

Under clause 6 of the First Schedule of the Resource
Management Act 1991

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

CHEDWORTH PROPERTIES LIMITED

Dated 18 December 2015

To: **Hamilton City Council**

Name of Submitter: **Chedworth Properties Limited**

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

Introduction

1. CPL owns some 116ha of land in the northern part of the Variation area. CPL has recently obtained LDP and subdivision consents for LDP Area J which has enabled it to commence work the first stages of its medium density residential subdivision.
2. CPL has owned the land since 1969. The vision and development concept for the Variation area commenced for CPL in 2001 and the land use options have been progressively refined and tested through a structure plan process by CPL in partnership with Tainui Group Holdings Limited and the Council.
3. CPL's vision is a "live work play" environment, with a carefully and comprehensively planned medium density residential area comprising residential homes, local shops and a network of greenspace. The residential homes will be designed and built to a high standard incorporating the latest learnings of medium density layout and design from New Zealand and overseas. Once

developed, the medium density residential area will add a significant amount of housing to Hamilton and provide greater choice through the housing types offered.

4. CPL also have an area of Ruakura Industrial Park zone within their Ruakura land holding and are concerned to ensure that the PDP provisions in the Variation are generally appropriate.
5. Subject to the amendments sought in this submission, the pattern of land use and zoning enabled by the Variation and structure plan:
 - (a) implements and effectively realise the live-work-play philosophy contained within the Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy and Future Proof, including providing a range of residential housing choices in close proximity to employment areas; and
 - (b) maximises a resident population within an easily accessible distance from the Hamilton CBD, while at the same time providing land uses which fulfil needs for residents in eastern Hamilton.
 - (c) maximises the opportunities to create a range of land uses that in turn provide for a range of employment opportunities at Ruakura, and therefore achieving the role of a primary employment area in eastern Hamilton;
 - (c) maximises the synergies between existing and proposed land uses as well as the relationships between land use, infrastructure and locational needs (eg. the Waikato Expressway, and employment to residential);

6. The Ruakura Structure Plan encapsulated in the Variation is the latest phase in a series of planning strategies and documents, all of which cite the potential benefits of development at Ruakura for a range of employment and residential activities. These documents include the Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy 2008 (“HUGS”), the FutureProof Growth Strategy and Implementation Plan 2009, and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (“PRPS”).
7. In June 2013 CPL in partnership with Tainui Group Holdings Limited lodged the private plan change request for part of the structure plan area that was heard and determined by the Board of Inquiry. The Board of Inquiry decision approved the plan change, subject to amendments which it outlined in its decision. Except as sought in this submission, the Variation accurately reflects the Board of Inquiry decision on the Plan Change.
8. CPL supports the variation reflecting both the detail of the Board of Inquiry decision to the Plan Change land (noting that changes are necessary to fit with the structure of the Proposed District Plan), as well as the transfer of the approach established by the Board of Inquiry in its decision to the balance of the structure plan area.
9. In general terms, where any minor changes are sought to the Board of Inquiry text and approach, these have arisen from the experience using the provisions through LDP/subdivision resource consent applications post-Board decision.

Amendments sought and reasons for relief

10. CPL supports the Variation and seeks that it be adopted, subject to the changes as set out in the schedule at **Attachment A** to this submission.
11. CPL seeks the relief set out in **Attachment A** or alternative relief to like effect to address the reasons set out in the schedule.

General reasons for relief

12. CPL supports the Variation for the following reasons:
 - (a) The Variation provides a comprehensive planning regime to allow the development of the structure plan area to be undertaken in an orderly, timely and integrated manner.
 - (b) The Variation will provide positive social effects for the health and wellbeing of new residents as well as way of life for the wider Hamilton community including increased residential choices, local employment opportunities and improved access and availability to local commercial and retail activity (particularly for the Hamilton East area).
 - (c) The amenity of the area will be enhanced through development enabled by the Variation through the provision of an extensive open space network and the addition of integrated and well-planned neighbourhoods.
 - (d) The Variation will enable a number of environmental benefits, including water quality, and terrestrial and freshwater habitats that are superior to those of the present

day, and better manage biosecurity risks through consolidation of existing transitional facilities.

- (e) Subject to the changes sought in this submission, the Variation appropriately manages environmental effects arising from new urban land uses provided for.

13. The specific changes to the Variation sought by CPL are set out in **Attachment A**. Broadly, these changes can be summarised as follows:

- (a) Ensuring that the structure plan features (roads, open spaces etc) are shown and referred to indicatively, and instead determine their precise location and extent through subsequent Land Development Plan (**LDP**) consents;
- (b) Removing references in the provisions to specific infrastructure requirements and outcomes where these and the effects to be mitigated are better determined through LDP processes and/or the subject of Private Development Agreements;
- (c) Reducing the consent threshold for the Medium Density Residential buildings from a site area of 400m² to a site area of 250m² (irrespective also if its semi-detached, duplex or terrace housing);
- (d) Various changes to the LDP provisions including removing reference to the need to accord with specific LDP areas, the determination of activity status based on the grant of an

- LDP consent and to achieve consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision;
- (e) A small number of other changes to ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision, including the provisions on non-notification, including the requirement to obtain written approvals of road controlling authorities when obtaining LDP consent for medium density residential zoned land;
 - (f) Various minor amendments to development controls to provide for optimum outcomes, reflect best practice or current designs developed through LDP applications that have been lodged;
 - (g) Revising the Electricity National Grid Corridor provisions to reflect the Board of Inquiry decision;
 - (h) Changing the Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria to ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision such that they deal with Ruakura specific resource management issues rather than issues of a more general nature;
 - (i) Rezoning the balance of the Chedworth landholding to the east of Spine Road (North) and to the north of Greenhill Link Road from General Residential to Ruakura Medium Density Residential; and
 - (j) Various amendments to the Variation maps and plans as a consequence of the relief sought, to fully reflect the current

anticipated provision of infrastructure, open space and amenities in the Variation area and to correct various mapping errors and omissions.

