



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)	Submission point	Subject	Oppose / Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision sought
1	Gary Martin & Maree Leet	1.1	Medium Density	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned with potential effects on their property from proposed medium density housing. 2. 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks amendments to the plan change to enhance and protect existing amenity of the area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks greater clarity on how subdivision objective 23.2.2 applies to enhancing and maintaining existing amenity. 2. Seeks inclusion of a 25m setback from road (SH39) in the form of a greenbelt. 3. Seeks retention and protection of existing significant/mature trees. 4. Seeks clarity on the timing of development, and potential for deferral. 5. Opposes potential for use of poor quality building cladding.

2	Brian & Eleanor Robertson	2.1	General	Support	1. Provides much needed affordable housing in the north-west and close to the expressway	1. Approve PC7.
3	Ministry of Education	3.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports the proposed development in Rotokauri North as it will provide much needed housing for Hamilton.</p> <p>2. The key elements of interest include the:</p> <p>a) Approximately 137ha Medium Density Residential zone to enable up to 2000 residential units; and</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks continued engagement with Council and the developer, particularly in relation to staging and timing of development.</p> <p>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.</p>
4	Sung Ho Jung & HA Rim Jung	4.1	General	Support	1. Support PC7.	2. Approve PC7.
5	Philip Laird	5.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 in its current form.</p> <p>2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. 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</p>	<p>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed including retention of:</p> <p>a) The extent of the Medium Density Residential zone & Business 6 zone;</p> <p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p> <p>c) The PC7 specific provisions, including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p>

					<p>Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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', 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. 	<p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
6	Chris Laird	6.1	General	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports PC7 in its current form. 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 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. 4. 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. 5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed including retention of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

					<p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>7. 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.</p>	
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/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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>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 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>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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					<p>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 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>	
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 area from Structure Plan), but approve the development subject to requiring the developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:
		8.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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,

					<p>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 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>	
9	Dennis Dove & Diane Godden	9.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	<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>
		9.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	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.	

					<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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					<p>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 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>	
10	Arie & Batami Pundak	10.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	<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>
		10.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>premature before these key transport connections have been constructed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					effects beyond the Rotokauri North boundaries have not been resolved.	
11	Miranda Collinson	11.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or 2. Delete section 3.6d (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:
		11.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 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 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
12	Rob & Barbara Barris	12.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		12.2	Structure Plan/Infrastru	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

			<p>cture/Transport</p>		<p>the wider network of roads and other infrastructure and will create an inefficient pattern of transportation and land use.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. 	<p>developer to adhere to all existing Structure Plan provisions, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	--	------------------------	--	--	--

					<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 infrastructure in a way that is</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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>	
13	NZ Transport Agency	13.1	Structure Plan	Support	1. Supports proposed Policy 3.6A.2.4d, proposed Objective 3.6A.2.5, and proposed Policy 3.6A.2.5a.	1. No specific relief sought
		13.2	Structure Plan/Transport	Support with amendments	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.	<p>1. Seeks insertion of a new policy to support Objective 3.6A.2.4:</p> <p><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 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;</u> and • <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>
		13.3	Structure Plan/Transport	Support with amendments	<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 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>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> <p>ii. <u>Prior to any development beyond Stage One occurring, an Integrated</u></p>

		13.4	Structure Plan/Transport	Support with amendments	<p>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 Collector Road 1. A consequential amendment will be required to Appendix 2, Figure 2-8A to provide an indicative location for this cycle way.</p>	<p>Transport Assessment (ITA) report prepared by a suitably independent, experienced and qualified person shall be submitted with any resource consent application for such development (as required by Rule 25.14.4.3). The purpose of the ITA is to identify the number of lots/dwellings that can be developed beyond Stage One, prior to the construction of the strategic transport corridors identified below.</p> <p><i>Note: it is acknowledged that as a staged development the construction of the strategic transport corridors may not necessarily be required at the same time, therefore the “triggering” of specific thresholds identified in the ITA may be dependent on the sequence of staging.</i></p>
		13.5	Structure Plan/Transport	Support with amendments	<p>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.</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>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</p>

						<p>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.</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>
		13.6	Structure Plan/Transport	Support with	1. On the basis that the proposed amendments to Rule 3.6A.4.2 are adopted, additional assessment criteria are also	Seeks the following amendments to the assessment criteria in 3.6A.4.3 b):

