

APPENDIX A
ANALYSIS & RECOMMENDATION TABLES

General Support

A number of submitters support PC2 on the grounds that it will create a range of benefits. The existence of those benefits is largely uncontested (although I understand that Fonterra will call evidence challenging the scale of the benefits) and accordingly it is appropriate that the submissions be accepted.

With regards to the submission from the Turangawaewae Trust Board [7.0], I note that the recorded location of the Manga Harakiekie Pa Site is several hundred metres to the south of Hutchinson Road. It is acknowledged that the area of the influence of the pa site would extend to the north towards the PC2 site. There is no suggestion that the Te Awa Lakes development would directly impact the pa site itself, and the ownership of land immediately to the south of Hutchinson Road adjacent to the Waikato River is in the hands of the applicant. Further, while the extraction of water from the Waikato River is not a matter that is governed by PC2, I note that there has been no suggestion to date from the applicant that a water take would be needed for the development. If a water take is required in the future, a resource consent to authorise it would be required from the Waikato Regional Council.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Brownie Investments - Vanessa Gibson	1.00	Support	Seeks good quality development with extra housing and recreational opportunities as industrial use not the best use of land.	Accept
Dhiraj Koli	2.00	Support	Supports plan change in entirety.	Accept
Mike McCleery	3.00	Support	Supports proposed land uses and better treatment for the Waikato River.	Accept
Andrew Yeoman	4.00	Support	Provide a gateway to Hamilton and world class attraction whilst enabling the construction of additional housing.	Accept
Brownie Investments-Colette Brown	6.00	Support	Seeks gateway to Hamilton as an attractive feature for tourists with good access to housing via the expressway.	Accept

Turangawaewae Trust Board	7.00	Neutral	Requests minimal impact on Manga Harakiekie Pa Site and no extraction of water from Waikato River.	Accept
Hamilton Central Rotary	8.00	Support	Seeks an attractive entrance to the city and water feature destination.	Accept
Ian Schultz	9.00	Support	Seeks economic growth to the region and social and cultural benefits to the wider community.	Accept
Waikato Chamber of Commerce	10.00	Support	Supports plan change in entirety	Accept
Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	11.00	Support	Supports tourism opportunities.	Accept
Carla Parry	12.00	Support	Provide a tourism attraction for the region and support for Te Awa River Ride.	Accept
Te Awa River Ride Charitable Trust	13.00	Support	Provide a gateway to the region which complements the Te Awa River Ride and provides amenity for the community.	Accept
Brian Perry Charitable Trust	14.00	Support	Provide a gateway to the region which compliments the river ride and benefits the community.	Accept
MH Builders	15.00	Support	Provide a gateway to region, improvements to transport links and additional housing.	Accept
Birch Holdings Ltd	16.00	Support	Provide additional housing by expressway, tourism and economic benefits.	Accept

Ngaruawahia Community Board	18.00	Neutral	Retain Ngaruawahia as a strategic location for cultural tourism and future residential development.	Accept
Waikato River Explorer	21.00	Support	Provide connection to the Waikato River, tourism and additional housing.	Accept
Habitat for Humanity	22.00	Support	Provide a gateway to city and additional housing in close proximity to river and cycle trails.	Accept
Peregrine Developments Ltd	24.00	Support	Provide a gateway to the city with a great living environment close to Waikato River.	Accept
K'Aute Pasifika Trust- Kim Holt	25.00	Support	Provide a gateway to Hamilton with an increase in recreational activities and utilisation of the river.	Accept
Ngati Haua Iwi Trust	26.00	Support	Supports plan change in entirety.	Accept
Waitomo Adventures Ltd	27.00	Support	Provide a unique gateway to the region that complements Te Awa River Ride and Waikato River.	Accept
Planning and Construction Consulting Ltd	28.00	Support	Seeks employment and revenue opportunities.	Accept
Deloitte	29.00	Support	Supports plan change in entirety.	Accept
K'Aute Pasifika Trust- Rachel Karalus	30.00	Support	Seeks an attractive gateway to city to attract visitors and alleviate housing shortage.	Accept

Rob Hamill	32.00	Support	Provide residential use next to Waikato River and tourism in region.	Accept
Wel Networks	33.00	Neutral	Seeks early engagement, employment and remedy to housing shortage.	Accept
Perry Outdoor Education Trust	34.00	Support	Provide facility to use as part of programme for students	Accept
Karen Singers	35.00	Support	Supports opportunity for community	Accept
Aflex Technology	36.00	Support	Provide a gateway with additional housing next to the river and a facility which provides an activity for community and encourages visitors from outside the region.	Accept
SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.01	Oppose	Retain existing zoning due to increased traffic congestion, noise and light emissions and construction effects.	
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.26</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.26</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	
Swimming Waikato	38.00	Support	Seeks modern gateway to city with inclusion of residential housing and water park with link to river ride.	Accept
Hampton Downs Motorsport Park	39.00		Provide a gateway and residential use which delivers on housing shortage.	Accept
Steven Gordon	40.00	Support	Supports economic driver for Hamilton and region.	Accept

Swimming Waikato	42.00	Support	Provide a vibrant gateway which will enable hosting of open water swimming events and additional housing next to river.	Accept
Waikato DHB	43.00	Neutral	Seeks a health and well-being impact assessment to provide evidence on impacts of proposal.	Reject
Waikato Tainui	44.00	Support	Seeks economic growth; protection and enhancement of waterways and wetlands; and planting of native species. Supports subject to the recommendations in the Cultural Impact Assessment.	Accept
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.01	Oppose	Reject the plan change due traffic, noise and reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Reject
Fonterra	46.00	Oppose	Reject the plan change.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.38</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Fonterra's submission)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.38</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Fonterra's submission)</i>	Reject
Fonterra	46.02	Oppose	Avoid, remedy or mitigate traffic, economic, urban design, landscape and visual effects.	Accept
Fonterra	46.12	Support in part	Supports the proposal for an adventure park through a resource consent.	Accept

Fonterra	46.13	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it will not promote the sustainable management of resources; meet the needs of future generations; enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing; is contrary to the purposes and principles and fails to comply with Section 75 of the RMA; and does not represent the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan, in terms of s32.	
Hamilton and Waikato Tourism	48.00	Support	Provide a gateway to the city, activation of the Waikato River and visitor expenditure with the establishment of a tourism and recreational destination.	Accept
Peter O'Reagan	49.00	Support	Provide tourism in Hamilton and the region, additional houses, jobs and an attractive gateway to the city.	Accept
Carolyn Hopa	50.00	Support	Provide economic benefits, employment and housing and support based on the recommendations in the Cultural Impact Assessment.	Accept
Te Papaorotu Marae	53.00	Support	Seeks employment and well-being opportunities.	Accept
BTW Company	54.00	Support	Provide a diverse mixture of land uses; a gateway city can be proud of; provision of housing; tourism growth next	Accept

			to river and cycleway; protection, enhancement and access of Waikato river; and economic boost.	
Sport Waikato Education Trust	55.00	Support	Provide additional housing next to river and Te Awa River Ride and a gateway with efficient and unique use of land.	Accept
Arthur Mellsop	56.00	Support	Provide more houses, a vibrant city, employment and leisure activity next to river.	Accept
Kenneth Williamson	57.01	Support	Provide a unique environment, a gateway to Hamilton and destination for tourists and locals with an activity more appropriate by river.	Accept
Kenneth Williamson	57.02	Support in Part	Require planting on river bank.	Accept
Anne Edgecombe	58.00	Neutral		Accept
Marina McMahon-Ieremia	59.00	Support	Provide additional housing and a gateway with an efficient and distinctive use of land.	Accept
Ariona Ieremia	60.00	Support	Provide a gateway with an efficient and unique use of land and residential use by river.	Accept
Christine Corfe-Tan	61.00	Support in Part	Provide a noise barrier and visual screen, controls on noise levels, social problems, fumes and wildlife habitat.	Accept in Part
Hobbiton Movie Set	62.00	Support	Seeks tourism for region.	Accept

Industrial Development Feasibility

In addressing Industrial Development Feasibility I rely on the Development Feasibility JWS, the relevant reports provided by the applicant and the report from Hamish Anderson attached in Appendix F.

The fundamental premise of PPC2 is that it is not because of the specific geotechnical characteristics of the site, it is not commercially viable or feasible to establish a development on the site in accordance with the current Industrial and Deferred Industrial zoning(s) applied to it, and as a result the District Plan zoning is inappropriate.

If this premise is proven/accepted, then any effects of the removal of the site area from the industrial land resource are rendered illusory on the basis that industrial development could not and would not have occurred on the site.

