

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**

TAINUI GROUP HOLDINGS LIMITED

Dated 2 March 2016

To: **Hamilton City Council**

Name of Submitter: **Tainui Group Holdings Limited**

This is a further submission by Tainui Group Holdings Ltd (**TGH**) on submissions on Proposed Variation 1 to the Proposed Hamilton District Plan (**the Variation**).

Scope of further submission

1. TGH 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 or opposition are contained in the attached Schedule and in TGH's original submission.

Jurisdiction

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

TGH wishes to be heard in support of this further submission



Peter Hall

On behalf of Tainui Group Holdings 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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Name	Submission Point	Plan Provision	Type	Summary	TGH 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 in the Plan Overview as drafted.
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	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 TGH 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 with predevelopment discussions.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the TGH and CPL land. For the balance land, and in any event, the Historic Places Act provides processes for managing the impact of development on

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				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.		archaeology.
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 already 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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	TGH 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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						District Plan to predict or specify.
				Amend 3.7k) to include the entire Knowledge Zone, not just Precinct C.	Oppose	3.7k appropriately refers only to Precinct C as the Waikato Innovation Park and AgResearch have existing concept plans which have been incorporated into the variation.
				Amend 3.7l) 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.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.07	3.7 Ruakura	Support in part	Add a rule to give effect to Objective 3.7.2.4 and its supporting policies by requiring appropriate alternative access for Ruakura Residents prior to the closure of Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of alternative routes is appropriately part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act, rather than a matter to be specified in the District Plan.
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 TGH submission.
Browne, Clare	20.01	3.7 Ruakura	Oppose	Add a new provision that includes providing fencing, planting and other methods of noise and visual disturbance for the increase in rail traffic along the railway corridor.	Oppose	The East Coast Main Trunk Line is designated for railway purposes. Other than reverse sensitivity, the effects of the use of the rail line are managed in terms of that designation rather than through District Plan rules through the variation.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Insert Chapter 3.7 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the TGH 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	Oppose	TGH opposes the variation including additional detail

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Sequence and Indicative Dates. Amend 3.7f) to provide details of development sequence and anticipated timeframes for development.		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 3.7k) to refer to the whole Knowledge Zone.	Oppose	3.7k appropriately refers only to Precinct C as the Waikato Innovation Park and AgResearch have existing concept plans which have been incorporated into the variation.
				Amend 3.7l) 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 area of the proposed Ruakura Structure Plan, and especially Air Quality.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission is not a statutory requirement applicable to variations under the RMA.
The University of Waikato	26.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Adopt the provisions of the Knowledge Zone which were developed through the Proposed Plan review process.	Support	Support subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission.
				Adopt the decision of the BOI into the Proposed Plan in whole subject to exceptions.	Support	Support subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission.
Goodwin, Graeme Ernest	05.01	3.7 Ruakura	Oppose	Amend the underlying zoning for the Percival - Ryburn area to be Residential.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan level as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Kalnins, Alex	14.01	3.7 Ruakura	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 Industrial Park in the variation.
Broadbent, Morris	15.01	3.7 Ruakura	Support	Clarify how 1600 additional residential houses	Oppose	The effects of the quantum and type of residential

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

			in part	will impact on peak travel times on Powells Road and Wairere Drive.		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.
West, Jennifer	50.04	3.7.1.1 Ruakura Logistics Zone – Inland Port	Oppose	Remove "proposed" from 3.7.1.1b) and add in "quarantine facilities". Fully assess the impact on surrounding City population of a completed Ruakura Structure Plan in light of an event of low probability with high impact, with particular regard to the size and scale of the project.	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.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.05	3.7.1.1 Ruakura Logistics Zone – Inland Port	Oppose	Request a full assessment of any potential effect of low probability which has a high potential impact on surrounding areas, particularly in regard to the presence of hazardous facilities.	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.
West, Jennifer	50.05	3.7.1.2 Ruakura Logistics Zone – Logistics	Support in part	Provide certainty that the inland port has the ability to obtain approval to operate a Transitional Facility under the Biosecurity's Act.	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.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.06	3.7.1.2 Ruakura Logistics Zone – Logistics	Oppose	Amend to provide certainty that the inland port has the ability to obtain approval to operate as a Transitional Facility under the Biosecurity's Act and that requirements to gain approval have been investigated.	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.
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	43.08	3.7.1.4 Knowledge Zone	Support in part	Amend 3.7.1.4b) to remove references to inland port and logistics opportunities and the existing primary economic base of the region.	Oppose	The references to economic drivers and potential co-locational benefits are relevant resource management matters and should be retained in the provisions.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.01	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zoning for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area and remove any reference to deferred logistics for this area.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.02	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land, including Rule 3.7.1.6(b), Objective 4.2.11 and Policy 4.2.11a.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Cowie, William	30.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Madarang, Domingo	35.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.05	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.03	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Wang, Meggie	42.05	3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	Reference to deferred logistics for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area is appropriate in this clause. The reference appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation contained within the Proposed Regional Policy Statement, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.11	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Support in part	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.06	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Support in part	Amend to provide a more direct link between the Percival / Ryburn Road area and Ruakura Road to the south, the university and Silverdale prior to closing Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan.
Madarang, Domingo	35.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Cowie, William	30.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

