

ATTACHMENT 2 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Ref	Submitter name	Address	Key points / relief sought	Submission status	To be heard
1	Kevin Thomas Groom	2F Riro Street, Hamilton	None	Support	No
2	Cheryl Robertson Go To Collection-Madam Woo	6 Sapper Moore-Jones Place, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around construction effects such as truck movements, noise and dust. Would like conditions around construction, including minimising traffic during lunch time due to business. 	Neutral	No
3	Murray J. Vereker-Bindon Three Oaks Trust	Apartment 3 - 240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that applicant initially sought non-notification. Summary of application would have assisted. Lack of assessment of effects on adjoining properties and lack of recognition of the six apartments at 240 Victoria Street. Concerned at what is shown on the Precinct Plan. Considers there is ambiguity around construction period and concerned as a resident at the acoustic assessment assuming operation would be 24 hours. Considers the silt and sand soils along the riverbank are inherently unstable and construction will cause problems; citing issues with construction of Victoria on the River. Requests notification, that a summary is provided to himself and his neighbours and that an assessment of effects is provided. Requests construction restricted from 7am to 6pm and a mitigation scheme for construction noise and vibration on adjoining properties. Requests condition survey of adjoining properties prior to construction, professional vibration report, details on monitoring and mitigation, and guarantees around costs of any required repairs. Requests applicant consults with adjoining properties to agree upon ways to mitigate effects prior to consent being granted. 	Oppose	Yes
4	Sarah Tse Guan Teng Carlos Joblin Holdings Ltd.	PO Box 308071, Auckland	None	Support	No
5	Sharryn Patricia Franklin	297 Ulster Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports all the positives/benefits of the proposed theatre. Theatre will be architecturally significant for Hamilton. 	Support	No
6	Franklin Wayne Brown	9 Perindale Drive, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposal as it allows for a revitalisation of the CBD. Supports the mix of contemporary and traditional designs. 	Support	No
7	Rachael Ann Peplow	95 Albert Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers it will have minimal impact on the heritage of the hotel, but in fact spruce up the façade and revitalise the CBD. Proposal will be a good thing, bringing people into CBD who will use the restaurants, motels and retail etc. 	Support	No
8	Joanne Michele Bailey and Murray James Barker	Apartment 4 - 240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned constraints highlighted in pre-application meeting haven't been addressed. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration in the design on the residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street. • Notes a 'proposed park' is shown on the Precinct Plan yet this land cannot be acquired. • No details on noise, privacy and safety risks that will be generated on the residential dwellings. • Concerned that while the plans show the Upper River Promenade running in front of the residential dwellings, it will not connect appropriately due to contours and contradict the District Plan's intentions around access to the river through Embassy Park. • Concerned design of promenade will see it at the same level as lower living and bedrooms of 240 Victoria Street apartments; resulting in unacceptable safety, privacy and security issues that contradicts District Plan policy and CPTED principles. • Proposal reduces the ability to provide more residential opportunities within the CBD. • No justification for the boundary encroachment into the embankment. • The design of the proposal is inconsistent with the Riverfront Development Design Guides. • Concern at vibration risk due to volume of proposed earthworks, lack of detail on works in Embassy Park given stability risks, and whether piling into embankment will be appropriate given additional Council process required. • Unsure if consideration has been given to 7.5.1a; assessment by geotechnical engineer on stability of area. • Acoustic assessment is invalid as hasn't considered effects on nearest residential dwellings and submitter considers there are more than 100 residents within 200m. Notes diagram in acoustic assessment shows 238 and 240 Victoria Street as 'new art gallery'. • Concerns over appropriateness of noise survey and that assessment doesn't consider effects of patrons within Embassy Park or theatre, hotel and food and beverage tenancies. • Despite referring to the German standard, the acoustic assessment doesn't detail how effects will be eliminated during process and there needs to be an assessment (and pre-construction survey) into the construction and operational vibration impacts on the 240 Victoria Street apartments. • Transport assessment highlights the troublesome traffic/travel issues of proposal being in CBD. • Concerned that use of heavy vibration rollers and piling highlighted in geotechnical assessment has not been considered in acoustic assessment. • While theatre, hotel and food and beverage tenancies have potential to add value to residential dwellings, noise, security, privacy and vibration risks could disadvantage value of dwellings. • Requests drawings are amended to correctly reflect environment and redevelopment of the area. 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the promenade's height and distance to 240 Victoria Street apartments is amended. Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. Requests a condition survey of 240 Victoria Street apartments prior to construction so damage caused by construction can be identified, and liabilities/remedy commitments are established. 		
