

Under clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

---

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED RUAKURA VARIATION  
1 TO THE HAMILTON PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**CHEDWORTH PROPERTIES LIMITED**

Dated 2 March 2016

---

To: **Hamilton City Council**

Name of Submitter: **Chedworth Properties Limited**

This is a further submission by Chedworth Properties Ltd (**CPL**) on submissions on Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Hamilton District Plan (**the Variation**)

**Scope of further submission**

1. CPL supports or opposes the submissions of submitters as detailed in the attached Schedule.

**Submissions supported or opposed**

2. The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are indicated in the attached Schedule.

**Reasons for further submission**

3. The reasons for support and opposition are contained in the attached Schedule and in CPL's original submission.

**Jurisdiction**

4. CPL has the ability to make a further submission on the Variation as it has an interest in the Variation greater than the interest that the general public has for the following reasons:

- (a) CPL was an original proponent of the Ruakura Private Plan Change request heard by the Board of Inquiry.
- (b) CPL is a key landowner in the Ruakura Structure Plan Area.

**CPL wishes to be heard in support of this further submission**



---

**Peter Hall**

On behalf of Chedworth Properties Limited

Date: 02 March 2016

**Address for service of submitter:**

Boffa Miskell

PO Box 91250

Auckland

Attention: Peter Hall

Telephone: 09 359 5325

Email: [peter.hall@boffamiskell.co.nz](mailto:peter.hall@boffamiskell.co.nz)

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Name	Submission Point	Plan Provision	Type	Summary	CPL Further Submission	Further Submission text
Cycle Action Waikato	10.01	1 Plan Overview	Support in part	Add the 'Safe System' approach as set out in the Government's Safer Journeys strategy.	Oppose	There is sufficient detail as drafted in the Plan Overview.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.02	1.1.2.2 Integration of the Plan with Other Plans and Documents	Oppose	Amend 1.1.2.2c) Ruakura Development Plan; Board of Inquiry Decision to make it clear the area being considered was not part of the Ruakura Schedule Area and Board of Inquiry process.	Oppose	The explanation at 1.1.2.2 accurately describes the relationship between the Ruakura Schedule Area and the R1 area.
West, Jennifer	50.01	1.1.2.2 Integration of the Plan with Other Plans and Documents	Oppose	Amend wording to clarify the relationship between the Board of Inquiry Plan Change and the Variation.	Oppose	The explanation at 1.1.2.2 accurately describes the relationship between the Ruakura Schedule Area and the R1 area.
West, Jennifer	50.02	Figure 1a	Support in part	Insert reference to National Standard for Air Quality. Require a complete assessment of effects for the whole Ruakura Structure Plan on Air Quality.	Oppose	Figure 1a already includes a reference to National Environmental Standards, which will include by definition National Standard for Air Quality. There is no need or statutory requirement for such assessment.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.03	Figure 1a	Oppose	An assessment of the effects of the whole Ruakura Structure Plan on Air Quality, including vehicle emissions.	Oppose	There is no need or statutory requirement for such assessment. Figure 1a already includes a reference to National Environmental Standards, which will include by definition National Standard for Air Quality.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.01	1.1.9 Notification Non-notification Rules	Support	Retain '1.1.9 Notification Non-notification Rules' as notified.	Oppose	Changes to 1.1.9 may be required as consequential amendments to reflect the requirements for the obtaining of Affected Party Consent as sought by CPL in its submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.09	3 Structure Plans	Support	Replace any general reference to 'Three Waters Infrastructure' with 'Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure'.	Oppose	'3.7 Ruakura' contains a number of references to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure. The requested amendment is not logical in some instances.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.01	3 Structure Plans	Oppose	Request a full and accurate "Assessment of Environmental Effects" (including all amenity issues and vehicle emissions) be carried out.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission is not a statutory requirement applicable to variations under the RMA.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.01	3 Structure Plans	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative, advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				with predevelopment discussions. Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.		the impact of development on archeology.
Cycle Action Waikato	10.02	3 Structure Plans	Support in part	Add the 'Hamilton Biking Plan' to the list of HCC documents (along with ACCESS Hamilton, etc).	Oppose	The variation area has detailed reference to cycling outcomes.
Waikato Regional Council	21.01	3 Structure Plans	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the CPL Submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.20	3.7 Ruakura	Support in part	Retain LDP approach to development.	Support	Support subject to various changes sought in the CPL Submission on the provisions and maps relating to LDPs.
				Oppose consideration of industrial land allocation.	Oppose	Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS) contains the industrial land allocation for Ruakura. This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Waikato Regional Council	21.12	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Retain provision 3.7ii, Appendix 2 Figures 2-15A and 2-15B and rules 3.7.3.3 (including rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Freight Logistics Action Group	46.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Retain Chapter 3.7 Ruakura.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.04	3.7 Ruakura	Oppose	Amend 3.7b) to reflect the more accurate land available for research and innovation activities.	Oppose	3.7b) would appear to be an accurate reflection of the land available for research and innovation activities.
				Add 3.7f)iv. Figure 2-16B expected development sequence and indicative dates.	Oppose	CPL opposes the variation including additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or specify.
				Amend 3.7i) to remove “is fixed” when referring to Ruakura Open Space Zone until consideration of noise, air, transport, flooding and visual amenity effects to Fairview Downs have been considered.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Retain the amendments to Chapter 3 of the Plan as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
West, Jennifer	50.03	3.7 Ruakura	Oppose	Insert a provision for the monitoring of this project from its outset at construction and throughout each stage of development.	Oppose	There is no need to insert specific monitoring provisions into the District Plan as sought by the submitter. The need for monitoring conditions is a matter that would be addressed as part of the resource consent application for future development, and will differ depending on the scale and location of development.
				Amend 3.7b) to refer to industrial land and delete reference to employment.	Oppose	The reference to employment land is appropriate in this clause.
				Amend the total figure of 77ha available for research and innovation.	Oppose	3.7 would appear to be an accurate reflection of the land available for research and innovation activities.
				Add iv. Figure 2-16B Expected Development Sequence and Indicative Dates. Amend 3.7f) to provide details of development sequence and anticipated timeframes for development.	Oppose	CPL opposes the variation including additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or specify.
				Amend 3.7i) by deleting reference to Open Space "is fixed" until consideration has been given to the effects on Fairview Downs and its environs.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
				Amend 3.7 to reflect the fact that the matter of national significance that required a BOI hearing was an inland port and logistics area.	Oppose	The plan change in its entirety was identified by the Minister for the Environment as being a matter of National Significance, and the Minister’s decision was not limited to only the inland port and logistics areas.
				Insert a provision that an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) be completed that includes all environmental effects of the whole	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission is not a statutory requirement applicable to variations under the RMA.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				area of the proposed Ruakura Structure Plan, and especially Air Quality.		
The University of Waikato	26.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Adopt the decision of the BOI into the Proposed Plan in whole subject to exceptions.	Support	Support subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission.
Broadbent, Morris	15.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support in part	Clarify how 1600 additional residential houses will impact on peak travel times on Powells Road and Wairere Drive.	Oppose	The effects of the quantum and type of residential development provided by the variation has been fully assessed by the Council in its section 32 assessment of the variation and deemed to be appropriate to manage with the Land Development Plan approach.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.06	3.7.1 Structure Plan Components	Support in part	Request that the residential areas adjacent to the Spine Road should be given full consideration for loss of amenity and required mitigation to resolve issues.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.07	3.7.1.3 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Request a full Assessment of Environmental Effects from the entire Ruakura Structure Plan.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission is not a statutory requirement applicable to variations under the RMA.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.10	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Include an explanation of how the 110kv transmission line will progress from under to above ground.	Oppose	The timing and staging of any undergrounding has yet to be determined and consented and is inappropriate to include in the District Plan through the variation.
Hamilton City Council	32.04	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Support	Amend to provide additional clarity to which area the underground 110kV transmission lines apply, ie Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone.	Oppose	The timing and staging of any undergrounding has yet to be determined and consented and is inappropriate to include in the District Plan through the variation.
Bothwell, Jenny	04.02	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Move the Spine Road closer to the Waikato Expressway. Build residential homes immediately behind Aldona Place and double glaze all homes in Aldona Place.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is inappropriate as the location of the Spine Road has been determined through structure planning to be appropriate to both meet its traffic functions, the various functions of the adjoining open space and to allow for the efficient use the Ruakura land for development. The location suggested by the submitter would in effect locate two roads right next to each other and not allow the Spine Road to best service development land.
				Plant tall trees beside new housing. Make the green belt wider - at least 200m or even 500m.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter would be a significant imposition of costs and a very inefficient use of a scarce urban land resource, without any proven resource management benefit
				Keep people out of the green zone or build high fences to keep them away from residents	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter would result in very poor open space outcomes.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				property.		
West, Jennifer	50.26	3.7.1.8 Open Space Network	Oppose	Clarify that visual amenity and buffer areas are part of mitigation measures for residents.	Oppose	Subject to the changes sought by CPL in its submission, the functions of the open space network are otherwise adequately described in 3.7.1.8 Open Space Network.
Hamilton City Council	32.05	3.7.1.8 Open Space Network	Support	Amend to clarify the area and radius for a neighbourhood reserve, ie 0.5 ha and 500m.	Oppose	The amendment sought by the submitter is inappropriate and unnecessary because the specific location and size of neighbourhood reserves are best determined through the Land Development Plan process.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.11	3.7.1.8 Open Space Network	Oppose	Provide an adequate buffer for Fairview Downs from the Spine Road to mitigate roading effects and transport.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is inappropriate as the location of the Spine Road and its associated buffer has already been determined through structure planning to be appropriate to both meet its traffic functions, the various functions of the adjoining open space and to allow for the efficient use the Ruakura land for development.
				Amend Open Space Network and identify it as Three-Waters Infrastructure if used for stormwater only.	Oppose	The open space network is intended to be multifunctional and include stormwater, ecological, amenity and recreational functions. The identification of areas used for stormwater treatment is inappropriate in this context.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.12	3.7.1.9 Stormwater	Support in part	Require an approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
				Amend 3.7.1.9a) to refer to the precise nature and location of these stormwater facilities will be established through an approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan.	Oppose	The nature and location of the stormwater management facilities is appropriately included as an information matter with LDP applications, in conjunction with the extent, scale and timing of land development and should not be specified in the District Plan.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.07	3.7.1.9 Stormwater	Support in part	Amend 3.7.1.9 to require an ICMP to provide flood protection for Fairview Downs.	Oppose	The avoidance of adverse downstream flooding effects is a matter considered with district LDP and subdivision consents and with regional water discharge application associated with land



## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						development. It is unnecessary to include additional reference in 3.7.1.9.
West, Jennifer	50.13	3.7.1.9 Stormwater	Oppose	Reinstate Rule 3.7.3.2 and make it clear to require an ICMP before any land development is planned.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.13	3.7.1.11 Indicative Infrastructure Development Programme	Oppose	Amend 3.7.1.11a) to remove the incremental development of the Spine Road.	Support	Support the deletion of incremental development of the Spine Road for the reasons set out in the CPL submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.14	Objective 3.7.2.1	Support in part	Amend 3.7.2.1 to delete 'general'.	Oppose	The word 'general' is necessary in this objective as it provides for an appropriate degree of flexibility in outcomes which will be determined through the Land Development applications.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.08	Objective 3.7.2.1	Support in part	Amend Objective to remove the word 'general' so development is in accordance with the vision.	Oppose	The word 'general' is necessary in this objective as it provides for an appropriate degree of flexibility in outcomes which will be determined through the Land Development applications.
Hamilton City Council	32.06	Objective 3.7.2.1	Support	Amend Policy 3.7.2.1e to refer to multiple functions of open space.	Support	The Open Space network has multiple functions
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.09	Objective 3.7.2.2	Support in part	Amend 3.7.2.2a to align with amenity for the rest of Hamilton City.	Oppose	Objective 3.7.2.2a is specific to development at Ruakura and subject to the changes sought by CPL in its submission, appropriately recognises the need to avoid significant adverse effects on existing amenity in a context where existing amenity values will change with urbanisation.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.15	Objective 3.7.2.2	Oppose	Amend 3.7.2.2a to include 'that is consistent with other residential areas within Hamilton City' when referring to residential amenity.	Oppose	Objective 3.7.2.2a is specific to development at Ruakura, and subject to the changes sought by CPL in its submission, appropriately recognises the need to avoid significant adverse effects on existing amenity in a context where existing amenity values will change with urbanisation.
				Add new 3.7.2.2a iv. 'Mitigating the adverse effects of logistics and industry on social and environmental wellbeing in knowledge, residential and open space	Oppose	The additional objective matter sought by the submitter is unnecessary as the expectation on managing effects on amenity is already set out in the objective, subject to the changes sought by CPL.