14. In general terms, these changes are required to:
 - (a) Ensure the Variation is consistent with the detail and approach established by the Board of Inquiry;
 - (b) Give effect to national and regional policy statements;
 - (c) Better allow the Council to achieve integrated management of land and control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land; and
 - (d) Otherwise achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.
15. Without detracting from the generality of the above reasons, additional specific reasons for the changes sought are set out in **Attachment A**.

Further additional and/or consequential relief

16. CPL seeks any such other changes to the Variation as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in this submission and to otherwise achieve consistency in detail and approach with the September 2014 Board of Inquiry Decision on the Proposed Ruakura Development Plan Change.
17. CPL seeks any such other consequential changes as necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.

Trade Competition

18. CPL could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Request to be heard

19. CPL wishes to be heard in support of this submission.



Peter Hall

On behalf of Chedworth Properties Limited

Date: 18 December 2015

Address for service of submitter:

Boffa Miskell

PO Box 91250

Auckland

Attention: Peter Hall

Telephone: 09 359 5325

Email: peter.hall@boffamiskell.co.nz

Attachment A

Submission Table: Chedworth Properties Limited

Council's proposed variation tracked changes shown as ~~strike-outs~~ and underlines.

Relief sought in this submission shown as shaded as ~~strike-outs~~ and underlines.