				<p>amendments</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p><u>ix. 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	Structure Plan/Figures	Support with amendments	1. Does not support the additional collector access connection to SH 39 and seek that this be removed.	1. Seeks amendment to Figure 2-8A to remove the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39. 2. Seeks any consequential amendments to PPC7 to remove any provision for the proposed additional collector access connection to SH 39.
		13.8	City Wide	Support	1. Supports proposed Rule 25.14.4.1 k)ii. and proposed assessment criteria 1.3.3 O1 a).	1. No specific relief sought
14	Jennifer McKenzie & Ewen Drysdale	14.1	Transport	Oppose	1. Exelby Road is unable to cope with extra/large volumes of traffic generated from PC7 without major roading upgrades. 2. Exelby Road has dangerous intersections, hazardous corners, and hills with no visibility.	1. Seeks requirement for Exelby Road upgrade.
		14.2	General	Oppose	1. Proposed housing typology will result in devaluing of property and increase in crime.	1. Increase policing in the Rotokauri North area to deal with crime.
		14.3	General	Oppose	1. Construction will generate noise, dust and traffic.	1. No specific relief sought.
		14.4	General	Oppose	1. Pollution and removal of existing trees will contribute to global warming.	1. No specific relief sought.
		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	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.
16	Peter & Kerry Santner	16.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		16.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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.</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>	
17	Jianfeng Zhou	17.1	General	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports PC7 in its current form. 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 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. 4. Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The extent of the Medium Density Residential zone & 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..

					<p>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.</p> <p>5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.</p> <p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
18	Qiong Yang	18.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 in its current form.</p> <p>2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned</p>	<p>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:</p> <p>a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;</p> <p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p> <p>c) The PC7 specific provisions, including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p>

					<p>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.</p> <p>5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.</p> <p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
19	Lily Investments 372 Exelby Road	19.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 in its current form.</p> <p>2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:</p> <p>a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;</p> <p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p> <p>c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p>

					<p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.</p> <p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
20	Lily Investments 265	20.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 in its current form.</p> <p>2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:</p> <p>a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;</p> <p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p> <p>c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk</p>

					<p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.</p> <p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p> <p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
21	Green Seed Holdings Ltd 350 Exelby Road	21.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 in its current form.</p> <p>2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2.</p> <p>3. PC7 is in alignment with the National Policy Statement Urban Development Capacity, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,</p>	<p>1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of:</p> <p>2. a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;</p> <p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p>

					<p>and the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 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. 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. 	<p>c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p> <p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
22	Green seed Holding Ltd 335 Te Kowhai Road	22.1	General	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports PC7 in its current form. 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone;

					<p>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.</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA.</p> <p>6. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>b) The Rotokauri North Structure Plan; and</p> <p>c) The PC7 specific provisions including its integrated subdivision, urban design, bulk and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing.</p> <p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
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:

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 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. 4. 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. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 and location rules package, and including requirements for affordable housing. <p>2. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

24	Charles Ma	24.1	General	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports PC7 in its current form. 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 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. 4. 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. 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including retention of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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.
----	------------	------	---------	---------	---	---

					plans, and achieves a better urban design and amenity outcome.	
25	Kay & Mark Moroney	25.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		25.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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>

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

					<p>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 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>	
26	Tania Browning	26.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		26.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	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:

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

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

					<p>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 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>	
27	Judith Browning	27.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		27.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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>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 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>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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

					<ol style="list-style-type: none">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	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

28	Ann Harvey	28.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		28.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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 major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection</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>

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

					<p>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 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>	
29	Shane & Antonia Withey	29.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		29.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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>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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					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.	
30	Nilesh Kumar & Raksha Singh	30.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		30.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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</p>

					<p>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 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>Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.</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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 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>	
31	Shane & Virginia Henderson	31.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		31.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	---	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 Whittaker	33.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		33.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
34	Richard Ruske	34.1	General	Support	<p>1. Supports PC7 and its intention to deliver residential development in the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area.</p>	<p>1. Approve PC7 with amendments.</p>

		34.2	Structure Plan	Support	<p>1. Supports rezoning of Rotokauri North Structure Plan area from Future Urban to Medium Residential.</p> <p>2. Supports insertion of the RNSP into the ODP.</p> <p>3. The MDRZ provisions proposed in the RNSP are supported.</p>	<p>1. Seeks to rezone the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area to a combination of Medium Density Residential and Business Zone 6 (Neighbourhood Centre).</p>
		34.3	Future reserve	Neutral	<p>1. PC7 does not identify the future reserve shown in the Rotokauri Structure Plan resulting in uncertainty over the future boundary conditions.</p>	<p>1. Seeks clarity on the interface of the proposed zoning and whether PC7 enables or precludes this future reserve area.</p>
		34.4	Community Focal Point	Neutral	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks clarity on the potential delivery mechanism of the community focal point.</p>
		34.5	Transport infrastructure	Oppose	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks the collector road shown in the Rotokauri Structure Plan to be provided as it provides key linkages to network infrastructure.</p>
		34.6	Three water Infrastructure	Neutral	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. Seeks clarity on how PC7 provides for connectivity of infrastructure to adjacent and/or upstream land</p>

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is insufficient information to determine if upsizing of infrastructure will cater for wider network growth. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports PC7 in its current form. 2. PC7 will promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is not contrary to Part 2. 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. 4. Accords with and will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA. 5. The applicant has undertaken ongoing consultation with hapuu representatives. 6. Although 'out of sequence' for the development of future urban zoned greenfield land, PC7 ensures adequate 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks approval of PC7 as proposed, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The extent of the Medium Residential zone & Business 6 zone; 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 affordable housing. 2. Any other consequential changes necessary to satisfy the relief sought by the submitter. 3. Seeks to amend PC7 to incorporate a rear lane vehicle access duplex acceptable solution typology in the permitted activity standards, rules and

