

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
1.01	p2, s4	The submitter supports the NOR and would like to be involved in the upcoming discussions.	None
2.01	p1	<p>The specific parts of the notice of requirement my submission relates to are that part of Te Kowhai East Road which is proposed to become a Major Arterial road and in particular the intersection of Te Kowhai East Road and Tasman Road.</p> <p>The submitter opposes any restriction on current access to and egress from the property at 40 Te Kowhai East Rd, unless these are mutually agreed between Council and the land owner (Sapphire Group Ltd).</p>	That the current access to, and egress from, the property at 40 Te Kowhai East Rd from or to Te Kowhai East Rd be permitted to continue.
3.01	6	<p>The submitter supports the NoR from a transport perspective, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The designation for the strategic arterial network enables Hamilton City Council to deliver critical infrastructure to an area zoned for future growth.• The objectives of the project are consistent with the General development principles in APP11 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) that seek to:• Not compromise the safe, efficient and effective operation and use of existing and planned infrastructure, including transport infrastructure ...• Connect well with existing and planned development and infrastructure• Promote compact urban form, design and location to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o minimise energy and carbon use;o minimise the need for private motor vehicle use;o maximise opportunities to support and take advantage of public transport in particular by encouraging employment activities in locations that are or can in the future be served efficiently by public transport;o encourage walking, cycling and multi-modal transport connections; ando maximise opportunities for people to live, work and play within their local area.• The use of the transport hierarchy that prioritises multi-modal transport options aligns with the outcomes sought in the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2021-2051, such as those relating to transport emissions reduction, integrated transport systems that support future growth, and improved accessibility and transport options.• The proposed arterial network supports the 30-year vision for the public transport network in the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2022-2032.• Public transport prioritisation along several of the zones identified in the NoR.• Connections to Rotokauri Transport Hub contribute to the delivery of a reliable and efficient bus service.	No relief sought
3.02	7	The submitter recommends continued discussions with WRC’s public transport planning team prior to detailed design work being undertaken to ensure adequate provision is made for public transport route planning and infrastructure.	<p>The submitter recommends the following conditions be included on the designation in relation to public transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Requiring Authority must give at least 12 weeks written notice to Waikato Regional Council of disruption to public transport routes during construction.• The Requiring Authority must engage with Waikato Regional Council prior to detailed design work to ensure adequate provision is made for public transport elements and infrastructure, including bus priority lanes, bus stop location planning, bus stop design and other matters that enable safe and efficient delivery of public transport services.
3.03	8	The WRC-managed Waikato Central Drainage Scheme is located to the north of the proposed designation.	We recommend a condition be included on the designation to the effect that "Where diversion of stormwater into Waikato Regional Council managed drains is proposed in the future, Waikato Regional Council’s Integrated Catchment Management directorate shall be consulted and provisions shall be made to address downstream effects on the drainage network, such as increased flooding (magnitude and duration) and erosion. These adequate provisions must include upgrading the downstream network to offset the identified effects”.
3.04	9	The Design Report provides that the road network will form part of the flood conveyance into the Greenway Corridor. There is no assessment of the future frequency and magnitude of such overflows. There is also no assessment of the risks associated with disruption to the transport network resulting from such overflow events and duration of disruption, or the effects of utilising the proposed strategic roading network infrastructure for flood conveyance on the infrastructure itself. We consider the 2023 Auckland Anniversary flood event and associated disruption and effect on the community should be taken as a lesson for such consideration.	<p>Provide further assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The future frequency and magnitude of flood overflows to the roading network.• The risks associated with disruption to the transport network resulting from such overflow events and duration of disruption.• The effects of utilising the proposed strategic roading network infrastructure for flood conveyance on the infrastructure itself.
3.05	10	We are concerned that no assessment has been undertaken against the Hazards and risks (HAZ) chapter of the WRPS within the NoR or supporting appendices.	Provide an assessment of the proposed designation against the Hazards and risks (HAZ) chapter of the WRPS.
4.01	4 & 3	WLL opposes this NOR in its entirety due to the extent and nature of impacts on its land, the uncertainties attached to the NOR, and the significant adverse impact it will have on the continued operation of the above businesses.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.02	5 & 6	WLL considers that the infrastructure proposed is in direct contravention to the existing land use planning. The industrial land base in Hamilton City is a key economic driver for the regional economy, making it a valuable resource that needs to be recognised and protected. The designation will adversely impact on established businesses in a manner that will render them unviable. Unlike these businesses, the infrastructure proposed will have no positive economic impact on Hamilton.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.03	7	WLL is somewhat surprised to see that the NOR relates to stormwater, given that there is no stormwater infrastructure on WLL’s property in the Rotokauri Structure Plan. Further, there appears to be no justification of the stormwater requirement, including no rational for its size. The Final Report simply notes "It [stormwater] is not a detailed design and as such there remain issues to be resolved in future design stages. Similarly, there are potential innovations that could be applied to minimise and optimise the design footprint. Further opportunities may arise through detailed design and further engagement with adjoining developers is likely as the design of their plans progress." Given the scale and uncertainly on WLL, it is inappropriate to grant the designation on undetailed designs.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.04	8	It is not clear how access will be provided to the property should only part of the land be taken.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.05	9	While it is accepted by WLL that an assessment of alternatives is not required to be a question of the best route, nor require every alternative to be fully considered, WLL has not seen any economic reporting within the assessment of alternatives. Economic considerations are important here, given the designation will affect commercial/industrial land holdings from WLL, while alternatives are through undeveloped farmland.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
4.06	10	Case law suggests that consideration of whether a notice of requirement will be implemented forms part of the decision-making process. WLL is concerned that there is currently no funding for construction within HCC’s Long-Term Plan 2021-2031. Furthermore, WLL is concerned that this project is contingent on that funding and development demand. There is a lot of uncertainty as to whether this project will be implemented, causing unnecessary anxiety, disruption, financial worry and stress on landowners and business operators.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.07	11, 12 & 13	The lapse period proposed is fifteen years, while the standard period in the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) is five years. The extended period is said by Hamilton City Council to reflect the uncertainty of timing for urbanisation. The effects of the extended lapse period on landowners and business operators needs to be given weight in considering whether this NOR should be granted. This is because of the uncertainty that arises for affected landowners, and to avoid the adverse and associated effects of ‘planning blight’. An extended and non-standard lapse period means that WLL will be restricted in future use of its property, and this planning blight will also have negative impacts on current and future commercial leasing arrangements. It also appears that this project and the Rotokauri Greenway Corridor interact at several locations. The designation for the Greenway is for 10 years, having been designated in May 2020. This designation is set to lapse 2030. Given the timing and dependence on each other, this designation should align with the Greenway, making the standard five-year lapse period more appropriate.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.08	14	If the NOR is granted, the designation should have conditions reducing the uncertainty for landowners. For example: Review period (a) A better approach would be to have a ‘review period’ condition for the designation, given the proposed extended lapse period. ³ Should the lapse period be desired for a period beyond five years, a review period condition would provide updates to the landowners and more certainty on whether the designation is still required.	WLL seeks that the NOR is recommended to be rejected.
4.09		If the NOR is granted, the designation should have conditions reducing the uncertainty for landowners. For example: Construction start date (b) Currently, there is also no condition that requires construction to be started within a specified time. A condition of this nature would help provide certainty for landowners and business operators. Affected person assistance	
4.10		If the NOR is granted, the designation should have conditions reducing the uncertainty for landowners. For example: Affected person assistance (c) A condition relating to owner assistance would provide certainty for owners. The condition can specify that independent experts or legal professional services will be provided to landowners who enter into early negotiations either through the hardship mechanism or through section 185 of the RMA. The condition can also outline how these resources will be accessible for owners (i.e., details of who to contact to start a process).	
5.01	4	The proposed NOR overlaps sections of Designations E99 and E117, which are both administered by NZTA as the Requiring Authority.	That E99 and E117 are considered primary designations and HCC's proposed RSI designation a secondary designation.
5.02	4	Te Kowhai Road/Burbush Road Roundabout is located within an 80 km p/h posted speed limit and has an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of over 6,000. The Integrated Transport Assessment supporting the NOR RSI provides traffic modelling projected for the year 2051 which forecasts an AADT of 10,863 at this intersection.	No relief sought
5.03	4	SH1C has a 100 km/h posted speed limit and a current AADT volume of almost 7,000 vehicles.	No relief sought
5.04	5, 6(ii)	The potential effects of the detailed design implications in relation to: The SH1C bridge abutments and piers and their protection from local road traffic which will travel beneath SH1C	NZTA seeks addition of the following new condition: <u><i>Prior to commencement of construction, the Requiring Authority will engage with the New Zealand Transport Agency during detailed design on the following matters as a precedence to the requirements of Section 177 of the RMA:</i></u> <u><i>a)The State Highway 1C bridge abutments and piers and their protection from local road traffic.</i></u>
5.05	5, 6(ii)	The potential effects of the detailed design implications in relation to: Mitigation for the severance of the existing SH1C pedestrian cycleway The severance will result from the local road connections to be constructed beneath SH1C, connecting the proposed designation minor arterial and collector roads located west of SH1C, to the local roads east of SH1C (Arthur Porter Drive, Te Kowhai East Road and Chalmers Road).	NZTA seeks addition of the following new condition: <u><i>Prior to commencement of construction, the Requiring Authority will engage with the New Zealand Transport Agency during detailed design on the following matters as a precedence to the requirements of Section 177 of the RMA:</i></u> <u><i>a)Mitigation for the severance/continuation of the State Highway 1C off-road cycleway.</i></u>
5.06	5, 6(iii)	NZTA wishes to be involved in the construction phase of the Project in relation to traffic management. NZTA should be considered as a key stakeholder in consideration of construction traffic management. NZTA supports the proposed NoR subject to the addition of a new condition and amendment of Proposed Condition 8.	NZTA seeks amendments to Proposed Condition 8 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) to ensure NZTA’s interests as the road controlling authority are observed. Amend proposed Condition 8.3(b) as follows to specifically include NZTA in the Stakeholder and Engagement Plan for engagement during construction and to mitigate and manage construction traffic effects: <u><i>Condition 8.3(b) - A Stakeholder and Engagement Plan which will identify affected stakeholders (including the New Zealand Transport Agency) and describes how stakeholders and the public will be communicated with and can register complaints during construction in relation to the following matters:</i></u>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
6.01	5, 6, 7 & 8	<p>TRGL is a subsidiary of Chalmers Properties Limited (Chalmers) and is advancing plans to develop a new commercial hub on Lot 50 DP 471831 which is bounded by Te Kowhai East Road and Arthur Porter Drive (Site). The Site is owned by TRGL.</p> <p>Chalmers is a large property development and investment company with property holdings throughout Auckland, Hamilton, and Dunedin. Chalmers and TRGL are owned by the Port of Otago whose 100% shareholder is the Otago Regional Council.</p> <p>The Site comprises approximately 2.28 ha of industrial zoned land and forms part of the ‘Te Rapa Gateway’. The Te Rapa Gateway is the gateway to Hamilton and is strategically located minutes away from the Waikato Expressway, the Main Northern Railway, Te Rapa Road, Avalon Road and The Base. It contains prime industrial and commercial land.</p> <p>TRGL’s development outcomes for the Site are significantly impacted by the notified designation extent sought by the NoR. The NoR therefore has the potential to result in significant adverse effects on TRGL, including on its ability to use or develop the Site in both in the interim and operational period.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.02	26	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 6.01, 6.06, 6.07, 6.08, 6.09]	(a) That the NoR be declined; or ...