The applicant has produced two expert reports on the matter. A peer review of the applicants' latest expert Development Feasibility report has been undertaken on behalf of HCC by Mr Hamish Anderson, a development feasibility expert with significant experience in the field.

Mr Anderson and the applicants Development Feasibility experts have conferenced and have prepared an agreed JWS. The Development Feasibility JWS records that:

As a consequence of the adverse existing site ground conditions, development of the Te Awa Lakes site as a modern high-quality industrial development is not commercially viable in the current market. Applying substantially more aggressive cost and revenue sensitivities to the development feasibility does not change that conclusion. It is also reasonable to assume that based on construction technology available today, development of the Te Awa Lakes site on a commercial basis as a modern, high quality industrial development is likely not commercially viable in the next 10-15 years.

Given the above agreement amongst the Development Feasibility experts that Industrial development of the site is not viable, I recommend that all the submission points below that seek rejection of PPC2 on development feasibility grounds be rejected. I have recommended acceptance of the remainder of the submission and further submission points that sought evidence on the development feasibility matter.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato District Council	17.03	Neutral	Requests evidence that the cost of remediating the site for industrial use is uneconomic.	Accept

<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.01</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.04	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the level of demand for prime industrial space in Hamilton is understated.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.08</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Future Proof	23.01	Support	Provide evidence that it is not economic to develop the site for industrial purposes.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.02</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.06</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. Evidence should also consider the additional economic costs that may arise in respect of the continued operation and expansion of industrial activities elsewhere within the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept in part
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.24</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.05</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.03	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the level of demand for prime industrial space in Hamilton is understated.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.09</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Contact Energy	51.03	Oppose	Decline the plan change as it will have adverse economic effects for Te Rapa North and the region.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject

<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
---------------------	---------------	----------------	---	--------

Strategic Land Use and Economics

In addressing Strategic Land Use matters I rely on the relevant information provided by the applicant as part of their updated AEE dated 21 August 2019, the statement of evidence of Mr Luke O'Dwyer – Hamilton City Planning Manager (see Appendix F), and the Economics/Strategic Issues JWS.

A significant number of submission and further submission points seek that PPC2 be rejected on wider strategic landuse grounds. These points are raised by existing industrial activity operators (Fonterra, Ports of Auckland, Contact Energy, AFFCO, Open Country Dairy), the NZ Transport Agency, the Waikato Regional Council, and one private landowner submitter. Waikato District Council and Hamilton City Council were neutral on strategic landuse matters but sought further information and evidence on the issue.

The evidence of Mr O'Dwyer sets out that PPC2 challenges the established strategic land use planning framework for the Te Rapa North area. The following excerpts from his evidence clearly convey the fundamental nature of strategic landuse issues to the acceptance or rejection of PPC2:

- 1. While the established policy framework for land use in Te Rapa North and industrial nodes more generally is one that that is directive in maintaining the integrity of industrial nodes, the framework is not prohibitive and enables the possibility for land use change, so long as that change can be robustly justified in an evidential sense.*
- 2. The current zoning in place for this part of the City reflects a long-term history of HCC and other parties working collaboratively to establish the area as an industrial resource to cater for the long term economic growth and prosperity of Hamilton and the sub-region.*
- 3. The collective action of the City and other agencies to identify this area for industrial land uses has provided benefits to the City. These benefits include signalling to the market that industrial activities can clearly establish in Te Rapa North, and that market actors can have the confidence to invest capital to bring land to market to support industrial business growth.*
- 4. Additionally, the decisions of HCC and others to strategically plan for industrial development at Te Rapa North provided land use certainty for public investment, such as that by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to invest in the development of significant transport infrastructure (such as the Te Rapa Bypass) to support the intended land use.*
- 5. Given the above, the land use change being sought by the applicant is a serious matter for HCC.*

After comprehensively addressing a range of matters he considers relevant, Mr O'Dwyer concludes that from a strategic planning viewpoint there is insufficient evidence for PPC2 to be declined. Mr O'Dwyer's conclusions are consistent with those of the applicants planning expert Mr Olliver, and of Future Proof whose submission now supports PPC2. Different conclusions are held by other expert planners who support the positions taken by the industrial submitters.

The range of expert planning and economic opinion on the matter indicates the complexity of the issue and the long history underpinning land use allocations/zonings and infrastructure investment, particularly in what is now the northern extent of Hamilton City. I am mindful however of the currently uncontested Development Feasibility expert evidence that the site is not viable for industrial development for the next 10-15 years.

Taking that as a given, and after having reviewed all the information currently available to me, having had the benefit of expert multi-disciplinary conferencing on strategic land use and economics matters, and after having undertaken my own analysis of PPC2 against the relevant criteria in the Waikato RPS, my view is that there is no impediment solely on Strategic Land Use grounds (including consideration of economic effects) to acceptance of PPC2.

On that basis I recommend that the submission points set out below seeking that PPC2 be rejected on strategic landuse grounds are rejected. The submission and further submission points seeking that further information on the issue be provided are recommended to be accepted or accepted in part.

I reaching this conclusion I have given consideration to the position of Future Proof, the Waikato Regional Council and Hamilton City Council (as submitter), given that Hamilton City as the territorial authority is charged with giving effect through the District Plan to the Future Proof landuse allocations embedded in the Waikato RPS. Given that Future Proof and Hamilton City Council (as submitter) no longer oppose PPC2 on strategic land use grounds, and that the analysis and information that has become available in the period since submissions closed positively addresses some key aspects noted in the Waikato Regional Council submission, this is an indication that PPC2 is not a fundamental problem to strategic landuse in northern Hamilton.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato District Council	17.00	Neutral	Requests evidence on whether there is an over or under supply of industrial land, the effect on the Te Rapa North and Horotiu Industrial Nodes, precedent effects and if this is the best place for residential development.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.01</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.01</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.01</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and the ongoing availability of industrial land</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.01</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and the ongoing availability of industrial land</i>	Accept
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.01	Oppose	Reject the plan change in its totality.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.05</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.05</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

Open Country Dairy Limited	19.05	Oppose	Reject the plan change as there is no compelling argument for establishing a tourism and recreational destination in this area at the cost of valuable industrial land.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.09</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.07	Oppose	Retain the industrial land in the Te Rapa area due to location next to existing and planned industrial areas and its proximity to the Waikato Expressway.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.08	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to opportunity for new industrial development to provide a comparatively higher amenity environment.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.12</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.09	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zoning ensures an integrated, efficient and coordinated delivery of regionally important infrastructure is enabled.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.13</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.10	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zoning provides a framework to assist with the management of potential adverse effects, in particular those effects on the existing and serviced industrial zoned areas of the city.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.14</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.11	Oppose	Reject the plan change as industrial land is a finite and valuable resource that needs to be used efficiently and effectively for employment purposes and to provide social and economic wellbeing of the City.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

Open Country Dairy Limited	19.12	Oppose	Reject the plan change as industrial land should be retained for industrial uses as those uses cannot establish in other parts of the city.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.13	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zone is a critical component in ensuring the efficiency of dairy manufacturing and export within the region.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.17</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.14	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to employment benefits of industrial land and industrial land being a key economic driver for the region.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.18</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.15	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the Te Rapa North Industrial Zone ensures industrial land is not diluted by non-industrial activities, or developed out of sequence with other industrially zoned land in the City.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.19</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.16	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the limited range of land uses provided for in the Te Rapa North Industrial area is specifically intended to reflect the existing Te Rapa Dairy Factory activity and the opportunity that opening the Waikato Expressway provides for travelling motorists.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.20</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.17	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the application is not consistent with the RPS in ensuring industrial land remains available.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.21</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