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

				zones'.		
				Amend to provide examples of measures to mitigate air emissions.	Oppose	Air quality mitigation measures are not required as air quality is a matter regulated under regional planning provisions and not the District Plan.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.08	Objective 3.7.2.2	Support in part	Retain Objective 3.7.2.2 and Policy 3.7.2.2a.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes to this objective sought in the CPL Submission.
				Either Retain Policy 3.7.2.2b	Support	Support subject to the specific changes to this objective sought in the CPL Submission.
				Amend Figures 2-14, 2-15A and B, 2-16, 2-17 and 2-18 - to rezone the land to the north of Powells Road as Residential Medium; or Amend Policy 3.7.2.2b so that it does not preclude residential land use, subdivision and development of the EAF site.	Oppose	Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS) contains the industrial land allocation for Ruakura. This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Waikato Regional Council	21.18	Objective 3.7.2.3	Support	Retain objectives 3.7.2.3 and 3.7.2.4 and policies 3.7.2.3a-e and 3.7.2.4a-d	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the CPL Submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.08	Objective 3.7.2.3	Support	Amend to provide reference to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure Figures.	Oppose	The addition of references to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure Figure in objective 3.7.2.3 is inappropriate as it unnecessarily limits options for achieving the integrated provision of infrastructure.
				Amend Policy 3.7.2.3a to refer to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure being secured by an appropriate legal mechanism.	Oppose	The mechanism to secure infrastructure is inappropriate to include in a District Plan policy.
Waikato Regional Council	21.19	Objective 3.7.2.4	Support	Retain objectives 3.7.2.3 and 3.7.2.4 and policies 3.7.2.3a-e and 3.7.2.4a-d.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the CPL Submission.
Gibbons, Matthew	06.03	Objective 3.7.2.4	Support in part	Amend to discourage people driving to work and prioritise bus movements.	Oppose	The Structure Plan process has already determined the appropriate level of public transport to service the R1 growth area. This will change as the area develops and it is not an appropriate or necessary resource management method to include mechanisms to discourage people driving to work and prioritise bus movements.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.01	3.7.3.1 Ruakura Structure Plan	Support	Amend 3.7.3.1 to remove the word 'general' so	Oppose	The word 'general' is necessary in this clause as it

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

		Area	in part	land use and development is in accordance with.		provides for an appropriate degree of flexibility in outcomes which will be determined through the Land Development applications.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.18	3.7.3.1 Ruakura Structure Plan Area	Oppose	Amend 3.7.3.1 to delete 'general'.	Oppose	The word 'general' is necessary in this clause as it provides for an appropriate degree of flexibility in outcomes which will be determined through the Land Development applications.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.09	3.7.3.1 Ruakura Structure Plan Area	Oppose	Either Retain Rule 3.7.3.1 and amend the Ruakura Structure Plan Figures 2-14, 2-15A and B, 2-16, 2-17 and 2-18 - to rezone the land to the north of Powells Road as Residential Medium; or Amend Rule 3.7.3.1 so that it does not preclude residential land use, subdivision and development of the EAF site.	Oppose	Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS) contains the industrial land allocation for Ruakura. This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.15	3.7.3.2 Land Development Plan	Support in part	Retain the boundaries of the proposed Land Development Plan Areas. Amend 3.7.3.3d so that there are no 'staging' for development.	Oppose	The extent of Land Development Plan areas should be identified at consent stage to ensure proper integrated resource management. The identification of Land Development Plan areas on the Figure is arbitrary and serves no resource management purpose.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.21	3.7.3.2 Land Development Plan	Support in part	Add 3.7.3.2 Integrated Catchment Management Plan to make this a pre-requisite to all land use and development.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
West, Jennifer	50.08	3.7.3.2 Land Development Plan	Oppose	Amend to consider wider landscaping provisions for the whole development.	Oppose	Sufficient methods are included in the variation, including the LDP provisions as notified, to provide for an appropriate assessment of landscape implications of development.
				Reinstate Rule 3.7.3.2 and make it clear to require an ICMP before any land development can be considered. Add details of development sequencing and anticipated timeframes in a new figure.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
West, Jennifer	50.25	3.7.3.2.1 Consent for Land Development	Oppose	Provide more landscaping in each Land Development Plan area to provide the best visual effect to adjacent residences, while providing screening from noise, vibration, dust, pollutants and traffic.	Oppose	The open space network included in the structure plan is adequate to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects of development on adjacent residences. It is also superior to other transitional areas between zones in other parts of Hamilton City.
Hamilton City Council	32.10	3.7.3.2.1 Consent for Land Development	Support	Insert new provision to clarify the relationship between indicative staging and future Land Development Plan requirements.	Oppose	CPL opposes the inclusion in the variation of additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or specify
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.19	3.7.3.2.1 Consent for Land Development	Support in part	Amend 3.7.3.2.1a) iii. to add swales. 3.7.3.2.1c - support.	Oppose	The amendments sought by the submitter are opposed as they are unnecessary. The land development plan already requires detail of linear wetlands.
				3.7.3.2.1d - delete “but not to exclude the Spine Road from the area”. Amend 3.7.3.2.1f ii. to include 'surround established areas'.	Oppose	The amendments sought by the submitter are opposed as they are unnecessary. The land development plan will determine the necessity of connection to surrounding established areas.
Waikato Regional Council	21.20	3.7.3.2.1 Consent for Land Development	Support	Retain rule 3.7.3.2.1.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the CPL Submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.20	3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment	Support in part	Delete 3.7.3.2.2 ii which relates to development in the absence of an Integrated Catchment Management Plan.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
				Amend 3.7.3.2.2 viii. to add 'and existing surrounding areas'.	Oppose	A Water Impact Assessment is required to be submitted with a Land Development Plan. The land development plan will determine the necessity of connection to surrounding established areas.
				Amend 3.7.3.2.2 iv. to remove reference to 'new' when referring to stormwater devices.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule in its entirety as the matters set out in 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment are information requirements rather than rules and are better placed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

						Development Plans
				Add new 3.7.3.2.2 xi. (as per BOI) Information on how wastewater (including trade waste) will be managed to minimize any impacts on the reticulated network.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule in its entirety as the matters set out in 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment are information requirements rather than rules and are better placed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land Development Plans.
				Add 3.7.3.2.2 xii. (as per BOI) A list of measureable targets and indicators for monitoring compliance of the LDP with conditions from Water Impact Assessment.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule in its entirety as the matters set out in 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment are information requirements rather than rules and are better placed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land Development Plans.
				Add 3.7.3.2.2 xiii. (as per BOI) An assessment of the effects of staged development on existing and planned city Three Waters infrastructure.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule in its entirety as the matters set out in 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment are information requirements rather than rules and are better placed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land Development Plans.
Hamilton City Council	32.11	3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment	Support	Delete Rule 3.7.3.2.2iii regarding interim connections. Delete Rule 3.7.3.2.2x regarding the effect of staged or interim connections.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule in its entirety as the matters set out in 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment are information requirements rather than rules and are better placed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land Development Plans. The principle of allowing for interim connections is sought and supported elsewhere in the submission by CPL and is appropriate given the complex and staged nature of land development at Ruakura. The removal of the ability to provide interim connections potentially imposes significant costs on development which are unjustified in section 32 RMA terms.
West, Jennifer	50.14	3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment	Oppose	Reinstate Rule 3.7.3.2 and make it clear to require an ICMP before any land development is planned.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.22	3.7.3.2.3 Notification Rule	Oppose	Delete 3.7.3.2.3a) last paragraph which refers to all Restricted Discretionary activities within the Inland Port shall be considered without notification or affected person approval.	Oppose	Rule 3.7.3.2.3a) is required to provide for an efficient resource management process. The restricted discretionary activity activities are envisaged within the zone and any adverse effects anticipated and limited. Any such adverse effects are addressed through a combination of detailed assessment criteria or by compliance with development standards and controls.
Waikato Regional Council	21.21	3.7.3.2.3 Notification Rule	Support in part	Amend the Rule 3.7.3.2.3 to require affected party approval from the NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council for all Land Development Plan applications.	Oppose	The written approval of NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council for LDP applications should not be required in all instances, particularly where the scale and consequential adverse effects of the LDP application will be less than minor.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.03	3.7.3.2.3 Notification Rule	Oppose	Amend the Variation to require affected party approval from the NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council as was required in the BOI decision. These are for all Land Development Plan applications; for all high traffic (1500 vpd) generating activities; and for non-compliance with the staging requirements.	Oppose	The written approval of NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council for LDP applications should not be required in all instances, particularly where the scale and consequential adverse effects of the LDP application will be less than minor.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.16	3.7.3.3 Staging and Traffic Requirements	Oppose	Delete the second bullet point in Rule 3.7.3.3.d, and any other Rules that dictate the timing or order of individual Areas for development (insofar as the affect Area R).	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of rule 3.7.3.3d in its entirety.
				Delete the proposed Industrial zoning of the EAF site; and rezone the land as Residential. Rezone an alternative area of land nearby as Industrial, and to zone the EAF Site as Residential.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Waikato Regional Council	21.16	3.7.3.3 Staging and Traffic Requirements	Support	Retain provision 3.7.ii, Appendix 2 Figures 2-15A and 2-15B and rules 3.7.3.3 (including rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.23	3.7.3.3 Staging and Traffic Requirements	Oppose	Amend 3.7.3.3b) to refer to the uptake of land will depend on market demand for 'logistics'.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary.
Hamilton City Council	32.12	3.7.3.3 Staging and Traffic Requirements	Support	Amend 3.7.3.3b) to improve readability and clarity.	Support	CPL supports the submission point, subject to the changes being limited to readability and clarity.

