

Report: **Waikato 2070 Summary of Submissions**

To: **Waikato 2070 Hearings Panel, Waikato  
District Council**

Abbreviations

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| CBD   | Central Business District                  |
| FP    | Future Proof                               |
| H2A   | Hamilton to Auckland (corridor initiative) |
| HNZPT | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga        |
| GPS   | Government Policy Statement                |
| HCC   | Hamilton City Council                      |
| HPL   | Horotiu Properties Limited                 |
| PDP   | Proposed District Plan (Waikato)           |
| PT    | Public Transport                           |
| NIMT  | North Island Main Trunk rail line          |
| NZTA  | New Zealand Transport Agency               |
| NPS   | National Policy Statement                  |
| RPS   | Regional Policy Statement                  |
| SH1   | State Highway 1                            |
| SH2   | State Highway 2                            |
| SNA   | Significant Natural Area                   |
| WDC   | Waikato District Council                   |
| WRPS  | Waikato Regional Policy Statement          |

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Submission 1 Peter Jackson  | 6  |
| Submission 2 Shand Properties   | 6  |
| Submission 3 New Zealand Transport Agency                                 | 7  |
| Submission 4 Transpower New Zealand Ltd                                   | 10 |
| Submission 5 Straterra and the Aggregate and Quarry Association           | 11 |
| Submission 6 Genesis Energy Limited                                       | 11 |
| Submission 7 Heritage New Zealand   | 12 |
| Submission 8 Waikato Regional Council                                     | 14 |
| Submission 9 Judy Arnstad   | 16 |
| Submission 10 Arnstad   | 17 |
| Submission 11 GD Jones  | 17 |
| Submission 12 Synlait Milk  | 18 |
| Submission 13 Diamond Creek Farms Limited                                 | 19 |
| Submission 14 Horotiu Properties Limited                                  | 21 |
| Submission 15 Meredith MacKenzie  | 23 |
| Submission 16 Malibu Hamilton   | 23 |
| Submission 17 Cynthia Tucker  | 25 |
| Submission 18 LIC   | 26 |
| Submission 19 Waikare Lake Care Group                                     | 26 |
| Submission 20 Angela  | 26 |
| Submission 21 Ute Moerchen Ludwig   | 27 |
| Submission 22 Mercury   | 27 |
| Submission 23 Rudy Van Dam  | 28 |
| Submission 24 Simon Upton & Bhaady Miller                                 | 29 |
| Submission 25 Fiona Scott   | 30 |
| Submission 26 Tainui Group Holdings                                       | 30 |
| Submission 27 Pokeno Village Holdings Limited                             | 32 |
| Submission 28 Hamilton Older Riders Social Equitable Club                 | 34 |
| Submission 29 Jean Tregida  | 34 |
| Submission 30 Northgate Industrial Park Ltd and Northgate Development Ltd | 35 |
| Submission 31 Dorothy Derecourt and David McKeown                         | 36 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Submission 32 Allen Fabrics Ltd (Murray Hammond Allen)   | 36 |
| Submission 33 Ministry of Education                      | 37 |
| Submission 34 NZTE Operations Limited                    | 39 |
| Submission 35 Patricia Sylvia Ferguson                   | 39 |
| Submission 36 Auckland Council                           | 40 |
| Submission 37 Horticulture New Zealand                   | 45 |
| Submission 38 Future Proof Implementation Committee      | 48 |
| Submission 39 2SEN Ltd and Tuakau Estates Ltd            | 53 |
| Submission 40 Nick Hall                                  | 54 |
| Submission 41 Huntly Community Board                     | 55 |
| Submission 42 Ohinewai Area Committee Submission         | 57 |
| Submission 43 Hamilton City Council                      | 59 |
| Submission 44 Ambury Properties Limited                  | 65 |
| Submission 45 Ngati Tamaoho Trust                        | 69 |
| Submission 46 Ohinewai Lands Ltd                         | 70 |
| Submission 47 Rangatahi Ltd                              | 72 |
| Submission 48 Thorntree Orchards Ltd (Sir William Birch) | 74 |
| Submission 49 Havelock Village Limited                   | 75 |
| Submission 50 Whaingaroa Environmental Defence           | 77 |
| Submission 51 Thorntree Orchards Ltd                     | 80 |
| Submission 52 Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board            | 81 |
| Submission 53 Toni Hill                                  | 82 |
| Submission 54 Tainui Hapu                                | 83 |
| Submission 55 Lakeside Development 2017 Limited          | 85 |
| Submission 56 Alison Cunningham                          | 87 |
| Submission 57 C M Huxtable                               | 87 |
| Submission 58 Ian J Anderson and Gail M Anderson         | 88 |
| Submission 59 Angela Kimber                              | 88 |
| Submission 60 Mike Bell                                  | 89 |
| Submission 61 Jenny Kelly                                | 89 |
| Submission 62 Kirriemuir Trustee Limited                 | 90 |
| Submission 63 Lesley Thornley                            | 92 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Submission 64 Rosser Thornley            | 93  |
| Submission 65 Gabrielle Parson           | 94  |
| Submission 66 Charlie Young              | 95  |
| Submission 67 Collinsons                 | 96  |
| Submission 68 Graham Harkness            | 96  |
| Submission 69 Unknown                    | 96  |
| Submission 70 Huntly War Memorial Hall   | 97  |
| Submission 71 Ian McAlley                | 97  |
| Submission 72 Unknown                    | 98  |
| Submission 73 John Lawson                | 99  |
| Submission 74 Kim                        | 100 |
| Submission 75 Mercer Community Committee | 100 |
| Submission 76 McLuskie                   | 101 |
| Submission 77 Nick Hall                  | 102 |
| Submission 78 Peter Thompson             | 103 |
| Submission 79 Unknown                    | 103 |
| Submission 80 Shaun Jackson              | 104 |
| Submission 81 Brett Titchmarsh           | 105 |
| Submission 82 Claire McLennan            | 105 |
| Submission 83 Papakura Local Board       | 105 |
| Submission 84 Dr Lesley Topping          | 106 |
| Submission 85 Kainga Ora                 | 107 |
| Submission 86 Karla Stevenson            | 108 |
| Submission 87 David Whyte                | 109 |
| Submission 88 Chris Aitchinson           | 110 |
| Submission 89 Sarah Aitchinson           | 111 |
| Submission 90 Ayla Aitchinson            | 111 |
| Submission 91 Archer Aitchinson          | 112 |
| Submission 92 TerraFirma                 | 112 |

**Submission 1 Peter Jackson**

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Submission Number:   | 1             |
| Submitter Name   | Peter Jackson |
| Summary of Submission  |               |
| <p>1. Remove 20 hectares at 131-139 Dominion Road, Tuakau, from the 30+ year residential timeframe to allow for immediate development.</p> |               |

**Submission 2 Shand Properties**

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 2                        |
| Submitter Name  | Shand Properties Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support overall regeneration of town and villages.</li> <li>2. Support Focus 03.2 Build Our Businesses.</li> <li>3. Support and amend Focus 03.3 Embrace Our Identity to reword "industrial zones" to "activity zones identified in Waikato 2070".</li> <li>4. Support 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan, particularly the residential land to the south of East Mine Road, the East Mine Business Park to the north of East Mine Road and south of the expressway.</li> <li>5. Extend the Business Park to the west to cover land between North Island Main Trunk Line and Great South Road (See submission for map amendment).</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal Submission (Chris Dawson):</p> <p>Support Strategy, would like the term activity zones to be used to avoid confusion with the Proposed District Plan process. Would like to cater for Industrial (65ha), Business and Residential land. Huntly development map should also identify the land parcel between the railway line and the current state highway 1.</p> <p>Additional Written Submission:</p> <p>Presented an additional map that was put on the screen to show the land parcels spoken about.</p> |                          |