9	Mark Hatwell Hatwell Properties Ltd	PO Box 162, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around traffic management, hours of construction and overall duration, disruption to parking, parking of construction personnel and ability to develop site in the future. Concerned as has not been provided information to date on how traffic management for Sapper Moore-Jones Place will be conducted. Has questions on whether the street will remain open during construction and how public will gain access to the theatre from the promenade. Requests that he is kept informed of these matters before consent is granted. 	Neutral	Yes
10	Eric Gerald Clark	Apartment 6 - 240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	Refer to the key points / relief sought for submission 8 Joanne Michele Bailey and Murray James Barker	Oppose	Yes
11	Mark Walton	104 Oceanview Road, Mt Maunganui	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal will have a real positive impact on the regeneration of the city centre and region. 	Support	No
12	David Ian Bourke and Christine Anne Bourke	14 Riro Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will create substantial noise in an Amphitheatre environment, causing nuisance to the residential area. Oppose the removal of the three significant trees, which are landmarks. 	Oppose	Yes
13	Niall Baker Waikato Heritage Group	18 Sadler Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHG oppose the proposal and are concerned at the loss of historic heritage. Consider the heritage assessment and consideration of alternatives is inadequate. Concerned at the loss of three significant trees. Consider the proposal is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. Consider the AEE has not had regard to the relevant provisions of the District Plan, including strategic framework and heritage objectives and policies, or the Regional Policy Statement. Notes as a non-complying activity the requirements of section 104D of the RMA. Considers the Queen's Suite to be an important part of the hotel. Considers insufficient consideration to HCC's Heritage Policy has been had. Given heritage panel has now been dissolved, unclear on how heritage has been considered. Notes the District Plan's heritage provisions are currently under review as a result of limitations in heritage protection being identified. Considers the hotel is a significant anchor in the heritage precinct of the south-end and notes the RMA's definition of historic heritage includes surroundings. Considers the site has extensive history given it is one of only two remaining historic hotels. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers little consideration has been given to the historic gardens and the interiors. While rules don't arguably protect the interiors, there are spaces that should be protected. • Considers the degree of demolition to the hotel, gardens and trees will have more than minor effects on the environment – that may well be significant. • Considers the removal of the historic river façade and the gardens destroys the understanding of the historic values of the river side of the hotel. • Considers the protection of historic trees should be considered under heritage values for the historic place in addition to the STEM system which is limited in giving historic context. • Requests that HCC or the applicant commission a full survey of the garden which records all elements, patterns, materials etc. with a full plant inventory. Considers the removal of the garden may be a significant adverse environmental effect. • Requests a heritage landscape architect identify heritage values as a more appropriate recognition of the trees and historic gardens. • Considers a robust assessment of the proposal cannot occur without this information. 		