Open Country Dairy Limited	19.18	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the RPS in limiting new industrial land rather than reducing available land.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.22</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.19	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the RPS as new developments should be directed away from regionally significant infrastructure and should not result in incompatible adjacent land uses.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.23</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Future Proof	23.02	Support	Provide evidence to understand the loss of strategic industrial land and impacts on other industrial nodes	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.07</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. Evidence should also consider the impacts on the balance of the Te Rapa Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.25</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.06</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.00	Oppose	Reject the plan change in entirety.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.08</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.04	Oppose	Reject the plan change as there is no compelling argument for establishing a tourism and recreational destination in this area at the cost of valuable industrial land.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.06	Oppose	Retain the industrial land in the Te Rapa area due to location next to existing and planned industrial areas and its proximity to the Waikato Expressway.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.12</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.07	Oppose	Reject the plan change due opportunity for new industrial development to provide a comparatively higher amenity environment.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.13</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.08	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zoning ensures an integrated, efficient and coordinated delivery of regionally important infrastructure is enabled.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.14</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.09	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zoning provides a framework to assist with the management of potential adverse effects, in particular those effects on the existing and serviced industrial zoned areas of the city.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.10	Oppose	Reject the plan change as industrial land is a finite and valuable resource that needs to be used efficiently and effectively for employment purposes and to provide social and economic wellbeing of the City.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.11	Oppose	Reject the plan change as industrial land should be retained for industrial uses as those uses cannot establish in other parts of the city.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.17</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.12	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the existing zone is a critical component in ensuring the efficiency of dairy manufacturing and export within the region.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.18</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.13	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to employment benefits of industrial land and industrial land being a key economic driver for the region.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.19</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.14	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the Te Rapa North Industrial Zone ensures industrial land is not diluted by non-industrial activities, or developed out of sequence with other industrially zoned land in the City.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.20</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.16	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the limited range of land uses provided for in the Te Rapa North Industrial area is specifically intended to reflect the existing Te Rapa Dairy Factory activity and the opportunity that opening the Waikato Expressway provides for travelling motorists.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.22</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.17	Oppose	Reject the plan change as the application is not consistent with the RPS in ensuring industrial land remains available.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.23</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.18	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the RPS in limiting new industrial land rather than reducing available land.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.24</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.19	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the RPS as new developments should be directed away from regionally significant infrastructure and should not result in incompatible adjacent land uses.	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.25</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject

SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.02	Oppose	Retain existing zoning due to isolated pocket of residential land with lack of infrastructure including capacity in local schools, water, electricity and broadband.	Reject
Fonterra	FS3.09	Support	<i>Supports the submission and considers an isolated enclave of residential land adjoining strategically important heavy industrial land inappropriate and unsustainable.</i>	Reject
AFFCO	FS4.27	Support	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Open Country	FS5.27	Support	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.00	Oppose	Seeks robust and comprehensive evidence on whether the plan change gives effect to the policies in the RPS, particularly those in Section 6 Built Environment (RPS 6.1, 6.3, 6C, 6D and 6.16). These provisions promote a compact urban form which can accommodate Future Proof area's growth and establish a settlement pattern that provides certainty about timely and efficient provision of infrastructure.	Accept
Fonterra	FS3.10	Support	<i>Supports the submission and considers evidence should also address the matters in Policy 4.4 of the RPS as the development could compromise the continued operation and expansion of regionally significant industry.</i>	Accept
AFFCO	FS4.31	Support	<i>Supports the submission. The appropriate use for the site is industrial.</i>	Reject
Open Country	FS5.31	Support	<i>Supports the submission. The appropriate use for the site is industrial.</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.01	Oppose	Reject the plan change unless there is economic evidence to address the loss of industrial land, the current demand for residential and industrial land, the wider implications of residential activities, comparative costs and benefits given geotechnical constraints; and the impact of commercial aspects on other commercial centres.	Reject
Fonterra	FS3.11	Support	<i>Supports the submission and considers evidence should also address the effects on the continued operation and expansion of</i>	Reject

			<i>Te Rapa Dairy Factory and future development of industrial activities within the balance of the Te Rapa Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.32</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.32</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.02	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as it proposes an alteration to the agreed land use pattern in a strategic industrial node. This challenges the agreed Future Proof land use pattern and provides uncertainty about the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. If approved it could set a precedent for further challenges to the sub-regions agreed strategic direction.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.12</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and considers that the proposal has inadequately assessed the effects on Te Rapa Dairy Factory as regionally significant industry and establishes a precedent in terms of the approach that is adopted towards the protection of such activities.</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.33</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission due to inadequate consideration to effects on industrial activities.</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.33</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission due to inadequate consideration to effects on industrial activities.</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.03	Oppose	Requires evidence that includes information from the NPS-UDC.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.13</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.34</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.05	Oppose	Reject unless information can be provided to demonstrate that the plan change gives effect to Policy 6.3 of the RPS as the residential component could result in the Waikato Expressway investment not being realised.	Accept in part

<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and considers that such information should also demonstrate how the proposal gives effects to Policy 4.4 of the RPS as the development could compromise the continued operation and expansion of regionally significant industry.</i>	Accept in part
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.36</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The appropriate use for the site is industrial purposes. The expressway supports industrial activities. The applicant should also demonstrate how the proposal gives effect to Policy 4.4 of the RPS in regard to compromising the continued operation and expansion of regionally significant infrastructure.</i>	Accept in part
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.36</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The appropriate use for the site is industrial purposes. The expressway supports industrial activities. The applicant should also demonstrate how the proposal gives effect to Policy 4.4 of the RPS in regard to compromising the continued operation and expansion of regionally significant infrastructure.</i>	Accept in part
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.00	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is counter to the principles and objectives of the WRPS, Future Proof Growth Strategy, Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy and proposed Access Hamilton Strategy, in relation to the strategic integration of land use planning and infrastructure investment.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.18</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.37</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The provision of road infrastructure is an important element of contributing to the value of the land for industrial activities. (supports all NZTA submissions)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.37</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The provision of road infrastructure is an important element of contributing to the value of the land for industrial activities. (supports all NZTA submissions)</i>	Reject

New Zealand Transport Agency	45.02	Oppose	Seeks to maintain the long term benefits and investment of the Waikato Expressway, Hamilton Ring Road and Southern Links.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.03	Oppose	Seeks consistency with Future Proof and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The future proof strategy provides confidence for the Agency to invest in the sub-region and maintains the long term benefits of investments.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.04	Oppose	Seeks consistency with HUGS in achieving a compact city. Any departure from this needs to be carefully considered in terms of the existing and proposed infrastructure.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.05	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with Access Hamilton in ensuring an efficient integration of land use with the transport network, multi modal access, a viable bus route and safe and efficient road network. The development is likely to adversely impact congested areas including Wairere Drive and Te Rapa Road intersections.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.06	Oppose	Requests the change to the strategic framework be rejected unless it is justified by robust evidence including: * the need to advance residential and commercial land use when sufficient urban development capacity exists * the need for change from the existing strategic framework * consistency with the principles of the strategic framework * impact on the broader strategic framework	Accept in part
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept in part

New Zealand Transport Agency	45.07	Oppose	Opposes the plan change as the area is in close proximity to the Waikato Expressway and investments have been made in the Expressway to provide for a level of service to facilitate ongoing development of strategic industrial activities.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.08	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as a Memorandum of Understanding for the Northern Growth Corridor was signed in 2010 between Hamilton City Council, Waikato District Council and the Transport Agency which captures co-ordination of land use and large scale infrastructure investments required to enable strategic industrial activities and supporting residential development to operate effectively. The infrastructure partnership aims to provide co-location benefits particularly provided by a strategic industrial node. These benefits will be difficult to realise in other locations and costly to replicate.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.09	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as there is a difference between industrial land and strategic industrial nodes where substantial partnership investment has occurred. If the strategic industrial node is eroded, the Agency may come under pressure to provide a similar level of service in another location. This financial impact is a concern to the Agency.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.10	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as there is sufficient residential land to satisfy the requirements of the NPS Urban Development Capacity.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.11	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as the One Network charter signed by the Transport Agency, HCC and WRC in 2013 commits to making the best use of the existing transport network, before expanding	Reject

			it. The proposed development will result in more private vehicle movements occurring on an already congested part of the network.	
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.14	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as the development is inconsistent with agreed staging and timing for urban development in North Hamilton.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Fonterra	46.03	Oppose	Provide development that does not compromise the long term strategic planning framework for Hamilton City and the Region including the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and Future Proof; and altering the agreed land use pattern under the RPS and the strategic industrial node.	Reject
Fonterra	46.04	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is inconsistent with the planning framework for Hamilton City and the Waikato Region. All of Council's key strategic planning documents identify Te Rapa as an exclusively industrial area including the RPS, Future Proof and the District Plan.	Reject
Fonterra	46.05	Oppose	Reject the plan change for an isolated residential area in the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node as it will undermine the integrity of the Council's strategic land use planning as well as for the wider Waikato Region.	Reject
Fonterra	46.06	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the RPS as it proposes to fundamentally alter the agreed land use pattern.	Reject
Fonterra	46.07	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it mischaracterises the Perry Site as a greenfield area under Future Proof.	Reject
Fonterra	46.08	Oppose	Retain the existing zoning as the site is identified as future employment land under HUGS and it provides for growth and expansion of the Te Rapa site as a significant regional employer.	Reject
Fonterra	46.09	Oppose	Provide for growth that does not allow incompatible activities to be located in close proximity to one another.	Reject

