

**Facilities Management Division**  
*Te Uranga Whakahaere*  
The University of Waikato  
Private Bag 3105  
Hamilton, New Zealand

John Cameron  
Director of Facilities Management  
Phone 64-7-838 4188  
Email [rgty1102@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rgty1102@waikato.ac.nz)  
[www.waikato.ac.nz/fmd](http://www.waikato.ac.nz/fmd)



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**WAIKATO**  
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato*

## THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO

---

Submission on Variation 1 (Ruakura) to the  
Proposed Hamilton City District Plan

---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO**

**Submission on Variation 1 (Ruakura) to the Proposed  
Hamilton City District Plan**

18 December 2015

***CONTENTS***

	Page
<b>SUBMISSION FORM</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3 GENERAL SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4 SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>4</b>

---

**SUBMISSION FORM**

**Submitter Details**

Full name of submitter: *The University of Waikato*  
Contact name if different from above: *John Cameron*  
Address for service of the submitter: *Private Bag 3105,*  
*HAMILTON, 3240*  
Contact phone number: *(07) 857 0342*  
Email: *rgty1102@waikato.ac.nz*

**Trade Competition**

The University of Waikato **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The University of Waikato is directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that -

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Attendance at Council hearing**

The University of Waikato **wishes to be heard** (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of its submission.

If others make a similar submission, University of Waikato **will not** consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

**Signature of submitter**

Signature of submitter:  
(or person authorised to sign on  
behalf of submitter)



Dated: 17 December 2015

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

This document contains The University of Waikato's (the University's) submission on Variation 1 (Ruakura) to the Proposed Hamilton City District Plan ('the Proposed Plan').

## **2 THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO**

The University of Waikato was established in 1964 on a 65 hectare site and today has a student population of 12,000, employs some 2,000 staff, and has an annual turnover in excess of \$200M.

The University has built research quality to be ranked No. 3 in New Zealand (when University and College of Education scores are combined) and has forged strong links with universities, research institutes and partners around the world.

The University is committed to delivering a world-class education and research portfolio, providing a full and dynamic university experience which is distinctive in character, and pursuing strong international links to advance knowledge. The overarching themes of the University vision are excellence, distinctiveness, and international connectedness.

The 65 hectare campus is characterised by its planting and extensive green spaces, many of which are used by the community for casual and organised recreation.

The beauty of the campus is regularly attested to by staff and students, and is a significant distinguishing feature of this University, compared to most other New Zealand universities. The University is very keen to ensure it protects and enhances the campus beauty and amenity value.

The University wishes to acknowledge the consultation process which has occurred for the Plan review, particularly with respect to the Knowledge Zone provisions and the Ruakura proposal. The University made a submission on the original Draft Plan and also made formal submissions to the Proposed Plan and the Board of Inquiry hearing.

---

### 3 GENERAL SUBMISSIONS

The University wishes to make the following general submissions to the Ruakura Variation.

1. The University has been a key stakeholder in the Proposed Plan review process and the BOI process for the Change to the Operative District Plan. The University was overall comfortable with the development of the planning framework and rule provisions for the campus which were progressed in a collaborative approach with significant input from the University. The University seeks to adopt the provisions of the Knowledge Zone which were developed through the Proposed Plan review process including the final recommendations to the plan provisions which were advanced through the hearings process.
2. The University considers that the BOI provided a rigorous and critical evaluation of the Ruakura Structure Plan and took into account the interests of the University. The University anticipates that the decision of the BOI will be adopted into the Proposed Plan in whole. The only exceptions anticipated may be inconsistencies with the Proposed Plan format or where there may be a need for a technical correction which does not have any material consequence in terms of the Structure Plan or off site effects.
3. An important planning principle that the University understood had been accepted with the Proposed Plan review was that activities on the University campus could be enabled through a Concept Plan or through a Permitted Activity rule mechanism. This is considered appropriate for the University campus given that it has a mature level of existing development and spatial structure. This was raised in correspondence to Council (Harrison Grierson letter dated 27 August 2015) however it is a concern to the University that the Variation provisions may still require a resource consent for any activity that is not in accordance with a Concept Plan - see Rule (Rule 8.4.1(h)). This is not acceptable to the University and we wish to engage with Council to resolve this matter. The University seeks amendments to the plan provisions to achieve a planning framework for Permitted Activities as well as a mechanism to enable a Concept Plan