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
3 Structure Plans			
3.7 Ruakura, clause 3.7 a)	Support in Part	<p>The explanation at 3.7 a) i – vi generally accurately records the vision behind the development of the Ruakura Structure Plan, with the exception of the following:</p> <p>3.7 a) iv refers to comprehensively planned areas of residential housing providing both a range of housing types and affordability. While the provision of housing choice can provide for more affordable options, affordability is a not a key driver behind the vision and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Amend 3.7 a) iv as follows:</p> <p><i>iv. Develop comprehensively planned areas of residential housing connecting with Fairview Downs, providing a range of housing choice and affordability.</i></p>
3.7 Ruakura, clause 3.7 b)	Support in Part	<p>3.7 b) records that the Ruakura Structure Plan provides 405ha of employment land incorporating</p>	<p>Amend 3.7 b) as follows:</p> <p><i>b) The Ruakura Structure Plan provides 373 <u>405</u>ha of employment land</i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>an inland port, freight and logistics hub and other employment land. This clause does not properly recognise the significant component of Ruakura Industrial Park area that also makes up the employment land and should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p><i>incorporating an inland port, freight, and logistics hub, industrial park and other employment land. It also provides 77ha for research and innovation activities, allowing for the expansion of the existing Waikato Innovation Park and maximising opportunities for connectivity and interaction between the University of Waikato and AgResearch.</i></p>
3.7 Ruakura, clause 3.7 f)	Support in Part	<p>Clause 3.7f should reflect the fact that the open space areas and infrastructure are indicative only, as is referenced in other provisions.</p>	<p>Amend 3.7 f) as follows:</p> <p><i><u>f) The relevant Ruakura Structure Plan Figures in Appendix 2 indicate the eventual pattern of development within Ruakura and include:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i><u>i. Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan – which shows the land use zoning and indicative open space areas;</u></i> <i><u>ii. Figures 2-15 A and B Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure;</u></i> <p><i><u>A. Which shows the indicative locations of strategic infrastructure for the transport network within the Ruakura Structure Plan</u></i></p> <p><i><u>B. Which shows the indicative locations of strategic three waters network within the Ruakura Structure Plan</u></i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>iii. Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas – which shows the different areas for staged development within the Ruakura Structure Plan;</u> <u>iii iv. Figure 2-17 Inland Port Building Setbacks and Landscape Controls – which shows the setbacks and controls for the Inland Port; and</u> <u>v. Figure 2-18 Cyclist and Pedestrian Network Plan – which shows the connectivity of the indicative locations of proposed and existing cycle and pedestrian network within the Ruakura Structure Plan and to surrounding areas.</u></p>
3.7 Ruakura, clause 3.7 i)	Support in Part	A minor amendment is required to Clause 3.7i to update to refer to “Ruakura Industrial Park”.	<p>Amend 3.7 i as follows:</p> <p><u>ii. The 405ha identified above comprises the Ruakura Inland Port and logistics zone (approximately 195ha) and general industrial Ruakura Industrial Park zone land (approximately 210 ha). The staging and timing identified provides for Stage 1 of the Inland Port and logistics zone (shown as A on Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas) and up to 30 hectares of</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>general industrial development to 2021. The Ruakura Structure Plan is linked to the development of Hamilton section of the Waikato Expressway. Further development beyond the initial 80ha identified for the 2010-2021 period should not occur until the Hamilton section of the Waikato Expressway is completed and connected to the Ruakura land in a manner that does not undermine the efficient functioning and safety of the transport network, or another infrastructure solution has been demonstrated to satisfy the relevant criteria for alternative land release in Method 6.13.3 of the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</u></p>
3.7.1.6 Residential Zones	Support in Part	<p>The amendments to 3.7.1.6 appropriately add reference to the One Integrated Retail Development Area provided for within the Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone. The clause however retains reference to an emphasis on affordable housing. While the provision of housing choice can provide for more affordable options, affordability is a not an emphasis of the zone.</p>	<p>Amend 3.7.1.6 a) as follows:</p> <p><i>a) The Ruakura residential area provides for a mixture of development that aligns accords with the densities proposed for General Residential, Medium-Density Residential and Large Lot Residential Zones. The intention is to provide an area with various housing choices, including site size and housing typologies, including</i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p>an emphasis on affordable housing. Residential development in the General Residential and Medium-Density Residential Zones is positioned to maximise existing connectivity from Fairview Downs and the Hamilton Ring Road. <u>One Integrated Retail Development is provided for within the Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone to serve the surrounding catchment (see Figure 2-16 in Appendix 2).</u></p>
3.7.1.7 Transportation network	Support in Part	<p>Clause 3.7.1.7 requires a diagram to clearly define the extent of the road sections described. Otherwise it lacks precision.</p> <p>Generally, the clause is too prescriptive in respect to the location of Strategic water and wastewater infrastructure, which should be details determined by LDPs.</p> <p>Spine Road North prescribes property access and intersection arrangements which require further investigation and should be determined at LDP stage.</p>	<p>Add a diagram to clearly define the extent of the road sections described in 3.7.1.7, including ‘urban’ sections.</p> <p>Amend 3.7.1.7 as follows:</p> <p>3.7.1.7 Transportation Network a) The Waikato Expressway forms the eastern boundary of the Structure Plan area. Possible interchanges to this Expressway are located in the Structure Plan area. The objective of those interchanges is to provide connectivity with the City’s strategic transport network and access to the inland port and industrial areas.</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>The classification of the Spine Road (Central and North) north of the Fifth Ave Extension should be changed from Minor Arterial Road to Indicative Collector Road to reflect the anticipated traffic volumes and status of this road and allow for its final alignment to be determined. The forecast volumes do not accord with a Minor Arterial Road. Minor Arterial status may be required in the future but the Variation should ensure the efficient use of resources by not forcing the delivery of oversized infrastructure that is not required to mitigate the effects of development well ahead of when it is required</p> <p>Reference to 'ground level' for the Spine Road (south) is unclear as to intent. Specifying the width of the bridge is unnecessary.</p> <p>Ruakura Road West has unnecessary duplication.</p>	<p><i>b) — <u>Adjacent to the spine road corridor is an open space corridor of a similar width which incorporates a range of functions, including stormwater reserve, walkways and cycleways.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>The transport network to service the Structure Plan area is comprised of the following hierarchy, which describes the form and function of the various routes:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>a) The Waikato Expressway forms the eastern boundary of the Structure Plan area. There are two interchanges to the Waikato Expressway connecting to major arterials within the City's network at the Greenhill Link Road interchange in the north, and the re-aligned Ruakura Road interchange in the south.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>b) Greenhill Link Road will initially be two-lane with provision for a four-lane major arterial City Gateway route connecting the Waikato Expressway to the City's Ring Road at Wairere Drive/Crosby Road roundabout. Access is provided via the Spine Road intersection. Strategic water and</u></i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p>wastewater infrastructure will can co-locate in this corridor.</p> <p>c) The Spine Road North is a minor arterial collector road to the north of Greenhill Link Road and provides strategic connectivity to the future residential development in the north. This will be a two-lane minor arterial road, with direct property access on the western side and intersection only access on the eastern side of the Spine Road. The corridor will likely provide for public transport, on-street parking, a shared walking and cycle path and swales for stormwater management. Strategic wastewater and water infrastructure will can co-locate within the corridor, coupled with the undergrounded 110kv Transpower transmission line.</p> <p>d) The Spine Road (central) will initially be a two-lane minor arterial collector road south of Greenhill Link Road to the Fifth Avenue extension. The form and function of this road is to primarily service residential and industrial development through intersection access. The corridor will likely provides for public transport,</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>parking, shared footpath and cycle path and a swale area for stormwater management. Strategic wastewater and water infrastructure will can co-locate within this corridor, coupled with the underground 110kv Transpower transmission line.</u></p> <p><u>e) Fifth Avenue Extension will initially be two-lane with provision for a four-lane major arterial road extending the Cross City Connector arterial network from Wairere Drive to the Spine Road. The corridor provides for public transport, a shared walking and cycle path and a swale area for stormwater management.</u></p> <p><u>f) The Spine Road (south) will initially be two-lane with provision for a four-lane major arterial road from Fifth Avenue south to Ruakura Road West. This extends the Cross City Connector arterial to the Ruakura Industrial Park area. This section includes a <u>four-lane road bridge over the East Coast Main Trunk Railway. At ground level, the</u></u></p> <p><u>The corridor provides for public transport, shared footpath and cycleway and a swale area for stormwater management. Strategic</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>wastewater and water infrastructure will co-locate within the corridor.</u></p> <p><u>g) Ruakura Road (urban) will continue to function as a two-lane minor arterial road between the Wairere Drive Ring Road and the Spine Road. The corridor provides for public transport and shared footpath and cycle path.</u></p> <p><u>h) Ruakura Road West will initially be a two-lane minor arterial road with provision for a four-lane major arterial City Gateway route, connecting the Spine Road major arterial to the Waikato Expressway. A series of signalised intersections will provide access to the Inland Port and Ruakura Logistics Zone north. A signalised intersection also provides access to the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones and the proposed service centre to the south. A series of signalised intersections will provide access to the Inland Port, Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and the proposed service centre to the south.</u></p> <p><u>The corridor provides for public</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><i>transport, shared footpath and cycle path and swale area for stormwater management.</i> <i>The Collector road network below serving the arterial network shows indicative connections but will be assessed at each Land Development Plan stage to ensure transport connectivity between development areas and the greater structure plan.</i></p>
<p>3.7.1.8 3.7.1.8 Open Space Network</p>	<p>Support in Part</p>	<p>Figure 2-14 only shows the indicative location and extent of the Ruakura open space network, with its precise location and extent to be determined by subsequent LDP consents. Clause 3.7.1.8 should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Amend 3.7.1.8 as follows:</p> <p><i>3.7.1.8 3.7.1.8 Open Space Network Figure 2-14 shows the indicative location and extent of the Ruakura open space network. This is intended to accommodate and provide for a range of functions including stormwater and ecological management, a well-connected pedestrian and cycleway network linking open space land, neighbourhood reserves for passive and informal recreation, and amenity strips between different activity zones. The following are key components of the open space network:</i></p> <p>....</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
3.7.1.10 Water and Wastewater	Oppose	<p>Clause 3.7.1.10 Water and Wastewater is unnecessarily prescriptive and does not provide sufficient flexibility. The clause reads in part as a rule rather than a description of anticipated outcomes. It includes for example a 'requirement' at d) that provision shall be made to extend the wastewater interceptor across the Waikato River and into the Peacocke Structure Plan area in a manner envisaged by Council's Wastewater Master Plan.</p> <p>This clause does not address the effects of staged development and such infrastructure should only be required/provided when needed to ensure the efficient use of resources. Being so specific on these matters in District Plan provisions is not an effective or efficient method. By way of example, the Council has already decided not to extend the FEI to Peacocke.</p>	<p>Delete 3.7.1.10 Water and Wastewater</p> <p>Delete consequential cross references to these provisions.</p> <p>Make such consequential amendments as are necessary to objectives, policies, rules, assessment criteria and information requirements to address this submission point.</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>Water and Wastewater provision should be determined by mechanisms such as Private Development Agreements and not prescribed in the District Plan.</p> <p>Clause 3.7.1.11 which follows correctly records that the Infrastructure Development Programme is indicative and that Land Development Plans are expected to further refine these transportation and three waters infrastructure needs. This renders the preceding descriptions unnecessary.</p>	
3.7.1.11 Indicative Infrastructure Development Programme	Support in Part	<p>Outcomes such as vesting of three-waters infrastructure and its location within road corridors and whether it is protected by easements over private land should be determined by mechanisms such as the LDPs and Private Development Agreements and not prescribed in the District Plan. Clause 3.7.1.11 should be amended accordingly. The objective should be to promote the efficient use of resources and ensure that the provision of infrastructure is</p>	<p>Amend clause 3.7.1.11 as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.1.11 Indicative Infrastructure Development Programme</u> <u>a) Figures 2-15A and B illustrate the Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure necessary to support the city and growth cell. Rules 3.7.3.3 and 3.7.3.4 detail the nature and staging of transportation and three waters infrastructure requirements. Land Development Plans are expected to further refine these transportation and three waters infrastructure needs. It is</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>directly related to effects. The provisions should not therefore require infrastructure provision ahead of time or sized beyond requirements.</p> <p>Construction should not be referred to in the clause. Should the Council want it built ahead of anticipated effects then it should meet a fair and equitable share of this cost based on the respective capacity required by current and future developers.</p>	<p><u>expected that the provision of the planned strategic three waters infrastructure network would be integrated, and constructed and vested concurrently with the development of the transport network (in particular the incremental development of the Spine Road)-Land Development Plan areas.</u></p> <p><u>b) Where strategic infrastructure is developed on land not held by Council, easements in gross in favour of Hamilton City Council will be required to secure access to any public infrastructure. It is Council's expectation that all Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure will be vested in Council.</u></p>
3.7.1.12 Connections to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure	Oppose	Clause 3.7.1.12 is unnecessarily prescriptive and does not provide sufficient flexibility. The clause reads in part as a rule rather than a description of anticipated outcomes.	Delete 3.7.1.12 Connections to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure
Objective 3.7.2.1 and Policies 3.7.2.1a - 3.7.2.1f	Support in part	The proposed amendments to Objective 3.7.2.1 and Policies appropriately record that Land within the Ruakura Structure Plan Area will be developed in 'general' accordance with the vision for	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.1d as follows:</p> <p>3.7.2.1d <i>Develop comprehensively planned areas of residential housing connecting with Fairview Downs, providing a range of housing choice and affordability.</i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>the Ruakura Structure Plan and the importance of the Structure Plan area, including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a significant new employment area based around the development of a regional logistics hub. • Maximise the use of existing infrastructure investment; • Align land-use patterns with the area’s planned infrastructure investment to achieve integrated transport and land use development with an emphasis on logistics and freight; and • Develop comprehensively planned areas of residential housing, providing a range of housing choice. <p>The reference to affordability in policy 3.7.2.1d should be removed. While the provision of housing choice can provide for more affordable options, affordability should not be an outcome prescribed by District Plan policy.</p>	