Fonterra	46.10	Oppose	Provide for development that does not compromise existing and planned investment in road, rail and three-waters infrastructure.	Reject
Fonterra	46.11	Oppose	Seeks growth that does not compromise Fonterra's current and future operations and Contact Energy's co-generation plant.	Reject
Fonterra	46.14	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with the NPS-UDC which seeks to ensure there is development capacity for both residential and business land.	Reject
Fonterra	46.17	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with Access Hamilton and HUGS which require a compact city.	Reject
Fonterra	46.19	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it could lead to the under utilisation of existing infrastructure with capacity to service already planned new residential development and increased costs for the district and reduced housing affordability.	Reject
Fonterra	46.20	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it will not deliver a signature gateway to Hamilton North.	Reject
Fonterra	46.21	Oppose	Reject the plan change as an isolated island suburb as it is poor urban design.	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.01	Oppose	Seeks to ensure a strategic industrial node is not lost to, or compromised by, residential development, unless consistent with the NPS-UDC and an amended Regional Policy Statement.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.19</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and agrees that the proposal is premature in advance of supporting evidence provided through the NPS-UDC and amended RPS framework which ensures that an amended settlement pattern will not compromise the continued operation and expansion of regionally significant industry.</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.39</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The proposal is based on inadequate supporting evidence including NPS-UDC and amended RPS framework and presents a risk of compromising ongoing regionally significant infrastructure (HCC 47.02-47.12)</i>	Reject

<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.39</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. The proposal is based on inadequate supporting evidence including NPS-UDC and amended RPS framework and presents a risk of compromising ongoing regionally significant infrastructure (HCC 47.02-47.12)</i>	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.02	Oppose	Seeks evidence that there is a need for additional residential zoned land within the City.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.20</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and requires analysis of the available residential land supply including opportunities within land adjoining the City that has been identified for residential expansion.</i>	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.04	Oppose	<p>Seeks a s32 which includes a full assessment of the costs, benefits and alternatives including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The costs, benefits and alternatives to the land use pattern set out in the Regional Policy Statement * Information on the effect on Te Rapa North and Horotiu as strategic industrial nodes * Information on consistency with the NPS-UDC * Information on whether the residential use undermines residential areas in Rototuna, Ruakura, Rotokauri and Peacocks and whether there is enough residential capacity to meet the NPS-UDC * Costs and benefits of developing the land for industrial use compared to residential * Alternatives to industrial uses * Costs and benefits of leaving the land undeveloped * Costs of residential development on the site compared with other residential areas * Compare for industrial and residential the risks and effects of liquefaction and costs of managing those effects * Effects, costs and benefits of a hotel in the visitor accommodation overlay 	Accept

			* The costs and benefits of the neighbourhood centre being of a suburban centre scale	
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.08	Oppose	Requests alignment of zoning with SHA application.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Contact Energy	51.00	Oppose	Decline the plan change.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.27</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the submission</i>	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
Contact Energy	51.01	Oppose	Decline the plan change as it undermines WRPS and the strategic industrial node. The land is strategically set aside for locating new and existing industrial activities and it is cut off from other residential areas.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
Contact Energy	51.02	Oppose	Decline the plan change as it will undermine long standing planning strategies and allow strategic industrial land to be used in an ad hoc, unplanned way.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.00	Oppose	Decline the plan change.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.28</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Reject

AFFCO	FS4.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Open Country	FS5.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.01	Oppose	Decline plan change as it does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and specifically the policies contained in Section 6, the development principles in Section 6A and Future Proof land allocation and staging in section 6D of the WRPS.	Reject
AFFCO	FS4.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Open Country	FS5.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.02	Oppose	Decline the plan change as there is sufficient capacity for infill/intensification in Rototuna, Peacocke, Rotokauri and Ruakura where development is prioritised under Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy (HUGS).	Reject
AFFCO	FS4.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Open Country	FS5.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.03	Oppose	Decline plan change due to the lack of connectivity between plan change area and existing residential development and infrastructure and inconsistency with HUGS.	Reject
AFFCO	FS4.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Open Country	FS5.41	Support	Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.04	Oppose	Decline the plan change as it is not identified within the strategic industrial planning documents as forming part of the existing or future residential land resource.	Reject

<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject
Ports of Auckland	52.05	Oppose	Decline the plan change due to the loss of industrial land in strategic industrial node and proper consideration not being given to the long-term land use requirements for industrial development in the region; and the locational attributes of the Te Rapa North Area including proximity to the State Highway and rail networks as well as benefits that will occur from agglomeration of industrial activity with the Horotiu Industrial Park.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject

Reverse Sensitivity

Existing industrial land users in the Te Rapa/Horoitu area oppose the PPC partly on the grounds of reverse sensitivity. The NZ Transport Agency also notes concerns about potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operation of the Waikato Expressway that bounds the site to the north.

I note here that the opposition on reverse sensitivity grounds appears, at least for Fonterra, to be limited to the residential and visitor accommodation activity components of the PPC and does not extend to the water adventure park components that are proposed to be accommodated by the Major Facilities Zone which are supported by Fonterra.

Reverse Sensitivity is not defined in the RMA, the National Planning Standards, or the Hamilton City District Plan. This reflects the fact that reverse sensitivity is a concept that has evolved through application of the RMA and has been identified as an effect by case law that has flowed from it.

I agree with the relevant submitters and the applicant that there is the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to occur on existing industrial activities and on the operation of the Waikato Expressway.

This matter needs to be carefully considered particularly given that the Hamilton City District Plan contains an Objective (12.2.5) that investment in the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site as a national and regionally important strategic facility is supported. Supporting policies to that Objective require that:

The Dairy Manufacturing Site should be recognised for the important benefits it contributes to the community and dairy industrial base for the Waikato (Policy 12.2.5a)

Subdivision, use and development shall not compromise the ongoing and efficient operation of the Dairy Manufacturing Site (Policy 12.2.5b)

The Dairy Manufacturing Site, as an integral facility to the agricultural sector of Waikato, shall retain its opportunities for continued use, intensification and expansion (Policy 12.2.5b)

The ongoing development and use of the Dairy Manufacturing Site shall be supported through the application of specific provisions to enable heavy buildings and structures, noise emissions and heavy vehicle movements occur in a manner to ensure the efficient operation of the Dairy Manufacturing Site (Policy 12.2.5b)

Likewise the Waikato Expressway is a nationally significant piece of infrastructure, established and operating in accordance with a designation included in the relevant District Plan(s), including the Hamilton City District Plan.

The WRPS requirement, through Objective 3.12, is that the potential for reverse sensitivity is minimised. In my view, “minimise” is a more restrictive requirement than “mitigate”, but is not as stringent as “avoid”. In any event, I note that the WRPS does not direct avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.

The applicant notes that there are several characteristics of the site and surrounding area that on their own provide mitigation of reverse sensitivity effects. These characteristics are as follows:

- The triangular shape of the site with the 650m eastern boundary fronting the Waikato River with rural-residential development on the opposite river bank – the proposed residential components of Te Awa Lakes are consistent with the development across the river and thus avoid reverse sensitivity effects.

- A western boundary of 1.3km with the Waikato Expressway and Te Rapa Road – traffic noise effects can efficiently and effectively be mitigated through acoustic insulation requirements for dwellings and visitor accommodation – noting that traffic noise from the Waikato Expressway is likely to be the governing factor in terms of all noise experienced at the Te Awa Lakes site meaning industrial noise is unlikely to require treatment in its own right.
- A 650m southern boundary with Hutchinson Road – land to the south of Hutchinson Road is zoned Te Rapa North Industrial (Deferred Industrial) with half of the land owned by and thus under the control of the applicant. Approximately 325m to the south of Hutchinson Road is the boundary of the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing site.
- Existing topography and screening meaning that the Affco and Open Country Dairy plants to the west of the site will not be visible from the Te Awa Lakes residential areas

From my own professional and personal experience and assessment of the site and surrounding area, I agree with the applicant as to the reverse sensitivity mitigation value of these characteristics.

The applicant has proposed a number of measures within PPC2 to address reverse sensitivity effects as follows:

- Rules requiring acoustic treatment of all dwellings within 100m of the Waikato Expressway
- Design criteria to direct outdoor living areas of dwellings within 200m of the Waikato Expressway to be orientated away from the Expressway, and within 100m of Hutchinson Road to avoid being orientated to the south toward the dairy factory
- Prohibition on any dwellings being constructed within 25m of Hutchinson Road, which will achieve the recommended (and uncontested) 350m separation distance from the Dairy Manufacturing Plant site on odour grounds.
- Proposal to establish commercial activity fronting Hutchinson Road through the application of Business Zoning on that frontage.

The applicant also notes that the residential areas proposed by PPC2 are outside of the noise emission boundary from the Te Rapa dairy manufacturing site.