6.03	26	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 6.01, 6.06, 6.07]	... or (b) That the extent of the designation boundary as it applies to the Site is reviewed and reduced; and ...
6.04	26	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 6.01 and 6.06 to 6.13.]	... or ... and (c) That the proposed NoR conditions be amended to address the matters raised in this submission; and ...
6.05	26	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 6.01 and 6.06 to 6.13.]	... or ... and (d) Any such further or consequential relief required to achieve the outcomes sought by this submission.
6.06	11, 12, 13, 14 & 15	<p>TRGL opposes the extent of land identified for the designation on the basis that the designation extent is excessive and is not reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the Requiring Authority for which the designation is sought.</p> <p>As notified, the proposed designation boundary:</p> <p>(a) Traverses the centre of the Site extending from Kowhai East Road to Arthur Porter Drive (the proposed Arthur Porter Drive realignment));</p> <p>(b) Extends along the Site’s southern, southwestern and eastern boundaries (the proposed minor arterial Te Kowhai Road (west extension)); and</p> <p>(c) Extends along the Site’s northern and eastern boundary (the proposed minor arterial Te Kowhai Road (west extension)).</p> <p>The extent of proposed designation across the Site results in a significant reduction in TRGL’s ability to use and develop the Site in an integrated and efficient manner. The Proposed Arthur Porter Drive realignment severs the Site and results in two disconnected lots. This has serious implications on future development outcomes for the Site including access, traffic-related effects, and a significant reduction in the Site’s developable area.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposed Te Kowhai Road West Extension extends along a significant portion of the Site’s road frontages. The extent of the designation area will result in a loss of key access, developable area, and loss of future landscaped buffer areas.</p> <p>The above effects have not been adequately addressed by the NoR application material or the Requiring Authority’s assessment of alternatives.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.07	16, 17, 18 & 19	<p>The proposed designation extent and 15-year lapse date result in significant impacts on TRGL’s use and development of the Site.</p> <p>There is currently no funding allocated for the construction of the Rotokauri Arterials Project. TRGL is concerned that the lack of funding creates increased uncertainty as to whether and when the designation will go ahead. In the interim, affected landowners are unable to fully utilise or develop their land creating inappropriate planning blight.</p> <p>The Site is a major landholding for TRGL in Hamilton and is currently in a vacant state. To date, TRGL has placed significant effort into advancing development outcomes for the Site.</p> <p>The absence of funding and significant designation extent create real risk of planning blight for the Site. TRGL has concerns that the designation will prevent efficient use of the Site by significantly constraining the development potential, lessening the attractiveness of the Site to potential tenants, and requiring significant redesign to TRGL’s preferred development outcomes on the Site.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.08	20, 21, 22	<p>TGRL does not consider that adequate consideration has been given to alternative sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the designation.</p> <p>The assessment of alternatives fails to properly consider alternative alignments which avoid adverse effects on the Site.</p> <p>There is no proper consideration or assessment of an option which:</p> <p>(a) Avoids traversing the Site altogether; or</p> <p>(b) Minimises the designation boundaries to the greatest extent possible.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.09	23	TRGL is also concerned that the specific adverse effects of the NoR on the Site have not been appropriately assessed by the Requiring Authority. TRGL considers this to be a significant shortcoming in light of the significant impacts and extent of designation within the Site.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.10	24	TRGL does not consider the proposed NoR conditions are sufficient to: <p>(a) Ensure that access to the Site during construction and operation is maintained in a safe, efficient and effective manner. ...</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point number: 6.04]
6.11	24	TRGL does not consider the proposed NoR conditions are sufficient to: <p>... (b) Ensure a process for the review of the extent of designation upon further detailed design (and subsequent removal of land not required for construction or operation). ...</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 6.02 to 6.05]
6.12	24	TRGL does not consider the proposed NoR conditions are sufficient to: <p>... (c) Provide an opportunity for affected landowners to negotiate early land acquisition.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point number: 6.04]
6.13	25	TRGL opposes the 15-year lapse date as it results in excessive uncertainty for the use and development of the Site.	[See relief sought at Submission Point number: 6.04]

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
7.01	3,4, 5	<p>The Submitters have an interest in landholdings at Te Kowhai/Burbush Roads in Rotokauri North (inclusive of Lot 7 DPS 15255 and Lot 6 DP 359488 which are directly impacted by The NoR).</p> <p>Scope of submission This submission relates to the NoR in its entirety.</p> <p>Nature of submission The Submitters oppose the NoR in its entirety.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.02	11 (a)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 7.01 and 7.05 to 7.12]	The Submitters seek that The NoR: (a) Be Withdrawn; OR...
7.03	11 (b)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 7.01 and 7.05 to 7.12]	The Submitters seek that The NoR:... (b) That The NoR is amended to respond to the concerns of the Submitters; OR...
7.04	11 (c)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 7.01 and 7.05 to 7.12]	The Submitters seek that The NoR:... (c) That the alignment and location of The NOR be amended to properly respond to the title boundaries and surrounding roading network in a safe and efficient manner
7.05	6 (a) to (f)	<p>Reasons for submission The primary reasons for this submission are that The NoR:</p> <p>(a) fails to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and therefore fail to meet the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”);</p> <p>(b) fails to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</p> <p>(c) fails to enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the Rotokauri (and wider Hamilton) community to be met;</p> <p>(d) is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of the relevant planning documents, including the Operative Hamilton City DistrictPlan Unitary Plan(“RPS”);</p> <p>(e) is inconsistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA, including sections 74 and 75, including the functions of Hamilton City Council (“Council”) under s 31; and</p> <p>(f) will have significant adverse effects on the environment;</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.06	6 (g)	<p>Reasons for submission (continued) (g) is not an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.07	6 (h)	<p>Reasons for submission (continued) (h) fails to comply with s 171(1)(b) of the RMA, as adequate consideration has not been given to alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the proposed works in circumstances where the Council does not have an interest in the land sufficient for undertaking the work; and in light of (f) above;</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.08	6 (i)	<p>Reasons for submission (continued) (i) is not reasonably necessary to achieve the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designations are sought.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.09	8 (a)	<p>The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason:</p> <p>(a) The NoR and its Assessment of Alternatives is flawed and insufficiently justifies the route chosen. For example:</p> <p>i. The NoR does not reflect the most efficient route and a superior alignment in respect of the northern section between Te Kowhai Road and the Greenway Designation could be achieved. No such alternative has been considered or addressed.</p> <p>ii. The current boundary of The NoR significantly reduces the development and subdivision potential and value of the remainder of Lot 7 DPS 15255 such that it is unable to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, as it will be severed from the remainder of the emerging Rotokauri North development/community and is of insufficient size to achieve a high quality living environment.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.10	8 (b) (i)	<p>The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason:</p> <p>(b) The concept design for the road layout and The NoR land take area is fundamentally, and fatally flawed. For example, The NoR:</p> <p>i. Has not accurately reflected the Operative Rotokauri North Structure Plan collector road locations or their future intersections with the Minor Arterial/NoR (particularly the future realignment of Burbush Road).</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.11	8 (b) (ii), (iii), (iv)	<p>The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason:</p> <p>(b) The concept design for the road layout and The NoR land take area is fundamentally, and fatally flawed. For example, The NoR:</p> <p>ii. Relies on (and is based on) information which does not accurately reflect the known stormwater catchment for this location (i.e it fails to acknowledge the Te Otamanui catchment which is separate to the Ohote catchment) and has not accounted for the approved Rotokauri North Sub Catchment Integrated Catchment Management Plan;</p> <p>iii. Does not provide for or integrate with conditions of the existing Greenway Designation; and</p> <p>iv. Does not provide for alignment between the designs and levels for the Greenway which were approved under the Covid-Fast Track legislation.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
7.12	8 (c) i	The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason: (c) The concept design and The NoR boundary/location will not enable a high quality urban environment to develop in Rotokauri North. For example, The NoR: i. Fails to acknowledge that for part of the northern length of the Minor Arterial the corridor will have a residential zoning on both sides (creating severance and likely landlocking sites from access to a road network);	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.13	8 (c) ii	The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason: (c) The concept design and The NoR boundary/location will not enable a high quality urban environment to develop in Rotokauri North. For example, The NoR: ii. Will not deliver an attractive “gateway’ into Rotokauri North.	