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
Objective 3.7.2.2	Support in Part	The requirement to protect the amenity values of surrounding communities and facilities cannot be achieved where those amenity values are in part afforded by existing rural activities in the variation area and where the variation promotes the urbanisation of that land.	<p>Amend Objective 3.7.2.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.2</u> <i>Development and land use activities in the Ruakura Structure Plan are designed, developed and implemented in a manner which protects avoids significant adverse effects on the amenity values of surrounding communities and facilities, while providing for urbanisation.</i></p>
Policy 3.7.2.2b	Support in Part	<p>The indicative nature of the figures referred to in policy 3.7.2.2b require only ‘general’ accordancy and will still achieve the outcomes sought by the structure plan. Other provisions in the variation also ensure key outcomes are met.</p> <p>The policy is inconsistent with rule 3.7.3.1 which requires land use and development within the Ruakura Structure Plan Area shall be in ‘general accordancy’ with the figure specified.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.2b as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.2b</u> <i>Land use, subdivision and development of the Ruakura Structure Plan will be undertaken in general accordancy with Figures 2-14, 2-15A and B, 2-16, 2-17 and 2-18 outlined in Appendix 2 Structure Plans.</i></p>
Policy 3.7.2.2e	Support in Part	The indicative nature of the figures referred to in policy 3.7.2.2e	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.2e as follows:</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>require only 'general' accordance and will still achieve the outcomes sought by the structure plan. Other provisions in the variation also ensure key outcomes are met.</p> <p>The policy is inconsistent with rule 3.7.3.1 which requires land use and development within the Ruakura Structure Plan Area shall be in 'general accordance' with the figure specified.</p>	<p><u>3.7.2.2e</u> <u>Logistics, industry, knowledge, residential and open space activities and development will use land allocated and serviced for these purposes in general accordance Figures 2-14, 2-15A and B, 2-16 and 2-17 outlined in Appendix 2 Structure Plans.</u></p>
Policy 3.7.2.2f	Support in Part	<p>Although there is no issue with the general requirement to safeguard the land identified for these purposes in policy 3.7.2.2f, for the same reasons as stated above the word 'generally' should be included.</p> <p>The policy is inconsistent with rule 3.7.3.1 which requires land use and development within the Ruakura Structure Plan Area shall be in 'general accordance' with the figure specified.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.2f as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.2f</u> <u>Logistics, industry, knowledge, residential and open space land generally identified on Figure 2-14 will be safeguarded for these purposes.</u></p>
Policy 3.7.2.3a	Support in Part	Policy 3.7.2.3a specifies the method by which infrastructure can be committed, namely through commitment through 'an	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.3a as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.3a</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>appropriate legal mechanism'. In doing so, other potential methods are discounted. This part of the policy should be deleted.</p> <p>Where the Council requires the developer to deliver strategic infrastructure then they should meet a fair and equitable proportion of the cost based on the capacity being provided.</p>	<p><u>Land within the Ruakura Structure Plan will not be developed until adequate infrastructure is provided to mitigate the effects of the development.</u> <u>and a commitment to the development of the Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure by an appropriate legal mechanism.</u></p>
Policy 3.7.2.3c	Support in Part	Policy 3.7.2.3c requires LDPs to be supported by development of Strategic Infrastructure. There are circumstances where LDP can be obtained and implemented without the need to build strategic infrastructure. This requirement of the policy should be deleted.	<p>Amend Policy 3.7.2.4b as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.3c</u> <u>The use and development of land for urban development is inappropriate unless a Land Development Plan has been approved by the Council and is supported by the development of Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure.</u></p>
Policy 3.7.2.4b	Oppose	Policy 3.7.2.4b requires that the transport network supports efficient passenger transport and walking and cycling, including grade separate facilities on arterial routes. This policy should not be generally applicable and should be deleted as the majority of roads within the variation area will be	Delete Policy 3.7.2.4b