### Submission 3 New Zealand Transport Agency

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 3                            |
| Submitter Name   | New Zealand Transport Agency |
| Summary of Submission  |                              |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partially support the Waikato 2070 subject to greater connections with H2A, Spatial Plans and Future Proof.</li> <li>2. The submitter seeks to ensure a collaborative approach when progressing to the next stages of the developing Waikato 2070.</li> <li>3. The submitter has identified the need for additional evidence and justification for divergence from the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) concerning settlement activities and how residential land should come forward.</li> <li>4. The submitter has an interest in urban development and integrated land use and transport planning. Given the submitter's role, the statutory objective is to undertake functions that contribute to the affordable, integrated, safe and responsive and sustainable land transport system in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) 2018-2021. The document outlines strategic priorities of safety, access, environment and value for money. A key priority is a modal shift from single car occupancy travel (dependency) in private vehicles to walking, cycling, and public transport.</li> <li>5. The submitter seeks greater connections between Waikato 2070 and the H2A, along with the RPS with provisions for the integration of transport and land use planning (see s6.3.1).</li> <li>6. The submitter does not agree that Waikato 2070 is applying staging appropriately concerning the Waikato District Plan, because the purpose and role are not clear.</li> <li>7. The submitter requests a diagram be added showing the linkage concerning the WDP and RPS and align the Waikato 2070 with the various structure plans.</li> <li>8. The submitter requests translation from the Blueprint project into Waikato 2070 and better articulation of the measures. The submitter notes that the evidence base underpinning the land strategy other than the Blueprint project is not clear and calls into the feasibility of the growth locations.</li> <li>9. The submitter (NZTA) would only support growth locations that are evidence-based in terms of their need to fulfil the overall spatial strategy, linked to transport requirements and GPS. The submitter seeks that the WDC review Waikato 2070 concerning policies contained within the RPS. Show evidence concerning large areas of additional commercial and industrial land, so they do not conflict with section 6.1.4 and Sections 6C and 6D and divergence from the RPS and Future Proof.</li> <li>10. The submitter is concerned that the growth patterns would impose significant infrastructure costs and be difficult to service with public transport.</li> <li>11. The submitter requests the following evidence: a summary table showing rough</li> </ol> |                              |

allocation in the proposed strategy by phase of industrial and commercial land; justification around the phasing of residential areas; why additional sites and growth are away from main settlements; additional infrastructure required to support this strategy and funding from WDC and developers (overview map); any limitations on access to 3 Waters and transport (access points and PT); schemes for active travel and reduced car travel; community infrastructure and clarify what is a "priority growth investment zone" is.

12. The submitter seeks more detail on dwelling and industrial land yields to allow a better understanding of growth for future travel demand in line with policy - 4.2.3.

13. The submitter provides the following specific feedback:

Tuakau - 04.1 Identified intensification and no short-term proposal for a new rail station.

Pokeno - 04.2 and 04.3 rationale for the identification of commercial and industrial land release, access to rail and roading not shown correctly, particularly the expressway.

Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi - 04.4 rationale for commercial and industrial land allocations is unclear, and the SH2 corridor is extremely sensitive. Acknowledgement that these areas will come under pressure, but needs to indicate servicing and that it does not have significant constraints.

Te Kauwhata 04.6 The submitter supports the employment areas in this settlement, with an opportunity to identify active mode links.

Huntly and Ohinewai - 04.7 The submitter questions the isolated industrial and commercial allocation in these areas and its location adjacent to SH1 and it is inconsistent with the GPS and RPS. Ohinewai is not a site conducive to active modes and PT.

Taupiri - 04.9 has a large area of industrial and commercial signaled but is isolated, and the infrastructure and rationale for growth are not justified.

Ngaruawahia - 04.10 will need a high-quality active mode shift.

Horotiu - 04.12 Clear links to Ngaruawahia and better descriptions of the transport linkages.

Raglan - 04.13 Identify the risks and resilience issues for intensification given it is a coastal settlement and restrictions to service the area with PT. Consider community infrastructure as part of growth as out-commuting (SH23 to Hamilton) for schooling will continue. The above submission will require further discussion and collaboration with WDC, which should revolve around evidence and justification for the strategy around long-term transport and land use integration.



## Hearing

### Verbal Submission (Nick Gibbons):

Spoke to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport. Welcomes signalling of density around town centres. Would like to see the evidence base that has been used to inform the strategy and in particular the industrial land areas. Would like more references to transport links including public transport and rail. Does not support the Industrial in Pokeno and is unclear on the North bound off-ramp or Industry in Mangatawhiri/Mangatangi. Does not support the Industrial in Ohinewai. Mode shift in Ngaruawahia needs to be addressed and Hopuhopu should be included on the Ngaruawahia map. Settlement plans should show proposed dwelling numbers and demand. Would like to continue to work with WDC to improve the strategy. Staging and timing of the infrastructure. Significant Public Transport nodes need to be identified.

### Additional Written Submission:

A powerpoint presentation was shown that the submitter spoke to.

**Submission 4 Transpower New Zealand Ltd**

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 4                          |
| Submitter Name   | Transpower New Zealand Ltd |
| Summary of Submission  |                            |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partially supports the Waikato 2070</li> <li>2. Given the strategy is in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991, it therefore must consider the relevance of the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.</li> <li>3. Supportive of council developing a strategy to provide a long-term plan to achieve livable, thriving and connected communities.</li> <li>4. Seek that section 4 (identifying where and when growth can occur) recognize and provide for the National Grid as required by the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008.</li> <li>5. Seek that the National Grid corridor management approach requiring that no subdivision/development occur within 14-37m wide from the centerline of the National Grid line and applying a 12m National Grid Yard is applied to any development areas.</li> <li>6. Identification of development areas is supported; however identification of the National Grid on the development maps to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised.</li> </ol> |                            |

### Submission 5 Straterra and the Aggregate and Quarry Association

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Submission Number:  | 5  |
| Submitter Name  | Straterra and the Aggregate and Quarry Association |
| Summary of Submission   |  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Waikato 2070 strategy does not acknowledge the importance of the extractive sector, particularly within the Waikato District's economy and employment opportunities, while supporting infrastructure development in other areas of NZ.</li> <li>2. The submitter notes that there is potential to locate unexploited mineral resources that will support a low carbon economy.</li> <li>3. Mineral extraction is highly regulated by the Resource Management Act, Carbon Zero Act and other environmental regulations, and provides a significant economic contribution.</li> <li>4. The submitter seeks that minerals are essential and should be recognized as a direct input into housing, Roading and infrastructure construction that will accommodate the anticipated growth.</li> <li>5. The submitter seeks that there is provision and protection in the Waikato 2070 strategy to enable existing and future mining and aggregate extraction activities.</li> <li>6. The submitter seeks a regime that provides for mineral exploration is important.</li> </ol> |  |

### Submission 6 Genesis Energy Limited

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 6                      |
| Submitter Name   | Genesis Energy Limited |
| Summary of Submission  |                        |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the Waikato 2070 strategy</li> <li>2. Section 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan</li> <li>3. The submitter seeks the inclusion of the Huntly Power Station in the Huntly and Ohinewai Development Area map. This is necessary to provide context to the future growth areas, and ensure any actual/potential environmental effects are identified and addressed at the strategic growth planning level.</li> </ol> |                        |

### Submission 7 Heritage New Zealand

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 7                    |
| Submitter Name   | Heritage New Zealand |
| Summary of Submission  |                      |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for the whole strategy with amendments.</li> <li>2. Amendment sought: General - Strategy amended to provide greater background detail and references to development documents and the links to Blueprints needs better alignment.</li> <li>3. Submission looks for more understanding of the contribution of cultural and history heritage in the future urban form –</li> <li>4. Section 02.0 for better alignment with implementation methods submitter seeks to create a cascade of consideration related to history heritage through the strategy especially in relation to all identities. Amend section 02.0 to reflect and consider that all heritage places and structures are to be considered as part of the districts history and to be regarded as opportunities and elements must be treasured and protected.</li> <li>5. Section 03.03 supports this section. Consider that a greater level of leadership and guidance is required to achieve the intentions under the implementation section of section 03.3 i.e. after identification how will heritage be protected or reflected in development.</li> <li>6. Consistency of language needs to be reviewed. Sections need to be amended to reflect the range of parties involved in heritage tourism and there would be benefit in a definition of heritage tourism.</li> <li>7. Seek the following: 1. "Protect our finite natural, heritage from loss of values." 2. "Ensure ....reflects <del>this history</del> natural, cultural and built heritage of the area and site, through the involvement of natural, cultural and built heritage experts in the early design phrase of structure plans or similar preliminary phrases of design",</li> <li>8. Support sustainable tourism ... work in partnership with Iwi, Tourism, and heritage agencies ... in a meaningful manner, whilst ensuring important sites and their intrinsic values retained."</li> <li>9. Identification and mapping of cultural and historic heritage: Support for this section. In relation to section 04.0 of this section wishes to understand if areas signaled for development have already been investigated in terms of heritage and any constraints this could pose. Supports preliminary investigation prior to the development for meaningful preservation as opposed to an ad hoc approach at a later stage and utilize already undertaken research.</li> <li>10. Seeks the following: amend the Glossary to include a new defined term "historic heritage" to encompass those cultural and built heritage places and items envisaged to be protected as identified in Section 03.3 Embrace our identity.</li> <li>11. Amend glossary for definition of heritage tourism as follows: "Travelling to experience</li> </ol> |                      |

the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past."