Wang, Meggie	42.11	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Support in part	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
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.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.08	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						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 is 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 property.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter would result in very poor open space outcomes.
West, Jennifer	50.18	3.7.1.7 Transportation Network	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 would include Integrated Transport Assessments.
				Seek clarity that vehicle emissions are considered in any air quality assessment.	Oppose	Air quality is a matter regulated under regional planning provisions and not the District Plan.
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 changed sought by TGH 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.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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 within 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 projection for Fairview Downs.	Oppose	The avoidance of adverse downstream flooding effects is a matter considered in district LDP and subdivision consents and with regional water discharge applications associated with land 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 the TGH 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	Support	The Open Space network has multiple functions

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				functions of open space.		
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 TGH 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 TGH 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 zones'.	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 TGH.
				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 TGH Submission.
				Either Retain Policy 3.7.2.2b	Support	Support subject to the specific changes to this objective sought in the TGH 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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 TGH Submission.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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 TGH Submission.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	17.02	Objective 3.7.2.4	Support	Retain Policy 3.7.2.4e) - improved safety, accessibility, connectivity and efficiency within the transportation network.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the TGH 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.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.02	Objective 3.7.2.5	Support	Retain Policy 3.7.2.5e. Retain Policy 3.7.2.5f.	Support	Support subject to changes sought in the TGH Submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.16	Objective 3.7.2.7		Amend 3.7.2.7a to add the 'port' and provide clarity that support activities could include 'Customs and MAF facilities'.	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. This matter is controlled by the Biosecurity Act and not strictly something that can be determined through this planning process.
Silsbee, Scott and Lori	16.01	3.7.3.1 Ruakura Structure Plan Area	Support in part	Amend 3.7.3.1 to remove the word 'general' so land use and development is in accordance with.	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.
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	12.09	3.7.3.1 Ruakura Structure Plan	Oppose	Either	Oppose	Table 6-2 'Future Proof industrial land allocation' of

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Foundation, Hamilton		Area		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.		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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 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.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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	TGH 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
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 liner 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 TGH 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	TGH 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 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	TGH 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.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

				Add 3.7.3.2.2 xii. (as per BOI) A list of measurable targets and indicators for monitoring compliance of the LDP with conditions from Water Impact Assessment.	Oppose	TGH 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	TGH 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	TGH 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 principal of allowing for interim connections is sought and supported elsewhere in the submission and further submission by TGH 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.
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.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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	TGH 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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 TGH 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.
				Amend 3.7.3.3c) to clarify the Ruakura Retail Centre within the Knowledge Zone is subject to the Waikato Expressway (Hamilton section) being completed and connected.	Oppose	The staging and traffic requirements do not identify a requirement for a connection to the Waikato Expressway prior to the development of the Ruakura Retail Centre.
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	TGH supports the submission point, subject to the changes being limited to readability and clarity.
				Amend 3.7.3.3d) to insert cross references to the sections of the Plan where the Spine Road is defined.	Oppose	TGH has sought the deletion of this rule 3.7.3d in its entirety