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		unable to meet all of the transport outcomes sought.	
Policy 3.7.2.4e	Support in Part	Policy 3.7.2.4e requires opportunities to be provided for Grade-separated facilities on arterial routes. Whether facilities should be grade separated is a matter of design and inappropriately specified in the policy. Grade separated facilities are not being provided on the Link Road which is a Major Arterial and already under construction.	<p>Amend policy 3.7.2.4e as follows:</p> <p><u>3.7.2.4e</u> <u>Opportunities for improved safety, accessibility, connectivity and efficiency within the transportation network are provided including grade separated facilities on arterial routes.</u></p>
Rule 3.7.3.2.1 b)	Support in Part	<p>Consent for Land Development rule 3.7.3.2.1 b) states that the Ruakura Structure Plan is divided into a number of Land Development Plan Areas (as shown in Figure 2-16 in Appendix 2 Structure Plans).</p> <p>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. The part of Rule 3.7.3.2.1 b) requiring adherence to these areas</p>	<p>Amend Rule 3.7.3.2.1 b) as follows:</p> <p><u>b) The Ruakura Structure Plan is divided into a number of Land Development Plan Areas (as shown in Figure 2-16 in Appendix 2 Structure Plans).</u></p> <p><u>a) Consent for the urbanisation of land involving the activities listed in Rule 3.7.3.2.1 shall be obtained for the entire or staged section of these areas in entirety or a staged manner prior to land use, subdivision and development under any other rule of the Ruakura Structure Plan.</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>should be deleted, with consequential amendments made to Figure 2-16.</p> <p>Rule 3.7.3.2.1 b) inappropriately includes a double requirement for consent to be obtained both for the urbanisation of land activities listed in rule 3.7.3.2.1 as well as prior to land use, subdivision and development under 'any other rule' of the Structure Plan. This ignores that there are a range of activities provided for in the Structure Plan area which do not require a LDP.</p>	<p>Consequential deletion of Figure 2-16 in Appendix 2 Structure Plans</p>
Rule 3.7.3.2.1c	Oppose	<p>Rule 3.7.3.2.1c) states that land development and new buildings in the absence of a Land Development Plan is Non Complying.</p> <p>This rule incorrectly imposes an activity status based on the granting of another consent.</p> <p>The rule is unnecessary, given the broad scope of urbanisation activities which require a land development plan.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 3.7.3.2.1c</p>
Rule 3.7.3.2.1 d	Oppose	Rule 3.7.3.2.1 d), which specifies that LDP areas may be altered,	<p>Delete Rule 3.7.3.2.1 d</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		should be deleted as a consequential amendment to the amendments sought to rule 3.7.3.2.1 b) to remove reference to these areas.	
Rule 3.7.3.2.1 e	Support in Part	Neither open space provisions nor Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure will be relevant to every LDP and rule 3.7.3.2.1 e) should be amended accordingly.	<p>Amend Rule 3.7.3.2.1 e</p> <p><i><u>e) A Land Development Plan shall provide where relevant the following information as detailed in Appendix 1.2.2.25 Information Requirements – Land Development Plans:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i><u>i. General Requirements;</u></i> <i><u>ii. Concept Layout Plan;</u></i> <i><u>iii. Landscape Concept and Enhancement Plan (including a Native Fish Management Plan and Native Lizard Management Plan as required);</u></i> <i><u>iv. Water Impact Assessment;</u></i> <i><u>v. Integrated Transport Assessment;</u></i> <i><u>vi. Mitigation of Adverse Land Development Effects on Habitats;</u></i> <i><u>vii. Medium Density Residential Zone (where relevant); and</u></i> <i><u>viii. Open Space Provisions</u></i> <i><u>ix. Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure (as shown on Figures 2-15A and B)</u></i>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
Rule 3.7.3.2.2	Oppose	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 if they are to be included.	<p>Delete Rule 3.7.3.2.2 Water Impact Assessment</p> <p>Delete consequential cross references to this rule.</p>
Rule 3.7.3.2.3	Support in Part	The activities provided for in Residential Zones as restricted discretionary activities will not give rise to adverse effects on the road controlling authorities set out in Rule 3.7.3.2.3 that have not already been determined as being appropriate through traffic modelling. Activities in Residential Zones should be exempt from the requirement to obtain written approval from these authorities.	<p>Amend Rule 3.7.3.2.3 as follows:</p> <p><u><i>3.7.3.2.3 Notification Rule</i></u> <u><i>a) Except as provided for by sections 95A(2)(b) and (c), 95B(2) and (3) and 95C(1) to (4) of the Act applications for any Restricted Discretionary Activity identified with an asterisk (*) in section 4.5.4 of Residential Zones, 8.3.2, 8.3.3 and 8.9 of Knowledge Zone, 10.3, 10.6 or 10.7 of Ruakura Logistics Zone or 11.3, 11.6 or 11.7 of Ruakura Industrial Park Zone shall be considered without notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons except that applications for activities generating 1500 or more vehicle movements per day shall be limited notified to the following unless they have given their affected party approval:</i></u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>• New Zealand Transport Agency, Waikato Regional Council and Waikato District Council</u>, provided that the <u>requirement for affected party approval shall not apply to activities identified with an asterisk (*) in section 4.5.4 Residential Zones.</u></p> <p><u>Further to clause (a), all activities within the Inland Port (Sub Area A (Inland Port)) classified as a Restricted Discretionary Activity by Rule 25.8.3.14a) shall be considered without notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.</u></p> <p>Consequential amendments to the specific rule cross references in 3.7.3.2.3 as necessary.</p>
Rule 3.7.3.3 d)	Oppose	Rule 3.7.3.3 d) Staging and Traffic Requirements relates to the Spine Road construction trigger. The rule requires the extension of the Spine Road as specified as 'LDP applications are lodged'. The rule also requires that full extent of the Spine Road within each LDP area to be 'constructed' as part of the LDP application. The requirements to	<p>Delete Rule 3.7.3.3 d) Staging and Traffic Requirements</p> <p>Delete consequential cross references to this rule.</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		extend and construct the Spine Road as part of a resource consent are inappropriate. The rule as drafted appears to specify that these works are required with a resource consent application, rather than simply relying on the LDP consent process to impose conditions to this effect where such conditions are necessary. Should the Council require over-sized infrastructure early then they need to pay their fair and equitable share based on capacity required/provided.	
Rule 3.7.3.4	Oppose	Rule 3.7.3.4 Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure requires the provision of potable water supply, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure. These requirements should be the subject of LDP application assessment and conditions as necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects rather than specified in this rule.	Delete Rule 3.7.3.4 Delete consequential cross references to this rule.
4 Residential Zones			
Clause 4.1 f)	Oppose	Clause 4.1 f) specifies that for Residential Zones, a Land Development Plan in accordance with Rule 3.7.3.2 must be	Delete Clause 4.1 f)