12. In relation to mapping amend Strategy to include a mapping system related to the defined term "historic heritage "to encompass those cultural and built heritage places and items envisaged to be protected as identified in Section 03.3 Embrace our identity.
13. Incentivizing the use, restoration and conservation of heritage - submitter discusses the range of options available both monetary and non-monetary and considers these should be given strong consideration in the strategy for implementing the plan.
14. Considers the implementation methods. Embrace our Identity need to be amended to include a further method related to the development of and incentives strategy to support the retention and conservation of cultural and history heritage which could include information relating to both Council and other agencies and processes to preserve heritage.
15. Seek an additional measure in "Celebrate our history" 4 Develop an information and incentives strategy to advise and support landowners and developers protect and retain cultural and historic heritage.
16. Conclusion: HNZPT considers that a greater level of clarity needs to be provided in the strategy as to the nature of the cultural and historic heritage resource that is envisaged to be protected at the time of development and redevelopment to provide certainty that the intentions of the Blueprints are being met. In addition improved certainty around expectations relating to the protection of the finite cultural and historic heritage resource in the context of appropriate development would send a strong signal that development needs to retain cultural and history heritage in a meaningful manner.

### Submission 8 Waikato Regional Council

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 8                        |
| Submitter Name   | Waikato Regional Council |
| Summary of Submission  |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for the whole strategy with amendments. Include a constraints and opportunity map and associated assessment for each identified area (including numerical analysis). Include town center detail for Ngaruawahia. Include detail on why less growth is proposed for Ngaruawahia than previously identified. Remove growth areas identified in the strategy that are contrary to Future Proof and the WRPS.</li> <li>2. Amend whole of strategy to show more detail on the following;</li> <li>3. Current supply and demand for residential and commercial land -Projected demand for residential and commercial land</li> <li>4. Area (e.g. number of hectares), intended density, and potential yields from each area</li> <li>5. Potential yields from infill versus yields from greenfield.</li> <li>6. Intended densities and potential yield per stage</li> <li>7. Summary table with potential yield per time period for all locations</li> <li>8. Indicative priority areas for infrastructure provision and place making/community building initiatives</li> <li>9. Implementation plan including triggers/precursors to development</li> <li>10. Analysis of consistency with the NPS-UDC</li> <li>11. Clarify whether the intention for other settlements not included in the strategy is for no further expansion.</li> <li>12. Identify growth areas that are subject to residual risk and include acknowledgement that further investigation is required and that this may limit development in these areas.</li> <li>13. Further consider the impact of proposed growth areas on areas of high class soils.</li> <li>14. Include detail on the further work required to validate the future growth areas, particularly in relation to impacts on drainage networks. Include a section on implementation.</li> <li>15. Remove areas identified for growth longer than ten years from the Proposed District Plan.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal Submission (Miffy Foley):</p> <p>Supports the Strategy. Would like to see inclusion of demographic information and the demand to support the strategy. Useful to signal the intent for the areas that have not been signalled for growth so the community knows that they might not grow. The final strategy should be consistent with the policy direction set in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. More emphasis needs to be put on the Environment, High Class soils (growth cells in Tuakau) and</p> |                          |

flood risk areas identified. It would be useful to have an opportunity and constraints map for each area. Supports the town centre plans and would like to see a town centre plan for Ngaruawahia and the growth in Ngaruawahia seems inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement. Some of the growth areas identified are at odds with the direction in the Regional Policy Statement and Future Proof e.g. Ohinewai, and Te Kowhai. Storm water catchment management plans are required for drainage areas and the impacts on the drainage network should be factored into infrastructure calculations. Would like to see the implementation phase and how a growth area becomes reality. I.e. Structure plan, DC's, catchment management plans - a diagram may be helpful. The number of areas identified for growth seems like too many and we may be spreading ourselves too thin on the ground.

Additional Written Submission:

A powerpoint presentation was shown that the submitter spoke to.

**Submission 9 Judy Arnstad**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Submission Number:   | 9            |
| Submitter Name   | Judy Arnstad |
| Summary of Submission  |              |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre.</li> <li>2. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load.</li> <li>3. Support retention of 450m2 for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>4. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library.</li> <li>5. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>6. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |              |



**Submission 10 Arnstad**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Submission Number:  | 10          |
| Submitter Name  | Ron Arnstad |
| Summary of Submission   |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre.</li> <li>2. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load.</li> <li>3. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>4. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library.</li> <li>5. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>6. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 11 GD Jones**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Submission Number:   | 11       |
| Submitter Name   | GD Jones |
| Summary of Submission  |          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend proposal to allow for growth between 10-30 years in Tuakau, particularly for the area along Dominion Road and with a "future urban" zoning.</li> </ol> |          |

**Submission 12 Synlait Milk**

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Submission Number:  | 12           |
| Submitter Name  | Synlait Milk |
| Summary of Submission   |              |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support strategic purpose of the whole proposal, in particular, for future growth with the provision of infrastructure for urban land development to avoid loss in efficient transport and Council services.</li> <li>2. Support vision for livable, thriving and connected communities, both digitally and physically (roads, rails, cycle ways and walkways).</li> <li>3. Support avoidance of costly development patterns across the whole district. Protect heavy industrial areas from encroachment of sensitive activities and restriction of operational activities.</li> <li>4. Support statements within the whole proposal that protect highly-productive soils.</li> <li>5. Support 03.1 Grow Our Communities.</li> <li>6. Support 03.2 Build Our Businesses.</li> <li>7. Submitter has particular interest in 04.2 Pokeno Development and 04.3 Pokeno Town Centre Plan, referring to their submission on the Pokeno Blueprint.</li> <li>8. Apply symbol for the Pokeno Industrial Cluster to land on the south side of McDonald Road.</li> <li>9. Consider the potential for reverse sensitivity on submitters manufacturing facility in Pokeno.</li> </ol> |              |

**Submission 13 Diamond Creek Farms Limited**

|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 13                          |
| Submitter Name  | Diamond Creek Farms Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DCF supports the general intent of the strategy. However, although Section 4 identifies the growth areas within the district there is no information in the strategy as to how these growth areas have been identified. It appears to have adopted the same growth areas that are identified in the Future Proof Strategy.</li> <li>2. The Strategy fails to recognize various areas in the district that have the potential to grow and can support future development and growth within the region. Council needs to be more proactive in terms of identifying areas that have the potential for growth. Some villages within the district have existing facilities and these should be considered as part of any growth strategy for rural residential areas. Te Uku is one of those villages but is outside areas identified by the Futureproof Strategy. DCF owns 43 hectares of land which forms part of the settlement of Te Uku.</li> <li>3. The submission seeks that Te Uku is identified in the strategy as a growth area and that DCF's land is identified in Te Uku where rural residential activity can occur in a 1-3 year development timeframe. Te Uku is close to Raglan and has transport links to both Raglan and Hamilton. Creation into a larger village would ease pressure on the development in Raglan whilst providing a good lifestyle area.</li> <li>4. The surrounding properties within Te Uku comprise a mixture of Rural and Rural-Residential size allotments that do not conform with any planned rural residential development. DCF's land is well suited to rural lifestyle living and should be rezoned to Village Zone. The land provides the opportunity for a rural residential lifestyle in a location already served by a primary school, regular bus service and close transport links to Hamilton without compromising its growth or the Transport corridor to Auckland. DCF also owns over 200 hectares of land directly opposite the southern side of SH 23 to the south. DCF currently farms two properties as one unit but is finding it increasingly difficult due to SH23 separating the farm.</li> <li>5. The overall size, topography and location of streams and wetland areas restricts the use of the site as well. DCF has already undertaken some subdivisions of lifestyle blocks in the Rural zone and is enhancing wetland areas in and around those new blocks and continue to propose environmental enhancement along Matakotea stream.</li> <li>6. Rezoning would therefore ensure efficient use of a land resource, enable more efficient and appropriate development, enable a self-sufficient low-density rural lifestyle development, ensure other more productive larger rural allotments and provide a planned alternative to current ad hoc subdivision proposals.</li> </ol> |                             |
| Hearing   |                             |

Verbal submission (Joan Forret):

Would like Country Living or Village zoning for their property. They would like to grow the Te Uku village.