7.14	8 (c) iii	The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason: (c) The concept design and The NoR boundary/location will not enable a high quality urban environment to develop in Rotokauri North. For example, The NoR: iii. There is no certainty on the interface is expected between urban development and the arterial roads.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.15	8 (c) iv	The Submitters oppose The NoR for the following reason: (c) The concept design and The NoR boundary/location will not enable a high quality urban environment to develop in Rotokauri North. For example, The NoR: iv. The 15 year lapse date sterilises the development of the surrounding landholdings. The NoR is significantly larger than the road boundary in order to enable construction activities, and this has the potential to create a disconnect between the timing of development and the implementation of the road network, and thus jeopardises the ability to enable subdivision and development designs in the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area which aims to create a successful and high quality integrated urban environment.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.16	9 (a)	The Submitters oppose the conditions as they do not address concerns of the Submitters (outlined above) and in addition for following reason: (a) The network is likely to be constructed in stages, and not all of the conditions appropriately reflect any staging (and thus any changes to the environment that may occur between management plans prepared years ahead of when works in other stages are actually commenced).	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.17	9 (b)	The Submitters oppose the conditions as they do not address concerns of the Submitters (outlined above) and in addition for following reason: (b) The conditions do not include any provision for affected landowner input into the management plans BEFORE they are approved, or any resolution process for where the concerns of the landowner are not being adequately addressed by the outline plan of works/management plans	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.18	9 (c)	The Submitters oppose the conditions as they do not address concerns of the Submitters (outlined above) and in addition for following reason: (c) The Landscape Management Plan conditions are insufficient to ensure high quality environments, and should also require urban design input and requirements to ensure integration with the surrounding urban (or future urban) environment (i.e the objective is clear that it only relates to landscape matters).	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
7.19	10	There is also insufficient certainty or conditions to ensure that appropriate land use integration could occur in a meaningful manner between the Requiring Authority and adjacent land owner for scenarios where the development (or masterplanning for development) of adjacent land occurs ahead of the works subject to the NoR being implemented.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 7.02 to 7.04]
8.01	4 & 5 (1)	KiwiRail Holdings Limited interest in the proposal relates to the section of works on Te Kowhai East Road where they intersect with the North Island Main Trunk Line. It is understood that pedestrian improvements will be undertaken at the level crossing along with other improvements at the level crossing. The intersection of the road and rail corridors is to remain at grade.	KiwiRail requests the following: 1) that any designation for the roading project be secondary to the KiwiRail designation
8.02	4 & 5 (2)	KiwiRail Holdings Limited interest in the proposal relates to the section of works on Te Kowhai East Road where they intersect with the North Island Main Trunk Line. It is understood that pedestrian improvements will be undertaken at the level crossing along with other improvements at the level crossing. The intersection of the road and rail corridors is to remain at grade.	KiwiRail requests the following: 2) that it be a condition of the designation that an LSCIA [Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA)] be prepared and submitted to KiwiRail for comment in relation to the level crossing on Te Kowhai East Road and a requirement that any improvements required as a result of the LCSIA be implemented when the road upgrades are progressed.
9.01	2	<p>The properties at 153 and 173 Te Kowhai Road, legally described as Lot 1 DPS 15249 and Lot 2 DP 540282 are owned by the submitter. They are currently zoned Future Urban in the Hamilton District Plan. The submitter intends to rezone the properties to a live urban zoning, via a private plan change application in 2025. Consultation with Council’s planning and engineering teams has commenced in relation to the submitters rezoning intentions and the plan change has been allocated reference PC18. It is currently anticipated that the site will be rezoned to a light industrial zone.</p> <p>The NOR for Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure (the NOR) represents a significant piece of infrastructure with potential to unlock the surrounding structure plan area for development. More specifically, the arterial will provide the above properties with direct access to the strategic road network. The submitter supports it in principle.</p> <p>However, the NOR affects a significant amount of developable land on the above properties and impacts on the development yield able to be achieved. The designation currently requires 9.9892ha from the properties. The property at 153 Te Kowhai Road is also subject to a designation and land requirement for the Rotokauri Greenway (Designation A114), comprising approximately 4ha at the southern end of the site. At approximately 14ha, the land required from this property for the strategic infrastructure in Rotokauri consumes approximately 40% of the total property area.</p> <p>The submitter has been closely involved in the Rotokauri Greenway and Minor Arterial Transport Corridor resource consents (‘Greenway Fast Track’) that were approved under the COVID-19 Fast Track Consenting Act 2020 on 17 July 2024. The NOR and the Greenway Fast Track and the existing Greenway designation are separate processes and designs that need to be integrated to deliver the critical infrastructure for Rotokauri. Although the Greenway Fast Track decision has been available since July unfortunately the NOR (dated September 2024) does not consider its implications or attempt to integrate the two infrastructure components.</p>	The submitter acknowledges that parts of their land will need to be used for strategic infrastructure to service the wider growth cell. However, the submitter seeks amendments to specific aspects of the designation and the proposed conditions, to better integrate with the development intentions on the submitter’s properties, allow integration between the minor arterial and greenway infrastructure and to more fairly distribute the burden of infrastructure land requirements across the land parcels.

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
9.02	4.1	<p>Road alignment and designation location</p> <p>The specific part of the NOR that the submission relates to:</p> <p>The location of the proposed north-south minor arterial road alignment and the associated designation extent.</p> <p>The submission is:</p> <p>The alignment of the north-south minor arterial is positioned so that it is largely within the submitter’s property, running along its western boundary. The position of the road is shown on Drawings 4288564-100-CA-1008, 1009, 1010, 1401 and 1007. On those drawings the proposed western designation boundary runs along the boundary of the submitters property (Lot 2 DP 540282) and the adjoining land to the west (Lot 6 DP 359488) owned by Rotokauri North Holdings Ltd. The designation is approximately 65m wide. However, the ‘infrastructure corridor’ (i.e. the actual road), is positioned on the eastern side of the designation and is only about 35m wide. The AEE indicates that land not needed for the infrastructure corridor could have the designation removed in the future and be returned to the landowner.</p> <p>Positioning the designation as shown almost entirely on the submitters land will effectively remove development potential from the strip of land between the infrastructure corridor and the western boundary of the submitter’s property, comprising of approximately 1.5ha.</p> <p>The positioning of the road also does not take into account the zoning of the two properties referenced above. The submitters property is zoned Future Urban and will likely be rezoned industrial. The Rotokauri North Holdings property is zoned Medium Density Residential. If the minor arterial is built in the proposed position there will be a strip of land to the west that is not able to be developed for industrial purposes because of its size and shape, and location directly adjacent to the Medium Density Residential zoned property.</p> <p>The submitter proposes that the infrastructure corridor alignment be shifted to the west. The impact of the designation would therefore be shared equally between the two neighbouring land holdings that benefit from it. The submitter has consulted with and has been working collaboratively with the neighbouring landowner of Lot 6 DP 359488 on this matter. Refer to Attachment 1 for a plan demonstrating the requested realignment of the minor arterial road.</p> <p>See Attachment 1 in original submission.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following decision:</p> <p>The north-south arterial road to be shifted west so that the centreline of the road follows the western boundary of the submitters property, effectively straddling the common boundary between Lot 2 DP 540282 (153 Te Kowhai Road) and Lot 6 DP 359488 (17 Burbush Road), as shown on Attachment 1. This will require associated changes to accommodate tie ins to the wider design, including for stormwater management.</p> <p>See Attachment 1 in original submission.</p>
9.03	4.2	<p>Greenway design of wetlands</p> <p>The specific part of the NOR that my submission relates to:</p> <p>Wetland D6C, wetland G8 and wetland G7.</p> <p>The submission is:</p> <p>Wetlands G8 and D6C and their associated designations are on the submitters land. Wetland G7 is partly on the submitters land. The fast-track consenting process for the Rotokauri Greenway (‘Greenway Fast-Track’) obtained resource consent approval for construction of the greenway, approximately 1.2km of the Rotokauri minor arterial transport corridor up to (almost) the southern boundary of the site, and artificial wetlands 4A, 4B, 6 and 7A. The numbering and design of the wetlands differ between the Greenway Fast-Track and this NOR.</p> <p>Wetland G8 in this NOR was numbered Wetland 8A in the Greenway Fast-Track. Wetland G7 in this NOR was numbered Wetland 7A in the Greenway Fast-Track. Wetland 7B in the Greenway Fast-Track is not included in the NOR. Wetland D6C in the NOR was not included in the Greenway Fast-Track.</p> <p>The wetland designs in the Greenway Fast-Track differ significantly to the design of the same wetlands in the current NOR application. This creates uncertainties for the submitter as to what land areas are actually required and understanding the remaining developable land available. In particular, the Greenway Fast-Track design of Wetland 8A was based on detailed design and has a much smaller footprint than Wetland G8 in this NOR.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that amendments are made to the NOR to coordinate and align the wetland design, designation and land requirements with the design in the Greenway Fast Track consent. The submitter also requests this be integrated with development intentions of the adjoining submitters land. The relief sought includes amending the designation boundary for Wetland G8 to match the design of Wetland 8A in the Greenway Fast Track.</p>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
9.04	4.3	<p>Natural inland wetlands</p> <p>The specific part of the NOR that my submission relates to: The impacts on natural inland Wetland 8 and the Mangaheka drain.</p> <p>The submission is: The Ecological Impact Assessment Report (Beca 24 April 2024) prepared for the NOR identifies a natural inland wetland (Wetland 8 in Figure 1 below) on the property located at Lot 1 DPS 15249 (173 Te Kowhai Road), which is within 100m of the proposed works. This aligns with the ecological assessment prepared by the submitter's ecologist to support PC18. Preliminary design for PC18 includes avoiding direct effects on this wetland and exploring how it can be protected and potentially enhanced.</p> <p>Figure 1 (See in original Submission)</p> <p>Section 4.3.3 of the Ecological Impact Assessment states that Wetland 8 will experience <i>‘a high magnitude of wetland loss and modification is anticipated, and wetland offset and/or compensation will be required’</i> .</p> <p>There is no detail on what the extent of loss or modification on this wetland will be, whether it is loss of extent or hydrological or other effects. Section 5.4.2 of the Ecological Impact Assessment states that as part of the regional consenting process, the wetland loss, offset and compensation will be addressed. This is not appropriate. The effects on the wetland are as a result of the proposed arterial road that the NOR will authorise. Therefore, the effects should be addressed as part of this process, not deferred to a future consenting process. An integrated approach is required.</p> <p>The Ecological Impact Assessment recommends a condition requiring an Ecological Management Plan to be prepared prior to construction (EMP). However, without knowing what the effects are it is not possible to conclude that an EMP will adequately address them. In addition, without knowing what options there are to avoid, minimise, remedy, offset or compensate for the effects it is not credible to conclude that ‘the residual level of effects can be managed to Low levels’ (Ecological Impact Assessment, page 35).</p>	<p>The submitter requests that additional more detailed assessment of the effects on natural inland ‘Wetland 8’ (identified in Figure 1 above) be undertaken and the effects management hierarchy in the National Policy Statement Freshwater Management 2020 be applied to it. The submitter requests that information on the outcomes of that analysis, including any recommended conditions be provided.</p> <p>Figure 1 (See in original Submission)</p>