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>approved by Hamilton City Council before development can occur in the Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>This requirement inconsistent with the specific requirements of rule 3.7.3.2 Land Development Plan, and with that rule is unnecessary.</p>	
4.2.12 Explanation	Support in Part	<p>Objective 4.2.12 is that the Medium Density Residential Zone includes an Integrated Retail Development providing services and community facilities capable of meeting the day to day needs of the immediate neighbourhood.</p> <p>The explanation of this objective further limits the retail offer and the development form of the retail centre with its reference to a 'limited range' of goods and services and a 'walk in population'. It also specifies shop sizes which is inconsistent with rule 4.8.1. These references should be deleted from the explanation.</p>	<p>Amend 4.2.12 Explanation as follows:</p> <p><i><u>The Integrated Retail Development Centre will provide a limited range of everyday goods and services and essentially serve a walk in population. Being situated in a planned residential area it is essential that the range and scale of activities is compatible with neighbouring residential activity and local amenity values.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>The Integrated Retail Development Centre is small in land area and shop sizes are typically between 100-400m² GFA.</u></i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought						
Clause 4.5.1a	Support in Part	For the reasons stated in this submission reference to defined Land Development Plan Areas should be deleted. As a consequence, clause 4.5.1a should be amended.	<p>Amend Clause 4.5.1a as follows:</p> <p><i>a) The Medium-Density Residential Zone is divided into a number of Comprehensive Development Plan Areas (as shown in Appendix 3). <u>This excludes the Ruakura Structure Plan where Figure 2-16 identifies Land Development Plan Areas which are subject to Rules within 3.7.3.2.</u></i></p>						
Rule 4.8.2	Support in Part	For the reasons stated in this submission reference to defined Land Development Plan Areas should be deleted. As a consequence, Rule 4.8.2 should be amended.	<p>Amend Rule 4.8.2 Building Setbacks as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1570 967 2004 1364"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1570 967 1787 1150"><i>a) Transport corridor boundary – local and collector roads</i></td> <td data-bbox="1787 967 2004 1150"><u>3m</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1570 1150 1787 1294"><i>b) Transport corridor boundary – arterial roads</i></td> <td data-bbox="1787 1150 2004 1294"><u>5m</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1570 1294 1787 1364"><i>c) Boundary of a Land</i></td> <td data-bbox="1787 1294 2004 1364"><u>1.5m</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>a) Transport corridor boundary – local and collector roads</i>	<u>3m</u>	<i>b) Transport corridor boundary – arterial roads</i>	<u>5m</u>	<i>c) Boundary of a Land</i>	<u>1.5m</u>
<i>a) Transport corridor boundary – local and collector roads</i>	<u>3m</u>								
<i>b) Transport corridor boundary – arterial roads</i>	<u>5m</u>								
<i>c) Boundary of a Land</i>	<u>1.5m</u>								