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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 TGH 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.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.08	3.7.3.3.2 Industrial Land Stage 2 Rule (PRPS 2021 - 2041 Allocation)	Support in part	Review the traffic generation thresholds in Rule 3.7.3.3.2(a)(ii) to ensure the southern spine road connection between the Percival and Ryburn Road area and Ruakura Road will be provided.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is not sufficiently specific or appropriate.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.25	3.7.3.3.3 The Knowledge Zone Precinct C (including the Ruakura Retail Centre, but excluding Precincts A, B and D) Staging Rule	Oppose	Amend 3.7.3.3.3 to refer to the entire Knowledge Zone, not just Precinct C.	Oppose	Other parts of the Knowledge zone are subject to concept plan requirements in the variation and do not need to be included in clause 3.7.3.3.3.
				Add new 3.7.3.3.3b) 'The Ruakura Retail Centre will be provided as part of the Stage 2 development of the Ruakura Structure Plan.'	Oppose	The staging and traffic requirements do not identify a requirement for a connection to the Waikato Expressway prior to the development of the Ruakura Retail Centre. The proposed revision sought by the submitter has no resource management purpose.
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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 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.
				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 3.7.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.	Oppose	TGH 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	TGH 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	TGH has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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	TGH 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	TGH 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	TGH has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.28	3.7.3.4.3 Stormwater Network	Support in part	Amend 3.7.3.4.3a) so all stormwater 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.	Oppose	TGH has sought that this rule be removed for the reasons set out in its submission.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.03	4 Residential Zones	Support	Insert Chapter 4 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH and 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.
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 TGH submission.
Waikato Regional	21.02	4 Residential Zones	Support	Ensure that the Variation is consistent with the	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Council				provisions of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.		TGH 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)
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.02	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zoning for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area and remove any reference to deferred logistics for this area.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
				Amend so no heavy vehicle movements be given access to logistics sites from Percival or Ryburn Roads.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriate controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
Cowie, William	30.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
Madarang, Domingo	35.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						use of this land in the long term.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.04	4.1.4 Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified in the clause as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as logistics as being the most efficient use of this land in the long term.
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 TGH submission.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.09	Objective 4.2.10	Support in part	Amend policies 4.2.10b, 10.2.3(a)(iv) and 11.2.3(a)(iii) to avoid heavy vehicle movements on Percival Road and to avoid, minimise or mitigate noise and vibration to manage effects on residential amenity values.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Ensure noise and vibration infringements are subject to the normal tests for notification.	Oppose	Noise provisions are specific to development at Ruakura, and subject to the changes sought by TGH in its submission, appropriately recognise the need to avoid significant adverse effects on existing amenity in a context where existing amenity values will change with urbanisation. Notification tests were established through the Board of Inquiry and reflect the particular characteristics of the area.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.10	Objective 4.2.10	Support in part	Amend to recognise the amenity values of the existing Percival and Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	The objective should recognize that existing amenity values will change with urbanisation.
Wang, Meggie	42.10	Objective 4.2.10	Support in part	Amend to recognise the amenity values of the existing Percival and Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	The objective should recognize that existing amenity values will change with urbanisation.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.03	Objective 4.2.10	Support in part	Amend to require plantings a minimum of 10 metres high along Ryburn Road. Add a new provision to provide a sound proof wall or barrier. Add a new provision to provide a 40 metre buffer strip and planted bund down all of Percival Road. Add a new provision that prevents access of heavy vehicle movements to logistics sites from Percival or Ryburn Roads.	Oppose	The mitigation proposed by the submitter does not serve a resource management purpose and would not result in efficient urban development.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.04	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Delete Objective 4.2.11 which relates to development within the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Wang, Meggie	42.06	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.06	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Cowie, William	30.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Madarang, Domingo	35.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.03	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land, including Rule 3.7.1.6(b), Objective 4.2.11 and Policy 4.2.11a.	Oppose	The objective, policies and rules appropriately reference logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.05	Objective 4.2.11	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The objective appropriately references logistics as a future outcome for the Percival / Ryburn Roads area. This appropriately signals the long-term need to give effect to the industrial land allocation PRPS, and that logistics will be an efficient use of this land.
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 TGH submission.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m2 minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission, the density proposed in the variation for the Large Lot Residential Zone at Percival/Ryburn Road is appropriate. Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.05	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend 4.4.1a)i. to provide for minimum net site area of 2500m2 for Percival and Ryburn Road properties.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m2 minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						logistics.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.04	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.03	4.4.1 Density	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.03	4.4.1 Density	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Wang, Meggie	42.03	4.4.1 Density	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Percival / Ryburn Road area. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.		aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Cowie, William	30.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m2 minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Madarang, Domingo	35.06	4.4.1 Density	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m2 minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.04	4.5.4 Activity Status Table – Ruakura Medium- Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Amend 4.5.4 f) to provide for Papakainga as a restricted discretionary activity.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH 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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.05	4.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Amend Provision 4.11 to provide new assessment criteria for Papakainga.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
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	28.04	8 Knowledge Zone	Support	Retain Chapter 8 Knowledge Zone as notified.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui	27.06	8 Knowledge Zone	Support	Insert Chapter 8 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Incorporated						
Kellaway, Laura; Beaumont, Louise; and Adam, John P	49.01	8 Knowledge Zone	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.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.03	8 Knowledge 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.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the TGH and 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 process included an investigation of historic heritage and it is unnecessary to replicate that with the variation.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.03	8 Knowledge Zone	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to various changes sought in the TGH Submission on the provisions and maps relating to LDPs.
				Amend 8.2.5, 8.2.5b) and relevant explanation to clarify that adverse effects of the Ruakura Retail Centre are managed to avoid the impact on knowledge based activity.	Oppose	This objective and policy relates to managing the retail hierarchy in Hamilton. The requested amendment will not align with the retail hierarchy sought to be confirmed in the objective nor achieve the policies relating to that objective
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.31	Objective 8.2.1	Oppose	Amend 8.2.1 to refer to Knowledge Zone and delete specific references to precincts.	Oppose	The precincts are required to provide for the different facilities and functions within the Knowledge Zone.
West, Jennifer	50.22	Objective 8.2.5 Ruakura Retail Centre	Oppose	Amend 8.2.5, 8.2.5b) and relevant explanation to clarify that adverse effects of the Ruakura Retail Centre are managed to avoid the impact on knowledge based activity.	Oppose	The Ruakura Retail Centre is generally appropriately located within the Knowledge Zone and no additional methods are necessary to avoid impacts on knowledge based activities.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.32	8.3.1 Rules – Activity Status for Precincts A, B and D	Support in part	Amend 8.3.1 to include Precinct C in the activity status table, but excluding the Ruakura Retail Centre.	Oppose	The change sought by the submitter does not achieve the objectives of the knowledge zone, which include recognition of the place and function of the Ruakura retail centre.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.33	8.3.2 Rules – Activity Status for Precinct C (Except Ruakura Retail Centre)	Oppose	Delete Rule 8.3.2 regarding the activity status for Precinct C (excluding the Ruakura Retail Centre).	Oppose	The change sought by the submitter does not achieve the objectives of the knowledge zone, which include recognition of the place and function of the Ruakura retail centre.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.34	8.3.3 Rules – Activity Status for Precinct C - Ruakura Retail Centre only	Oppose	Amend 8.3.3 to remove reference to Precinct C.	Oppose	The change sought by the submitter does not achieve the objectives of the knowledge zone, which include recognition of the place and function of the Ruakura retail centre.
West, Jennifer	50.21	8.3.3 Rules – Activity Status for Precinct C - Ruakura Retail Centre only	Oppose	Limit the extent of land used for retail activity which is not knowledge-based to what is currently provided.	Oppose	The change sought by the submitter does not achieve the objectives of the knowledge zone, which include recognition of the place and function of the Ruakura retail centre. The extent of land used for the retail centre is generally appropriate.
Property Council of New Zealand	11.04	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
Waikato Regional Council	21.04	10 Ruakura Logistics 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 TGH submission.
Freight Logistics Action Group	46.02	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Support	Retain Chapter 10 Ruakura Logistics Zone.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Cooper, Russell (Rusty Racing)	39.04	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Opposes Ruakura Logistics Zone. Signage to be permitted at all major intersections redirecting customers to the existing business on Ruakura Road. Amend provisions so further development of the site is a temporary activity until such time it is required or purchased.	Oppose	The importance of the Ruakura Logistics Zone and methods to ensure its efficient development have been considered and approved through the Board of Inquiry. Road signs are outside of the ambit of District Plan provisions.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	44.04	10 Ruakura Logistics 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.	Oppose	An authority to modify consent has been granted for all of the TGH and 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 process included an investigation of historic heritage and it is unnecessary to replicate that with the variation
Smith, Noel Gordon	09.02	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	For LDP Areas E, A, F, C and G; Amend the maximum height restrictions on buildings, machinery and stacking material to a 2 level commercial building or 4 shipping containers height. Address noise, lighting effects and hours of operation.	Oppose	The requested amendments would impose unnecessary restrictions on development with the Ruakura Logistic Area without achieving any particular resource management purpose.
Cowie, William	30.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Madarang, Domingo	35.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
Future Proof Implementation Committee	28.05	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Support	Retain Chapter 10 Ruakura Logistics Zone as notified.	Support	Support subject to various changes sought in the TGH Submission on the provisions and maps relating to LDPs.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.07	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Support	Insert Chapter 10 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to various changes sought in the TGH Submission on the provisions and maps relating to LDPs.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.10	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
West, Jennifer	50.16	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Ensure that the Variation includes an inland port and logistics area with MAF/quarantine and customs facilities.	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.
New Zealand Transport Agency	34.07	10 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Support	Retain '10 Ruakura Logistics 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 TGH submission.
Gibbons, Matthew	06.01	10.1 Purpose	Oppose	Amend the location of the proposed logistics area away from the University and surrounding residential areas.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation. The location of the logistics area was confirmed through the Board of Inquiry.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.35	10.1 Purpose	Oppose	Amend 10.1c to refer to reducing New Zealand's carbon emissions and reducing congestion on North Island roads.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is opposed as carbon emissions are a national not local standard.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.36	Objective 10.2.1	Oppose	Amend 10.2.1a to include 'biosecurity approval' within the requirements for development.	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.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners	43.37	Objective 10.2.3	Support in part	Amend 10.2.3a iii. to refer to residential areas when considering development is visible and	Oppose	The proposed amendments to 10.2.3.a iii are inappropriate as this policy relates to development