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

				Amend 3.7.3.3d) to insert cross references to the sections of the Plan where the Spine Road is defined.	Oppose	CPL has sought the deletion of this rule 3.7.3d in its entirety
West, Jennifer	50.15	3.7.3.3 Staging and Traffic Requirements	Oppose	Ensure the Variation reflects the BOI decisions. Provide details of development sequencing and anticipated timeframes in a new figure.	Oppose	While CPL supports the variation reflecting the BOI decision, it opposes the inclusion of additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or specify.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.24	3.7.3.3.2 Industrial Land Stage 2 Rule (PRPS 2021 - 2041 Allocation)	Oppose	Amend 3.7.3.3.2 Industrial Land Stage 2 Rule (PRPS 2021 - 2041 Allocation) to refer to 'up to 115' of land being developed post 2021 and including 'general industrial not exceeding 40 hectares'.	Oppose	Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS) contains the industrial land allocation for Ruakura. This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.17	3.7.3.3.4 Medium Density Residential Staging Rule	Support in part	Extend the residential zoning to include the EAF Site. Amend Rules in 3.7.3.3.4 to enable a greater number of dwellings to be constructed.	Oppose	The extension of the residential zone and removal of the industrial zoning from the EAF site would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.18	3.7.3.3.5 General Residential Staging	Support	Retain 3.7.3.3.5 and amend to include the EAF site.	Oppose	The inclusion of the EAF site in clause 3.7.3.3.5 would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.19	3.7.3.3.6 Staging Activity Status	Support in part	Retain Rule 3.7.3.3.6, but with clarification whether this would apply to residential activities on the EAF site.	Oppose	The amendment of this rule to apply to the EAF site is opposed as the change to residential would not give effect to the PRPS.
				Delete 3.7.3.3.6(i) which refers to consistency with industrial land allocation.	Oppose	Clause 3.7.3.3.6(i) is necessary to give effect to the PRPS.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.26	3.7.3.3.6 Staging Activity Status	Oppose	Amend 3.7.3.3.6v to refer to the Silverdale Industrial area and Fifth Avenue Industrial area and removing the industrial development in excess of 16ha north of AgResearch.	Oppose	Rule 3.7.3.6v is consistent with the staging approach approved by the Board of Inquiry and is necessary to achieve the objectives of the variation.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.05	3.7.3.3.7 Traffic Generation	Oppose	Amend Rule 3.7.3.3.7 to require affected party approval from the NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato	Oppose	The written approval of NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council for LDP applications should not be required in all

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

				District Council as per the BOI decision.		instances, particularly where the scale and consequential adverse effects of the LDP application will be less than minor.
				Include a cross reference to the ITA information requirements in Rule 3.7.3.3.7.	Oppose	Internal cross reference as sought by the submitter is unnecessary.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.27	3.7.3.3.7 Traffic Generation	Support in part	Amend 3.7.3.3.7a) so any activity with trip generation of greater than 250 vehicles per day requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity.	Oppose	Traffic modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed by the Board of Inquiry.
Waikato Regional Council	21.23	3.7.3.3.7 Traffic Generation	Support in part	Amend Rule 3.7.3.3.7 to require affected party approval from the NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council as per the BOI decision.	Oppose	The written approval of NZ Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council for LDP applications should not be required in all instances, particularly where the scale and consequential adverse effects of the LDP application will be less than minor.
Waikato Regional Council	21.17	3.7.3.4 Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure	Support	Retain provision 3.7ii, Appendix 2 Figures 2-15A and 2-15B and rules 3.7.3.3 (including rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.13	3.7.3.4 Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure	Support	Provide additional clarity within 3.7.3.4 by referring to Land Development Plans.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.14	3.7.3.4.1 Potable Water Supply	Support	Provide additional clarity within Rule and remove unnecessary introduction covered within 3.7.3.4.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.15	3.7.3.4.2 Wastewater Network	Support	Insert new provision outlining the extension of the wastewater network to align with Land Development Plan Areas and amend to provide additional clarity.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.16	3.7.3.4.3 Stormwater Network	Support	Amend to remove reference to approved ICMP and replace with relevant ICMP. Replace 'reflect' with 'be consistent with' regarding stormwater discharge points.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.02	3.7.3.4.3 Stormwater Network	Support in part	Amend 3.7.3.4.3a by removing 'where available'. Delete 3.7.3.4.3b which refers to the stormwater network in the absence of an ICMP.	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Fairview Downs	43.28	3.7.3.4.3 Stormwater Network	Support	Amend 3.7.3.4.3a) so all stormwater	Oppose	CPL has sought that this rule be removed for the



## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Residents and Owners Association			in part	management infrastructure shall be in accordance with an approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan.  Delete 3.7.3.4.3b) which refers to stormwater management in the absence of an Integrated Catchment Management Plan.		reasons set out in its submission.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.02	4 Residential Zones	Support	Retain the Residential Zone provisions as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.02	4 Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.02	4 Residential Zones	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.02	4 Residential Zones	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Gibbons, Matthew	06.02	4.1.3 Medium-Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Amend to recognise the need for more residential housing near the university and close to the central city.	Oppose	Land use patterns for Ruakura have been developed through a structure plan process and have been developed with reference to Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS).
Waikato Regional Council	21.30	Objective 4.2.10	Support	Retain objectives 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 and polices 4.2.10a – 4.2.10e and 4.2.11a.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.31	Objective 4.2.11	Support	Retain objectives 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 and polices 4.2.10a – 4.2.10e and 4.2.11a.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.10	4.5.4 Activity Status Table – Ruakura Medium- Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Retain Rule 4.5.4; and amend all associated plans so that the EAF Site is zoned Medium Density Residential.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.21	4.5.5 Rule – Ruakura Structure Plan Area – Staging	Support in part	Amend Rule 4.5.5.a) so that it also applies to the EAF Site.	Oppose	The application of Rule 4.5.5.a) to the EAF site would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Tainui Group Holdings Limited	48.37	4.6.6 Site Coverage	Support in part	Amend Rule 4.6.6 Site Coverage from a maximum of 50% to 45%.	Oppose	CPL opposes the amendment to coverage as sought on the basis it is unnecessary and would not provide for the efficient development of residential land.
Bothwell, Jenny	04.03	4.12 Other Resource Consent Information	Support in part	Remove the T intersection from the plans for the subdivision off Powells Road.	Oppose	The relief requested is inconsistent with the Ruakura Structure Plan, which has undergone detailed traffic engineering consideration.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.06	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Retain Chapter 11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.08	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Retain '11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone Area' as notified insofar as it reflects the decisions made by the Board of Inquiry.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Gallagher, Fiona	22.01	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support in part	Amend to provide clarity on the type of Industrial, including construction, noise and hours of operation.	Oppose	Sufficient clarity on these matters is already provided in the provisions.
Poirier, Robert	02.01	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support in part	There will be no access roads to the proposed industrial parks via Fairview Downs, specifically Powells Road.	Oppose	Access from Powells Road should not be unduly restricted. Rather this matter would need to be considered as part of an Integrated Transport Assessment submitted with any Land Development Plan application.
Gallagher, Peter Murray	03.01	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support in part	Amend location of Spine Road to be closer to Waikato Expressway.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.05	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions. Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology. The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Freight Logistics Action Group	46.03	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Retain Chapter 11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.05	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.05	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Either - Amend Chapter 11 to allow residential development to occur at the EAF site, or rezone the EAF site Residential Medium Density.	Oppose	The removal of the industrial zoning from the EAF site would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
West, Jennifer	50.09	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Ensure that areas that are undeveloped are maintained.	Oppose	The maintenance of areas will be considered with resource consent applications, if a relevant matter, and need not be prescribed in the District Plan.
				Call all Industrial areas "Industrial Park Zone" and give a proper name to the area of industrial land in the Fairview Downs area.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is apposed as there is a clear difference in function between the Ruakura Logistics and the Industrial Park Zone which is accurately reflected in the variation.
				Provide more landscaping in each Land Development Plan area to provide the best visual effect to adjacent residences, while providing screening from noise, vibration, dust, pollutants and traffic.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.12	11.1 Purpose	Oppose	Either amend Chapter 11 to allow residential development to occur at the EAF site, or rezone the EAF site Residential Medium Density.	Oppose	The removal of the industrial zoning from the EAF site would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Fairview Downs	43.40	11.1 Purpose	Oppose	Amend 11.1c) to include reference to 'Fairview Downs Industrial Park'.	Oppose	Further specificity of industrial zone names is not required to achieve the relevant objectives of the variation.
Residents and Owners Association				Amend 11.1d) to delete 40m 'setback' and replace with 'setbacks and amenity buffer' when referring to existing residential development.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.03	11.1 Purpose	Support in part	Insert a requirement to commission a study on the combined effect of pollution and air quality for existing residential areas including Fairview Downs, Silverdale, Hillcrest, and other affected areas and provide mitigation for homes affected.	Oppose	Air quality is a matter regulated under regional planning provisions and not the District Plan.
Medhurst, David Gordon	08.01	11.1 Purpose	Oppose	Amend location of Spine Road away from existing housing and provide a larger buffer zone between existing and proposed housing in Fairview Downs.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space to properly manage effects on neighboring properties.
Eastside Apostolic	12.13	Objective 11.2.1	Oppose	Either amend Chapter 11 to allow residential	Oppose	The removal of the industrial zoning from the EAF site