9.05	4.4	<p>Lapse date</p> <p>Specific part of the NOR that my submission relates to: Proposed 15 year lapse date.</p> <p>The submission is: The lapse period creates uncertainty in timing of delivering the infrastructure. For the submitter, the southern portion of their property relies on access from the arterial road and a 15 year lapse period creates uncertainty about if or when the designation will be implemented. A shorter lapse period is consistent with urban development in the Rotokauri Structure Plan area with some development already consented and others, such as the submitter actively pursuing development through PC18.</p>	<p>The submitter seek the following decision: A lapse period of 10 years for the designation.</p>
9.06	4.5	<p>Overland Flow Path</p> <p>Specific part of the NOR that my submission relates to: Provision for the North-South Arterial to accommodate an overland flow path (OLFP) from the Greenway.</p> <p>My submission is: The Greenway Fast Track considered the issue of overland flow paths from the Greenway to the north under flood conditions, and proposed that the OLFP could be over the submitters land.</p> <p>However, Condition 42 of the Rotokauri Greenway designation (A114) states; <i>During detailed design and prior to the lodgement of the Outline Plan of Works the following matters shall be considered and incorporated into the design and its documentation.</i> <i>...f. Maintaining the overland flow routes to the north of Basins 3 and 4 along the proposed Arterial Road. Documentation relating to the Rotokauri Arterial Transport Network design shall be provided to confirm this has been allowed for.</i></p> <p>Condition 42f indicates that the OLFP to the north was a live issue at the time of the Greenway Notice of Requirement in 2019, and HCC as requiring authority included the condition based on the expectation that the future design would incorporate the OLFP within the proposed North-South Minor Arterial.</p> <p>The NOR acknowledges that one of the design criteria in the Rotokauri ICMP is; ‘Overland flow shall be along road corridors or in designated drainage reserves’ (Beca Design Report p51). However, the Design Report states that the OLFP cannot run down the minor arterial due to limitations from the catchment boundary, pipe cover and the need for a low point above the Greenway culvert. The design should be reconsidered to confirm the extent to which these are constraints or whether redesign could allow the OLFP to be included in the Minor Arterial corridor as envisaged by condition 42f of designation A114. Otherwise the OLFP will need to be accommodated within the submitters property, which is likely to further reduce the developable area.</p>	<p>See the relief sought in relation to Submission Point 9.07.</p>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
9.07	4.5	<p>Overland Flow Path - continued</p> <p>The Greenway Fast Track consent includes conditions 9 and 10 set out the following;</p> <p><i>9. The Consent Holder shall work collaboratively with the owners of Lot 2 DP 540282, Lot 6 DP 359488, Lot 11 DPS 15255, Lot 10 DPS 15255 prior to and during detailed design of:</i></p> <p><i>a. the emergency spillway and portion of the Rotokauri Greenway that adjoins the emergency spillway...</i></p> <p><i>10. Any final design of subclause (a) shall ensure that either option 1 or option 2 is achieved:</i></p> <p><i>a. Option 1: The final design shall not increase flow for any rainfall event up to and including the 100-year RCP 8.5 MFE climate change rainfall scenario onto Lot 2 DP 540282, Lot 6 DP 359488, Lot 11 DPS 15255, Lot 10 DPS 15255, during the same rainfall event; or</i></p> <p><i>b. Option 2: the landholdings of Lot 2 DP 540282, Lot 6 DP 359488, Lot 11 DPS 15255, Lot 10 DPS 15255 provide written agreement to an alternative standard.</i></p> <p>These conditions acknowledge that the are some uncertainties with the OLFP and it is important that affected landowners are involved in the design and decision making process for it.</p>	<p>The submitters seek the following decision:</p> <p>Redesign the North-South Minor Arterial to accommodate the OLFP from the Greenway to the Mangaheka.</p>
9.08	4.6	<p>Integration of the NOR with the Greenway and adjacent development</p> <p>Specific part of the NOR that my submission relates to:</p> <p>All those aspects that involve the integration of the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation design with the design of the Greenway and the design and development of adjacent land holdings.</p> <p>The submission is:</p> <p>The AEE Report for the NOR sets out, in various sections, that integration between the NOR design/construction and the surrounding development plans is important and required. The development in the surrounding locality may occur ahead of HCC delivering the minor arterial and therefore there needs to be collaboration between parties (HCC and development community) on design details and construction timeframes to maximise integration and efficiency of development.</p> <p>The submitters’ involvement with the Greenway Fast Track highlighted insufficient design coordination between the NOR, the Greenway and land developers and seeks that this be addressed as far as possible through this NOR.</p> <p>It is also considered that there is an opportunity to optimise design details, particularly for stormwater management, through the current NOR process to better integrate with the known development intentions of neighbouring/affected properties.</p> <p>There is no requirement in the draft conditions relating to collaboration or sharing of information and/or integration with surrounding development plans. This will be particularly important where developers seek to progress with development plans ahead of the construction of the minor arterial roads.</p>	<p>The submitter seek the following decision:</p> <p>That the NOR design be reviewed and reconsidered in conjunction with the design of the Greenway and the evolving land development plans and designs of adjacent landowners in order to achieve a consistent design approach that supports integration between infrastructure and land use.</p> <p>That there is opportunity to integrate the design in the NOR with the greenway design and with the neighbouring developers to ensure that the outcomes are fit for purpose and the most efficient approach as possible.</p> <p>That a new condition be added as follows;</p> <p>The Requiring Authority shall work collaboratively with the owners of land adjacent to the NOR to share information and integrate, as far as practicable, the design of the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure works with the Greenway design and construction and the land development and design of adjacent landowners.</p>
9.09	4.7		<p>In relation to all of the above submission points the submitter also seeks any similar or alternative relief that would achieve the same outcomes.</p>
10.01	p2	<p>The submitter opposes the compulsory acquisition of 0.2056ha of land @79 Te kowhai East Road, Burbush, Hamilton - Lot 1 DPS 68406 in CT SA540/684.</p>	<p>No relief sought</p>
10.02	p2	<p>The submitter believes the road can be constructed without the need to acquire the part of the mentioned property.</p>	<p>No relief sought</p>
10.03	p2	<p>The acquisition of land will destroy his Christmas tree business.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks compensation for his Christmas Tree business</p>
10.04	p2	<p>The project will cause significantly more noise and vibration that will affect the quiet enjoyment of his family home.</p>	
10.05	p2		<p>The submitter suggests Council considers purchasing the entire property (79 Te Kowhai East road) so that his quiet environment that he enjoys is not affected or that Council considers a solution whereby he is not left with less land that may come in the form of a boundary adjustment with neighbouring properties or nearby land compensation.</p>
11.01	4	<p>The Submitter is currently undertaking master-planning and infrastructure analysis of the site and has commenced further discussions with HCC regarding the Emerging Areas Process and future use of the site.</p>	<p>No relief sought</p>
11.02	7,9b,9c	<p>Preliminary assessments undertaken for TKE, note that three waters will rely on future extensions of three waters through the proposed alignment of the NOR.</p>	<p>[See relief sought at Submission Point number: 11.04]</p>
11.03	8,9a,9c	<p>Provision of the NOR will safeguard and futureproof the proposed alignment and corridor width of the key transportation network and strategic infrastructure corridors for the Rotokauri Growth Cell and ability for future transportation and infrastructure connections to the north.</p>	<p>[See relief sought at Submission Point number: 11.04]</p>
11.04	9	<p>[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 11.02, 11.03]</p>	<p>The Submitter seeks that Hamilton City Council recommends the NoR for the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation be approved on the basis of the following:</p> <p>a) Sufficient width within the corridor to enable future three waters upgrades</p> <p>b) Coordination of three waters infrastructure with the site and the submitter, is properly considered;</p> <p>c) Such further relief or consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the matters raised above.</p>
12.01	Q12 (1) & (2)	<p>The submitter mentions that consent for the Greenway has been granted to Council via the Covid 19 Fast track consenting process and asks: what is the timing of construction and development of the Green way and minor arterial roads?</p>	<p>Information request.</p>
12.02	Q12 (1) & (2)	<p>When will the construction of the proposed minor arterial road which passes the end of the land know as 88 Exelby road begin?</p>	<p>Information request.</p>
12.03	Q12 (3)	<p>Whilst this road is being constructed are the owners of 88 Exelby road able to apply for a resource consent to develop 88 Exelby road and begin construction of a proposed sub-division including the link road connecting the to the minor arterial road at one end and Exelby road at the other end. Including associated services?</p>	<p>Information request.</p>
12.04	Q12 (4)	<p>Will the future development at 88 Exelby Road be able to discharge directly to the proposed greenway and its associated designated stormwater pond, or will further stormwater mitigation be required on site at 88 Exelby?</p>	<p>Information request.</p>
12.05	Q12 (5)	<p>Does the infrastructure include any sewage pumpstations provided by HCC, or will the developer of 88 Exelby road need to provide sewage pumping?</p>	<p>Information request.</p>
12.06	Q12 (6)	<p>What other items that may impact 88 Exelby road'.</p>	<p>Information request.</p>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
13.01	Form 21, Paras 3 to 6	<p>Refer to the following documents submitted along with the original submission:</p> <p>Attachment 1 - NoR/FT Comparison Plans</p> <p>Attachment 2 - Maven Associates Fast Track Infra Report</p> <p>Attachment 3 - Fast Track Artificial Wetland Design Plans</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>The Submitter is the legal owner of the following parcels of land which are directly affected by the NoR:</p> <p>a) Lot 53 DP 471831 (RT 694425)</p> <p>b) Lot 3 DP 4688484 (RT 628813)</p> <p>c) Part Lot 1 DP 30552 (RT SA5D/1082)</p> <p>d) Lot 2003 DP 576817 (RT1064310)</p> <p>The affected parcels referenced above are highlighted green in Figure 1 below. As indicated, the proposed designation boundaries traverse across all four parcels of land.</p> <p>As indicated within the NoR application documents (Section 1.6 of the Beca Design Report Appendix D – NoR Application), the Submitter has entered into a private development agreement with Hamilton City Council for the design and delivery of the Greenway and a portion of the Arterials south of Te Kowhai East Road.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submitter as a joint applicant with Hamilton City Council, has obtained resource consents from the Environmental Protection Authority through the COVID-19 Recovery Fast Track Consenting Act 2020 (Fast Track). Regional resource consents were granted on the 14th July 2024 for the construction and operation of the greenway, artificial wetlands and <u>the minor arterial road</u>. In addition, resource consent for soil disturbance under NES-Contaminated Land has been granted through the same Fast Track process.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]
13.01a	Form 21, Para 7	<p>BACKGROUND continued</p> <p>Various resource consent applications have also been applied for by the Submitter which have either been granted or are being processed by the relevant authority. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>a) Resource consent application for Stage 1 bulk earthworks has been approved by Hamilton City Council (010.2019.00010606.001) on the 11th May 2020 and has been given effect to.</p> <p>b) Resource consents were granted for earthworks, diversions, and groundwater takes by Waikato Regional Council (“WRC”) on the 3 February 2021. A further consent is currently being processed by WRC to reflect updates to earthworks as well as a consent application for stormwater diversion and discharge.</p> <p>c) Resource consent is currently being processed by Hamilton City Council for a Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) including the creation of approximately 280 residential units, earthworks, infrastructure and concurrent subdivision. This application includes the design and construction of a portion of the Minor Arterial Road and Wetlands 4A/4B.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]
13.02	Form 21, Para 21 (a)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 13.01, 13.01a, 13.06 to 13.09]	a) Update the NoR levels and alignment to reflect the levels and design approved through the Fast Track process....