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Association				meets appropriate standards. Amend v. to include noise and vibration.		controls that apply to transport corridors and open space only. Residential amenity is addressed in 10.2.3a iv.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.10	Objective 10.2.3	Support in part	Amend policies 4.2.10b, 10.2.3(a)(iv) and 11.2.3(a)(iii) to avoid heavy vehicle movements on Percival Road and to avoid, minimise or mitigate noise and vibration to manage effects on residential amenity values.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act. Subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission, the objective will establish an appropriate framework for managing impacts on amenity
				Ensure noise and vibration infringements are subject to the normal tests for notification.	Oppose	Notification provisions relating to noise were considered and confirmed through the Board of Inquiry. The variation provides appropriate methods to exceed noise and vibration standards where appropriate.
				Amend policy 10.2.3(a)(vi) to require (rather than provide) for the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee. Add a new policy 11.2.3(a)(iv) to require the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee for land zoned Ruakura Industrial Park Zone north of Percival Road and add a new rule similar to Rule 10.5.1 in the Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Oppose	Policy 10.2.3(a)(vi) appropriately provides for the establishment of a CLC, with the rules setting out the specific requirements.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.06	Objective 10.2.3	Support in part	Amend to give the same protection from light spill, noise and vibration from future logistics development as other residential areas within the city.	Oppose	Subject to the changes sought by TGH, the objective will appropriately recognize that an existing residential level of amenity cannot be achieved with the urbanisation of the land at Ruakura.
				Extend the Community Liaison Committee's role to all of Percival Road.	Oppose	A Community Liaison Committee is not required for the Ruakura Industrial Park to the north and west of Percival Road, as its function is appropriately limited to inland port activities and its membership prescribed to ensure the efficient functioning of the Committee.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.38	10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Amend 10.3k) to refer to 250 or greater 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 by the Board of Inquiry.
West, Jennifer	50.32	10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Clarify that Noxious Industries should not be allowed to establish within the Ruakura Structure Plan area. This includes woodlots,	Oppose	The District Plan already provides a definition of noxious activities which are appropriately excluded from Ruakura.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				logs, woodchip, cement, or any other bulk product that will require detrainning, standing in piles on hardstand and reloading.		
Ruakura Residents Group	37.18	10.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	Amend the building setback rules in Chapters 10 and 11 to require a 30m building setback from the Percival Road frontage, to complement the landscape buffer rule.	Oppose	There is no resource management justification for this setback which is contrary to the principle of efficient use of land.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.07	10.5.1 Inland Port Community Liaison Committee	Support	Retain 10.5.1 Inland Port Community Liaison Committee but include all of Ryburn and Percival Road residents.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is inconsistent with the Board of Inquiry decision which prescribed membership of the CLC to ensure the efficient functioning of the Committee.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.39	10.5.2 Noise Management	Support in part	Amend 10.5.2(a) to refer to Noise and Vibration Management Plan and include information in Appendix 1.2.2.20.	Oppose	The amendments requested are unnecessary to achieve the objectives relating to noise and amenity.
West, Jennifer	50.28	10.5.2 Noise Management	Oppose	Amend 10.5.2(a) Noise shall be managed in accordance with an approved Noise Management Plan as provided by the Board of Inquiry. Include a Complaints Procedure that will give neighbouring occupants access to a call-line to log complaints.	Oppose	The amendments requested are unnecessary to achieve the objectives relating to noise and amenity and adequately provided for under the CLC procedures in the variation.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.14	10.5.4 Landscape Screening	Support in part	Review Policies 4.2.10d-e, Rule 10.5.4 and Rule 11.5.3 to ensure they are effective and clear, including referencing the correct Land Development sub-areas shown on Figure 2-16.	Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is insufficiently clear. TGH sought the deletion of the LDP sub-areas for the reasons set out in its submission.
				Add an additional clause to Rule 10.5.4 and Rule 11.5.3 restricting any car parking and access within the buffer area.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements, access or parking from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.08	10.5.4.1 Stage One (West of Percival Road)	Support in part	Amend the planted bund or buffer strip to 40m down all of Percival Road.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission has no resource management purpose and does not provide for the efficient use of land.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.09	10.5.4.2 Stage Two (Following Closure of Ruakura Road and Percival Road)	Support in part	Amend the planted bund or buffer strip to 40m down all of Percival Road.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission has no resource management purpose and does not provide for the efficient use of land.
Carmichael, Natasha	19.10	10.5.4.3 Stage Three (north of	Support	Amend the planted bund or buffer strip to 40m	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission has no resource