14	Tony Morgan and Helen Jarman	Apartment 1 - 240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration in the design on the residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street. • Notes a 'proposed park' is shown on the Precinct Plan. • No details on noise, privacy and safety risks that will be generated on the residential dwellings. • Concern at vibration risk due to volume of proposed earthworks, lack of detail on works in Embassy Park given stability risks, and whether piling into embankment will be appropriate given additional Council process required. • Unsure if consideration has been given to 7.5.1a; assessment by geotechnical engineer on stability of area. • Acoustic assessment is invalid as hasn't considered effects on nearest residential dwellings and submitter considers there are more than 100 residents within 200m. Notes diagram in acoustic assessment shows 238 and 240 Victoria Street as 'new art gallery'. • The acoustic assessment doesn't consider the noise and vibration effects, including from increased heavy vehicles during construction, on the 240 Victoria Street apartments. • Concerned that use of heavy vibration rollers and piling highlighted in geotechnical assessment has not been considered in acoustic assessment. • Concerned at pre and post development stormwater calculations within the civil services report, noting no mitigation for the 2-year storm event. Considers the sizing of the 10-year storm event for the orifice does not ensure it will be big enough. • Considers the water supply analysis is cursory and not in accordance with HCC model. • Requests drawings are amended to correctly reflect environment and redevelopment of the area. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the promenade's height and distance to 240 Victoria Street apartments is amended. Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. Requests a condition survey of 240 Victoria Street apartments prior to construction so damage caused by construction can be identified, and liabilities/remedy commitments are established. 		
15	Vanessa Williams Hamilton Central Business Association		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal aligns with the HCBA's focus on growing activities, events and experiences within the CBD to increase foot traffic for local businesses and revitalise the CBD. Supports the proposal given the various benefits for the region. 	Support	Yes
16	Brian James Squair	156 Beerescourt Road, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal and cites research around how civic anchors such as theatres provide a wide range of positive social, economic and cultural effects. 	Support	No
17	Rawiri Bidios Te Haa O Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa (THAWK)	Po Box 13054, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal subject to the completion of the agreed upon consultation plan to provide for the cultural safety of the proposal during construction. Proposal is supported but THAWK reserves the right to withdraw support should the cultural safety plan not be implemented as agreed. 	Support	Yes
18	Arikinui Paretope ARA Linda Te Namu Smith Te Hauauru Rohe Wakaminenga of the Confederation of United Tribes	PO Box 27096, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to consult or get consent (section 4 of the Local Government Act 2002) Desecration of an Urupa is a breach of tikanga, native customary title and treaty rights Waikato-Tainui and THaWK does not represent them 	Oppose	Yes
19	Nicola Hamon	12 Gavin Heights, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitters to HCC's 10-year plan rejected the commitment to give \$25 million to the proposal, and it will increase city debt. The removal of an A ranked heritage building sets a precedent for the removal of others. The hotel and its historic garden should be afforded full protection given it is one of only two historic hotels in the city. Removal of the significant trees is opposed as the current system does not protect them. Requests a Heritage Landscape Architect assesses the historic garden/trees. 	Oppose	No
20	Orlando Robbins	171A Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally neutral to the proposal as a whole Opposes the red oxide/brown colour scheme as considers it depressing. Requests the finish be re-designed to bring it into the 21st century. 	Oppose / Neutral	No
21	C Murray Earl	240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the whole proposal on the basis that it is contrary to Council and Regional Council strategies and policies. Considers will cause adverse environmental effects that cannot be adequately managed. The proposal does not promote the purpose and principles of the RMA. 	Oppose	Yes
22	C Murray Earl and Lynden Ann Earl	1 Rostrevor Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the whole proposal on the basis that it is contrary to Council and Regional Council strategies and policies. Considers will cause adverse environmental effects that cannot be adequately managed. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not promote the purpose and principles of the RMA. 		