**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

Foundation, Hamilton				development to occur at the EAF site, or rezone the EAF site Residential Medium Density.		would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.41	Objective 11.2.2	Oppose	Amend 11.2.2a to include reference to minor roads. Include clarification on assessment of effects expected of the industrial park zone on surrounding areas including Fairview Downs and mitigation available.	Oppose	The relief requested by the submitter is opposed as setbacks are not required from minor roads to achieve the relevant amenity objectives of the variation.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.42	Objective 11.2.3	Oppose	Amend 11.2.3a ii. to include reference to residential areas. Amend 11.2.3a iii. by adding 'identifying and' at the beginning.	Oppose	The relief requested by the submitter is opposed as Point iii as currently worded adequately the avoidance or mitigation of adverse effects of industrial activities on existing residential areas.
				Amend 11.2.3 Explanation to delete 'these can have' and replace with 'these should not have' when referring to an impact on residential or open space areas.	Oppose	The requested amendments change the intent of the explanation from explaining why the objectives and policies are required to a new objective which is inappropriate.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.43	11.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Delete * from n) Transportation service centre RD; o) Drive-through services RD; v) Transport depot RD; cc) Childcare facilities RD.	Oppose	To ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision, an “*” should be retained for these activities so that these activities can be considered without notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.
				Amend ff) to 250 or more vehicle movements per day.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.14	11.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Either amend Rule 11.3 to provide for Residential dwellings and Community facilities as a Permitted Activity at the EAF site or rezone the EAF site to Residential Medium.	Oppose	The provision of Residential dwellings and Community facilities as a Permitted Activity at the EAF site would dilute its effectiveness as an industrial zone by both taking up scarce industrial land for alternative uses and by introducing inappropriate uses within the zone. In doing so this relief sought would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
West, Jennifer	50.33	11.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Clarify that Noxious Industries should not be allowed to establish within the Ruakura Structure Plan area. This includes woodlots, logs, woodchip, cement, or any other bulk	Oppose	The District Plan already provides a definition of noxious activities which is appropriate.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				product that will require detraining, standing in piles on hardstand and reloading.		
Hamilton City Council	32.23	11.4.1 Permitted Activities	Support	Amend current cross reference to include all specific standards under 11.5.	Oppose	The relief sought is unclear
				Provide clarity for plan users by including additional reference to 3.7.3.5.	Oppose	The relief sought is unclear. The section referenced appears to have been deleted.
Hamilton City Council	32.24	11.5.3 Landscape Screening	Support	Amend to provide clarity to plan users.	Oppose	CPL has sought various changes to the landscape screening provisions.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.45	11.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	Amend 11.7x to any activity generating 250 or more vehicle movements per day.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Waikato Regional Council	21.06	15 Open Space Zones	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.06	15 Open Space Zones	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.06	15 Open Space Zones	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.		An evaluation of historic heritage was undertaken as part of the PDP process and need not be reconsidered as part of the variation.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.07	15 Open Space Zones	Support	Retain Chapter 15 Open Space Zones and specifically the inclusion of the Ruakura Open Space Zone as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.04	15.1 Purpose	Support in part	Provide mitigation including plantings in the swale for loss of visual amenity, double glazing for increased noise, ventilation for pollution and other necessary requirements for loss of existing amenities.	Oppose	The measures sought by the submitter are not required to achieve the objectives of the variation
Bothwell, Jenny	04.01	15.1 Purpose	Support in part	Do not allow public access to the green belt or build a protective fence to keep people out and prevent privacy being invaded.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation, particularly as the open space network has multiple uses.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.46	15.1 Purpose	Support in part	Add to 15.1a) 'so long as this is not the only use of the open space.' to the end of 15.1a). Add to the end of 15.1f) '(when not provided as part of a transport corridor' when referring to pedestrian and cycle connections and 'Ruakura open space areas will primarily provide for recreation, amenity and natural values that provide for the social and cultural wellbeing of surround areas and may serve other functions as well as (but not only) stormwater and ecological management.' Add to 15.1i) 'and these are not the only use of the open space area'.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is an unnecessary addition to the purpose.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.48	15.4 Rules – Interpretation of Ruakura Open Space Zone	Oppose	Amend 15.4a) to delete all except for the first sentence.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point does not provide for flexibility in the design and final layout of open space areas.
Innovation Waikato Limited	38.05	15.6.7 Parking Lot in Ruakura Open Space Zone (Lot 3 DPS 66853)	Support in part	Amend Rule 15.6.7b) to 'parking lot is to be used for staff and visitor parking only'.	Support	Support subject to various changes sought in the CPL submission on the provisions and maps relating to LDPs.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.49	15.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Amend 15.7v to include swales and remove site specific context for Sheridan Street and Nevada Road and apply to where adjacent to residential properties.	Oppose	15.7 appropriately specifies Sheridan Street and Nevada Road and widening its purpose to other residential areas is not required to mitigate anticipated adverse effects.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.07	23 Subdivision	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land, and in any event, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.07	23 Subdivision	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.08	25 City-wide	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL land. For the balance land the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.		heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.08	25 City-wide	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.08	25 City-wide	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
West, Jennifer	50.29	25 City-wide	Oppose	Seek a traffic assessment for the whole structure plan, and subsequently review and amend the modelling done for the Plan Change.	Oppose	The effects of the quantum and type of development provided by the variation has been fully assessed by the Council in its section 32 assessment of the variation and is appropriate to manage traffic effects with the Land Development Plan approach.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.50	25.4.5.1 Activities Required to be Assessed using the Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure	Oppose	Add new 25.4.5.1b) 'Projects and Structure Plans involving several hazardous facilities or sites are required to have an overall assessment of cumulative risk.'	Oppose	The matter sought to be added by the submitter is controlled by the Biosecurity Act 1993. The District Plan should not seek to duplicate the processes and regulation under the Biosecurity Act 1993.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.05	25.4.5.1 Activities Required to be Assessed using the Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure	Support in part	Include a full hazard risk assessment and subsequent necessary requirements.	Oppose	The matter sought to be added by the submitter is controlled by the Biosecurity Act 1993. The District Plan should not seek to duplicate the processes and regulation under the Biosecurity Act 1993.
Hamilton City Council	32.29	25.5 Landscaping and Screening	Support	Retain provision 25.5.3.7 as notified in the Proposed District Plan 2012 which relates to Internal Planting.	Oppose	The internal planting requirements are appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.51	25.5.3.1 Landscaping	Oppose	Amend 25.5.3.1a) i. to include minor arterials and delete reference to all residential and special character zones.	Oppose	Planting on minor arterials is opposed as this would result in inefficient use of land and is not required to achieve the objectives of the variation.
Innovation Waikato Limited	38.03	25.5.3.1 Landscaping	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.5.3.1(iii) by deleting the reference to Open Space.	Support	The relief sought by the submitter improves the efficiency of the provisions.
AgResearch	47.03	25.5.3.1 Landscaping	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.5.3.1(iii) by deleting the reference to Open Space.	Support	The relief sought by the submitter improves the efficiency of the provisions.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.10	25.8.3.7 Noise Performance Standards for Activities in all Zones Except Major Facilities, Knowledge, and Open Space Zones, Ruakura...	Support in part	Amend 25.8.3.7 by removing 'Ruakura Industrial' so that Ruakura Industrial noise limits are the same as other industrial areas in Hamilton.	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Fairview Downs	43.52	25.8.3.7 Noise Performance	Oppose	Amend 25.8.3.7 to delete exclusion for	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Residents and Owners Association		Standards for Activities in all Zones Except Major Facilities, Knowledge, and Open Space Zones, Ruakura...		Ruakura Industrial Park Zone in title.		the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.09	25.8.3.11 Noise-sensitive Activities – Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and Precinct C of Knowledge Zone	Support	Retain '25.8.3.11 Noise-sensitive Activities – Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and Precinct C of Knowledge Zone' as notified insofar as it reflects the decisions made by the Board of Inquiry.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.31	25.8.3.11 Noise-sensitive Activities – Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and Precinct C of Knowledge Zone	Support	Amend 25.8.3.11d) to clarify the standard does not apply to feeder roads serving the expressway interchanges.	Support	The relief sought is supportive of efficient development outcomes.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.11	25.8.3.13 Noise Performance Standards for Activities in the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones	Support in part	Amend 25.8.3.13 by removing 'Ruakura Industrial' so that Ruakura Industrial noise limits are the same as other industrial areas in Hamilton.	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.53	25.8.3.13 Noise Performance Standards for Activities in the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones	Oppose	Amend 25.8.3.13 to delete reference to Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.09	Appendix 1 District Plan Administration	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.09	Appendix 1 District Plan Administration	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.09	Appendix 1 District Plan Administration	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL and TGH land. For the balance land the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.02	Appendix 1 District Plan Administration	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP. Seek a comprehensive	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.



## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				Heritage Assessment of the historic site and include a Ruakura Heritage Area - specifically in the Knowledge Zone.		
Hamilton City Council	32.32	1.1 Definitions and Terms	Support	Include the deferred definitions from the Notified Proposed District Plan 2012 in the variation as a decision is needed. This includes Interface Design Control Area (Ruakura Logistics Zone and Ruakura Industrial Park Zone), Logistics and Freight Handling Activities, Logistics and Freight Handling Infrastructure and Research and Innovation Activities.	Oppose	This requested change to the provisions will result in inconsistency with definitions included within the Plan Change approved through the Board of Inquiry with consequential impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Ruakura provisions.
West, Jennifer	50.31	1.1 Definitions and Terms	Oppose	Amend 1.1 Definitions and Terms to include bitumen manufacturing plants and products within the definition of Noxious Industries.	Oppose	The variation includes an appropriate definition for noxious activities.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.10	1.2 Information Requirements	Support	Retain '1.2 Information Requirements' insofar as it reflects the decisions made by the Board of Inquiry.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.57	1.2.2.21 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend 1.2.2.21a) to apply for activities generating 250 or more vehicle movements per day.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.12	1.2.2.21 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support in part	Amend to require assessment for >250 vehicles per day, making it consistent with other industrial areas in Hamilton City.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.59	1.2.2.23 Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Amend 1.2.2.23a) to apply for activities generating 250 or more vehicle movements per day.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.60	1.2.2.24 Ruakura Open Space Zone	Oppose	Amend 1.2.2.24a) to apply for activities generating 250 or more vehicle movements per day.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is unnecessary. Modelling has demonstrated that 1500 vpd is an appropriate trigger and this was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
West, Jennifer	50.27	1.2.2.25 Land Development Plans	Oppose	Amend to consider wider landscaping provisions for the whole development.	Oppose	Subject to the changes sought in the CPL submission, sufficient methods are included in the variation, including the LDP provisions as notified, to provide for an appropriate assessment of landscape implications of development.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.61	Water Impact Assessment	Support in part	Delete 1.2.2.25o)ii. which refers to development where there is no approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
Hamilton City Council	32.34	Water Impact Assessment	Support	Delete 1.2.2.25 (o)(iii) and (x) to align with Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure and remove reference to interim development.	Oppose	The principal of allowing for interim connections is sought and supported elsewhere in the submission and further submission by CPL and is appropriate given the complex and staged nature of land development at Ruakura. The removal of the ability to provide interim connections potentially imposes significant costs on development which are unjustified in section 32 RMA terms.
West, Jennifer	50.12	Water Impact Assessment	Oppose	Reinstate Rule 3.7.3.2 and make it clear to require an ICMP before any land development is planned.	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve integrated development of land at Ruakura and determined that a Water Impact Assessment required through an LPD application is an appropriate method to manage the effects of development on three waters, where no ICMP exists. This approach has been appropriately applied to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area under the variation.
West, Jennifer	50.30	Integrated Transport Assessment	Oppose	Seek a traffic assessment for the whole structure plan, and subsequently review and amend the modelling done for the Plan Change. Seek the traffic on Silverdale Road to be regularly monitored to assess effects of increasing HCV traffic and other vehicles.	Oppose	The effects of the quantum and type of residential development provided by the variation has been fully assessed by the Council in its section 32 assessment of the variation and deemed to be appropriate to manage with the Land Development Plan approach.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.62	Open Space Provisions	Oppose	Add to 1.2.2.25x) to include a new bullet point 'The area between the Fairview Downs Industrial Area and Spine Road on the eastern boundary of Fairview Downs.'	Oppose	The references sought in this submission point are unnecessary.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.09	1.3 Assessment Criteria	Support	Retain Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.64	F Ruakura	Oppose	Add new provision to 1.3.2F.a) Interface Design Control Area v. which relates to development on the Spine Road that is adjacent to	Oppose	The Interface Design Control Area already applies along the Spine Road where appropriate to mitigate visual effects of industrial development and no

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				properties in Aldona Place and Drake Place.		amendment is required.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.65	N1 Land Development Plans	Oppose	Amend 1.3.3 N1h) and i) to include swales.	Oppose	The relief to include swales in the provisions is unnecessarily specific.
Hamilton City Council	32.36	N1 Land Development Plans	Support	Delete N1k) which refers to interim development.	Oppose	The principle of allowing for interim connections is sought and supported elsewhere in the submission and further submission by CPL and is appropriate given the complex and staged nature of land development at Ruakura. The removal of the ability to provide interim connections potentially imposes significant costs on development which are unjustified in section 32 RMA terms.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.66	N5 Ruakura Open Space Zone	Oppose	Amend 1.3.3N5a) to include swales.	Oppose	The relief to include swales in the provisions is unnecessarily specific.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.10	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.10	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.10	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL land. For the balance land, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Waikato Regional Council	21.24	Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan – Land Use	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Figures 2-14 - 2-18.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.10	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Support	Retain Figure 2-14 New Figure.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.01	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Delete the proposed Ruakura Industrial Park zoning over the EAF Site and all properties to the north of Powells Road.  Rezone all land on the northern side of Powells	Oppose	The removal of the industrial zoning from the EAF site and the rezoning of all land on the northern side of Powells Road as Medium Density Residential Zone would impact the industrial land use allocation detailed in Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

				Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.  Rezone the EAF Site Medium Density Residential Zone.		allocation’ of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS). This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must ‘give effect’ to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.67	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Amend the location of the Spine Road away from Fairview Downs and extend the Open Space next to the Spine Road, while providing for more than just Three Waters Infrastructure.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties and achieve a proper traffic function.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.12	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Support	Retain Figure 2-14 as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.25	Figure 2-15A Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Transport	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Figures 2-14 - 2-18.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.14	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support	Retain provision 3.7ii, Appendix 2 Figures 2-15A and 2-15B and rules 3.7.3.3 (including rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.68	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend the location of the Spine Road away from Fairview Downs and extend the Open Space next to the Spine Road, while providing for more than just Three Waters Infrastructure.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties, to provide proper traffic function and to provide for efficient use and development of land.
Hamilton City Council	32.38	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support	Delete Powell’s Road notation across the Ruakura Open Space Zone, after crossing the Spine Road west to Fairview Downs.	Oppose	Consistency is required with the Expressway designation interface with the local road network.
				Replace existing Figure 2-15A with updated Figure 2-15A.	Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the outcome sought may be inconsistent with the Expressway designation interface with the local road network.
Gallagher, Fiona	22.02	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support in part	Amend the location of the Spine Road and change the land use to residential.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties, to provide proper traffic function and to provide for efficient use and development of land
Byron, Nigel Christopher	01.01	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend location of Spine Road to be closer to Waikato Expressway.	Oppose	The Spine Road has been appropriately located with adjoining Open Space areas to properly manage effects on neighboring properties, to provide proper