13.03	Form 21, Para 21 (b)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 13.01, 13.01a, 13.06 to 13.09]	...b) Update the NoR road typology Zones 1 and 8 to reflect road typologies being considered through the CDP consent process....
13.04	Form 21, Para 21 (c)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 13.01, 13.01a, 13.06 to 13.09]	...c) Consistency between plans within appendices provided in support of the NoR. ...
13.05	Form 21, Para 21 (d)	[The relief sought addresses issues listed at Submission Point numbers: 13.01, 13.01a, 13.06 to 13.09]	...d) Such further relief or consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the matters raised above.
13.06	Form 21, Paras 8 to 10	<p>SCOPE OF SUBMISSION</p> <p>This submission relates to the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation in its entirety, but the Submitters interest is primarily on the general alignment and boundaries of the NoR as notified on the 7th October 2024.</p> <p>The Submitter is generally supportive of the proposed NoR as it is necessary to service the Rotokauri growth cell in accordance with the Rotokauri Structure Plan. The Submitter also supports the NoR objectives “to provide a well-integrated multi modal transportation network that promotes a wide range of safe, responsive, efficient, and sustainable transport modes including walking, cycling, and public transport.”</p> <p>The Submitter has made significant progress in design and consenting including the Minor Arterial and the artificial wetlands and as such is seeking changes to the boundaries and levels of the designation to be consistent with the existing consents and design.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
13.07	Form 21, Paras 11 to 14	<p>REASON FOR SUBMISSION</p> <p>As acknowledged within the Beca Design Report (Appendix D - NoR Application), given the parallel work of the Fast Track process, the road and flood level modelling and design within the NoR may be superseded.</p> <p>With the consents now being approved in July 2024 through the Fast Track process and updated modelling and design undertaken as a result, the Submitter requests that the updated road and flood levels and artificial wetland design and locations be reflected within this NoR. Comparison between the Fast Track consented design and NoR are shown in Attachment 1.</p> <p>The Maven Associates vertical alignment of the Minor Arterial differs from the Beca NoR design to account for improvement to constructability and diversion of overland flows.</p> <p>Section 4.5 of the Maven Infrastructure report provided with the Fast Track application (included in Attachment 2) details the adjustments made to Beca’s design (including the Greenway designation design). In summary, the adjustments relate to the catchments and the corresponding size of the artificial wetlands. The current design of artificial wetlands prepared by Maven Associates is included in Attachment 3.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]
13.08	Form 21, Paras 15 to 18	<p>REASON FOR SUBMISSION</p> <p>Furthermore, the CDP resource consent includes the design and construction of a portion of the Minor Arterial which will extend from Te Wetini Drive and Akoranga Road to Chalmers Road as indicated in Figure 2 below and artificial wetlands 4A/4B.</p> <p>The portion of the Minor Arterial and artificial wetlands (4A/4B) located within the CDP area are currently being assessed by Hamilton City Council and will be subject to engineering plan approval and constructed and vested through the subdivision process. The consent design for the CDP including arterial and artificial wetlands 4A/4B are based off the resource consents approved through the Fast Track process (see Attachment 3).</p> <p>The Minor Arterial Road design proposed within the CDP, does not align with some of the roading typology zones included in the NoR Application (Appendices B and J- NoR Application)- specifically Zones 1 and 8. As indicated in Figure 3 below, Zones 1 (red), 3 (yellow) and 4 (green) and 8 (light purple) apply to the Submitters site.</p> <p>Roading cross-section typologies for the CDP are shown in Figure 4 below. In summary the Submitter is proposing a 28.4m road width up to the Chalmers Road intersection with a 10m carriageway. The Submitter is seeking changes to these road typology zones within the NoR to align with those being proposed and considered within the CDP application.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]
13.09	Q12 (3)	<p>REASON FOR SUBMISSION</p> <p>Furthermore, the Submitter notes there is disparity between some of the road typologies within Appendix B.2 and Appendix J of the NoR. Specifically, the plans for Zone 4 do not align between the appendices. The Submitter request that the plans within Appendix J align with plans within Appendix B.2 of the NoR (in addition to above changes re alignment with the CDP plans).</p> <p>The Submitter considers that the misalignment between designs will not promote the sustainable management under Part 2 of the RMA as:</p> <p>a) The potential adverse effects (including transport, stormwater, flooding effects) from the proposed NoR on the use and development of the Submitters land (and associated costs) won’t be avoided remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>b) The social, economic and cultural well-being of the community will not be provided for if the NoR results in an inefficient use and development of land that is already subject to consents and design.</p>	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 13.02 to 13.05]
14.01	Q12 (3)	<p>The property [see Figure 1 in the Submission] is located within the Special Natural Zone, General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. Located within the Rotokauri Structure Plan, there is a Rotokauri Ridgeline Area overlay across the western boundary of the property and two proposed Collector Transport Corridor run through the property. See Figure 2 in submission.</p> <p>RDL have a live resource consent application with Council for a two-lot subdivision to create two super lots of 10.33 hectares and 38.46 hectares. See Figure 4 in the submission. The application is on hold while servicing issues are resolved.</p> <p>RDL have been working with both the Planning Guidance Unit and Strategic Development Unit at Council for approximately three years on the ultimate roading layout for their property and the wider network that would supersede the Rotokauri Structure Plan. The Rotokauri Structure Plan is outdated and does not give effect to higher order planning documents that have been published since, particularly the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater.</p> <p>The application is currently on hold while residual matters, particularly related to servicing, are resolved. The applicant and Council are working towards an agreed approach.</p> <p>The proposed designation boundary will encroach into the property, as shown in Figure 5 (property indicated by red dashed line) to accommodate Minor Arterial transport corridor (Figure 5) and stormwater infrastructure (artificial wetlands - Figure 6)</p> <p>The resource consents for the Rotokauri Greenway have been obtained via the Environmental Protection Authority (fast-track consent process) as of 14 July 2024. It is critical to the development of the property that the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor is constructed.</p>	[This is introductory text only. No relief sought.]
14.02	2.1	The design for the components of the designation is currently "Preliminary - Design Under Deevlopment for Consultation Purposes Only".	Request the opportunity to further refine the design with Council.