23	Alicia Todd Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO Box 3942, Wellington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FENZ recognize the importance of the proposal in terms of supporting the revitalisation of the CBD and providing for the cultural and social aspirations of the city. • The risk of fire represents a potential adverse effect of low probability but high impact. • The proposal therefore needs to consider the operational requirements of FENZ to adequately provide for firefighting emergency response activities on site. • FENZ notes that the applicant assumes the required water supply demand for firefighting will be available and assumes a sprinkler system will be provided throughout. • FENZ notes there is a risk of conflict between patrons exiting the theatre foyer in the event of an emergency against firefighters entering at the same location, and that the existing hydrants within Victoria Street and Sapper Moore-Jones Place are poorly located. • FENZ recommend that careful consideration is given to an evacuation procedure. • FENZ seeks a condition of consent requiring water supply and access be provided in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. 	Neutral	Yes
24	Carl Peter de Leeuw	238a Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned constraints highlighted in pre-application meeting haven't been addressed. • Notes inconsistencies between application form, certificates of title, the public notice and reports supporting the proposal in terms of inclusion of Embassy Park. • Acoustic assessment hasn't considered effects on 238 and 240 Victoria Street instead showing a 'new art gallery'. Concerns over appropriateness of noise survey. • Oppose the redevelopment of Embassy Park turning it into a 'front door' to the theatre. • The elevated boardwalk has no sense of connection with the river. Considers works in Embassy Park will remove existing connections to river and is an adverse effect not positive. • Considers the proposal will deliver increased noise to the surrounding area, damage to an archaeological site, loss of privacy to residents, damage to habitat (roost trees in Embassy Park for ruru and tui), regular heavy vehicle truck movements and loss of links to the river compared to existing uses. • Proposal will turn Sapper Moore-Jones Place into a service lane with access restrictions. • Oppose temporary closures of Victoria Street for large events as will restrict their access. • No consideration in the design on the residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street, with a 'proposed park' is shown on the Precinct Plan. • No details on noise, privacy and safety risks that will be generated on residential dwellings. • Concerned at the lack of detail on Embassy Park, such as retaining effect/surcharge on 240 Victoria Street, drainage/discharge measures, protection from falling, privacy. • Concerned at the loss of footpath on Sapper Moore-Jones Place and reduction on pedestrian-orientated area. Unsure on what pedestrian protection measures are proposed. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned at the arboricultural response provided (in draft), such as no justification for large variances between HCC scores and revised one, no response on heat radiation, discrepancy on what significant trees are proposed to be removed. • Proposal reduces the ability to provide more residential opportunities within the CBD. • No justification for the boundary encroachment into the embankment, with the screen structure encroaching into the vista of 238 and 240 Victoria Street which may expect unfettered vistas when abutting the riverbank. • Concerned the illuminated screen will affect day and night cycle for birds and wildlife. • The design of the proposal is inconsistent with the Riverfront Development Design Guides. • Concerned at Developed Design Report seeking to 'encourage 24-hour activity' which is not in keeping with the adjoining residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street. • Concerned that while the plans show the Upper River Promenade running in front of the residential dwellings, it will not connect appropriately due to contours and contradict the District Plan's intentions around access to the river through Embassy Park. • Concerned at the lack of detail on Embassy Park (earthworks etc.), yet it shows redeveloped plaza at RL39500 which is above 238 and 240 Victoria Street, with no details on structural impact or detail of mitigation around light, privacy, noise. • Acoustic assessment hasn't considered effects on nearest residential dwellings and submitter considers there are more than 100 residents within 200m. Notes diagram in acoustic assessment shows 238 and 240 Victoria Street as 'new art gallery'. • Concerns over appropriateness of noise survey. • Despite referring to the German standard, the acoustic assessment doesn't detail how effects will be eliminated during process and there needs to be an assessment (and pre-construction survey) into the construction and operational vibration impacts on the 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments. • Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. • Concerned that use of heavy vibration rollers and piling highlighted in geotechnical assessment has not been considered in acoustic assessment. • Requests drawings are amended to correctly reflect environment and redevelopment of the area and reflects the entire development (e.g. Embassy Park). • Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. • Requests a condition survey of 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments prior to construction so damage caused by construction can be identified. • Requests that closest residents are considered within the proposed Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan. • Requests defined working hours during construction which consider adjacent residents. • Requests condition requiring double-glazing of 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments. 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