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

and Bryce		east coast main trunk railway)	in part	down all of Percival Road.		management purpose and does not provide for the efficient use of land.
Wang, Meggie	42.08	10.5.4.3 Stage Three (north of east coast main trunk railway)	Support in part	Retain the existing landscape screening provisions in Rule 10.5.4.3 and include the ability to further assess as part of a Land Development Plan process.	Oppose	It is inappropriate to further assess mitigation as part of a Land Development Plan application.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.08	10.5.4.3 Stage Three (north of east coast main trunk railway)	Support in part	Retain the existing landscape screening provisions in Rule 10.5.4.3 and include the ability to further assess as part of a Land Development Plan process.	Oppose	It is inappropriate to further assess mitigation as part of a Land Development Plan application.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	17.07	10.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	Retain Rule 10.7 as notified.	Oppose	TGH has requested amendments to 10.7 ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision. In particular an “*” should be added to additional activities in rule 10.7 such that under rule 10.8 these activities can be considered without notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
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 TGH submission.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.08	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Insert Chapter 11 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
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 TGH submission.
Gallagher, Fiona	22.01	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Support	Amend to provide clarity on the type of	Oppose	Sufficient clarity on these matters is already provided

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

			in part	Industrial, including construction, noise and hours of operation.		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.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land. The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Madarang, Domingo	35.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land. The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Cowie, William	30.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land. The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Smith, Noel Gordon	09.03	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	For LDP Areas E, A, F, C and G; Amend the maximum height restrictions on buildings, machinery and stacking material to a 2 level commercial building or 4 shipping containers height. Address noise, lighting effects and hours of	Oppose	The requested amendments will unduly restrict development with the Ruakura Logistic and Industrial Park Zones, without a clear resource management purpose.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				operation.		
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 TGH and CPL 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.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.11	11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH submission.
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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 Foundation, Hamilton	12.13	Objective 11.2.1	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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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	43.42	Objective 11.2.3	Oppose	Amend 11.2.3a ii. to include reference to	Oppose	The relief requested by the submitter is opposed as