I agree that these measures will be efficient and effective in mitigating the component environmental effects that could potentially give rise to reverse sensitivity effects. I have however reflected upon whether reverse sensitivity is “more than the sum of its parts” ie if all the component adverse effects are either avoided or mitigated/minimised to (at most) minor levels, is there still a cumulative effect left from an accumulation of the component effects which may create an overall reverse sensitivity issue?

Allied to this and applying the above definition(s), and in light of the various assessments of technical effects matters by the specialists upon whose advice I rely that indicate that all potential component adverse effects can be mitigated to minor levels, it seems to me that the issue of reverse sensitivity in this case is in the realm of perceived rather than actual adverse environmental effects.

In addressing this aspect I am conscious of the established principle that the RMA is not a zero effect statute, and that while an environmental effect may be detectable (eg some noise from industrial activity in Horotiu may be heard at night in the Te Awa Lakes residential area under certain conditions) that does not automatically equate to an actual (as opposed to a perceived) adverse effect being created.

The existence of perceived adverse effects is not a legitimate ground under the RMA to reject a proposal. In like manner, in this case I do not believe that any complaints from residents of the Te Awa Lakes residential areas about lawfully established industrial activity based on perceived adverse effects could be legitimately upheld. I do however appreciate that the need to deal with any such perception based complaints from the Te Awa Lakes residential area (assuming any are received, which in itself is not a given) is an additional activity that the industrial operators in question would not likely otherwise have to undertake.

My view on this point assumes that the existing industrial activities are either internalising their adverse effects in an effective manner, or are managing their off-site effects (eg noise) to comply with relevant restrictions, and will continue to do so. I believe that assumption to be correct given the lack of complaint from established residents in the area, some of which are closer to existing industrial activities than the Te Awa Lakes residential areas will be. Mr O’Dwyer also addresses this issue in his report on Strategic Landuse Issues attached in Appendix F, in the context of Fonterra’s applications to the Waikato Regional Council for replacement discharge permits for the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing site.

A further matter raised by the industrial operators, and particularly Fonterra, is that the ongoing development of their industrial sites could be curtailed due to the increased risk profile (through greater chances of some form of notification) and costs (time and financial) inherent in any future consent application process produced by the presence of the residential development at Te Awa Lakes. I agree in principle that the presence of additional landowners and occupiers in the general area potentially increases the complexity of future consent processes. However, I am of the view from professional experience that regardless of the degree or amount of opposition that a proposal may face or the process it follows post-lodgement, if it is a fundamentally sound proposal in resource management terms it will invariably receive consent subject to conditions.

However, in light of the WRPS requirement to minimise reverse sensitivity effects, I have considered whether there are any other measures that can be employed through the PPC2 provisions to minimise the potential for perception based complaints that may accumulate over time. It would seem that the only other feasible mechanism that could be employed is the introduction of plan provisions requiring “no complaint” covenants to be registered on residential titles created at the Te Awa Lakes site. Scope to consider the imposition of such covenants is provided by the submission from Contact Energy [51.05] which specifically seeks such relief.

No complaint covenants are lawful and are used in other statutory plans in New Zealand – one example being the Auckland Unitary Plan Rule D25.6 to address reverse sensitivity effects on the Port of Auckland. While not on its own a particularly effective measure (given that in theory at least a landowner could ignore the covenant and lodge complaints regardless), when combined with the other measures proposed by the applicant it could represent a comprehensive response to potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, given concerns about the enforceability of such covenants I am not at this point sufficiently persuaded to recommend their inclusion in the PPC2 provisions.

Based on the all the above I conclude that the potential reverse sensitivity effects of the Te Awa Lakes proposal can, while high in potential significance, be effectively minimised to a low intensity through the measures proposed by the applicant.

On that basis, there is in my view no sufficient justification to reject PPC2 on reverse sensitivity grounds.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato District Council	17.01	Neutral	Seeks provisions to address reverse sensitivity, visual amenity, traffic and noise effects on neighbours.	Accept

<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.01</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Accept</i>
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.02</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Supports the submission in part. Concerned whether issues relating to reverse sensitivity, traffic and noise matters will be appropriately addressed.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.02</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and has concerns around the scant regard given to reverse sensitivity.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.02</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission and has concerns around the scant regard given to reverse sensitivity.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.02	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to being incompatible with existing industrial activities. The retention of an adequate buffer is needed.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.06</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.03	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to the risk of reverse sensitivity effects. Te Rapa North Industrial Zone was intended to minimise the risk of reverse sensitivity issues.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.07</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
Open Country Dairy Limited	19.06	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to concern that future projects in Horotiu will be compromised by adjacent incompatible land uses.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.01	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to being incompatible with existing industrial activities. The retention of an adequate buffer is needed.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.07</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.02	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to the risk of reverse sensitivity effects. Te Rapa North Industrial Zone was intended to minimise the risk of reverse sensitivity issues.	<i>Reject</i>

<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.08</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
AFFCO New Zealand Limited	31.05	Oppose	Reject the plan change due to concern that future projects in Horotiu will be compromised by adjacent incompatible land uses.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>
Waikato Regional Council	41.04	Neutral	Include provisions to address reverse sensitivity.	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.14</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.35</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.35</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Fonterra	46.01	Oppose	Avoid reverse sensitivity effects from a significant number of residential dwellings. Reverse sensitivity effects can effect economic viability or investment decision making for existing activities.	<i>Reject</i>
Contact Energy	51.04	Oppose	Decline the plan change as the introduction of an incompatible use may impact on long standing activities and flexibility to operate.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	<i>Reject</i>
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	<i>Reject</i>
Contact Energy	51.05	Oppose	Requests that the applicant prove that the amenity experienced in the new zone will be comfortable and appropriate to avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential effects or the existing zoning should be retained.	<i>Reject</i>
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	<i>Reject</i>
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	<i>Reject</i>

Contact Energy	51.06	Oppose	Requests provisions to address reverse sensitivity effects including policy to signal amenity expectations from living adjacent to existing and new industrial activities, inclusion of effective buffers, setbacks, screening and bunding requirements in structure plan and requests realistic noise levels at boundaries, no complaints covenants and residential design to manage noise.	Accept in part
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Accept in part
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Accept in part
Ports of Auckland	52.06	Oppose	Decline plan change due to its proximity to regionally significant industrial development which will cause reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Reject

Geotechnical and Natural Hazards

In addressing geotechnical and natural hazard effects I rely on the Stormwater and Water Quality JWS, the Geotechnical JWS, and the expert reports from Megan Wood (Stormwater) and Ann Williams (Geotechnical) attached in Appendix F.

Natural Hazards

The primary natural hazard that must be addressed at the site is flooding from the immediately adjacent Waikato River. This is encapsulated in the following excerpt from the report from Councils expert stormwater advisor:

1. *"The SMP refers to two 100 year ARI event flood levels in the Waikato River at the site of RL14.78m (WRC flooding modelling) and RL15.87m (WDC Planning Maps) and states that the latter has been adopted for the purposes of determining finished floor levels of proposed buildings.*
2. *The Geotechnical Summary Report (CMW Services, 12 August 2019) provides a third Waikato River flood level of RL16.3m (an unofficial recording of water level at the site during a flood in 1996). The geotechnical reports states that a level of RL16.5m has been used for the upcoming earthworks design phase.*
3. *At the expert caucusing, this item was discussed, and I sought clarification about what design flood level was considered appropriate for the site and what design flood level was being used to inform the design of the various aspects of the proposed development that this relates to, i.e. building platform and floor levels and the design of the outlet from the recreational lakes".*

The design flood level matter is also referenced in the report from Councils expert geotechnical advisor as follows:

"It is proposed as far as possible to balance cut to fill across the site to achieve a final site level of not less than RL16.5 m. This level is close to historical river flood levels identified as RL 15.87 m in the Operative Waikato District Plan. The ODP does not currently consider the effects of climate change, although the Applicant considers that this effect might be of the order of 0.1 m. The applicant acknowledges anecdotal evidence that flood levels may have exceeded this level. The cross-sections of the proposed dams provided suggest that the existing riverbanks will need to be lowered considerably, raising concerns around flood risk and the impact such flooding might have on site integrity".

Depending on the final level that is to be relied upon (and subject to the appropriateness of that level being confirmed), a rule may need to be introduced to Chapter 3 of the District Plan stipulating a minimum floor level for development on the site. This is because minimum floor levels only apply within the Flood Hazard Overlay of the District Plan, and it is not proposed to apply the Flood Hazard Overlay across the Te Awa Lakes site.

This important matter remains unresolved as at the time of completing this report. I note that the management of the significant risks from natural hazards is a Matter of National Importance that must be recognised and provided for under section 6 of the RMA.