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						traffic function and to provide for efficient use and development of land
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.13	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support	Retain Figure 2-15A as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
West, Jennifer	50.17	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Seeks monitoring of the traffic on Silverdale Road to assess effects of increasing HCV traffic, other vehicles and pedestrians.	Oppose	The provisions include detailed transport staging rules and a requirement to obtain Land Development Plans for the urbanisation of the land. Land Development Plan application will include Integrated Transport Assessments.
Waikato Regional Council	21.26	Figure 2-15B Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Three Waters	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Figures 2-14 - 2-18.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.14	Figure 2-15B New Figure	Support	Retain Figure 2-15B as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Hamilton City Council	32.39	Figure 2-15B New Figure	Support	Amend Figure 2-15B to refer to Indicative Reservoir location.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is opposed as the indicative reservoir site is yet to be determined.
Waikato Regional Council	21.15	Figure 2-15B New Figure	Support	Retain provision 3.7ii, Appendix 2 Figures 2-15A and 2-15B and rules 3.7.3.3 (including rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
West, Jennifer	50.24	Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas	Support in part	Add a new Figure 2-16B Expected Development Sequence and Indicative dates.	Oppose	CPL opposes the variation including additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or specify.
Waikato Regional Council	21.27	Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Figures 2-14 - 2-18.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.04	Figure 2-16 New Figure	Support in part	Retain the proposed Land Development Plan Areas within Figure 2-16.	Oppose	CPL seeks that the Land Development Plan areas shown on the figure be deleted
				Delete the proposed 'Ruakura Industrial Park Zone' zoning of the EAF Site; and Rezone 'Area R' as Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone.	Oppose	The amendment sought to the Figure would not give effect to the PRPS.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.69	Figure 2-16 New Figure	Oppose	Add new Figure 2-16B expected development sequence and indicative dates.	Oppose	CPL opposes the variation including additional detail on development sequencing and indicative dates. The exact sequencing and timing of development depends on a number of factors including demand that are outside the remit of the District Plan to predict or

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						specify.
Hamilton City Council	32.40	Figure 2-16 New Figure	Support	Insert LDP Areas for General Residential land adjacent to Fairview Downs (eastern boundary).	Oppose	Land Development Plans are not required or necessary for development with General Residential Areas, given the extent of these areas and the relative certainty of outcomes provided for. The relief sought is not consistent with BOI decision or how other General Residential Areas are administered in Hamilton City.
West, Jennifer	50.23	Figure 2-16 New Figure	Oppose	Provide more landscaping in each Land Development Plan area to provide the best visual effect to adjacent residences, while providing screening from noise, vibration, dust, pollutants and traffic.	Oppose	CPL seeks that the Land Development Plan areas shown on the figure be deleted
Waikato Regional Council	21.28	Figure 2-17 Inland Port Building Setbacks and Landscape Controls	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Figures 2-14 - 2-18.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Cycle Action Waikato	10.03	Figure 2-18 New Figure	Support in part	A number of amendments to Figure 2-18 Ruakura Cyclist and Pedestrian Network Plan. Including; alignment with Hamilton Biking Plan, intersection upgrades and infrastructure improvements to improve cycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter should not be included in the district plan as these matters are for the road controlling authority to deliver.
Byron, Nigel Christopher	01.02	Appendix 14 Noise and Vibration	Support in part	Clarify the city wide characteristics of the Ruakura Industrial Park Zone, including noise, vibration, air quality, hours of operation and light pollution.	Oppose	Development controls including those relating to noise were determined by the Board of Inquiry
Waikato Regional Council	21.11	Appendix 17 Planning Maps	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.07	Appendix 17 Planning Maps	Oppose	Amend the Map Labelled 'Ruakura Variation Area' as follows; Delete the proposed 'Ruakura Industrial Park Zone' zoning over the EAF Site; and rezone all land on the northern side of Powells Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Oppose	The amendments to the planning maps as sought will impact the industrial land use allocation detailed in Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS). This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

Property Council of New Zealand	11.11	Appendix 17 Planning Maps	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.11	Zoning Maps	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL land. For the balance land, and in any event, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Waikato Regional Council	21.32	20A	Support	Support the extension of the medium density residential zone to the eastern side of the Spine Road.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
DSE Nominees Limited	25.01	20A	Oppose	Rezone the site at 4 Greenhill Road / 8 Gordonton Road from a Medium Density Residential Zone to either a Business 1 (Commercial Fringe) or 5 (Suburban Fringe) Zone.	Oppose	The proposed rezoning could result in effects to surrounding residential zoned land.
Waikato Regional Council	21.33	29A	Support	Support the extension of the medium density residential zone to the eastern side of the Spine Road.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.34	30A	Support	Support the extension of the medium density residential zone to the eastern side of the Spine Road.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the CPL submission.
Eastside Apostolic Foundation, Hamilton	12.06	30A	Oppose	Delete the Industrial zoning from Planning Map 30A and rezone the EAF Site Residential Medium Density.	Oppose	The amendments to the planning maps as sought will impact the industrial land use allocation detailed in Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS). This section of the PRPS is beyond challenge. Under s74(2)(a)(i) of the Resource Management Act a District Plan must have regard to any proposed regional policy statement, and once operative, must 'give effect' to the RPS. The relief sought by the submitter would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS.
Kalnins, Alex	14.02	38A	Oppose	Provide a green barrier or wall for the Rigger Place East Street residences and for the Claudelands area.	Oppose	There is no resource management reason for the green barrier or wall as sought by the submitter, as Rigger Place is located a significant distance from land proposed to be zoned Ruakura Logistics or Ruakura

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						Industrial Park in the variation.
Roughton, Judith Annette	13.01	38A	Support in part	Increase size of green belt around Fairview Downs to 100m	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation, is not required for any resource management purpose and would not provide for the efficient use and development of the scarce land resource at Ruakura.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.03	38A	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP. Seek a comprehensive Heritage Assessment of the historic site and include a Ruakura Heritage Area - specifically in the Knowledge Zone.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation. The relief sought goes beyond the variation.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.04	39A	Support in part	Seek a comprehensive Heritage Assessment of the historic site and include a Ruakura Heritage Area - specifically in the Knowledge Zone.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation. The relief sought goes beyond the variation.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.08	40A	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation. The relief sought goes beyond the variation.
West, Jennifer	50.06	48A	Oppose	Amend to provide additional width over the allotted 40m for greenspace and cycleway and passive recreation at Sheridan and Nevada Rds.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.12	Features Map	Support in part	Amend to include an archaeological assessment or as an alternative advice is placed on the Council's record system to assist with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the CPL land. For the balance land, and in any event, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on archaeology.
				Amend to include a review of historic heritage buildings and places and include within Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; Built Heritage of the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.22	20B	Support	Retain Features Map 20B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.23	29B	Support	Retain Features Map 29B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated



**Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL**  
March 2016

						if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.05	38B	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.24	38B	Support	Retain Features Map 38B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.06	39B	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.25	39B	Support	Retain Features Map 39B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.07	40B	Support in part	Seek the inclusion of a number of historic places, sites, plantings and area into Appendix 8 and 9 of the PDP.	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of heritage value and this need not be replicated in the variation.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.26	40B	Support	Retain Features Map 40B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.27	47B	Support	Retain Features Map 47B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.
West, Jennifer	50.07	48B	Oppose	Amend to provide additional width over the allotted 40m for greenspace and cycleway and passive recreation at Sheridan and Nevada Rds.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.28	48B	Support	Retain Features Map 48B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or

## Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions CPL

March 2016

						relocated.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	23.29	49B	Support	Retain Features Map 49B.	Support	Support subject to the inclusion of appropriate methods in the District Plan which through the variation which allow the Features Map to be updated if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or relocated.