauri North Structure Plan area from Future Urban to Medium Residential. 2. Supports insertion of the RNSP into the ODP. 3. The MDRZ provisions proposed in the RNSP are supported.	1. Seeks to rezone the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area to a combination of Medium Density Residential and Business Zone 6 (Neighbourhood Centre).	Support in part Oppose in part	Support relief to approve PC7, however, amendments sought by submitter conflict with the primary submissions of GSCL as detail below.
		34.3	1. PC7 does not identify the future reserve shown in the Rotokauri Structure Plan resulting in uncertainty over the future boundary conditions.	2. Seeks clarity on the interface of the proposed zoning and whether PC7 enables or precludes this future reserve area.	Oppose	It is not appropriate to zone for reserves ahead of land purchased and/or vested. These can be duly managed through the subdivision process.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
		34.4	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.	Oppose	The Proposed Rotokauri North Structure Plan is not required to “replicate” features of the operative Rotokauri Structure Plan as this is a “replacement” Plan. Community facilities can be accommodated in the proposed Business 6 zoning and/or any future reserves.
		34.5	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.	Oppose	The Proposed Rotokauri North Structure Plan is not required to “replicate” features of the operative Rotokauri Structure Plan as this is a “replacement” Plan.
		34.6	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. 2. There is insufficient information to determine if upsizing of infrastructure will cater for wider network growth.	1. Seeks clarity on how PC7 provides for connectivity of infrastructure to adjacent and/or upstream land 2. Seeks a more detailed understanding of catchment wide servicing to enable residential development beyond the boundaries of the PC7 area.	Oppose	The potential for upstream capacities (once that land is rezoned in the future) for three waters infrastructure have been addressed.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			3. 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.			
36	Bo Ram Yu	36.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned that proposal will result in his property being blocked off from direct access to SH 39. 2. PC7 should be consistent with the Rotokauri Structure Plan regarding future access of SH39. 3. Requests a local road be developed to provide access other than from SH 39. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow future vehicle access from SH39; or 2. Seeks PC7 include the requirement for a local road to be developed to provide access to 301 Te Kowhai Road from adjoining lots. 	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Rotokauri North Structure Plan is not required to “replicate” features of the operative Rotokauri Structure Plan as this is a “replacement” Plan.</p> <p>Local road connections are not required to be shown on the Structure Plan. The PC7 provisions sufficiently address future connectivity through avoidance of rear lots and cul-de-sac's which drive an interconnected roading pattern across the area which can be achieved and addressed through the subdivision process.</p>
73	Stuart and Sue McFarlane	73.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposed to zoning change to Medium Density Residential. 2. PC7 will devalue surrounding properties. 3. Impacts of noise and dust pollution during development. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decline PC7. 	Oppose	<p>The land has been earmarked for future growth. The existing environment is rural, as such the current existing environment will change and has always been anticipated to change to an urban environment through the Hamilton City Council and Waikato Regional Council planning documents.</p>

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			4. Cheaper housing attracts crime.			
78 (LA TE)	Lorraine van Asbeck	78.1	<p>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.</p> <p>2. Opposes the Collector Road 1/SH39 intersection – give way sign or future roundabout.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. A roundabout at the Collector Road 1/SH 39 intersection will compromise access to</p>	1. Seeks no direct access onto Te Kowhai Road/SH 39 from the proposed Rotokauri North Subdivision.	Oppose	Safe access can be provided onto SH39. Final detail is subject to resource consents for design and approvals from Waka Kotahi under s176 of the RMA.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			<p>properties 336 and 338 Te Kowhai Road.</p> <p>5. Increased water run-off from road will increase flooding at front of properties.</p> <p>6. Increase in noise.</p> <p>7. 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.</p>			
79 (LA TE)	Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated	79.1	1. Supports a co-ordinated, co-operative and collaborative approach.	1. Approve the Rotokauri North Private Plan Change 7, subject to any further amendments the Panel may consider necessary to reflect and provide for the recommendations of the CIA Report.	Support	The applicant is committed to its continued engagement with the TWWG and the outcomes reflected in the CIA to achieve the objectives for Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao – Waikato Tainui Environmental Plan.
		79.2	1. Supports the objectives and strategies of Te Ture Whaimana through mitigation recommendations contained within the Cultural Impact Assessment.			
		79.3	1. Supports that the objectives have been achieved for Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao – Waikato Tainui Environmental Plan through			