#### 4 SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS

Section 8 - Knowledge Zone			
Specific Provision	The University's submission is:	The University seeks the following decision from Council:	Support/ Oppose
Section 8.1 Purpose	The University supports the description of the University campus in paragraph b.	Retain Section 8.1.	Support
Section 8.2 Objectives and Policies Policy 8.2.1f	<p>This policy states that development within the precincts is in general accordance with a Concept Plan. The University seeks that the Proposed Plan provisions enable activities on the campus by way of Permitted Activity provisions as well as through a Concept Plan mechanism. The University campus rule frameworks needs to take into account the level of development and spatial structure which currently exists.</p> <p>Relying on a resource consent decision to enable a broad range of activities is not an effective or efficient rule mechanism for the University campus.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8.2.1(f) to remove reference to Precinct D.</p> <p>Alternatively, amend as above and introduce a new policy specifically for the University.</p>	Support in part
Section 8.2 Objectives and Policies Objective 8.2.2 Policy 8.2.2.2a	The University considers that the objective and policy are appropriate and will help to achieve positive environmental outcomes in terms of accessibility to and around the University.	Retain Objective 8.2.2 and Policy 8.2.2a	Support

<b>Section 8 - Knowledge Zone</b>			
<b>Specific Provision</b>	<b>The University's submission is:</b>	<b>The University seeks the following decision from Council:</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
Section 8.2 Objectives and Policies Objective 8.2.3 Policy 8.2.3a	The University considers that the objective and policy are appropriate and will help to achieve positive environmental outcomes for the Knowledge Zone area.	Retain Objective 8.2.3 and Policy 8.2.3a	Support
Section 8.2 Objectives and Policies Objective 8.2.4 Policy 8.2.4 a, b and c	The University considers that the objective and policy are appropriate and will help to achieve positive environmental outcomes for the Knowledge Zone area.  It appears that this objective and set of policies is not applicable to the University. This should be clarified by modification to the format/layout of the objectives and policies or alternatively more precise wording of the objectives and policies	Amend Objective 8.2.4 and the associated policies to clarify which parts of the Knowledge Zone they apply to.	Support in Part
Section 8.2 Objectives and Policies Objective 8.2.6 Policy 8.2.6 a-f	This is a key section for the University. The University is comfortable with the objectives and policies which provide an appropriate balance between recognising the need to enable a wide range of activities on the campus, maintaining a high standards of design and appearance and also ensuring adverse effects on the surrounding neighbourhoods are minimised.  We note that Policy 8.2.6(f) refers to enabling the University to develop a Concept Plan as opposed to <i>requiring</i> a Concept Plan. This is appropriate as it does not preclude activities utilising a permitted activity framework.	Retain Objective 8.2.6 and Policies y 8.2.6 a-f.	Support
Section 8.3 Activity Status Tables	This is a key section for the University as it assigns the rule framework for which activities require resource consent and also establishes the	Retain Rules aa) to e) and g) to ww) Delete Rule ff).	Support (with the

<b>Section 8 - Knowledge Zone</b>			
<b>Specific Provision</b>	<b>The University's submission is:</b>	<b>The University seeks the following decision from Council:</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>
Rules aa) to ww)	<p>Concept Plan mechanism.</p> <p>The University supports all the activities listed as a Permitted Activity.</p> <p>The University accepts the rule mechanism ee) in relation to the Interface Area including the definition of the Interface Area to 30m from a public boundary.</p> <p>The University queries Rule ff) as this requires a further resource consent for buildings within the Interface Zone even if they already have approval as part of a Concept Plan. If the buildings have been assessed and been granted as part of a Concept Plan approval then no further resource consent should presumably be required.</p>		exception of Rule ff).
Section 8.4 General Rules	<p>As discussed in our general submission points, Rule 8.4.1h) would appear to override the permitted activity rule provisions which apply to the University campus.</p> <p>The University considers that the rule should be deleted or amended to exclude the University.</p>	Amend or delete Rule 8.4.1h).	Oppose
Rule 8.4.1			
Section 8.6 Specific Standards	The University is comfortable with these specific standards.	Retain Rule 8.6.1, 8.6.2 and 8.6.3.	Oppose
Rule 8.6.1, 8.6.2 and 8.6.3			
Section 8.9	The Rule 8.9xxix may require amendment to recognise that Permitted Activities that are not in accordance	Amend Rule 8.9xxix to acknowledge that activities may still be Permitted Activities even if they	Support in Part

Section 8 - Knowledge Zone			
Specific Provision	The University's submission is:	The University seeks the following decision from Council:	Support/ Oppose
RDA Assessment Criteria Rule 8.9xxix	<p>with an approved Concept Plan do not necessarily require consent.</p> <p>In addition, the Matters of discretion currently link to <i>N-Ruakura</i>. This appears to be an error with the correct linkage being to <i>C- Knowledge Zone and Major facilities Zone</i>.</p>	<p>are not in accordance with an approved Concept Plan and to link to the Assessment Criteria - <i>C Knowledge Zone and Major facilities Zone</i>.</p>	

N:\1520\131883\_01\500 Del\R004 University Draft Submission to Ruakura Variation v1.doc