25	Pieternella Frederika de Leeuw	Apartment 5 - 240 Victoria Street, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned constraints highlighted in pre-application meeting haven't been addressed. • Notes inconsistencies between application form, certificates of title, the public notice and reports supporting the proposal in terms of inclusion of Embassy Park. • Acoustic assessment hasn't considered effects on 238 and 240 Victoria Street instead showing a 'new art gallery'. Concerns over appropriateness of noise survey. • Oppose the redevelopment of Embassy Park turning it into a 'front door' to the theatre. • The elevated boardwalk has no sense of connection with the river. Considers works in Embassy Park will remove existing connections to river and is an adverse effect not positive. • Concerned that while the plans show the Upper River Promenade running in front of the residential dwellings, it will not connect appropriately due to contours and contradict the District Plan's intentions around access to the river through Embassy Park. • Concerned design of promenade will see it at the same level as lower living and bedrooms of 240 Victoria Street apartments; resulting in unacceptable safety, privacy and security issues that contradicts District Plan policy and CPTED principles. • Considers the proposal will deliver increased noise to the surrounding area, damage to an archaeological site, loss of privacy to residents, damage to habitat (roost trees in Embassy Park for ruru and tui), regular heavy vehicle truck movements and loss of links to the river compared to existing uses. • Proposal will turn Sapper Moore-Jones Place into a service lane with access restrictions. • Oppose temporary closures of Victoria Street for large events as will restrict their access. • No consideration in the design on the residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street, with a 'proposed park' is shown on the Precinct Plan. • No details on noise, privacy and safety risks that will be generated on residential dwellings. • Concerned at the lack of detail on Embassy Park, such as retaining effect/surcharge on 240 Victoria Street, drainage/discharge measures, protection from falling, privacy. • Concerned at the loss of footpath on Sapper Moore-Jones Place and reduction on pedestrian-orientated area. Unsure on what pedestrian protection measures are proposed. • Concerned at the arboricultural response provided (in draft), such as no justification for large variances between HCC scores and revised one, no response on heat radiation, discrepancy on what significant trees are proposed to be removed. • Proposal reduces the ability to provide more residential opportunities within the CBD. • No justification for the boundary encroachment into the embankment, with the screen structure encroaching into the vista of 238 and 240 Victoria Street which may expect unfettered vistas when abutting the riverbank. • Concerned the illuminated screen will affect day and night cycle for birds and wildlife. • The design of the proposal is inconsistent with the Riverfront Development Design Guides. 	Oppose	Yes
----	--------------------------------	---	---	--------	-----

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned at Developed Design Report seeking to 'encourage 24-hour activity' which is not in keeping with the adjoining residential dwellings at 238 and 240 Victoria Street. • Concerned that while the plans show the Upper River Promenade running in front of the residential dwellings, it will not connect appropriately due to contours and contradict the District Plan's intentions around access to the river through Embassy Park. • Concerned at the lack of detail on Embassy Park (earthworks etc.), yet it shows redeveloped plaza at RL39500 which is above 238 and 240 Victoria Street, with no details on structural impact or detail of mitigation around light, privacy, noise. • Acoustic assessment hasn't considered effects on nearest residential dwellings and submitter considers there are more than 100 residents within 200m. Notes diagram in acoustic assessment shows 238 and 240 Victoria Street as 'new art gallery'. • Concerns over appropriateness of noise survey. • Despite referring to the German standard, the acoustic assessment doesn't detail how effects will be eliminated during process and there needs to be an assessment (and pre-construction survey) into the construction and operational vibration impacts on the 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments. • Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. • Concerned that use of heavy vibration rollers and piling highlighted in geotechnical assessment has not been considered in acoustic assessment. • Requests drawings are amended to correctly reflect environment and redevelopment of the area and reflects the entire development (e.g. Embassy Park). • Requests a new acoustic and vibration assessment is prepared that considers all affected. • Request the promenade's height and distance to 240 Victoria Street apartments is amended. • Requests a condition survey of 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments prior to construction so damage caused by construction can be identified. • Requests that closest residents are considered within the proposed Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan. • Requests defined working hours during construction which consider adjacent residents. • Requests condition requiring double-glazing of 238 and 240 Victoria Street apartments. 		