### Submission 14 Horotiu Properties Limited

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 14                         |
| Submitter Name  | Horotiu Properties Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                            |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HPL supports the general intent of the Strategy.</li> <li>2. However, it fails to recognize various areas in the district that have the potential to grow and can support future development and growth within the region. There is also no information in the Strategy as to how these growth areas have been identified and it appears to have adopted the same growth areas identified in the Future Proof Strategy.</li> <li>3. The strategy restricts the residential activity to a small area in Horotiu. HPL owns land at Sullivan Road, Horotiu.</li> <li>4. The submission seeks that HPL's land is identified in the strategy as an area in Horotiu where residential activity can occur in a 1-3 year development timeframe. The land is an ideal location for a planned Village zone because: (a) it is too small and does not contain appropriate infrastructure for it to be considered a productive rural property (b) it is bounded by roads on three sides, two of them being arterial routes which places significant constraints on access and the ability to increase the land holding, thus ruling out the ability to enable rural productive activities (c) It has a unique topography comprising 60% flat land with the remaining land moderate to steeply sloping as well as an artificial water course 3000m<sup>2</sup> in area. Thus a significant portion of the site is already restricted in its suitability. (d) Faces security issues in relation stock as there is no site supervision and (e) Environment is predominantly lifestyle blocks which could raise reverse sensitivity concerns.</li> <li>5. HPL's land is currently leased as an additional run-off for a local farmer. There have been stock losses from the land, and the rental from the lease barely covers the annual rates bill and the arrangement is not sustainable. Futureproof identified Horotiu as a rural village with a residential density of 8-110 dwellings per hectare, which is consistent with enabling a village zoning not currently proposed in Horotiu. Substantial industrial growth is anticipated however the density targets are not provided for and land for housing is required.</li> <li>6. The HPL land provides a high amenity residential environment in close proximity to future employment opportunities, which is particularly relevant as the strategy proposes an industrial park in Horotiu in 3-10 years.</li> <li>7. Rezoning the land to Village zone will mean a more efficient use of the land, provide significant economic wellbeing of the owner and council via additional development contributions and rates. Sustainable addition of housing will be provided over above that otherwise anticipated, which provides much needed demand and variety of product. The HPL property is also appropriately located in close proximity to the existing Horotiu village.</li> </ol> |                            |

Hearing

Verbal submission:

Would like the site identified for Village zoning. The land is no longer productive and already surrounded by lifestyle sections.

**Submission 15 Meredith MacKenzie**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 15                 |
| Submitter Name   | Meredith MacKenzie |
| Summary of Submission  |                    |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter seeks the recreation use of beaches, particularly for horse riding.</li> </ol> |                    |

**Submission 16 Malibu Hamilton**

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Submission Number:   | 16              |
| Submitter Name   | Malibu Hamilton |
| Summary of Submission  |                 |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the purpose of the Waikato 2070 strategy</li> <li>2. The submitter seeks to ensure our towns offer employment and housing choice, particularly within Whaingaroa (Raglan).</li> <li>3. The submitter seeks that the Waikato 2070 endeavors to promote the Blueprint initiatives for Whaingaroa which includes increasing the local economy by the creation of a business hub for high tech promotion and exchange.</li> <li>4. The submitter notes that some small scale developments are able to create their own infrastructure services and should not be prohibited.</li> <li>5. The submitter supports the need to protect key industry sectors due to economic wealth creation and employment opportunities but maintains that industry does have the responsibility to operate in a manner that embraces social, cultural and environmental wellbeing.</li> <li>6. The submitter supports the intent of industrial and business clusters that may possibly be set up to utilise the product of another industry resulting in a closed-loop system.</li> <li>7. The submitter notes that tourism in Whaingaroa (Raglan) needs assistance from Waikato District Council to foster employment and manage peak season issues.</li> <li>8. The submitter supports the aim to partner with local hapu/iwi to achieve their aspirations and protect our history with sustainable and resilient land use pattern</li> <li>9. The submitter supports the direction to increase capability and capacity for the communities benefit and the direction to build a resilient local workforce.</li> <li>10. The submitter notes that the ten implementation points if pursued could result in achieving the vision of a thriving community that boosts employment levels and positive outcome.</li> <li>11. The submitter seeks that WDC work with the community board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special character as identified in the Blueprints.</li> <li>12. The submitter supports the ring fencing of high class soils from subdivisions and</li> </ol> |                 |

industrial development, however it is crucial we set aside land use for the horticultural and agricultural sectors that produce our food sources, but are also eco-friendly. The submitter notes that it is crucial to set in place local production for local areas and to reduce the carbon footprint of food travel miles.

#### Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan

13. The submitter supports the current 10m height in the Raglan CBD, and would like to maintain the CBD area identified in Plan Change 14 along with the Business overlay of Bankart Street and 8, 10 and 12 Wainui Road, however there is concern that current character will not be retained.

14. The submitter opposes the use of Gilmour Street as a main thoroughfare due to the potential adverse effects on health and safety of users on Gilmour Street and Stewart Street. It is inappropriate to use Gilmour Street as a main thoroughfare. Bankart Street was designed to take the heavier weight load and facilitate a safer pathway for traffic to use.

#### Section 04.4 Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi Development Plan

15. The submitter notes that the ring fencing of Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi for future commercial and industrial purposes is at odds with restricting development on rural land.

16. The submitter supports the retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones and retaining the bus station in front of the Raglan Public Library as it is well established and fits into the existing traffic patterns.

17. The submitter supports the advancement of the WDC Trail Strategy 2016, particularly the trails identified as Raglan Coast/Raglan Town Centre/Raglan West High 201 Ragland Coast/Raglan East/Raglan West/ Te Uku High 208 Raglan Coast/Ragland Heads. They will reduce the use of cars and therefore result in lower emissions and a sustainable outcome.

18. The submitter seeks recognition and need for public transport within Raglan.

19. The submitter seeks that the council could assist the township by focusing on issues for Whaingaroa (Raglan) population growth and for peak tourist season that results in a lack of car parks, public transport to and from the reserves, beaches and Hamilton. There is potential for electric vehicles, bikes, share ride projects and shuttle services to ease congestion and reduce adverse climate effects.

20. The submitter seeks that the Council promote, encourage and assist developers in achieving home star ratings of 6 or more and Green star ratings for commercial developments during construction and for ongoing performance.

21. The submitter seeks the development of a structure/spatial plan for Raglan to manage the adverse effects to support community aspirations and sustainable management of natural resources. More robust planning is needed to avoid ad-hoc investment and piecemeal development patterns and reduce the inefficient use of natural and physical resources.



- 22. The submitter supports the focus on the social infrastructure as described in the glossary and considers that planning for land use to provide for hospitals, education and public facilities are part of the fabric for social needs.
- 23. The seeks recognition of the need for wastewater, storm water and drinking water required to support the increased summer and overall population and promote ecological and environmental protection and restoration.
- 24. The submitter notes that growth should be balanced and weighed against the costs to the infrastructure network and inserting the words wastewater, storm water and drinking water into the infrastructure section of the Waikato 2070 is prudent.