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought		
			<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;"><u>Development Area or Area Boundary</u></td> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> </tr> </table>	<u>Development Area or Area Boundary</u>	
<u>Development Area or Area Boundary</u>					
23 Subdivision					
Clause 23.3	Support in Part	Subdivision Rule 23.3 imposes different activity classifications in the absence of an approved Land Development Plan. In practice LDPs and subdivision consent applications can be processed in parallel and this can result in proper resource management integration. These provisions should be deleted from the table.	Amend Clause 23.3 Rules-Activity Status Tables in the “Ruakura Medium Density Residential Zone” to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delete the “without an approved LDP” column. • Replace the heading “with an approved LDP” with “<u>Subdivision activity</u>”. 		
Rule 23.6.8	Support in Part	For the reasons stated above	Amend Rule 23.6.8 Subdivision in the Medium-Density Residential and Rototuna Town Centre Zones as follows: <p>a) Subdivision shall only take place in conjunction with a Comprehensive Development Plan or Land Development Plan for Ruakura application or after a Comprehensive Development Plan or Land Development Plan for Ruakura application has been granted.</p>		

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
General			
Rule 25.7.5	Support in Part	Rule 25.7.5 Rules-Activity Status-Electricity National Grid Corridor is inconsistent with rule 25H.14.1 of the Board of Inquiry Decision. There are some minor drafting changes which impact on the application of the rule.	Amend Rule 25.7.5 Rules-Activity Status-Electricity National Grid Corridor to ensure consistency with rule 25H.14.1 of the Board of Inquiry Decision.
Rule 25.7.7	Support in Part	Rule 25.7.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria is inconsistent with the Board of Inquiry Decision. Additional matters of discretion are introduced which impact on the application of the rule.	Amend Rule 25.7.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria to remove references to Matters of Discretion “I-Network Utilities and Transmission” and “N- -Ruakura” in respect of Ruakura Activities xiii, xiv and xv and replace those matters with the matters of discretion from rule 25H.14.2.1 of the Board of Inquiry Decision.
1.1.2 Definitions	Support in Part	Amendments to definitions required to support the provisions and ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry decision.	Amend 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan as follows: Replace the existing definition and associate diagram for National Grid Corridor and National Grid Yard with the definitions for National Grid, National Grid Yard, National Grid Corridor and Sensitive Activity from the Board of Inquiry Decision.

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p>Insert the definitions from Board of Inquiry Decision, or as otherwise required as are necessary to support terms used in the Ruakura Structure Plan zones.</p>
<p>Clause 1.2.2.25</p>	<p>Support in Part</p>	<p>Variation amendments to the Land Development Plans Information Requirements to ensure consistency with the Board of Inquiry Decision and to avoid information requirements that are inconsistent with the matters for assessment and therefore unnecessary. The purpose of neighbourhood reserves is more than just visual amenity.</p>	<p>Amend Clause 1.2.2.25 Land Development Plans as follows (renumber accordingly):</p> <p><u>Land Development Plan</u></p> <p><u>An application under Rule 3.7.3.2.1 shall be accompanied by a Land Development Plan including the following information:</u></p> <p>....</p> <p><u>d) Where relevant the the location of proposed Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure to ensure connectivity across the entire structure plan and adjacent land development plan areas.</u></p> <p><u>g) The location and dimension of open spaces, and the total area provided for each open space purpose consistent with the purpose of the Ruakura Open Space Zone and Ruakura Structure Plan.</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><i>m) Where staged development of any Land Development Area is sought then the following indicative information for the balance area shall be provided:</i></p> <p><i>i. The location and width of proposed roads and carriageways and their integration with the existing and future transport network;</i></p> <p><i>ii. The location of proposed Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure to ensure connectivity across the entire structure plan and adjacent land development plan areas.</i></p> <p><i>ix. Methods to ensure implementation of a Native Fish Management Plan for the Land Development Plan Area consistent with the requirements of a Schedule Structure Plan Area-wide Native Fish Management Plan.</i></p> <p><i>x. Methods to ensure implementation of a Native Lizard Management Plan for the Land Development Plan Area consistent with the requirements of a Schedule Structure Plan Area-wide Native Lizard Management Plan.</i></p> <p><i>o) A Water Impact Assessment based on anticipated development in the</i></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p><u>Land Development Plan that includes the following:</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>ii. Where there is no approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan, how the proposal is consistent with the development of and gives effect to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure including as shown on Figures 2-15A and B in Appendix 2 for the entire structure plan area.</u></p> <p><u>y) Neighbourhood reserves – these will be required as part of the subdivision process and the establishment of residential neighbourhoods. As such the location of the neighbourhood reserves on Figure 2-14 within Appendix 2 is indicative only. Each neighbourhood reserve shall be an area of approximately 0.5ha and serve a catchment area of approximately 500m radius. Neighbourhood reserves complement the range of facilities provided by the Ruakura Open Space Zone and provide a focal point for, and contribute to the visual amenity of the local community.</u></p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in Part	<p>Matters of Assessment N1 Land Development Plans require at e) Consistency with the Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure network and at f) information in respect of staging.</p> <p>Infrastructure in e) is already covered as a matter of discretion at a) and b), while f) is an information requirement. Both should be deleted.</p> <p>Diversions of interim connects as anticipated in k may not always be relevant.</p> <p>The submitter’s experience is that where permanent connections have been provided, the Council consider them to be only interim because they have not installed the headwork capacity specifically for Ruakura. Instead this capacity has been allocated to other growth cells where development is or has not occurred. This is despite Ruakura paying Citywide development contributions for such</p>	<p>Amend Matters of Assessment N1 Land Development Plans as follows:</p> <p>Deleting matters e and f.</p> <p>Amending k as follows:</p> <p><u>Where relevant, How the Whether the Land Development Plan provides for the eventual diversion of interim connections to Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure including as shown on Figures 2-15A and B and any approved Integrated Catchment Management Plan including timing and triggers for such diversions.</u></p> <p>Include a definition of “Interim Connections” in a manner that addresses the matters raised in this submission to avoid ambiguity.</p>