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Residents and Owners Association				residential areas. Amend 11.2.3a iii. by adding 'identifying and' at the beginning.		the references to residential areas are appropriate.
				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 intension of the explanation from explaining why the objectives and policies are required to a new objective which is inappropriate.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.11	Objective 11.2.3	Support in part	Amend policies 4.2.10b, 10.2.3(a)(iv) and 11.2.3(a)(iii) to avoid heavy vehicle movements on Percival Road and to avoid, minimise or mitigate noise and vibration to manage effects on residential amenity values.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act and, subject to the amendments sought by TGH, the management of amenity appropriately dealt with in the objective.
				Ensure noise and vibration infringements are subject to the normal tests for notification.	Oppose	The variation includes appropriate methods providing for infringements of noise and vibration rules.
				Add a new policy 11.2.3(a)(iv) to require the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee for land zoned Ruakura Industrial Park Zone north of Percival Road and add a new rule similar to Rule 10.5.1 in the Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Oppose	A Community Liaison Committee is not required for the Ruakura Industrial Park north of Percival Road and would not meet a resource management purpose. Unlike the Inland Port, this area is likely to be occupied by various operators meaning a CLC is not an effective method.
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 buy introducing inappropriate uses within the zone. In doing so this relief sought would neither have proper regard to nor give effect to the PRPS as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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 product that will require detrainning, standing in piles on hardstand and reloading.	Oppose	The District Plan already provides a definition of noxious activities which is appropriate.
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.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.19	11.4.3 Building Setbacks	Support in part	Amend the building setback rules in Chapters 10 and 11 to require a 30m building setback from the Percival Road frontage, to complement the landscape buffer rule.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation
Ruakura Residents Group	37.20	11.5 Rules – Specific Standards	Support in part	Add a new policy 11.2.3(a)(iv) to also require the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee for the land zoned Ruakura Industrial Park Zone north of Percival Road (Land Development Plan Area F as shown on Figure 2-16) and add a new supporting rule similar to Rule 10.5.1 in the Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Oppose	A Community Liaison Committee is not required for the Ruakura Industrial Park north of Percival Road and would not meet a resource management purpose. Unlike the Inland Port, this area is likely to be occupied by various operators meaning a CLC is not an effective method.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.44	11.5.2 Transportation Service Centres	Oppose	Add to 11.5.2a) 'so long as the arterial road is not adjacent to a residential area'.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.15	11.5.3 Landscape Screening	Support in part	Review Policies 4.2.10d-e, Rule 10.5.4 and Rule 11.5.3 to ensure they are effective and clear, including referencing the correct Land Development sub-areas shown on Figure 2-16.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
				Add an additional clause to Rule 10.5.4 and Rule 11.5.3 restricting any car parking and access within the buffer area.	Oppose	Excluding car parking and access within any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.09	11.5.3 Landscape Screening	Support in part	Retain the existing landscape screening provisions in Rule 11.5.3 and include the ability to further assess as part of a Land Development Plan process.	Oppose	Key mitigation methods were determined through the Board of Inquiry process and should not be further assessed as part of a Land Development Plan application.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Wang, Meggie	42.09	11.5.3 Landscape Screening	Support in part	Retain the existing landscape screening provisions in Rule 11.5.3 and include the ability to further assess as part of a Land Development Plan process.	Oppose	Key mitigation methods were determined through the Board of Inquiry process and should not be further assessed as part of a Land Development Plan application.
Hamilton City Council	32.24	11.5.3 Landscape Screening	Support	Amend to provide clarity to plan users.	Oppose	TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH and 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.		An evaluation of historic heritage was undertaken as part of the PDP process and need not be reconsidered as part of the variation.
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated	27.09	15 Open Space Zones	Support	Insert Chapter 15 of the Ruakura Variation into the District Plan.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
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 TGH 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 TGH

March 2016

Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.08	3.7.1.4 Knowledge Zone	Support in part	Amend 3.7.1.4b) to remove references to inland port and logistics opportunities and the existing primary economic base of	Oppose	The references to inland port and logistics are appropriate.
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.
West, Jennifer	50.35	15.6.6 Ruakura Open Space Minimum Width	Oppose	Amend to provide additional width over the allotted 40m for greenspace and cycleway and passive recreation at Sheridan and Nevada Rds.	Oppose	The additional width sought by the submitter will impose costs on the efficient development of land without a corresponding justified benefit.
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 TGH 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.
West, Jennifer	50.36	15.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	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 and would result in inefficient urban development.
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 TGH and 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	Oppose	The PDP has already identified buildings and places of

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

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	11.07	23 Subdivision	Support	Accept the Ruakura Variation in its entirety.	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Cowie, William	30.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Wang, Meggie	42.04	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Madarang, Domingo	35.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.04	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.04	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.05	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.07	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Amend the Large Lot Residential Zone Rules to provide for a 2,500m ² minimum lot size to the Percival / Ryburn Road area.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Carmichael, Natasha and Bryce	19.11	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	Seek the same rights as other large lot residential zoned areas.	Oppose	Further intensification and fragmentation of this land will limit opportunities for future land use change aligning with the RPS, will not allow the long term efficient use of the land and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts on future industry and logistics.
Cooper, Russell (Rusty)	39.03	25 City-wide	Oppose	Opposes Ruakura Logistics Zone.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Racing)						the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
				Signage to be permitted at all major intersections redirecting customers to the existing business on Ruakura Road.	Oppose	This is not a matter that should be considered as part of the variation to the district plan.
				Amend provisions so further development of the site is a temporary activity until such time it is required or purchased.	Oppose	The relief would not provide the efficient use and development of the land resource at Ruakura.
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 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.
Smith, Noel Gordon	09.04	25 City-wide	Oppose	For LDP Areas E, A, F, C and G; Amend the maximum height restrictions on buildings, machinery and stacking material to a 2 level commercial building or 4 shipping containers height. Address noise, lighting effects and hours of operation.	Oppose	The relief sought is contrary to the development outcomes determined by the Board of Inquiry and unnecessary for resource management purposes.
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 TGH 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 TGH 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 deemed to be appropriate to manage 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	Support	Include a full hazard risk assessment and	Oppose	The matter sought to be added by the submitter is