					<p>provision for infrastructure ensuring alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement, Future Proof, The Waikato Plan and Hamilton urban growth documents.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8. Design testing undertaken by the applicant has identified that the permitted activity provisions for duplex dwellings require amendment to allow alternative forms of design.</p>	<p>design which require amendment to Rule 4.7.12 and the Rotokauri North Acceptable Solutions Code contained in 4.14.</p> <p>4. Opposes any changes being made to PC7 except where those changes are agreed to and supported by the applicant.</p>
		35.2	Residential	Support with amendm ents	<p>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).</p>	<p>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.</p>
36	Bo Ram Yu	36.1	General	Supports with amendm ents	<p>1. Concerned that proposal will result in his property being blocked off from direct access to SH 39.</p> <p>2. PC7 should be consistent with the Rotokauri Structure Plan regarding future access of SH39.</p>	<p>1. Allow future vehicle access from SH39; or</p> <p>2. Seeks PC7 include the requirement for a local road to be developed to provide access to 301 Te Kowhai Road from adjoining lots.</p>

					3. Requests a local road be developed to provide access other than from SH 39.	
37	David and Cathy Dewes	37.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	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:
		37.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure/Transport	Oppose	<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</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>

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

					<p>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 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>	
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/Infrastructure	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:

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

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 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>	
39	Gerard Guzzo	39.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		39.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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>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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

					<ol style="list-style-type: none">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	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

40	Peter & Julie Caddingan	40.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		40.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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 major upgrades to the full length of Exelby Road, the intersection</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>

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

					<p>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 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>	
41	Josh & Michaela Gill	41.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		41.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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>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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					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 concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		42.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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</p>

					<p>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 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>Structure Plan area and including the likely cost of the required roading upgrades.</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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 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>	
43	K E Benson	43.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		43.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		45.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
46	Julie Caddigan	46.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		46.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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.	
48	Steven Powell	48.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		48.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
49	Juanita Martin	49.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		49.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		51.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
52	Zachary Pulman-Gaby	52.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		52.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		54.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
55	Susan Rothery	55.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		55.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 Ward-Allen	57.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		57.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
58	Jennifer McKenzie	58.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		58.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		60.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
61	Dianne Heerdegen	61.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		61.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
62	Rebecca Miles	62.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		62.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		63.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
64	Hiipora (Sybil) Nelson	64.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		64.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		66.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
67	Jane & Dave Sole	67.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		67.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
68	Martin & Amanda Verhoeven	68.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		68.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 Stewart	69.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or
		69.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
70	Larissa Underhill	70.1	General	Oppose	1. Oppose PC7 in its entirety unless specific concerns are addressed.	1. Decline PC7; or

		70.2	Structure Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 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 	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
--	--	------	-------------------------------	--------	---	---

					<p>Exelby Road and Lee Road intersection, and Rotokauri Road down to Nawton.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>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.</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>	
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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<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</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>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 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</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>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

					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 Plan/Infrastructure	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 area. This proposal will result in a poorly integrated arm of development that significantly impacts on traffic in other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.

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

					<p>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 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>	
73	Stuart & Sue McFarlane	73.1	General	Oppose	1. Opposed to zoning change to Medium Density Residential.	1. Decline PC7.

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. PC7 will devalue surrounding properties. 3. Impacts of noise and dust pollution during development. 4. Cheaper housing attracts crime. 	
74	Keith & Jennifer Patterson	74.1	General	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve PC7.
75	Perkins Family Trust (E Robertson, J Marsh & J Patterson)	75.1	General		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support rezoning from Future Urban to Medium Density Residential. 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve PC7.

					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	Transportation	Oppose	<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>1. Seeks no direct access onto Te Kowhai Road/SH 39 from the proposed Rotokauri North Subdivision.</p> <p>2.</p>

					<p>4. A roundabout at the Collector Road 1/SH 39 intersection will compromise access to 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 (LATE)	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	79.1	General	Support	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.
		79.2	General	Support	1. Supports the objectives and strategies of Te Ture Whaimana through mitigation recommendations contained within the Cultural Impact Assessment.	
		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	1. Generally supports rezoning the PC7 area, and the creation of a medium-density residential zone.	1. Approve with requested amendments.

					2. Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato must be given effect to through PC7.	
		80.2	Hydrology	Support with amendments	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. Protecting existing aquatic values in the wider Rotokauri development area will be dependent on maintaining the existing hydrology (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>	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. Seeks further clarity on how hydraulic neutrality is to be achieved post development.</p>
		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

				amendments	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledges there are currently limited public transport services available to PC7 area. 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). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No specific relief sought.
		80.5	Transport	Support with amendments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, the ITA assumes a status quo split of transport modes and does not have sufficient accommodation for walking and cycling. 2. It would be useful to include consideration of how students will travel to schools. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeks clarification on how walking & cycling are being handled throughout the development particularly at intersections and connections outside the PC7 area. 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 amendments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--