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>capacity. A definition of the term “interim connection” will assist any such ambiguity.</p> <p>The submitter supports the use of the WIA method as included in the LDP provisions.</p>	
1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in Part	The Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria were carefully worked through and ultimately incorporated in the Board of Inquiry decision to deal with Ruakura specific resource management issues. The variation adds additional matters of a more general natures which are unnecessary and risk running counter to the specific matters developed for Ruakura. References to such additional matters should be deleted.	Delete all references in the Medium Density Residential and Industrial Park Zone to Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria other than, where relevant to N – Ruakura, G-Transportation and F-Hazards and Safety.
Planning Maps and Figures			
Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan	Support in Part	The balance of the Chedworth landholding to the east of Spine Road (North) and to the north of Greenhill Link Road should be rezoned from General Residential to Ruakura Medium Density Residential. Although current	Amend Figure 2-14 Ruakura Structure Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone the balance of the Chedworth landholding to the east of Spine Road (North) and to the north of Greenhill Link Road from General

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		<p>development planning work indicates this area to be used as a stormwater basin, its inclusion in the Ruakura Medium Density Residential will allow this function to be assessed as part of the LDP for other Chedworth Medium Density areas.</p> <p>The Spine Road is not fixed in its position and neither is the final width of adjoining swales and as such it is not appropriate to include dimensions of Open Space zoned land adjoining it.</p> <p>The extent and placement of the Ruakura Open Space zone within the Medium Density Residential Zone area in the Chedworth landholdings is better determined by LDP consent rather than specified on the planning maps. At most an indicative outcome could be shown on the structure plan, rather than a very precisely defined layout and extent.</p> <p>The Indicative Neighbourhood Reserves are of limited purpose and</p>	<p>Residential to Ruakura Medium Density Residential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the Open Space dimensions from the Spine Road • Remove the Ruakura Open Space zone from the Medium Density Residential Zone area in the Chedworth landholdings and replace with Medium Density Residential Zone. • Remove Indicative Neighbourhood Reserves notations. • Zone the land underneath roads according to their adjoining zoning and show roads as an overlay in indicative positions. • Make other changes to this Figure as necessary to give effect to this submission. • Consequential changes to Figures 2-15A, 2-15B, 2-16, 2-17 and 2-18 to give effect to the above.

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		better established through LDP processes.	
Figure 2-15 A Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Transport	Support in Part	<p>Figure 2-15 A Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Transport does not fully reflect the current anticipated road network and hierarchy.</p> <p>The classification of the Spine Road (Central) north of the Fifth Ave Extension should be changed from Minor Arterial Road to Indicative Collector Road to reflect the anticipated traffic volumes and status of this road and allow for its final alignment to be determined. Forecast volumes do not accord with a Minor Arterial Road.</p>	<p>Make such changes as necessary to Figure 2-15 A Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Transport to reflect the current anticipated road network and hierarchy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the classification of Spine Road north of the Fifth Ave Extension from Minor Arterial Road to Indicative Collector Road. • The inclusion of a note that specifies that whereas the transport connections are sought to be achieved as shown, the plan is diagrammatic only and the roads indicative.
Figure 2-15 B Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Three Waters	Support in Part	Figure 2-15 B Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Three Waters does not fully reflect the current anticipated three waters infrastructure.	<p>Make such changes as necessary to Figure 2-15 B Ruakura Strategic Infrastructure – Three Waters to reflect the current anticipated three waters infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of a note that specifies that whereas the infrastructure provision is

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
			<p>sought to be achieved as shown, the plan is diagrammatic only and the network indicative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the “Stormwater” green circle notation to “Stormwater Outfall”.
Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas	Oppose	For the reasons stated above, Land Development Plan Areas should not be specified and mapped.	Delete Figure 2-16 Ruakura Land Development Plan Areas and reference to the Plan in the relevant provisions.
Figure 2-18 B Ruakura Cyclist & Pedestrian Network Plan	Support in Part	Figure 2-18 B Ruakura Cyclist & Pedestrian Network Plan does not reflect the current anticipated cycle and pedestrian network.	<p>Make such changes as necessary to Figure 2-18 B Ruakura Cyclist & Pedestrian Network Plan to reflect the current anticipated cycle and pedestrian network, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of a note that specifies that whereas the cycle and pedestrian network is sought to be achieved as shown, the plan is diagrammatic only and the network indicative.
District Plan Maps 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 39, 40, 47, 48 and 49.	Support in Part	The District Plan Maps Legend does not appropriately reference the Ruakura Structure Plan area and zones.	Amend the District Plan Maps Legend to appropriately reference the Ruakura Structure Plan area and zones.
District Plan Maps 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 39, 40, 47, 48 and 49.	Support in Part	Changes required to the Planning Maps to give effect to the relief	Amend the Planning Maps as follows:

The specific provision of the proposal that the submission relates	Support/Support in Part/Oppose this provision	Submission and Reasons	Decision Sought
		sought elsewhere in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone the balance of the Chedworth landholding to the east of Spine Road (North) and to the north of Greenhill Link Road from General Residential to Ruakura Medium Density Residential. • Remove the Ruakura Open Space zone from the Medium Density Residential Zone area in the Chedworth landholdings and replace with Medium Density Residential Zone. • Zone the land underneath roads according to their adjoining zoning and show roads as an overlay in indicative positions. • Make other changes to the Maps and Figure as necessary to give effect to this submission.