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
14.03	Q12 (2)	<p>Indicative Future Wetlands</p> <p>The “indicative future wetlands” (see Figure 7) are outside the designation boundary and straddle several property boundaries, which is unrealistic and undeliverable.</p> <p>Section 5.6 of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation] states, “Only wetlands that receive runoff from the proposed roads will be included within the proposed designation. This leaves several wetlands identified in the Greenway NoR and ICMP documents to be designed and developed in the future as part of adjacent subdivision developments. These other wetlands are indicatively shown on the drawings to show the wider stormwater management context”.</p>	<p>(a) Flexibility in relation to the location, sizing, and design of the "indicative future wetlands", and</p> <p>(b) The removal of these “indicative future wetlands” from the NOR drawings, or</p> <p>(c) All “indicative future wetlands” are labelled with the statement: “Any indicative future wetlands are an indicative option for providing stormwater storage outside of the constructed Greenway. Each land owner will determine, design and consent the actual design, location and size of any additional stormwater storage device related to their property.”</p>
14.04	Q12 (3)	<p>Future Connections to the Minor Arterial Transport Corridor</p> <p>Section 5.5.2 of the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation document goes on to acknowledge a number of challenges with reliance on the Rotokauri Structure Plan (RSP). We raise this as a concern, as the NOR design generally does not indicate where the future transport connections (collector roads) will be. The RSP is out of date and reliance on this document is unsuitable.</p> <p>In 2009, the RSP was updated to indicate likely transport routes, but since this time further higher order planning documents have been published which must be given effect to, particularly the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. There are a number of ecological features in Rotokauri that require consideration under these higher order planning documents. An example of this is natural inland wetlands, which did not require consideration when the RSP was published, that developers must now accommodate in development.</p>	<p>Requests clarity on how Council will deal with future connections into the Minor Arterial transport corridor designation, specifically in relation to reliance on the Rotokauri Structure Plan (RSP), which does not take into account higher order planning documents (such as National Policy Statement on Urban Development, National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater).</p>
14.05	Q12 (4)	<p>Culvert</p> <p>As detailed in Section 5.7.10a) of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation], the channel from the property via a culvert (Culvert 2) under the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor is required. It also details, “Upstream of the minor arterial the channel could continue further up into the wider subcatchment to provide a receiving drain for subdivision development. This remains the responsibility for developers to determine and HCC to approve..Other than a hollow at culvert 2’s inlet, this wider upstream channel is not part of the proposed designation”, which RDL acknowledges relates to their property.</p> <p>This reiterates the challenge for developers in the area to deliver housing as they are required to comply with the Rotokauri Structure Plan.</p> <p>Due to the NOR not providing certainty on the future roading layout (specifically Collector Roads), the stormwater catchment and discharge would vary, as would the culvert size. The NOR is enabling further uncertainty and is deferring responsibility to the developers, which will increase processing costs and timeframes at the time of resource consent lodgement.</p>	<p>(a) Once the design of Culvert 2 has proceeded beyond preliminary design, the design pack shall be circulated to RDL to provide feedback and ensure efficiency and integration with their proposal for the property.</p> <p>(b) That a condition be imposed on the designation requiring Culvert 2 to be designed in collaboration with RDL to ensure that the culvert design takes in account the latest development plan for the property. The suggested wording of this condition is:</p> <p>“The Requiring Authority shall work collaboratively with the owners of Lot 4004 Deposited Plan 576817 prior to and during the detailed design of Culvert 2.”</p>
14.06	Q12 (5)	<p>Timing</p> <p>Section 9.2 of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation] acknowledges that an integrated approach to the delivery of the Minor Arterial transport corridor and Greenway would be beneficial, and RDL supports this.</p> <p>RDL understands that the necessary resource consents for the Rotokauri Greenway have been obtained via the Environmental Protection Authority (fast-track consent process) as of 14 July 2024. It is noted this application includes a portion of the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor under this proposed designation. Based on this application, it is understood that the proposed portion of the Minor Arterial transport corridor relating to RDL’s property will be delivered first.</p> <p>It is critical to the development of the property that the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor is constructed, as is the Greenway.</p>	<p>Further certainty regarding the timing of the NOR designation.</p>
14.07	Q12 (6)	<p>Ecological Impact Assessment</p> <p>The Ecological Impact Assessment [Appendix G in the NOR documentation] only partially addresses how some of these ecological effects of the NOR will be dealt with. The submitter would like to ensure that the works required for the NOR will not result in an adverse effect on the property, such as the blocking of natural drainage.</p>	<p>Seeks specific clarification regarding whether any works, like dewatering or removal of ephemeral drains, through the NOR construction will result in the draining, partial draining or blockage of natural drainage of the property.</p>
14.08	Q12 (7)	<p>Level of Minor Arterial Transport Corridor</p> <p>The low point in the Minor Arterial transport corridor will determine the secondary overland flow spill point (and 100-year ARI flood levels) for the upstream/western development areas.</p> <p>The Roding Drawings [Appendix B.2 in the NOR documentation] shows a low point in the transport corridor at approximately RL33.50 metres. Low lying areas of the property will be below this level and will require filling to lift the connecting transport corridors to the Minor Arterial transport corridor and building platforms above the spill point.</p> <p>It is critical that the vertical alignment of the Minor Arterial transport corridor carefully considers the secondary overland flow paths and the effect on upstream development land. The existing sag in the vertical alignment in the vicinity of Culvert 2 should be kept as low as possible to limit the required fill to lift the property above the low point.</p>	<p>(a) Circulation of the design pack to provide feedback and ensure efficiency and integration with their proposal for the property.</p> <p>(b) That the vertical alignment of the Minor Arterial transport corridor be designed to the lowest practicable level.</p>
15.01	1.2	<p>The property [see Figure 1 in the Submission] is located within the Special Natural Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. Located within the Rotokauri Structure Plan, there is a Rotokauri Ridgeline Area overlay across the western boundary of the property and a proposed Collector Transport Corridor running along the southern boundary of the property. See Figure 2 in submission.</p>	<p>[This is introductory text only. No relief sought.]</p>
15.02	1.2 (p4)	<p>Pragma have been working with both the Planning Guidance Unit and Strategic Development Unit at Council for approximately three years on the ultimate roading layout for their property and the wider network that would supersede the Rotokauri Structure Plan. The Rotokauri Structure Plan is outdated and does not give effect to higher order planning documents have been published since, particularly the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater.</p>	<p>[This is introductory text only. No relief sought.]</p>
15.03	1.2 (p4)	<p>There is an application for 52 Lee Road lodged with Council for a Managed Care Facility (10.2024.12977.001). This application is currently on hold, following receipt of the Section 92 Request. This application is limited to the north-western portion of the property as shown in Figure 4 of the submission.</p>	<p>[This is introductory text only. No relief sought.]</p>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
15.04	1.2 (p4)	Pragma is currently preparing a resource consent application for concurrent land use and subdivision for the wider development of the property. This will require a connection to the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor, which Pragma requires certainty on as this will need to be considered in the topography and earthworks.	The submitter would like to take part in discussions and next stages of the design process, specifically for the Minor Arterial transport corridor and Culvert 2 , as part of the submission process.
15.05	1.2 (p4)	Pragma have been having ongoing conversations with Council and adjoining property owners in relation to the aforementioned proposed Collector Transport Corridor. The NOR provides little directive on this connection, however, this is critical and a priority as this informs the servicing connection for Pragma’s property and surrounding properties. The transport connection is essential to enable connectivity to ensure housing is able to be delivered that gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Housing and Business Assessment expected yields.	See relief sought at Submission Point 15.04.
15.06	1.3	The proposed designation boundary will encroach into the property, as shown in Figures 5, 6, and 7 (property indicated by red dashed line), primarily to accommodate stormwater drainage connectivity and conveyance (including the inlet to Culvert 2) for upstream development flows to the Greenway.	See relief sought at Submission Point 15.04.
15.07	2.1	Design	We request the opportunity to further refine the design with Council.
15.08	2.6	Pragma understands the necessary resource consents for the Rotokauri Greenway have been obtained via the Environmental Protection Authority (fast-track consent process) as of 14 July 2024. Based on this application, the submitter understands that the proposed portion of the Minor Arterial transport corridor relating to Pragma’s property will be delivered first. It is critical to the development of the submitter's property that the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor and Greenway are constructed.	[This is introductory text only. No relief sought.]
15.09	2.2	Indicative Future Wetlands As shown in Figure 6 , “indicative future wetlands” are shown on the property, which are not included within the designation footprint. Section 5.6 of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation] states, “Only wetlands that receive runoff from the proposed roads will be included within the proposed designation. This leaves several wetlands identified in the Greenway NoR and ICMP documents to be designed and developed in the future as part of adjacent subdivision developments. These other wetlands are indicatively shown on the drawings to show the wider stormwater management context.” They straddle several property boundaries, which is unrealistic and undeliverable.	(a) Removal of the “indicative future wetlands” from the NOR drawings. (b) Otherwise, seek that all “indicative future wetlands” are labelled with the statement: “Any indicative future wetlands are an indicative option for providing stormwater storage outside of the constructed Greenway. Each land owner will determine, design and consent the actual design, location and size of any additional stormwater storage device related to their property.”
15.10	2.3	Future Connections to the Minor Arterial Transport Corridor Section 5.5.2 of the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation document goes on to acknowledge a number of challenges with reliance on the RSP. We raise this as a concern, particularly as the NOR design generally does not indicate where the future transport connections (collector roads) will be. The RSP is out of date and reliance on this document is unsuitable. In 2009, the RSP was updated to indicate likely transport routes, but since this time further higher order planning documents have been published which must be given effect to, particularly the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. There are a number of ecological features in Rotokauri that require consideration under these higher order planning documents. An example of this is natural inland wetlands, which did not require consideration when the RSP was published, that developers must now accommodate in development.	Requests clarity on how Council will deal with future connections into the Minor Arterial transport corridor designation, specifically in relation to reliance on the Rotokauri Structure Plan, which does not take into account higher order planning documents (such as National Policy Statement on Urban Development, National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater).
15.11	2.3	As outlined in the Ecological Impact Assessment [Appendix G in the NOR documentation], there are a number of ecological features in Rotokauri that require consideration under these higher order planning documents. An example of this is natural inland wetlands, which did not require consideration when the Rotokauri Structure Plan was published, that developers must now accommodate in development.	No relief sought. [What implications, if any, do the presence of natural inland wetlands have for decisions on the Requirement?]
15.12	Q12 (3)	Culvert 2 As detailed in Section 5.7.10a) of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation], the channel from the property via a culvert (Culvert 2) under the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor is required. It also details, “Upstream of the minor arterial the channel could continue further up into the wider subcatchment to provide a receiving drain for subdivision development. However, this remains the responsibility for developers to determine and HCC to approve. This again reiterates the challenge for developers in the area to deliver housing as they are required to comply with the Rotokauri Structure Plan. As discussed in Section 1.2, the Rotokauri Structure Plan does not give effect to higher order planning documents that have been published since, particularly the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. Due to the NOR not providing certainty on the future roading layout (specifically Collector Roads), the stormwater catchment and discharge would vary, as would the culvert size. The NOR is enabling further uncertainty and is deferring responsibility to the developers, which will increase processing costs and timeframes at the time of resource consent lodgement.	(a) Once the design of Culvert 2 has proceeded beyond preliminary design, Pragma requests circulation of the design pack to provide feedback and ensure efficiency and integration with their proposal for the property. (b)That a condition be imposed on the designation requiring Culvert 2 to be designed in collaboration with Pragma to ensure that the culvert design takes in account the latest development plan for the property. The suggested wording of this condition is as follows: “The Requiring Authority shall work collaboratively with the owners of Lot 2 Deposited Plan 12201 prior to and during the detailed design of Culvert 2.”
15.13	2.5	Level of Minor Arterial Transport Corridor The low point in the Minor Arterial transport corridor will determine the secondary overland flow spill point (and 100-year ARI flood levels) for the upstream/western development areas. The level of the Minor Arterial transport corridor will set what land within a development needs to be lifted to provide freeboard to the 100-year ARI flood level. The Roading Drawings [Appendix B.2 in the NOR documentation] shows a low point in the transport corridor at approximately RL33.50 metres. This means low lying areas of the property will be below this level and will require filling to lift the connecting transport corridors to the Minor Arterial transport corridor and building platforms above the spill point. It is critical that the vertical alignment of the Minor Arterial transport corridor carefully considers the secondary overland flow paths and the effect on upstream development land. The existing sag in the vertical alignment in the vicinity of Culvert 2 should be kept as low as possible to limit the required fill to lift the property above the low point.	(a) Circulation of the design pack to provide feedback and ensure efficiency and integration with their proposal for the property. (b) That the vertical alignment of the Minor Arterial transport corridor be designed to the lowest practicable level.