**Submission 17 Cynthia Tucker**

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Submission Number:   | 17             |
| Submitter Name   | Cynthia Tucker |
| Summary of Submission  |                |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre.</li> <li>2. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare.</li> <li>3. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load.</li> <li>4. Support retention of 450m2 for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>5. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified.</li> <li>6. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ul> |                |

**Submission 18 LIC**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Submission Number:  | 18  |
| Submitter Name  | LIC |
| Summary of Submission   |     |
| <p>Focus areas 03.2 (Build over Businesses) and 03.3 (Embrace our Identity)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter supports building on existing industrial clusters and the promotion of the clustering of complementary business.<br/>Focus area 03.3 (Embrace our Identity)</li> <li>2. The submitter supports restricting industrial zones in rural areas.<br/>Focus area 03.2 (Build over Businesses)</li> <li>3. The submitter opposes rezoning of existing rural land for secondary industrial purposes.</li> </ol> |     |

**Submission 19 Waikare Lake Care Group**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 19                      |
| Submitter Name   | Waikare Lake Care Group |
| Summary of Submission  |                         |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend 04.6 Te Kauwhata Development Plan to dig a 20 metre canal from the Waikato River south of Ohinewai into the south western corner of Lake Waikare.</li> </ol> |                         |

**Submission 20 Angela**

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Submission Number:   | 20     |
| Submitter Name   | Angela |
| Summary of Submission  |        |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend 04.6 Te Kauwhata Development Plan to extend commercial land use on Wayside Road, Te Kauwhata.</li> </ol> |        |

**Submission 21 Ute Moerchen Ludwig**

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 21                  |
| Submitter Name  | Ute Moerchen Ludwig |
| Summary of Submission   |                     |
| <p>1. Reference to Train Station in 04.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan.</p> |                     |

**Submission 22 Mercury**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Submission Number:   | 22      |
| Submitter Name   | Mercury |
| Summary of Submission  |         |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mercury supports the Waikato 2070</li> <li>2. Focus area 03.3 (Embrace our Identity)</li> <li>3. The submitter has a direct interest within this focus area, particularly with the directive "Protect our environment" and the implementation measures "Promote ecological and environmental protection and restoration" and "Restrict residential development in areas at risk from natural hazards". The submitter advocates that land use activities located on low lying land should not be subjected to intolerable levels of flood risk. Development and urban growth need to be cognizant of such risks, which represent both a potential health and safety issue and an economic constraint.</li> <li>4. The submitter notes that it is not clear what analysis has been done to identify all of the relevant economic constraints and factors, which will ultimately determine whether council's growth visions can be realised.</li> <li>5. The submitter notes that the delivery of essential infrastructure must be efficient and strategically planned for. Where infrastructure is provided reactively to respond to development proposals, the delivery of infrastructure is likely to incur high capital and operational costs and be inefficient.</li> <li>6. The submitter also notes that there is a need for social services associated with urban development.</li> <li>7. The submitter notes that targeted rates are a fair and equitable way of recovering costs from those who directly benefit from the provision of public assets or services.</li> </ol> |         |

**Submission 23 Rudy Van Dam**

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Submission Number:  | 23           |
| Submitter Name  | Rudy Van Dam |
| Summary of Submission   |              |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support submission by Howard Lovell which involves rezoning his farm to residential.</li> <li>2. Amend the whole proposal to describe Taupiri as Alive Vibrant Dynamic Affordable Fresh Clean Attractive in the future.</li> <li>3. See submission for map of requested land use areas.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Rudy Van Dam):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rudy Van Dam read out written submission.</li> <li>2. Taupiri Community Board and local iwi are also in support of Rudy's submission.</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seeks better connections to the river, enlarged open space, including floating jetty</li> <li>2. Seeks land zoned for employment purposes, commercial and industrial; more opportunity for commercial and industry parks</li> <li>3. Seeks extension of river cycleway to Taupiri and Bridge over the river to the Hakarimata Ranges</li> <li>4. Promote maori heritage</li> <li>5. Town centre should be centralised around the dairy factory and possible new train station, maintain cluster of educational facilities and move neighbouring commercial premises to new commercial zone</li> <li>6. Create a new main road into Taupiri to be a new 'front door' to the town</li> <li>7. Extension of residential zone to 70ha with a mix of density to yield 1400 section.</li> <li>8. Articulates a vision for Taupiri's future</li> <li>9. Maps were presented on screen to show the area the submitter spoke to.</li> </ol> |              |

**Submission 24 Simon Upton & Bhaady Miller**

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 24                          |
| Submitter Name   | Simon Upton & Bhaady Miller |
| Summary of Submission  |                             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Strategy should be placed on hold until the public has an opportunity to view the Hamilton-Waikato Metropolitan Area Spatial Plan. This strategy and the Hamilton Metro Plan have to be coherent and residents should be able to comment on whether Waikato 2070 is adequately integrated with the Hamilton plan.</li> <li>2. The matters in section 2 relating to the environment and landscape should be reformulated.</li> <li>3. In section 3, the environment deserves to be a focus area in its own right. It is about more than identity.</li> <li>4. Waikato 2070's growth agenda should seek to be based on organic growth rather than be driven by overflow pressures from Hamilton (and Auckland). If towns are to retain their identity and support an urban form that is not reliant on long-distance commuting, then they cannot provide 'dormitory services' for these large centres.</li> <li>5. The Strategy correctly identifies the problem, but no evidence is provided that its development plans are doing anything other than accommodate business-as-usual commuter growth.</li> <li>6. The Strategy says almost nothing about what sort of growth its largest industry – agriculture – is likely to experience and the implications of climate policies for land use change and rural communities. This omission should be corrected.</li> <li>7. There is a need to address the relationship between urban areas and surrounding rural land. The draft Strategy is written exclusively from the point of view of accommodating urban expansion. There needs to be an equally clear account of the on-going integrity of rural spaces.</li> <li>8. Specifically, the Strategy should make it clear that its long-run goal is to preserve the identity of the four towns immediately north of Hamilton – Te Kowhai, Horotiu, Ngaruawahia and Taupiri – and maintain green and rural amenities around these centres. A single Hamilton to Taupiri conurbation should be expressly disavowed."</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal Submission (Grant Eccles):</p> <p>Simons welcomes the presence of the strategy. There is no mention of the challenges facing food and fibre industry or climate change. Forestation: also silent on this point. The strategy is general and does not talk to the individuality of the towns and villages. Would like to see urban limits imposed so that there is a hard and fast line of where growth and development occurs. Waikato 2070 should be considered at the same time as the metro plan. Towns in WDC</p> |                             |

should not be dormitory suburbs of Hamilton City. Towns should be intensified and not grown out. The practical details of the strategy need to match the high level objectives identified.

**Submission 25 Fiona Scott**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Submission Number:   | 25          |
| Submitter Name   | Fiona Scott |
| Summary of Submission  |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the whole proposal to include horse riding areas for the long term.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 26 Tainui Group Holdings**

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 26                    |
| Submitter Name  | Tainui Group Holdings |
| Summary of Submission   |                       |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tainui supports growth and will look to invest where appropriate. Note this strategy is for 50 years and urge the council to be bold in its undertakings and try to get ahead of growth while being innovative.<br/>Section 04.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan</li> <li>2. Hopuhopu is a significant development for Waikato-Tainui now and into the future. While identified as a Special Activity Precinct, more explicit recognition of its long-term future as a: Sports and Recreation Hub; World Class Conferencing and Business Precinct; World Class Heritage and Cultural Centre; Housing and Community Development is requested</li> <li>3. Section 04.5 Meremere, Mercer Development Plan: Waikato 2070 should reflect the significant potential of Meremere A for a waste management centre of excellence given its locational advantages, transport infrastructure and existing land use history. The strategy should also indicate the need for suitable infrastructure to support such activities including heavy power, water and transport connectivity.</li> <li>4. Section 04.5 Meremere B, Mercer Development Plan: Waikato 2070 should recognise the long-term possibility of the Hampton Downs-Meremere location (west of SH1) to further accommodate appropriate large-scale activities hard to locate in urban areas. This locality currently comprises a hub of such land uses i.e. motorsports park, regional landfill, regional prison and drag strip.</li> <li>5. Rotowaro locality is identified as an area with potential for long term industrial development given its infrastructure, location and industrial heritage.</li> </ol> |                       |

## Hearing

### Verbal Submission (Brain Croad and Manaaki Nepia):

Supports and strategy and highlights that this is the chance for Waikato District to be bold and take the opportunity to own the direction that the district takes in the future. Supports the Strategy is disappointed on how Meremere has been identified in the strategy. Meremere A supports development of this site but would like services to be available so that it can be developed into a waste management centre of excellence. Meremere B should be identified in the Strategy. Investigation for its future use needs to be completed but it should still be identified. Hopuhopu is an important investment for the tribe and will be a focus and needs to be included as part of the economic growth. Hopuhopu should be highlighted as a tourism and economic hub. Rotowaro land that Tainui purchased has potential and would like this to also be identified in the strategy.