Geotechnical Issues

In terms of geotechnical issues, the Geotech JWS at paragraphs 26, 27 and 28 records concerns about development on the part of the site referred to as the "Landform Dam" (this landform was indicated on the plan attached to the Geotech JWS, and is more clearly defined as areas Q and R on the Land Development Area plan provided with the PPC2 documentation). Those concerns centre around aspects of development on the landform dam that may compromise its geotechnical performance. The

geotechnical experts agreed that while appropriate controls can be designed to adequately mitigate these risks through the subdivision stage they are concerned about subsequent breaches that may pose a risk. Those matters are set out at paragraph 28 of the JWS.

This matter is further addressed in the following excerpt from the report from Councils expert geotechnical advisor:

“The applicant proposes to develop the Landform Dam for residential purposes. There are potential risks from development on the Landform Dam such as trenching or directional drilling for infrastructure placement, establishment or removal of large trees, different foundation types and construction methods, which might compromise dam performance by promoting piping erosion. It is accepted that these risks could be addressed with appropriate controls during initial site development, however risks remain around subsequent breaches as a result of landowner activities or Council maintenance works which might unintentionally generate preferential groundwater flow paths leading to internal erosion and potentially piping failure. Differential settlements might result in service leakage or “blow-out” which might have a similar effect. Although it is accepted that this risk might be low, construction of residences on the Landform Dam means that the residences and people residing in them could be at risk from localised dam failure”.

From a planning perspective I share the concerns referenced in the above excerpt. While in my view it may be possible to identify controls that can be placed on the required consents for subdivision formation and building construction, I am at this point unsure of how ongoing control and management of the types of activities of concern can be achieved on an enduring basis into the future, particularly where they may be carried out by third parties such as utility installers. I am also conscious that once an urban zoning is put in place on a particular piece of land it entails that the land has been deemed suitable for such development on an enduring basis. In this case Council needs to be certain that the site is suitable to be zoned Residential in knowledge of all the future activity that Residential zoning will enable and give rise to.

I note that a precautionary approach to the geotechnical risk matter is consistent with the requirement set out in Objective f) of the Vision and Strategy that requires:

“The adoption of a precautionary approach towards decisions that may result in significant adverse effects on the Waikato River, and in particular those effects that threaten serious or irreversible damage to the Waikato River”.

The Waikato River for the purposes of the Vision and Strategy is not restricted to the fluvial river environment, and includes the banks of the river and all its tributaries. On that basis, if geotechnical stability of the Te Awa Lakes site (and particularly the landform dam area) is compromised by the urban landuse proposed by PPC2, there is the potential for significant adverse effects and irreversible damage to the Waikato River. Given the precedence that the Vision and Strategy has amongst higher order RMA plans relevant to this process, the weight that must be given to Objective f) is significant.

The geotechnical risk matter also goes directly to the purpose of the RMA, which requires the health and safety of people to be provided for in managing the use and development of natural and physical resources.

In light of all the above, I cannot at this point recommend acceptance of the residential zoning components of PPC2. The residential components of PPC2 are the most susceptible to the natural hazard and geotechnical risks identified through the expert conferencing process that are yet to be resolved. Accordingly I recommend at this point that the submissions and further submissions set out below that oppose PPC2 on a range of geotechnical and natural hazard related grounds be accepted.

I note that Fonterra (see submission point 46.18) hold the view that the site and its current industrial development feasibility issue due to ground conditions is of the applicant's own making given the historic use of the site for sand extraction and the rehabilitation measures employed to date at the site, and that it is unreasonable to then use those constraints as a justification to initiate a change to the current zoning. In considering this matter I note the following:

- (i) The sand extraction activity is a lawfully established activity operating under a land use resource consent granted in the mid-1990's when the site was in the Rural Zone of Waikato District.
- (ii) During the extended period when the consented activity was being undertaken, various strategic planning exercises resulted in the site being transferred into Hamilton City and eventually receiving its current Industrial and Deferred Industrial zonings.
- (iii) Those strategic planning exercises did not consider the characteristics of the site to the same specificity as is now occurring through this plan change process.
- (iv) The conditions of the resource consent require the site to be rehabilitated back to a rural standard – those conditions are aimed at ensuring a rural landuse could be re-established on the site, and not at rehabilitating back to a standard suitable for a feasible industrial development.

I conclude that in terms of the point raised by Fonterra there is no justification in planning terms for the applicant's history of lawful use and development of the site, and the constraints that use and development may or may not have generated, to either on its own or cumulatively be a ground to decline PPC2. As a result, Fonterra's submission point 46.18 is recommended to be rejected.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato Regional Council	41.10	Support in Part and Oppose in Part	Retain existing Natural Hazard Overlays and clarify why the western most 'Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area' on Planning Map 1b is proposed to be removed.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	41.11	Oppose	Amend to ensure that Natural Hazards are addressed at the time of, or prior to, subdivision and development of the site.	Accept
Fonterra	46.18	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is unreasonable for Perry to seek residential enablement due to geotechnical issues caused by its own activities.	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.05	Oppose	Seeks evidence on how effects of multiple hazards will be managed including the large dams and liquefaction, and its implications for density and foundation design	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.42	Oppose in Part	Ensure the zoning, its associated rules and other plan requirements will not allow any activities on any areas of the	Accept

			land between the main linear lake and the Waikato River where the formation of this lake would elevate above acceptable levels the risks to people undertaking those activities on that land.	
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.43	Oppose in Part	Requests information on the potential for cyclic softening of soils, the assessed slope stability under SLS (Serviceability Limit State) and ULS (Ultimate Limit State) conditions accounting for cyclic softening; and the implications of this information for the need to include any additional provisions in the District Plan to manage these natural hazards.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.44	Oppose in Part	Requests information regarding the implications of the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area and the Waikato River Bank Stability Area.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	
Hamilton City Council	47.45	Oppose in Part	Amend to add "The cable ski lake and adjoining aqua park will be privately owned"	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	
Hamilton City Council	47.46	Oppose in Part	Amend to state that the linear lake is privately owned but accessible to the public and at a swimmable standard.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.47	Oppose in Part	Include reference to the main linear lake in 4.5.6a)iv	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept

Transport

In addressing Transport matters I rely on the Transport JWS and the expert evidence from Alasdair Gray attached in Appendix F.

The critical issue with regards to the potential transport effects of PPC2 is: whether the traffic movements that will be generated from the Te Awa Lakes development will consume enough capacity in the roading network such that the network will no longer have capacity to support the staged release of industrial land in the Te Rapa north area. There is clearly disagreement on this point between the Transport experts as to the capacity of the network.

In terms of roading improvements raised in the HCC and NZTA submission points below, PPC2 has been amended by the applicant in discussions with both submitters to include rules related to development staging and the provision of a series of agreed improvements (including pedestrian and cycle connection upgrades) to be funded entirely by the applicant.

In brief, Mr Gray's advice upon which I rely is that while the development of the Te Awa Lakes site pursuant to PPC2 would consume some of the network capacity earlier than otherwise programmed for the planning industrial land release, it will not make a material difference to the overall level of service that the network will eventually provide once all the industrial land is developed. The transportation mitigations proposed by the applicant and that have been included in the revised PPC2 provisions are sufficient to address the effects of the development, noting that the ultimate solutions to congestion on the future network (Te Rapa Road 4 laning and Northern River Crossing) are significant capital projects under the control of HCC that are not programmed.