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
15.14	2.6	<p>Timing</p> <p>Section 9.2 of the Design Report [Appendix D in the NOR documentation] acknowledges that an integrated approach to the delivery of the Minor Arterial transport corridor and Greenway would be beneficial, and Pragma supports this.</p> <p>Pragma understands that the necessary resource consents for the Rotokauri Greenway have been obtained via the Environmental Protection Authority (fast-track consent process) as of 14 July 2024. It is noted this application includes a portion of the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor under this proposed designation. Based on this application, it is understood that the proposed portion of the Minor Arterial transport corridor relating to Pragma’s property will be delivered first.</p> <p>It is critical to the development of the property that the proposed Minor Arterial transport corridor is constructed, as is the Greenway.</p>	Pragma requests further certainty regarding the timing of the NOR designation.
15.15	2.7	<p>Ecological Impact Assessment</p> <p>The Ecological Impact Assessment [Appendix G in the NOR documentation] identifies a number of ecological features, however only partially addresses how some of these ecological effects of the NOR will be dealt with.</p> <p>Section 4.3.3 of the Ecological Impact Assessment states, “The proposed designation intersects with six wetlands and is located within 100m of a further two wetlands. The Greenway and surrounding developments also intersect with these wetlands and the construction of the Greenway will result in the loss of wetland extent and value in the southern section of the proposed designation, prior to the construction of the Project. This is being addressed through a suite of regional resource consents for the Greenway and therefore effects on those six wetlands are disregarded for this Project.”</p> <p>The submitter would like to ensure that the works required for the NOR will not result in an adverse effect on the property, such as the blocking of natural drainage.</p>	Seeks specific clarification regarding whether any works, like dewatering or removal of ephemeral drains, through the NOR construction will result in the draining, partial draining or blockage of natural drainage of the property.
15.16		<p>Natural Wetlands</p> <p>The Ecological Impact Assessment [Appendix G in the NOR documentation] identifies a “confirmed wetland” in the property as shown in Figure 8. This is inconsistent with the Assessment of Ecological Effects included in the Rotokauri Greenway and Minor Arterial fast-track consent package and given it is outside of the 100 metre buffer, it is not considered relevant to the NOR.</p>	Seeks that the Ecological Impact Assessment [Appendix G in the NOR documentation] is updated to remove reference to this “confirmed wetland” on their property.
16.01	1	The effect that the proposed road near to the submitter’s property will have on the owners and occupiers of the submitter’s property, due to its location immediately alongside the submitter’s property. In particular, the following effects and other issues.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.02	2	Effects on access to the submitter’s property. The plans for the proposed road shows a development area that covers the main access driveway to the submitter’s property.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.03	3	Potential for interruptions to power supply, as the powerlines to the submitter’s property hang very low and close [to] the proposed road alignment.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.04	4	Potential effects of contaminants including but not limited to dust, polluting the rainwater collection, which is from roofs of buildings at the submitter’s property.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.05	5	Noise, dust and vibration effects on the dwelling on the submitter’s property and surrounding residential site. The house was built some 60 years ago right on the boundary and in very close proximity to the existing road and even closer proximity to the proposed road. The property has a garden area that extends up to and partly into the road reserve.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.06	6	Potential for flooding of the submitter’s property. The property is low lying and already suffers from occasional flooding due to drains functioning poorly near to the submitter’s property, with a high-water table, the proposed road is likely to increase water run-off soakage and flooding from the proposed road land which already causes septic tank back flow on the submitter’s property. This gives rise to health concerns.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.07	7	Construction, traffic noise and vibration during construction and operation of the proposed road.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.08	7	Visual effects during construction and operation of the proposed road, due to the proximity of the dwelling and surrounding section to the proposed road.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.09	8	We are also concerned that the Council has not given adequate consideration to the options for location of the proposed road further away from the submitter’s property, which would assist in minimising the impacts of the proposed road on the submitter’s property as outlined above.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.10	9	We are also concerned that the Council has not given adequate consideration to the various methods of reducing and minimising impacts on the submitter’s property, if there is no alternative but to locate the road as proposed.	[See relief sought at Submission Point numbers: 16.11 through 16.15]
16.11	11 (a)		Relocate the road to be further away from the submitter’s property.
16.12	11 (b)		Ensure that all possible measures are taken to minimise the effects of the construction and operation of the road on the submitter’s property.
16.13	11 (d)		Defer any construction works until there is absolute certainty that the road cannot be moved any further away from the submitter’s property, and/or that all possible measures are included in the designation to ensure that effects on the submitter’s property are as low as can possibly be achieved.
16.14	11 (e)		Defer the operation of the proposed road until there has been independent certification that all the required effects and mitigation measures contained in the designation, relating to the submitter’s property, have been fully implemented.
16.15	11 (f)		Reject the Notice of Requirement for the designation if the effects of the proposed road on the submitter’s property cannot be reliably achieved.

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
17.01	7, 20, 21, 32, 36	21. The Ministry supports the provision of shared pathways, bi-directional cycle ways and the upgrading of intersections that will improve safety access to educational facilities. Modal shift has positive impacts on student and staff health, reduces traffic congestion, and improves pick up times. Educational facilities should have accessible and safe pedestrian and cycling links as well as public transport facilities. [The submission includes conflicting statements, e.g.: paras 7 vs 21.] 20. "The Ministry broadly supports the Project aim to plan transport and infrastructure investment in Hamilton's Rotokauri area. In particular, the Project will improve active mode facilities, enhancing the safety of students walking and cycling to and from educational facilities." 21. "... it is considered that the proposed upgrades will provide adequate active mode infrastructure to the surrounding area". 7. "The Ministry supports the provision of active transport modes (e.g. walking and cycling) as proposed through the Rotokauri Transport Network, provided that access and supporting transportation functions required for educational facilities is appropriately accommodated in the future design of the network".	
17.02	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]
17.03	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]
17.04	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]
17.05	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]
17.06	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]	[Intentionally blank]
17.07	16, 22, 33, 34		
17.08	22 (a) 34 (a)	The Ministry has land interests adjacent to the NoR and, while it supports the overall intent of the Project, it is concerned that insufficient consideration has been given to how the integration of surrounding land uses will be facilitated by future network designs. In this regard: a) It is important that the project responds to, facilitates, and enables the establishment of future educational facility infrastructure in the key locations in the Rotokauri area to support growth. The design of the strategic transport and infrastructure network corridors should not preclude the ability of the Ministry to obtain access and supporting transportation functions required for a future educational facility;	See relief sought at submission points 17.12 through 17.19.
17.09	22 (b)	b) Insufficient consideration of how the land directly affected or adjacent to the designation boundary will be integrated with the transport network design.	See relief sought at submission points 17.12 through 17.19.
17.10	22 (c)	A key concern is how access and supporting transportation requirements for future educational facilities adjacent to the designation boundary will be facilitated. Particularly where multimodal corridors are planned or where fixed intersection design are proposed without full consideration of the site layout and function of adjoining land uses. There is potential for design conflict with the multimodal design of the road network. Fixed intersection locations may preclude the ability of the Ministry to achieve their own site needs (for example, enabling access, providing for larger vehicles such as buses, specific pedestrian requirements).	See relief sought at submission points 17.12 through 17.19.
17.11	22 (d) 34 (b)	There is no provision within the NoR as currently drafted to require engagement with key stakeholders around design integration of adjoining land uses with the transport corridor.	Include provision within the NoR to require engagement with key stakeholders around integration of adjoining land uses with the transport and infrastructure corridor. See relief sought at Submission Points 17.12 - 17.19
17.12	22 (e) 34 (b)	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	The Ministry considers that a land integration process should be established as part of the NoR to ensure that the integration of land directly affected or adjacent to the designation is fully provided for through the detailed design process to ensure appropriate outcomes for both HCC and stakeholders and sound resource management practice.
17.13	Appendix 1, p7	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	Land Use Integration Process This condition is to enable the future design of the strategic transport corridor to have regard to the design and functional needs of adjacent and directly affected landholdings, such as the Ministry's future educational facility, so that land use needs can be appropriately integrated into the Rotokauri strategic growth network design to achieve a well functioning urban environment. This will achieve efficient and effective integrated planning outcomes in line with sound resource management practice. Similar conditions have been adopted through the Support Growth Alliance (SGA) NoRs in Auckland by Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and are considered appropriate to be adopted by HCC for the purposes of this NoR
17.14	Appendix 1, p7	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> <u>a. The Requiring Authority shall set up a Land use Integration Process for the period between confirmation of the designation and the Start of Construction. The purpose of this process is to encourage and facilitate the integration of master planning and land use development activity on land directly affected or adjacent to the designation. To achieve this purpose:</u> <u>i. the Requiring Authority shall include the contact details of a nominated contact on the project website (or equivalent information source) required to be established by Condition [x]; and</u> <u>ii. the nominated contact shall be the main point of contact for a Stakeholder wanting to work with the Requiring Authority to integrate their development plans or master planning with the designation.</u>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
17.15	Appendix 1, p7	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> [Continued] <u>b. At any time prior to the Start of Construction, the nominated contact will be available to engage with a Stakeholder for the purpose of:</u> <u>i. responding to requests made to the Requiring Authority for information regarding design details that could assist with land use integration; and</u> <u>ii. receiving information from a Stakeholder regarding master planning or land development details that could assist with land use integration.</u>
17.16	Appendix 1, pp7-8	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> [Continued] <u>c. Information requested or provided under Condition [x]b. above may include but not be limited to the following matters:</u> <u>i. design details including but not limited to:</u> <u>A. boundary treatment (e.g. the use of retaining walls or batter slopes);</u> <u>B. the horizontal and vertical alignment of the road (levels);</u> <u>C. potential locations for mid-block crossings;</u> <u>D. integration of stormwater infrastructure; and</u> <u>E. traffic noise modelling contours.</u> <u>ii. potential modifications to the extent of the designation in response to information received through Condition [x]b.ii.</u> <u>iii. the timing of any response to information received through Condition [x]b.ii.</u> <u>iv. a process for the Requiring Authority to undertake a technical review of, or provide comments on, any master planning or development proposal advanced by the Stakeholder as it relates to integration with the Project; and</u> <u>v. details of how to apply for written consent from the Requiring Authority for any development proposal that relates to land is within the designation under section 176(1)(b) of the RMA.</u>
17.17	Appendix 1, p8	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> [Continued] <u>d. Where information is requested from the Requiring Authority and is available, the nominated contact shall provide the information unless there are reasonable grounds for not providing it.</u>
17.18	Appendix 1, p8	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> [Continued] <u>e. The nominated contact shall maintain a record of the engagement between the Requiring Authority and Stakeholders for the period following the date in which this designation is included in the HCDP through to the Start of Construction for a Stage of Work. The record shall include:</u> <u>i. details of any requests made to the Requiring Authority that could influence detailed design, the results of any engagement and, where such requests that could influence detailed design are declined, the reasons why the Requiring Authority has declined the requests; and</u> <u>ii. details of any requests to co-ordinate the forward work programme, where appropriate, with Stakeholders.</u>
17.19	Appendix 1, p8	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.08 through 17.11.	<u>[x] Land Use Integration Process</u> [Continued] <u>f. The record shall be submitted to Council for information ten working days prior to the Start of Construction for a Stage of Work.</u>
17.20	23	The Project is a large programme of works anticipated to be delivered in 3 stages. The quantum of construction required to deliver the projects will likely have temporary adverse effects on the surrounding environment. There are several educational facilities in proximity to the NoRs. There is potential for these educational facilities to be affected by traffic, noise and other nuisance effects arising from future construction works . The construction timing is yet to be determined, so there is uncertainty regarding the construction methodology, including the routes for construction vehicles and the location of construction laydown areas.	See relief sought at submission points 17.22 through 17.24.