**Submission 27 Pokeno Village Holdings Limited**

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 27                              |
| Submitter Name  | Pokeno Village Holdings Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                                 |
| <p>1. Pokeno Village Holdings Ltd (PVHL) has been instrumental in the development of Pokeno to date and is continuing to develop land at Pokeno known as the Pokeno Village Estate and the Pokeno Gateway Business Park. PVHL formed the majority of a landowner consortium (comprising Dines Group, Fulton Hogan, Hynds Pipe Systems and Winstone Aggregates) which authored The Pokeno Structure Plan 2008 (“PSP”). This private plan change became PC24 to the Franklin District Plan which provided for the insertion of the PSP into the District Plan. It became operative in 2010. In 2018 the PSP area was amended via PC21 (also prepared by PVHL) which zoned additional land in the south of Pokeno for residential development. The submitter has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Clarify the purpose of the Draft Strategy and its relationship with other statutory planning documents;</li> <li>(b) The timing of the release of the Draft Strategy, part way through hearings on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“PWDP”);</li> <li>(c) In respect of the Pokeno Development Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Details of the technical analysis</li> <li>(ii) How the Pokeno and Surrounds Spatial Plan influenced the development Plan; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>(d) The timing and duration of the consultation period.</li> </ul> <p><b>PURPOSE OF THE DRAFT STRATEGY AND RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS</b></p> <p>2. The precise purpose of the Draft Strategy and its relationship to other statutory planning documents is unclear from the text. In particular, it is unclear how the Strategy relates to the relevant RMA planning documents and Future Proof Strategy. The development pattern for Pokeno set out in the Draft Growth Strategy is not consistent with that provided for in the PWDP. PVHL therefore submits that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Finalisation of the future development areas shown in the Draft Strategy should be placed on hold until the outcomes of the PWDP process are known;</li> <li>(b) The Draft Strategy should be amended to include a comprehensive explanation of its relationship with other planning documents, including Future Proof and the spatial plans prepared under the Hamilton – Auckland Corridor Initiative.</li> </ul> <p><b>FUTURE GROWTH AREAS - POKENO</b> The Draft Strategy includes 50-year “Development<br/> PVHL submission: 4.13 PVHL therefore submits that the Draft Strategy should be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Acknowledge that the development of future growth areas will need further technical consideration and economic analysis before development can occur;</li> <li>(b) Acknowledge that the proposed staging of land release will need further</li> </ul> |                                 |



- technical consideration and economic analysis; and
- (c) Include the Pokeno Spatial Plan and details of how the Development Plan gives effect to it.

#### CONSULTATION – TIMING AND PROCESS

Submissions on the Draft Strategy opened on 13 November 2019 and closed on 24 January 2020 (including a one week extension), sitting across the annual holiday period. Inevitably, calling for submissions over the holiday period will reduce public participation and engagement. This is a very tight timeframe to make decisions on such important strategic matters with broad implications. PVHL requests that the timetable is amended to delay hearings until after decisions on the PWDP have been released.

#### Hearing

#### Verbal Submission (Colin Botica):

1. Should Pokeno grow beyond its current boundaries? No it should not. The intention is that Pokeno is a rural village.
2. Commends that council is looking at employment as well as residential so that jobs are provided for and it is not just a continued commuter town.
3. Employment zoned land is critical for each town and so if Pokeno is to grow further then it is a must.
4. Growing to the east could prove challenging in respect to urban design and how it connects to the town but this could be resolved with good planning and connections.

**Submission 28 Hamilton Older Riders Social Equitable Club**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Submission Number:  | 28   |
| Submitter Name  | Hamilton Older Riders Social Equitable Club (Horse Club) |
| Summary of Submission   |  |
| <p>1. Amend the whole proposal to consider the following; - a range of different environments for equines to train -more bridle trails and public places to ride equines around the district -allowing horses to ride on the beach for the social interaction of both horse and rider with the public. Amend whole of proposal to consider the following compromise for horses to be ridden on beaches in Raglan; Dec-Feb: No access between 9am and 5pm; March-May: No access between 10am and 4pm; June-Aug: No restriction on access; Sep-Nov: No access between 10am and 4pm.</p> |  |

**Submission 29 Jean Tregida**

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Submission Number:   | 29            |
| Submitter Name   | Jean Tregidga |
| Summary of Submission  |               |
| <p>1. Partially supports the Waikato 2070 strategy</p> <p>2. Section 01.3 Our District: This section needs to recognise that this district is also home to a large area of significant indigenous vegetation.</p> <p>3. Section 02.1 Our Natural Environment: Do not take away private property rights in natural landscapes</p> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission:</p> <p>1. Circulated a pack about forestry and various other evidence.</p> <p>2. Spoke about the history of her family's land, biodiversity and the Tourism of the area.</p> <p>3. The focus areas are good and believes that her land provides for this and should not be locked up from forestry.</p> <p>Additional written submission(s):</p> <p>1. Provides a range of background documents detailing the history related to the property, family and forestry interests and achievements</p> <p>2. Provides copies of submissions and presentations used elsewhere</p> <p>3. NZ Herald article which identifies the Mangatawhiri stream, Waipa River and Waikato River as 'worst spots' due to pollution from farming</p> |               |

**Submission 30 Northgate Industrial Park Ltd and Northgate Development Ltd**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Submission Number:  | 30  |
| Submitter Name  | Northgate Industrial Park Ltd and Northgate Development Ltd |
| Summary of Submission   |   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the intent of the proposal, in particular 04.12 Horotiu Development Plan.</li> <li>2. Implement 04.12 Horotiu Development Plan as currently provided for.</li> <li>3. Support the Industrial Zone proposed in Horotiu as in 04.12 Horotiu Development Plan.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal Submission (Kathryn Drew):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Waikato is seeing a demand for large format Industrial sites.</li> <li>2. The existing operative plan staged industrial zoning has been brought forward, the uptake rate has the potential to outstrip the supply.</li> <li>3. Northgate along with the adjoining land owner Dixon property would like the area signalled for Industrial and supports the growth cell in Horotiu.</li> <li>4. Infrastructure has already been invested so this should be utilised.</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission (Powerpoint):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Powerpoint presentation was displayed outlining what was discussed in the submitters verbal submission.</li> <li>2. Northgate supports Section 04.12 of the Growth Strategy as it relates to Horotiu.</li> <li>3. The land shown for future industrial development includes the Dixon land and 1 other major landowner.</li> <li>4. It's logical to expand industrial zones on land adjoining an industrial zone and where infrastructure can be extended to service the land.</li> <li>5. Council has and is heavily investing in Horotiu. Expansion in this location makes good financial sense.</li> <li>6. The major landowner (Dixon) is supportive of industrial zoning.</li> <li>7. We are seeing an increased need for larger industrial zoned sites, which means industrial land supply is going to be used up faster.</li> <li>8. Identification of this area within the Growth Strategy helps support future opportunities to develop the land for industrial purposes.</li> </ol> |   |

**Submission 31 Dorothy Derecourt and David McKeown**

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 31                                  |
| Submitter Name   | Dorothy Derecourt and David McKeown |
| Summary of Submission  |                                     |
| <p>1. Oppose Hopuhopu Business Park in 04.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan.</p> |                                     |