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

		be Assessed using the Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure	in part	subsequent necessary requirements.		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 improve the efficiency of the provisions.
				Amend the definition of 'transport corridor' by adding in an exclusion for railways and private roads in the Knowledge Zone.	Support	The relief sought by the submitter improve the clarity 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 improve the efficiency of the provisions.
				Amend the definition of 'transport corridor' by adding in an exclusion for railways and private roads in the Knowledge Zone.	Support	The relief sought by the submitter improve the clarity of the provisions.
West, Jennifer	50.10	25.8 Noise and Vibration	Oppose	Ensure the noise limits are the same for the whole City. As the areas develop, review noise requirements.	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
				Any Noise Management Plan should refer to the overall effect of the whole Ruakura Structure Plan incrementally. Ensure a complaints procedure is embedded in any Noise Management Plan.	Oppose	Assessment of cumulative impact of noise is embedded in the noise assessment methodology referred to in 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 TGH submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.52	25.8.3.7 Noise Performance Standards for Activities in all Zones Except Major Facilities, Knowledge, and Open Space Zones, Ruakura...	Oppose	Amend 25.8.3.7 to delete exclusion for Ruakura Industrial Park Zone in title.	Oppose	Controls relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the TGH submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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 TGH submission.
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 TGH 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 TGH submission, have been appropriately tailored to Ruakura.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.54	25.8.3.14 Non-Conformity with Standards in the Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Delete 25.8.3.14a) which relates to any activity in the Inland Port between specific noise standards as a restricted discretionary activity. Amend 25.8.3.14b) to 'Any activity in the Inland Port (Sub Area A) which exceeds 40dBLAeq (15 min) between 2300 and 0700 hours when measured at the boundary is a non-complying activity'.	Oppose	Controls and activity status relating to noise were determined through the Board of Inquiry and, subject to the changes sought in the TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH and 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.
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 Heritage Assessment of the historic site and include a Ruakura Heritage Area - specifically in	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 scope of the variation.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				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 of noxious activities.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.55	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	Amend Interface Area definition to include the Knowledge Zone but provide a exclusion for the Ruakura Retail Centre.	Oppose	The interface area is only required in respect of managing the visual amenity in industrial areas and not the Knowledge Zone.
				Amend the definition for transport corridor by adding in an exclusion for railways and private roads in the Knowledge Zone.	Support	The relief sought provides for additional clarity in the provisions.
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 TGH submission.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.56	1.2.2.20 Ruakura Structure Plan (Noise – Inland Port)	Support in part	Add 1.2.2.20 Ruakura Structure Plan (Noise - Inland Port) as notified in the Proposed District Plan 2012.	Oppose	Reference to notified PDP provisions is no longer relevant.
West, Jennifer	50.11	1.2.2.20 Ruakura Logistics Zone	Oppose	Ensure the noise limits are the same for the whole City. As the areas develop, review noise requirements. Any Noise Management Plan should refer to the overall effect of the whole Ruakura Structure Plan incrementally. Ensure a complaints procedure is embedded in any Noise Management Plan.	Oppose	Noise limits are appropriately tailored to Ruakura, as determined by the Board of Inquiry.
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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						the Board of Inquiry.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.58	1.2.2.22 Knowledge Zone Precinct C	Oppose	Amend 1.2.2.22a) 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	43.59	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 TGH 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 Residents Group	37.17	Landscape Concept and Ecological Enhancement Plan	Support in part	Amend the Land Development Plan criteria at 1.2.2.25(n)(iv) to require details of the Landscape Buffer Areas adjoining Percival Road and inland port area south of Ryburn Road.	Oppose	More than adequate detail is required in the as notified LDP provisions.
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 principle of allowing for interim connections is sought and supported elsewhere in the submission and further submission by TGH 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	Oppose	The Board of Inquiry considered methods to achieve

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				require an ICMP before any land development is planned.		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.
Fairview Downs Residents and Owners Association	43.63	1.2.2.27 Concept Plan for Knowledge Zone (excluding Precinct C)	Oppose	Amend 1.2.2.27 Concept Plan for Knowledge Zone to only provide exclusion for Ruakura Retail Centre.	Oppose	Precinct A, B and D have existing concept plans. Precinct C does not therefore all of Precinct C in its entirety should be excluded from this clause.
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 TGH 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 properties in Aldona Place and Drake Place.	Oppose	The Interface Design Control Area already applies along the Spine Road where appropriate to mitigate visual effects of industrial development and no amendment is required.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.12	N1 Land Development Plans	Support in part	Amend the Land Development Plan assessment criteria to require consideration of heavy vehicle routes and potential effects on residential amenity.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
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 swale in the provisions is unnecessarily specific in this clause.
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 TGH and is appropriate given the complex and staged nature of land development at Ruakura. The removal of the ability to

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						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 TGH 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 TGH 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 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.
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 TGH submission.
Goodwin, Graeme Ernest	05.02	Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	Amend the structure plan to change the Percival - Ryburn area zoning from Ruakura Logistics Zone to Residential; Or provide compensation to the land owners who are affected by the long term influence of an underlying Ruakura Logistics zoning.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
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 TGH submission.
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
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 Road as Medium Density Residential Zone. Rezone the EAF Site Medium Density Residential Zone.	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 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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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.
Cowie, William	30.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Madarang, Domingo	35.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road Residential Land	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Wang, Meggie	42.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Support in part	Either remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for this residential land; or apply Ruakura Logistics Zone to the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave immediately.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Remove all reference to a future Ruakura Logistics Zone or other employment zone for the Percival / Ryburn Road residential land.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
Cooper, Russell (Rusty Racing)	39.02	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Opposes Ruakura Logistics Zone.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is contrary to the sound structure plan outcomes promoted by the variation.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.01	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Amend Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan Land Use to identify the Percival / Ryburn Road land as Large Lot Residential zone.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land.
West, Jennifer	50.20	Figure 2-14 New Figure	Oppose	Limit the area of land that is zoned for retail activity so as not to take up valuable space which could be used for the expansion of other knowledge-based precincts or activities.	Oppose	The extent of retail has been fully determined by the Board of Inquiry.
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 TGH 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 TGH 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	Support	Support subject to the specific changes sought in the TGH submission.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