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			acceptance and mitigation recommendations in the Cultural Impact Assessment.			
80 (LA TE)	Waikato Regional Council	80.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supports rezoning the PC7 area, and the creation of a medium-density residential zone. Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato must be given effect to through PC7. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approve with requested amendments. 	Neutral	Refer to below comments.
		80.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The stormwater design goal for the subject area should be to achieve and demonstrate 'hydraulic neutrality' in a pre-versus 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 dependent on maintaining the existing hydrology 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Oppose	<p>Matters pertaining to stormwater design and discharge outcomes (including effects) are subject to the Waikato Regional Council consenting process for Stormwater Discharge, which are assessed by the Waikato Regional Council under all statutory and non-statutory documents including but not limited to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020, the Waikato Regional Plan and Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.</p> <p>The matters raised in the submission can be addressed through the regional consenting process which is not subject to (and will occur following) PC7.</p>

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			<p>(frequency, magnitude, duration and direction of flows) of the broader drainage network.</p> <p>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.</p>			
		80.3	1. To ensure that there is no unintended infestation of the site, provisions to control pest plants should be included in the plan change.	1. Seeks provisions in the plan change which includes assessment criteria for earthworks and fill activities to allow the consideration of effects on pest and disease management.	Oppose	PC7 relies on the operative District Plan provisions for earthworks. This matter should be dealt with by Hamilton City Council on a district wide basis as this is a district wide issue not just for PC7.
		80.4	1. Acknowledges there are currently limited public transport services available to PC7 area.	1. No specific relief sought.	Neutral	Neutral submission as there is no relief specified.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			<p>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</p> <p>3. Supports the consideration of public transport service after 1000 dwellings constructed (Table 13-1).</p>			
		80.5	<p>1. Generally, the ITA assumes a status quo split of transport modes and does not have sufficient accommodation for walking and cycling.</p> <p>2. It would be useful to include consideration of how students will travel to schools.</p>	<p>1. Seeks clarification on how walking & cycling are being handled throughout the development particularly at intersections and connections outside the PC7 area.</p> <p>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.</p>	Neutral	Design of intersections for pedestrian and cycling is a resource consent and engineering approval matter and not one that requires consideration at Plan Change level.
		80.6	<p>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</p>	<p>1. Seeks clarification on climate change scenarios used as part of assessments for flooding, stormwater and catchment management.</p>	Neutral	Climate change has been taken into consideration in the ICMP, and will continue to be taken into consideration (through adherence to the Waikato Technical Specifications) at design stages. No further information is needed at Plan Change stage.

Original Submission					Further Submission	
Sub #	Submitter name(s)	Point	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought	Oppose / Support	Reasons
			been no input from local and group CDEM on the proposed development areas and impact on emergency management.			

Original Submissions 7- 10, 12, 16, 25-33, 37-72		Further Submission	
Submission/Relief Sought		Support/ Oppose	Reason
1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.		Oppose	Refer to commentary below.
<p>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.</p> <p>2. The impacts on the wider area have not been adequately considered or addressed.</p> <p>3. Adequate integrated traffic modelling has not been undertaken to properly understand the impacts on the wider transport network and community.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>1. Decline PC7; or</p> <p>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:</p> <p>a) Requiring they construct the Rotokauri Minor Arterial Road;</p> <p>b) Provide an ITA that adequately assesses impacts on the wider transport network and have that ITA peer reviewed;</p> <p>c) Cater for the demand generated within the wider transport network;</p> <p>d) Requiring the developer to fund all necessary road network upgrades and additions;</p> <p>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.</p>	Oppose	<p>Effects on the wider network (including necessary upgrades to roads) can be addressed by individual and cumulative stages of development (including though the provision of future ITAs, which are required by the existing operative District Plan provisions). The existing operative District Plan provisions relating to the transport network and subdivision adequately provide for the assessment of wider transport effects (and facilitate the identification and necessity for any works to mitigate such traffic effects).</p> <p>The infrastructure necessary to achieve the development within the PC7 area is expected to be constructed as part of development with it the Rotokauri North area (as per the requirements of the infrastructure staging in Chapter 3.3A for Rotokauri North).</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. The unmanaged wider transportation effects will have the potential to adversely impact on land values.</p> <p>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.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>9. The health and wellbeing of the community will be threatened by poor road safety, noise and vibration, and increased travel times.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>12. The viability of the Rotokauri Transport Station may be undermined due to the current sequencing.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>15. The proposed upgrades of roading within the PC7 area will not be sufficient to provide</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
--	--	--	--