On the basis of the above, I recommend that the submission and further submission points seeking rejection of PPC2 on transport related grounds be rejected.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato Regional Council	41.06	Oppose	Reject due to limited opportunities to utilise pedestrian/cycle connections to more established parts of city.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.07	Oppose	Reject due to difficulty in providing passenger transport facilities and multi modal transport network. Development should be compact to minimise need for motor vehicles.	Reject
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.17</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.05	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it is not consistent with Access Hamilton in ensuring an efficient integration of land use with the transport network, multi modal access, a viable bus route and safe and efficient road network. The development is likely to	Reject

			adversely impact congested areas including Wairere Drive and Te Rapa Road intersections.	
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.12	Oppose	Revise the trip generation rates in the Integrated Traffic Assessment for the mixed use/service centre as this is low.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.13	Oppose in Part	Confirmation whether modelling incorporated into the ITA has included trip generation for land opposite Fonterra site. If not this needs to be done.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.16	Oppose in Part	Seeks development of phase 1 only subject to a maximum trip generation on Hutchinson Road and development of phase 2 not preceding the four-laning of Te Rapa Road and improvements to the Te Rapa/Hutchinson Road and Te Rapa Road/McKee Street intersections.	Accept in part
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept in part
Fonterra	46.15	Oppose	Reject due to high cost of roading upgrades that are not planned or programmed by Council.	Reject
Fonterra	46.16	Oppose	Reject the plan change as it may result in under-utilisation of transport infrastructure and the strategic purpose it was intended for. Potential constraints on North Island Main Trunk Line should be avoided, as that may lead to underutilisation of the land served by the strategic rail asset.	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.60	Oppose in Part	Amend 3.8.3 to recognise need for urban standard shared use path, appropriate facilities for passenger transport and upgrading of Kapuni/ Te Rapa Road and Ruffell Road/Te Rapa Road intersections.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.22</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as it is important that costs of improvements do not fall on future development within the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.61	Oppose in Part	Resolve traffic safety concerns at Hutchinson Road/ Te Rapa Road roundabout	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.23</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as it is important that costs of improvements do not fall on future development within the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.62	Oppose in Part	Amend 3.8.3 to delete the trigger for road upgrades and replace with improvements when required.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.24</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as it is important that costs of improvements do not fall on future development within the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.63	Oppose in Part	Amend to provide consistency with numbering and require the addition of staging rules for the development of the structure plan and transportation infrastructure improvements.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.25</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.64	Oppose in Part	Requests written evidence that the NZTA proposes to uplift that part of its designation (E81a) that the TAL Structure Plan overlies.	Reject
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Reject
Hamilton City Council	47.65	Neutral	Update of traffic modelling to ensure most up to date information is used.	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.26</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Contact Energy	51.07	Neutral	Seeks safe and efficient traffic movements.	Accept

<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.40</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of contacts submissions 51.00-51.07)</i>	Accept
Ports of Auckland	52.08	Oppose in Part	Require improvements to the transport network be incorporated as prerequisites for the development of land.	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland's submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Accept

Biosecurity

The Te Awa Lakes site contains alligator weed, which is listed in the Waikato Regional Pest Management Strategy as a Progressive Containment Pest Plant. As such, the site is subject to a Restricted Place declaration and Restricted Place Notice under the Biosecurity Act 1993 which prevents any work that could cause a spread of the weed. Given the extent of earthworks that will be needed to develop the site in the manner proposed by PPC2, there is the potential for significant adverse effects if the alligator weed was to spread to the Waikato River. A Weed Hygiene Plan is in place at the site and has been followed during the site investigation phase.

The applicant proposes a rule requiring that all work on and subsequent management at the site be undertaken in accordance with an approved Alligator Weed Management Plan which is to be prepared in consultation with the Waikato Regional Council and with reference to the Weed Hygiene Plan and the Biosecurity Act. To the extent that this a District Plan matter to control, this is an effective and efficient mechanism to address the alligator weed issue.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato Regional Council	41.09	Oppose in Part	Include controls to stop the spread of Alligator weed, listed as a progressive containment pest plant.	Accept

Development Controls

This section addresses submission points that seek specific amendments to objectives, policies or rules to address development control matters and the management of effects from the Te Awa Lakes development.

A large number of the submission points addressed in this section arise from the submission from HCC. Since the reactivation of the PPC2 process, the applicant and HCC (as submitter) have liaised extensively with regards to the comprehensive relief sought in the HCC submission. The outcome is that the applicant has proposed amendments that satisfy the relief sought in the vast majority of HCC submission points and are thus accepted by HCC (as submitter). I have examined those amendments and have found them all to be efficient and effective and able to be acted upon with little to no risk to the environment. On that basis I do not discuss them further in this section, and recommend that they be accepted.

The submission from Geoff Wilson [5.0] seeks that the maximum building height in the River Interface Overlay be reduced from the proposed 8m to 7.5m. The Urban Design JWS did not specifically address this matter. I rely on the applicants Landscape and Visual Assessment that concluded that the proposed form of development on the site is appropriate in landscape terms. The submitter has not provided any evidence to support the request to lower the height limit. Accordingly, I recommend that the submission point be rejected. In like manner I recommend that the submission point 37.05 from SC & AJ Hodgkinson seeking that residential development along the river bank of the Te Awa Lakes site be prevented is rejected.

SC & AJ Hodgkinson have also sought that controls be placed on major events that could occur on the Te Awa Lakes site. Presumably this concern relates to the part of the site that is proposed to be zoned Major Facilities Zone. In my view there is no need for specific control to be placed on major events at the site through the PPC2 provisions. The Hamilton City District Plan allows for Events in all zones of the city as a Permitted Activity (Rule 25.3.3a) provided that the standards in Rule 25.3.5.7 are met – those standards restrict crowd size, duration and hours of the event, numbers of time per year the event can occur, and noise that can be generated from the event. Any event on the Te Awa Lakes site (regardless of what zoning applies) that could not comply with one of the standards would require resource consent, in like manner to District Plan requirements in the majority of the remainder of Hamilton. On that basis, I see no need to apply specific event assessments as sought by the submitter.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Geoff Wilson	5.00	Support in Part	Reduce maximum height of buildings in River Interface Overlay area to 7.5m.	Reject
SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.03	Oppose	Seeks assessment for major events including days per year, time of day, type of usage, noise outputs, attendees and impacts on new residents.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.28</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.28</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.04	Oppose in Part	Requests replacing pine trees with native planting.	Accept in part
SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.05	Oppose	Retain green outlook along river. Remove buildings on west bank due to effect on character and amenity, impacts on Waikato River and quality of native ecosystem.	Reject
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.29</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.29</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Reject
Waikato Regional Council	41.08	Support in Part	Include objectives, policies and assessment criteria against which the Ecological Rehabilitation Plan can be assessed.	Accept in Part
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.15	Oppose in Part	Identify when stages will be implemented. Staging has a significant bearing on the extent to which the transport network will be affected and what works will be required.	Accept in Part

<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept in Part
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.18	Oppose in Part	Amend to include reference to designation E99a	Accept in Part
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.19	Oppose in Part	Provide screening of water features at the site with landscaping and setbacks included within the interface between the site, the Waikato Expressway and Te Rapa Road due to visual distraction for highway traffic.	Accept in Part
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept in Part
Hamilton City Council	47.03	Oppose in Part	Add provisions to ensure the developer provides the full cost of the infrastructure needed to service the development.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.21</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as it is important that costs of improvements do not fall on future development within the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.09	Oppose in Part	Amend Objective 3.8.1.1 "to develop" rather than enable a tourist and recreational attraction.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.10	Support policy set with amendment	Add a staging policy to ensure tourist and recreational attraction is established.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.11	Oppose	Delete Objective 3.8.1.3	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.12	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.8.1.3a	Accept

Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.13	Support in Part	Include Policy 3.8.1.3b under objective 3.8.1.2	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.16	Support policy set with amendment	Add new policy 3.8.1.2f as follows: "Staging and sequencing will ensure all residents of Te Awa Lakes Structure Plan area will always have access to the Main Linear Lake."	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.17	Support policy set with amendment	Add Rule 3.8.5.5 to elevate activity status to discretionary if staging rules are not met.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.18	Support policy set with amendment	Add new assessment criteria to Appendix 1.3.3N to include Te Awa Lakes	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.19	Support policy set with amendment	Amend to change "---The Adventure Park Visitor Accommodation precinct Overlay is also located ----"	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.20	Oppose in part	Clarify meaning of " Vehicular traffic will be encouraged to utilise the existing service centre and the mixed use block will serve the Te Awa Lakes community's needs"	Accept

<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.21	Support in part	Reword to identify when non-notification doesn't occur rather than rely on sections of the RMA which have recently changed.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.22	Support in part	Amend table title for clarity.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.23	Support in part	Amend heading in left hand column of title to refer to Figure 2-20.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.24	Support in part	Amend to make it clear which general rules in 4.8 do not apply to this overlay.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.25	Support in part	Amend restricted discretionary activities: matters of discretion and amend assessment criteria N to include Te Awa Lakes for "Land Development Activities". Include matters of discretion for duplex dwellings and papakainga	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.26	Oppose in part	Include retail between 150m ² and 399m ² in Te Awa Lakes Business Zone as a non-complying activity.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.27	Oppose in part	Seeks a maximum of 1,500m ² of retail, rather than the 2,500m ² as proposed.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.28	Oppose in part	Identify that drive-through services are a permitted activity only for those activities that are existing in the Te Awa Lakes Business Zone.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.29	Support in part	Add assessment criteria for 'Commercial Places of Assembly' for the Te Awa Lakes Business 6 Zone	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.30	Support in part	Re-number and reword to provide consistency	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.31	Support in part	Reword to remove reference to '2B'	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.32	Support in part	Reword to remove references to staging that are removed under the Proposed Plan Change.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.33	Oppose in part	Add assessment criteria for motorised activities in the Major Facilities Zone	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.34	Support in part	Add matters of discretion (Design and layout; and Character and Amenity) for visitor accommodation within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.35	Support in part	Amend numbering to provide consistency throughout the private plan change.	Accept

Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.36	Support in part	Include "Te Awa Lakes" within the heading of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.37	Support in part	Amend the table heading to read: " <i>Limit L_{Aeq} [15 min]</i> "	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.38	Support in part	Amend by removing standard that relates to noise levels between units as standards under 25.8.3.10 are sufficient.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.39	Oppose in part	Amend to provide consistency and clarity.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.40	Support in part	Provide for signage not facing the residential zone and provide signage on buildings where they are directed primarily at patrons.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.41	Oppose in part	Delete Rule 25.10.5.4 f) ii due to duplication of Rule 25.10.4	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.58	Oppose in part	Amend 3.8.4 to recognise the limited capacity in the current water supply.	Accept
Waikato Regional Council	FS2.04	Support	Supports the submission.	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.59	Oppose in part	Amend 3.8.4 to identify rising wastewater mains to connect directly to far western interceptor.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.66	Support policy set with amendments	Amend Policy 3.8.1.2b to include multiple functions of the open space network and provide access to the River	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.67	Oppose in part	Include Open Space Network in 3.8.2.8 and identify a description of the main components of open space and their functions to enable assessment of Land Development Plans	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.68	Oppose in part	Include Open Space Network rules to ensure open space functions as intended.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.69	Oppose in part	Amend 1.2.2.28f to ensure the main linear lake and various components of the open space network are provided.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.70	Oppose in part	Amend title of 4.5.6 to include open space network.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.71	Support in part	Retain the indicative open space network, except as modified by other submission points below.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.72	Oppose in part	Identify on Figure 2-19 indicative stormwater management areas as shown in CKL drawing U3454-480-00	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.73	Oppose in part	Remove from Figure 2-19 the dashed line indicating a 500m radial catchment.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.74	Oppose in part	Remove from Figure 2-19 the narrow strip of “indicative open space network” along the eastern side of the main linear lake connecting between the “indicative collector road” in the north and the “Indicative primary collector road to the south”.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.75	Oppose in part	Add to 3.8.2.8 Open Space Network a description of the Indicative River Access Locations, including their purpose and function.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.76	Oppose in part	Integrate the requirements of s.1.2.2.25 and s.1.2.2.28 (Volume 2, Appendix 1) to improve the Plan’s readability and efficiency.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	Accept
Ports of Auckland	52.07	Oppose in part	Seeks minimum acoustic insulation and ventilation standards for sensitive activities.	Accept in Part
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland’s submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Accept in Part
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.41</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission (supports all of Ports of Auckland’s submissions 52-52.08)</i>	Accept in Part

Water Quality

Given the HCC submission points and related further submissions in support requesting that water quality in the lakes be maintained at a swimmable standard (ie suitable for contract recreation) I have considered whether water quality in the lakes is a matter that the District Plan can exert control over. The lakes are artificially constructed publicly accessible water bodies that will fulfil a stormwater detention function and in that regard are part of the stormwater network, but will be privately owned and maintained (the remainder of the stormwater network, and all other water and wastewater services, will vest in Hamilton City Council in the usual manner). As the lakes would be a component of the landuse on the site and the stormwater treatment system, and one of functions of a TA under s31 of the RMA is the integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district, I see no jurisdictional issue with regards to HCC seeking a specific water quality outcome.

The JWS for Three Waters and Water Quality states that *“although it will be challenging, acceptable water quality conditions for contact recreation can be achieved in the lakes”*. Given that the experts agree that such a high standard of water quality can be achieved in the lakes, which will in turn discharge to the Waikato River, in my view the PC2 provisions relevant to management of the waterbodies within the Te Awa Lakes development will ensure that the quality of water discharging from the site will give effect to the Vision and Strategy (particularly Objective K), and will also ensure that there are not adverse implications on existing authorised discharges to and takes from the Waikato River as referred to in the submissions from AFFCO, Open Country Dairy, and Fonterra.

The majority of the relief sought in the HCC submission points with regards to water quality matters has been addressed by the applicant and those provisions accepted by HCC (as submitter). However, there remains an outstanding issue with regards to HCC submission point 47.57 in relation to the provision of a sub-catchment Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) at later application stages. The applicant has provided a sub-catchment ICMP with the PPC2 documentation, which has been accepted as appropriate for Plan Change assessment purposes by HCC, however HCC is of the view that a further more detailed sub-catchment ICMP will need to be provided at subsequent consent stages.

While I understand that the provision of the sub-catchment ICMP with the PPC2 documentation satisfies the HCC submission point, there will likely still be professional debate at the consent application stage about the matter. In my view it would be more satisfactory for the issue to be progressed as part of these proceedings, and in that regard both the applicant and HCC (as submitter) may wish to continue discussions on the matter and provide an update either through evidence and/or at the hearing.

Further, while not a matter directly raised in submissions or further submissions but stemming from the JWS for Three Waters and Water Quality, is the uncertainty surrounding the areas of land required for stormwater treatment on the site. The Water Quality experts agreed that the area of land required for wetland devices need to be determined through the plan change process – this is because the wetland devices will function as both stormwater treatment for the overall development and water quality treatment devices to maintain contact recreation water quality standards in the adventure park and linear lakes. If sufficient land has not been set aside for that purpose in the Master Plan for the site then there may be implications for the feasibility of the Master Plan, with attendant flow on effects throughout the development. This matter remains unresolved at the time of completion of this report.

Sub. Name FS. Name	Sub. Point FS. Point	Sub. Type	Summary	Recommendation
Waikato District Council	17.02	Neutral	Seeks clarification on stormwater and meeting the vision and strategy objectives about discharges to Waikato River.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.01</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
<i>Fonterra</i>	<i>FS3.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission. Fonterra's discharge consents may be affected by discharges from the plan change area.</i>	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as AFFCO has committed extensive expenditure to plant upgrades in recognition of the Vision and Strategy and relies on the Waikato River for its water supply which needs to be high quality.</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as OCD has committed extensive expenditure to plant upgrades in recognition of the Vision and Strategy and relies on the Waikato River for its water supply which needs to be high quality.</i>	Accept
SC & AJ Hodgkinson	37.06	Oppose	Retain river quality.	Accept
<i>AFFCO</i>	<i>FS4.30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as AFFCO has committed extensive expenditure to plant upgrades in recognition of the Vision and Strategy and relies on the Waikato River for its water supply.</i>	Accept
<i>Open Country</i>	<i>FS5.30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission as OCD has committed extensive expenditure to plant upgrades in recognition of the Vision and Strategy and relies on the Waikato River for its water supply.</i>	Accept
New Zealand Transport Agency	45.17	Neutral	Provide part of the designation for stormwater management.	
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.03</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission.</i>	
Hamilton City Council	47.06	Oppose	Seeks robust technical evidence to support feasibility of swimmable water and how ownership and maintenance issues will be resolved.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.07	Oppose	Seeks issues regarding the ownership and type of wastewater system to be used.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.14	Support policy set with amendment	Add new objective 3.8.1.3 to maintain lakes at swimmable standard.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.15	Support policy set with amendment	Add new policy 3.8.1.3a to require implementation of management plan for the lakes.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.48	Oppose in part	Add a definition for 'swimmable standard'.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.49	Oppose in part	Add a rule requiring maintenance of lake water quality at a swimmable standard	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.50	Oppose in part	Reserve discretion over the management plan for the main linear lake.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.51	Oppose in part	Include assessment criteria in N12 for ensuring lake at swimmable standard.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept

Hamilton City Council	47.52	Oppose in part	Amend 1.2.2.28 to provide consistency and require details of those responsible for monitoring.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	
Hamilton City Council	47.53	Oppose in part	Amend Figure 2-20 to include the main linear lake and the Northern Wetland within a single LDP Area separate from other LDP Areas; and include the Southern Wetland entirely within LDP Area A.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	
Hamilton City Council	47.54	Oppose in part	Add "17.6.8.2 The water quality in the cable ski lake and aqua park lakes shall be maintained to a swimmable standard."	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.55	Oppose in part	Requests a management plan to be provided as part of the information requirements to ensure cable ski lake and aqua park are swimmable.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.56	Oppose in part	Add a matter of discretion and assessment criteria K16 to maintain the water quality in the cable ski lake and aqua park at a swimmable standard.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept
Hamilton City Council	47.57	Oppose in part	Amend 1.2.2.28h to require sub-catchment ICMP or an approved ICMP.	Accept
<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>FS2.04</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports the submission</i>	Accept