26	Victoria Property Developments Ltd	c/o – PO Box 17, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports all parts of the proposal given the significant benefits the facility will enable. • Considers it is something to be proud of and will enable events not previously available. 	Support	No
27	Carolyn McAlley Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	PO Box 13339, Tauranga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNZPT is supportive of the proposal in principle given the potential rejuvenation of the CBD. • Proposal will have adverse effects on historic heritage, being built heritage, archaeology and significant trees. Does not consider these matters have been adequately addressed. 	Oppose	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate information on the specific sequence and nature of the works limits the ability to determine whether the proposed mitigation will sufficiently mitigate the adverse effects. • The site is rich in historic heritage. While several additions/modifications have been undertaken over the years, the buildings still contain several important and/or original features as identified in the Salmon Reed report. • HNZPT note the HNZPT Category 2 listing, the District Plan's Category A scheduling, the Group 2 archaeological scheduling and the 5x significant tree scheduling. • The archaeological assessment is insufficient in terms of detail, with the effects of the proposed works unclear and an accidental discovery protocol not appropriate. • Concerned at the lack of detail which makes it difficult to determine if the proposed mitigation could be commensurate to the adverse effects on built heritage. • Request greater level of detail on new hotel to ensure demolition of other heritage buildings can be considered mitigated and ensure historic hotel doesn't face uncertain future. • Request greater detail on works staging as it appears the construction of the hotel will be occurring after the theatre and no details on the stabilization of the hotel is provided. • Request that the street-facing frontages are 'faithfully' reinstated. • Request a greater recess between the hotel and the extension to the north along Victoria Street to allow more 'breathing space', particularly at parapet level. • Request the three-dimensional integrity of the heritage fabric is retained, as it is important that the rear elevations are not blown out at the back. No details are currently provided. • Request they are involved in the design/details of any required seismic works on the hotel. • Request that a suitable and meaningful location needs to be found for the wooden stairs and the associated leaded glass windows given the exceptional heritage value. • Request the remaining features of the Queen's Suite are reinstated within the hotel. • Requests that a programme of interpretation (in addition to recording prior to demolition) needs to be incorporated into the design that reflects the rich history of the site. • Requests that an 'envelope' is developed for any signage proposed on the canopy as not detail is currently provided. • Request certainty from suitably qualified experts that every endeavor will be made to ensure the long-term health and longevity of the remaining significant trees. • Request that an advice note is included advising of the need for an archaeological authority. 		
28	Taroi Rawiri Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Po Box 848, Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirms Waikato-Tainui have a working relationship with the applicant and others associated with the proposal. 	Support	No

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requests that Waikato-Tainui are consulted on the naming of the theatre and suggests the name reflects Hamilton, and tāngata whenua's relationship with the river/historic heritage.• Waikato-Tainui have reviewed the assessment of Maori values prepared by THaWK.• Waikato-Tainui acknowledges the commitment to ongoing engagement with tāngata whenua, and looks forward to continuing this throughout the development• Waikato-Tainui concurs with the recommendations in the assessment of Maori values, including expectation that protocols will be followed to notify the tāngata whenua working group (THaWK and Waikato-Tainui) of any discovery of artefacts or human remains.• Requests that Waikato-Tainui are notified and contribute to all management plans proposed in the development.• Requests that all management plans be assessed against the Vision and Strategy and Tai Timu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao (Waikato-Tainui) Environmental Plan and such assessment be relayed to Waikato-Tainui for discussion.		
--	--	--	---	--	--