17.21	24	The Ministry seeks to appropriately address and manage construction related effects and the ongoing potential effects the Project may have on the operation and management of educational facilities . Additionally, as the project is planned for works over the next 10 to 30 years, the Ministry's Submission is intended to address any new educational facilities that are developed proximate to the Project area in the future. The key issues that the Ministry has concerns about in relation to the NoRs include construction traffic effects , and stakeholder engagement . These concerns are outlined in detail below.	See relief sought at submission points 17.22 through 17.24.
17.22	25 26 27 31	Construction Traffic Effects 25. The surrounding educational facilities (and any future facilities) will potentially be affected by an increased volume of heavy vehicles to access the construction area of the NoRs. Further, there is potential for students making their way to and from educational facilities to pass through / near to construction areas. This is a traffic safety concern for students walking, cycling and using other active transport modes to educational facilities at peak pick up and drop off times and a network congestion issue. 26. Condition 8.1 requires the preparation of a CTMP [Construction Traffic Management Plan] prior to the start of construction, Condition 8.2 sets out the objectives of the CTMP which includes Stakeholder communication, and Condition 8.3 sets out the requirements of the CTMP.	27. The Ministry supports the inclusion of these conditions [Conditions 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3] but requests that specific reference is made to active mode users and educational facilities to address the estimated numbers, frequencies, heavy vehicle routes, detours and timing of traffic movements, including any specific non-working or non-movement hours (for example on roads servicing educational facilities during pick up and drop off times) to manage vehicular and pedestrian traffic near educational facilities or to manage traffic congestion. 31. The requested changes to address the above through the proposed conditions of the Designation are included in Appendix 1 to this submission .

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
17.23	Appendix 1, p9	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.20 through 17.22.	<p>The following amendment is to recognise pedestrians, cyclists, and other active transport users who rely on a CTMP to enable their safe and efficient movement through a construction zone. This is particularly relevant mode of transport for educational facility users.</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan 8.2 The objective of the CTMP is to minimise adverse effects on property access, <u>active transport users</u>, traffic safety and efficiency as a result of enabling or construction works activities, and effectively communicate those effects to stakeholders and the public. The CTMP forms part of the CEMP required by Condition 7.</p>
17.24	Appendix 1, p9	Relief addresses issues identified at Submission Points 17.20 through 17.22.	<p>8.3 The CTMP must include, as a minimum:</p> <p>....</p> <p>b. A Stakeholder and Engagement Plan <u>required by condition [x]</u> which describes how stakeholders and the public will be communicated with and can register complaints during construction in relation to the following matters:</p> <p>c. Methods for managing traffic effects, including through temporary traffic management activities, including:</p> <p>....</p> <p>iii. To maintain <u>vehicle access to and within</u> property and/or private roads <u>for all transport modes</u> where practicable, or to provide alternative access arrangements when it will not be.</p> <p>....</p> <p><u>x. The estimated numbers, frequencies, routes and timing of traffic movements, including how heavy vehicles must avoid the schools at peak school pick up and drop off times</u></p> <p><u>xi. identification of detour routes and other methods to ensure the safe management and maintenance of traffic flows, including public transport service, pedestrians, cyclists and other active mode users.</u></p> <p>....</p>
17.25	4 29 30 31	<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>4. The Ministry considers that they are a key stakeholder with land interests both adjacent to, and within proximity to, the Project.</p> <p>29. The Ministry is a key stakeholder to this NoR.</p>	<p>4. The Ministry requests HCC to consult and engage with the Ministry and directly affected educational facilities throughout the Project timeframe.</p> <p>29. This Submission requests that HCC consult with the Ministry to discuss the integration of the designation with future educational facilities and maintain engagement throughout the full extent of the Project timeframes to ensure sound resource management outcomes.</p> <p>30. The Ministry also requests that a Stakeholder Engagement condition is established to clearly identify who key stakeholders are. This is particularly important during the design and construction phase and the implementation of the CTMP to address nuisance effects and ensure the safety of students, staff and their whānau. The list of stakeholders should include both the Ministry and educational facilities within 1km of the staged works areas including Te Rapa School, Ngā Taiātea Wharekura, Te Kōpuku High, Pukete School, and any future educational facilities that may be established during the lifetime of the Project.</p> <p>31. The requested changes to address the above through the proposed conditions of the Designation are included in Appendix 1 to this submission.</p>
17.26	33	Relief addresses issues identified in Submission Point 17.25.	<p>The Ministry requests that HCC consult and engage with the Ministry as a key stakeholder. In particular:</p> <p>[a] consultation and engagement should occur immediately regarding its future landholding interests adjacent to the designation boundary.</p> <p>[b] Consultation should occur throughout the Project stages to ensure that the integration of land use and transportation planning occurs.</p> <p>[c] During the construction phase, individual educational facilities within proximity to the works area should be directly engaged through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) process.</p>
17.27	35 (a) Appendix 1, p8	Relief addresses issues identified in Submission Point 17.25.	<p>35. To ensure temporary construction effects associated with the NoR on the Ministry are appropriately managed, it is requested that appropriate conditions are imposed on the NoR in accordance with the RMA. It is requested that amendments to conditions as set out in Appendix 1 are adopted by HCC. The amendments sought include:</p> <p>a) Inclusion of a new condition to require a SCEMP [Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Management Plan];</p> <p><u>[x] Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Management Plan</u></p> <p><u>a. At least 6 months prior to the start of detailed design for a Stage of Work, the Requiring Authority shall identify:</u></p> <p><u>i. A list of Stakeholders;</u></p> <p><u>ii. A list of properties within the designation which the Requiring Authority does not own or</u></p> <p><u>iii. have occupation rights to; and</u></p> <p><u>iv. Methods to engage with Stakeholders and the owners and occupiers of properties identified in a.i. – ii. above.</u></p> <p><u>b. A record of a. shall be submitted within an Outline Plan for each relevant Stage of Work.</u></p>

Hamilton City Council Notice of Requirement - Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure - Submission Points

Submission Point Number	Submitter's Paragraph Number or Page Number (pX) of Question Number	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought (Relief Sought)
17.28	Appendix 1, p8	Relief addresses issues identified in Submission Point 17.25.	Management Plans <i>6.1 The following Management Plans must be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person and be submitted to the Territorial Authority for certification that they are consistent with the conditions of the Designation:</i> <i>f. Ecological Management Plan; and</i> <i>g. Landscape Management Plan - ;and</i> <i>h. Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Management Plan.</i>
17.29	35 (b)	Relief addresses issues identified in Submission Point 17.25.	It is requested that amendments to conditions as set out in Appendix 1 are adopted by HCC. The amendments sought include: b) Request that the Ministry and educational facilities within 1km of the designation boundary are identified as stakeholders in the CTMP [Construction Traffic Management Plan].
17.30	35 (c)	Relief addresses issues identified in Submission Point 17.25.	It is requested that amendments to conditions as set out in Appendix 1 are adopted by HCC. The amendments sought include: c) Changes to the CTMP [Construction Traffic Management Plan] to recognise effects on education facilities and address the estimated numbers, frequencies, heavy vehicle routes and timing of traffic movements, including any specific non working or non-movement hours (for example on roads servicing educational facilities during pick up and drop off times) to manage vehicular and active mode traffic near educational facilities or to manage traffic congestion. Also request additional amendments to ensuring safe access is maintained and detours are provided / communicated.
17.31	37, 34 (c)		Consequential amendments to the NoR to: 37. Give effect to the relief sought through this submission. 34 (c). Recognise both existing and proposed educational facilities.
18.01	para 1	The submitter understands that Wintec does not want people travelling through its campus.	
18.02	para 2	The submitter considers that the Rotokauri Greenway will help limit the number of people travelling through Wintec's campus.	
18.03	para 3	The sumbitter considers that the drain on his property and along the common boundary with the Wintec Campus will support the Rotokauri Greenway.	
18.04	para 3	Currently, the Rotokauri Drain along Wintec's southern boundary has minimal planting and is not very friendly to aquatic life.	
18.05	para 3	A line of pine trees on his property screens industrial activities along Gilchrest Street.	
18.06	para 3		Hamilton City Council and Wintec need to clarify [their] preferred position on ... stormwater requirements around Wintec, to support general development.
18.07	paras 4 & 5	The submitter comments on a pedestrian and cycle path between Rotokauri Suburban Centre and Avalon Drive	
18.08	Para 5		Hamilton City Council and Wintec need to clarify [their] preferred position for the connectivity from Te Wetini Drive to Avalon Drive for the general public.