				rules 3.7.3.3.1 – 3.7.3.3.7) and 3.7.3.4.		
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.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.06	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend Figure 2-15 A Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Transport to provide a more direct indicative link between the residents land and Ruakura Road to the south.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
				Ensure Heavy Commercial Vehicles are managed to minimise adverse residential amenity values through requiring a traffic management plan and include policies that recognise the ability of traffic movement to adversely effect amenity values.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
Wang, Yun-Chin and Kung-Yao Lin	40.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support in part	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.05	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Support in part	Amend to provide a more direct link between the Percival / Ryburn Road area and Ruakura Road to the south, the university and Silverdale prior to closing Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Wang, Meggie	42.07	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Provide a more direct link between the Percival / Ryburn Road area and Ruakura Road to the south and the city prior to closing Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Julian, Alan and Barbara	29.07	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend to provide a more direct link between the Percival / Ryburn Road area and Ruakura Road to the south and the city prior to closing Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Madarang, Domingo	35.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling,	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				in the direction of the University and Silverdale.		Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Fellowship Baptist Church	45.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Cowie, William	30.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Marsters, Derrick and Robyn	18.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
Spirig, Wendy and Roland	36.09	Figure 2-15A New Figure	Oppose	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
				Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	The class of vehicles permitted on roads is appropriately controlled by the Council under the Local Government Act.
				Retain a route which avoids severance effects for the Percival/Ryburn Rd community by providing travel, including walking and cycling, in the direction of the University and Silverdale.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of appropriate alternative routes will ultimately form part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act. It is unnecessary and potentially limits full consideration of alternatives in the future to include any greater specificity in the District Plan
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 traffic function and to provide for efficient use and

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

						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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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 TGH 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	TGH 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 TGH 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	TGH seek 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	TGH 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.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Smith, Noel Gordon	09.01	Figure 2-16 New Figure	Oppose	For LDP Areas E, A, F, C and G; Amend the maximum height restrictions on buildings, machinery and stacking material to a 2 level commercial building or 4 shipping containers height.	Oppose	The relief sought is contrary to the development outcomes determined through the Board of Inquiry process.
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 Plan 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.
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	TGH seek 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 TGH submission.
Ruakura Residents Group	37.13	Figure 2-17 New Figure	Support in part	Extend the landscape buffer shown on Figure 2-17 for the full length south of Ryburn Road, including Land Development Plan Area E and Area A.	Oppose	The relief sought in the submission point is unnecessary for resource management purposes and would not provide for the efficient use and development of a scarce land resource.
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 TGH 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	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

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Medium Density Residential Zone.		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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
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 TGH 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 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.
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.
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 as it would result in a significant shortfall in required industrial land at Ruakura.
Kalnins, Alex	14.02	38A	Oppose	Provide a green barrier or wall for the Rigger	Oppose	There is no resource management reason for the

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

				Place East Street residences and for the Claudelands area.		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 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 scope of 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 scope of the variation.
Madarang, Domingo	35.01	40A	Support	Amend so all vehicle movements are excluded from any buffer or interface areas down Percival Rd. Amend so no heavy vehicles access logistic or industrial sites from Percival or Ryburn Rds.	Oppose	Excluding vehicle movements from any buffer area or interface area is an inefficient use of land, imposes unnecessary costs on adjoining industrial land development and is not required to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of the land.
Alexander, Deanna-Rose	41.01	40A	Support in part	Either apply the same Large Lot Residential Zone rules to the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave as for all other Large Lot zoned areas in Hamilton City, including a 2,500m ² minimum lot size; or apply Ruakura Logistics Zone to the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave immediately.	Oppose	The Percival/Ryburn Road area has been correctly identified on the Ruakura Structure Plan level as both ultimately being required to meet the industrial land requirements of the RPS, but also as the most efficient use of this land. Further fragmentation of this land is opposed as this will limit opportunities for future land use change and will increase the potential for reverse sensitivity impacts.
Wang, Meggie	42.01	40A	Support	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zone for all land in the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.	Oppose	Appropriate development controls to address residential amenity have been considered and approved through the Board of Inquiry.
Julian, Alan and	29.01	40A	Support	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zone for all	Oppose	Appropriate development controls to address

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

Barbara			in part	land in the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave. Seek protection of amenity values for Percival/Ryburn Road.		residential amenity have been considered and approved through the Board of Inquiry.
Chibnall, David Evan and Karlene	31.01	40A	Support in part	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zone for all land in the Ryburn Road/Percival Road residential enclave.	Oppose	Appropriate development controls to address residential amenity have been considered and approved through the Board of Inquiry.
Cooper, Russell (Rusty Racing)	39.01	40A	Oppose	Opposes Ruakura Logistics Zone. Signage to be permitted at all major intersections redirecting customers to the existing business on Ruakura Road.	Oppose	The Ruakura Logistics Zone has been considered and approved through the Board of Inquiry.
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.
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 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.
Goodwin, Graeme Ernest	05.03	Features Map	Oppose	Amend to clarify how vehicle and cycle access is to be provided to the Ryburn/Percival Road area when and if Ruakura Road is closed.	Oppose	The closure of Ruakura Road and the provision of alternative routes is appropriately part of the road closure process under the Local Government Act, rather than a matter to be specified in the District Plan.
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 if the Transmission Lines are placed underground or

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH
March 2016

						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 relocated.

Ruakura Variation – Further Submissions TGH

March 2016

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.
--------------------------------	-------	-----	---------	--------------------------	---------	--