**Submission 32 Allen Fabrics Ltd (Murray Hammond Allen)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Submission Number:   | 32                                       |
| Submitter Name   | Allen Fabrics Ltd (Murray Hammond Allen) |
| Summary of Submission  |  |
| <p>1. Amend the Kimihia Lakes Special Activity Zone Development Time Frame to 3-10 years.</p> <p>2. Potential to investigate Kimihia Lakes for water storage for the Waikato District</p>  |  |
| Hearing  |  |
| Verbal submission:   |  |
| Additional written submission(s):  |  |
| <p>1. Amend the Kimihia Lakes Special Activity Zone Development Time Frame to 3-10 years.</p> <p>2. Concentrate on providing, protecting and pushing the location advantages for Ngaruawahia to Mercer for recreation</p> <p>3. Build our towns up, not out, to protect natural resources</p> <p>4. provide a river and seven lakes walk/cycle way</p> <p>5. Support tourism land uses which provide employment opportunities for Huntly</p> <p>6. Would like more detail regarding future business composition, industry sectors and council investment to support economic growth</p> <p>7. Would like more detail regarding the implementation measures and how integration will be achieved in respect to growth planning and investment</p> |  |

### Submission 33 Ministry of Education

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 33                    |
| Submitter Name  | Ministry of Education |
| Summary of Submission   |                       |
| <p>1. The Ministry of Education (the Ministry) is the Government’s lead advisor on the New Zealand education system, shaping direction for education agencies and providers and contributing to the Government’s goals for education and as such is a considerable stakeholder in terms of activities that may impact on educational facilities and assets in the Waikato area. The intent of the Ministry’s submission is therefore to ensure that the Draft Waikato 2070 facilitates and supports the development of a range of educational facilities within the Waikato District that will enable the community to meet its educational needs. The Ministry have a particular interest in the following focus areas:</p> <p>Grow our Communities</p> <p>2. The Ministry supports WDC’s direction to ‘Deliver well-planned and people-friendly communities’ and ‘Promote sustainable and cost-effective land-use patterns’. The Ministry also supports the proposed implementation measures set out below: Invest in place-making activities across communities including multi-use trails, greenways, cycle ways and walkways and open spaces and streetscape/public space improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrate land-use and transport to make better use of infrastructure and our transport connections.</li> <li>▪ Leverage existing transport networks, including walking and cycling infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Well situated and appropriately designed passive and active recreation areas.</li> <li>▪ Stage development and be adaptable to future growth scenarios.</li> <li>▪ Ensure connectivity and integration of greenfield development to existing built-form (street-block design).</li> </ul> <p>Build our Business</p> <p>3. The Ministry supports WDC’s direction to ‘Support existing businesses to grow and attract new businesses to the district’ and to ‘Help deliver inclusive growth’. The Ministry also supports the proposed implementation measures set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create regional and local skills training development for our people (build people capital).</li> <li>▪ Create economic and social opportunities that ensure our young people have access to employment and social activities that build a future in the district.</li> </ul> <p>Empower our People</p> <p>4. The Ministry supports WDC’s direction to ‘Increase capability and capacity’ and in particular to ‘Build a resilient local workforce’. The Ministry also supports the proposed implementation measures set out below:</p> |                       |

- Collaborate with health, social and education agencies (emphasis added) to ensure opportunities are not missed for our growing communities.
- Connect communities with agencies to help improve opportunities and outcomes.
- Identify skill requirements for future workforce and champion training programmes to support this.
- Create pipelines of opportunity for all sectors of society to access training and employment opportunities.
- Ensure there are pathways for training and employment opportunities within new and existing businesses within the district.
- Promote our young people as a future workforce.
- Assist Industry to build stronger relationships with education and training providers.

The Ministry requests that WDC engage with the Ministry as a key stakeholder throughout the development of the key growth areas of the district (as well as the other areas of the district that have significant constraints) to ensure that education is considered at a strategic level and aligns with the Ministry's strategy. This will ensure WDC are reaching their long-term goals as the district grows in and achieves their key focus areas.

**Submission 34 NZTE Operations Limited**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 34                      |
| Submitter Name   | NZTE Operations Limited |
| Summary of Submission  |                         |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support overall initiative in setting out a growth and economic development strategy.</li> <li>2. Support population projection for the Te Kowhai area in 04.11 Te Kowhai Development Plan and the recognition of the Airpark as a Special Activity Precinct.</li> <li>3. Oppose timeframe of 10-30 years the Te Kowhai Airpark in 04.11 Te Kowhai Development Plan and amend timeframe to develop the majority of the airpark within 10 years. Te Kowhai Airfield will develop its own onsite infrastructure (Three Waters) and this will be future proofed to connect into any council systems if the opportunities arise over the life of the strategy.</li> <li>4. Amend Sub-Regional Growth map to show Te Kowhai as an existing town or settlement.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports 2070 and gives certainty for Te Kowhai.</li> <li>2. Has concerns around the timeframe for their development and would like the timeframe to be brought forward to the 3-10 year time frame.</li> <li>3. Te Kowhai is missing from pages 24-25 of the strategy.</li> <li>4. Would like to see an infrastructure plan for Te Kowhai.</li> </ol> |                         |

**Submission 35 Patricia Sylvia Ferguson**

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 35                       |
| Submitter Name   | Patricia Sylvia Ferguson |
| Summary of Submission  |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly oppose 4.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan, especially relating to submitters property at Old Taupiri Road.</li> <li>2. Strongly oppose the planned commercial and industrial zones in 4.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan. Consider moving the planned commercial and industrial zones in 4.10 Ngaruawahia Development Plan to the eastern side of Great South Road between Kelm Road and Jew Road.</li> </ol> |                          |

**Submission 36 Auckland Council**

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 36               |
| Submitter Name   | Auckland Council |
| Summary of Submission  |                  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Auckland Council has an interest in ensuring an aligned strategic approach to these cross-boundary issues. Auckland Council supports the vision of the strategy, particularly the inclusion of 'connected communities' and the specific focus on transport and social infrastructure. We also support the Strategy's aim of combining economic and community development aspirations with future land use and infrastructure planning. It is unclear whether the spatial plans currently being developed are a part of the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Initiative or another plan/strategy. It is also unclear how the Strategy fits with/informs the Proposed Waikato District Plan and whether WDC anticipates the need for plan changes to give effect to the Strategy.</li> <li>2. Recommendation 1: as a recent associate member of Future Proof we suggest that greater detail be included on how the strategy fits with and delivers on the Future Proof Growth Strategy.</li> <li>3. Recommendation 2: explain what the Blueprints are and how they relate to the Strategy.</li> <li>4. Recommendation 3: Please include the anticipated population, household and employment growth figure(s) for the district in the Strategy. This could strengthen linkages between anticipated growth, the opportunities this creates and the focus areas, as well as informing Auckland's planning for growth.</li> <li>5. Recommendation 4: Clearly articulate the overall employment story for the district in the strategy and incorporate key information from the district-wide section of the Waikato Blueprint document. It is important to Auckland Council and Auckland Transport that residential growth is matched with employment opportunities so that new residents are not dependent on travelling long distances to employment centres and further demand is not placed on already congested transport networks. It is currently unclear whether the right quantity and quality of business land will be delivered to meet future needs.</li> <li>6. Recommendation 5: Where future business land has been identified, include its approximate area in the development plan, and (where available) an estimated employment count. There is currently little information in the Strategy on the amount of future business land available in the Waikato District and why particular locations have been identified.</li> <li>7. Recommendation 6: Include a list of committed and planned infrastructure projects required to support the anticipated growth and development alongside the development plans. There is a high level of uncertainty about what infrastructure will be required, and whether it will be provided in time for anticipated growth. Thus there is a need to know the likely magnitude of infrastructure investments that will be over the life of the strategy, particularly in the short to medium term.</li> </ol> |                  |



8. Recommendation 7: signal whether alternative funding sources will be required and identify the key implementation agencies/partners. This information would help ensure that cross-boundary infrastructure planning and delivery is aligned and integrated, and in place at the right time to support future growth.
9. Recommendation 8: Ensure the Strategy sufficiently addresses and responds to climate change. The Strategy currently contains very little acknowledgement of and response to climate change. Land use and planning decisions are fundamental to climate action. Many of the goals outlined in the Strategy will go some way towards addressing and responding to climate change. However, Auckland Council suggest that other aspects of the Strategy be further strengthened or reviewed to align with the Strategy's goal of demonstrating climate leadership such as:
  - Ensuring identified business areas are contiguous with existing townships to reduce motor vehicle dependence and leverage existing infrastructure.
  - Including triggers to ensure mass transit and community and social facilities are in place ahead of major urban developments.
  - Avoiding development within areas potentially susceptible to natural hazard risks.

#### Other Matters

10. Auckland Council/AT also makes reference to some cross-boundary considerations and working collaboratively with Waikato District Council. Given the proximity of the townships to Auckland, some Waikato District residents regularly use Auckland Council community facilities. Auckland Council has investigated the need for new facilities to support planned growth in Pukekohe and Paerata, and an interim cost-sharing agreement could provide Waikato residents access to large regional facilities well in advance of when there is enough rating base in Pokeno and Tuakau to support the development of their own facilities. Both Auckland and Waikato and businesses treat the transport connections across the Auckland/Waikato boundary as part of a continuous transport network; it needs to be planned accordingly. Auckland Council seeks to work with WDC to assess the volume and nature of trips across the boundary and establish a process to fund and procure projects that cross the boundary.
11. There is an opportunity in the Strategy to strengthen the recognition of mana whenua interests, namely the interests of relevant mana whenua from Tamaki Makaurau. Such iwi including Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua, Te Ākitai Waiohua Iwi Authority, Ngāti Tamaoho, Waikato-Tainui, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Tamaterā, Ngāti Whanaunga, Te Kawerau ā Maki, Te Ahiwaru and Ngāti Paoa. Mana whenua will likely have a particular interest in urban development outcomes relating to affordable housing, climate action and environmental protection, infrastructure servicing capacity, and provision of employment opportunities.

#### Feedback on Focus Areas

12. 03.1 Grow our communities- Deliver well planned and people-friendly communities  
Item 2 – We support the intention to encourage quality infill developments around future mass transit stations. However, it is critical to ensure that the timing of development is aligned and coordinated with the delivery of mass transit infrastructure and services. It is also important that the overall urban form around station locations provides good amenity and safe walking and cycling connections. Item 6 - We support the intention to ensure that towns offer employment and housing choice, including allowing development up to four storeys in and around town centres.
13. 03.1 Grow our communities- Promote sustainable and cost-effective land- use patterns  
Item 1 – We support the intention to respond to climate change and consider that growth itself is a mechanism to deliver or adapt Infrastructure in a way that increases climate resilience. This does not appear to be covered by the Strategy. Item 3 - We support the intention to integrate land-use and transport to make better use of infrastructure and transport connections. However, it is also important to recognise that there needs to be alignment and coordination between the timing of infrastructure delivery and the sequencing of development. Bulk infrastructure planning and delivery and development planning are two parallel, inter-dependent processes that ensure land is development-ready (refer to Future Urban Land Supply Strategy, Auckland Council, Figure 4). Item 4 - We support the leveraging of existing transport networks, including walking and cycling infrastructure but note the need to assess the capacity of existing networks and provide for the requirements of growth. Item 6 – We support locating future developments to capitalise on existing serviced network infrastructure and facilities. However, it is important to recognise that some infrastructure investment may still be required in these locations.
14. 03.2 Build our businesses- Supporting existing businesses to grow and attract new businesses to the district  
Item 1 - We support the intention to build on existing industrial clusters and promote the clustering of complementary businesses. This will ensure better utilisation of existing business land and provide employment opportunities for new and existing residents. Item 5 - We support the identification of new appropriately located areas for service industries to locate and expand. We suggest that there is a focus on providing larger sites for industries that require large floorplates.
15. 3.3 Embrace our identity- Protect our environment  
Items 1-6 - We support all the identified Focus Areas in this section of the Strategy. North Waikato’s network of wetlands and peat lakes is internationally significant and at risk from a range of land use impacts. The growth of the district will increase demand for access and improvements to a range of natural areas and open spaces. This presents an opportunity to promote environmental enhancement and protection efforts for these areas.
16. We recommend that the following be added (in addition to item 3);
17. “Protect, enhance and promote wetlands, peat lakes and other significant ecological areas”. And, “identify and develop a network of ecological corridors for native species”.

Item 4 - We support encouraging land uses that utilise highly productive land and restricting those uses that reduce them and diminish their quality. However, we recommend that the Strategy emphasize avoiding further fragmentation of highly productive land. This is linked to part 2.2 of the Strategy 'our rich soils'.

#### Feedback on Maps

##### Map- Where the district is situated (page 5)

18. The main settlements included in the Strategy, namely Tuakau, Pokeno, Te Kauwhata, Huntly, Ngaruawahia and Raglan could be highlighted by use of a different colour to represent them in the map.
19. Check that the locations of Papakura and Drury are shown correctly.
20. State Highway 22 from Pukekohe to Drury is not shown, nor is State Highway 3, linking Te Awamutu and Otorohanga with Hamilton.
21. The Hamilton section of the Waikato expressway is not shown, and the Huntly section could be shown as a solid line since it opens in February 2020. This would ensure the map has greater longevity.

##### Map- Natural Environment (pages 16-17)

22. This map is currently split between two pages making it difficult to read and would be better fitted to one page.
23. Map- Sub-Regional Growth (pages 24-25)
24. This map would also be easier to interpret fitted to one page and reduced in scale/extent to show the Waikato District, plus Hamilton and Auckland.
25. The location of existing airports, seaports and land ports (including the Port of Tauranga) could instead be shown on the map 'Where the district is situated' (page 5).
26. Support distinguishing between existing and proposed mass-transit stations (both short and long-term).
27. Suggest the use and location of 'S' and 'P' icons on the map to show existing business clusters be reviewed, perhaps shown alongside the location label.
28. As per map 1, the SH1 Huntly bypass could be shown with a solid line, and the Hamilton section shown as a proposed road.
29. This map could also be used as an index map, identifying the approximate spatial extent of the development plans for each settlement that follow this map.
30. Development Concept Plans
31. General feedback, all development concept plans
32. Suggest that a disclaimer is included clarifying that the development plans are indicative, and the development of these areas and the development timeframes will require structure planning and further technical evaluation and economic analysis, including considering impacts on transport networks.
33. No environmental context, constraints or opportunities are shown on the development plans. Streams, ridgelines, natural hazards, elite and prime soils or other natural features could be shown.

34. Some brief rationale could be included outlining why the development areas have been identified (as per key issue 2, employment).
35. Recommendations 5 and 6 (see key issues) also relate to the development concept plans, for ease of reference they are repeated below –
36. Where future business land has been identified, its approximate area (in hectares) is shown in the development plan, and (where suitable) an estimated employment count.
37. A list of committed and planned infrastructure projects required to support anticipated growth and development is shown alongside the development plans (or reference made to where this information can be found).
38. Pokeno Development Concept & Town Centre Plan • Support the integration with mass transit, east-west connections and identification of streams in the centre plan.
39. We recommend reconsidering commercial/business uses in Pokeno East. This area risks becoming an out-of-centre retail development focused on the highway, which would compromise the development of Pokeno Town Centre.
40. Huntly Development Concept & Town Centre Plan • Note that development is proposed within the catchment of a sensitive receiving environment (Lake Hakanoa).
41. Some of the development areas are established existing urban areas and indicate redevelopment, which could be distinguished from greenfield expansion of urban areas.

**Submission 37 Horticulture New Zealand**

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 37                       |
| Submitter Name   | Horticulture New Zealand |
| Summary of Submission  |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter notes that ideally a growth and economic development strategy should have occurred before the Proposed Plan Change process which is the District's resource management regulatory mechanism to deliver how, where and when growth occurs in the district.</li> <li>2. The submitter notes that there is a lack of clarity with regard to the relationship of this strategy and the Economic Development Plan adopted in 2015/2016, and the broader Future Proof Strategy.</li> <li>3. The submitter notes that a key growing area, the Pukekohe Hub, which straddles the Auckland Region and Waikato District boundary, includes a significant portion within north Waikato (including Tuakau Pokeno, Aka Aka, Te Kohanga, Onewhero and Pukekawa).</li> <li>4. The submitter seeks that land use decisions, particularly those about where urban growth is accommodated, need to be considered in light of food security. This is an important trade-off when highly productive land is concerned; it should not be assumed that horticultural land lost to urban development can be located elsewhere. It is also noted that population growth also generates an increased demand on food supply.</li> <li>5. The draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land must be considered in the Waikato 2070.</li> <li>6. The submitter noted that in the Waikato District Council's Economic Development Plan (2015/2016), the very first sentence reads: "The Waikato Region is synonymous with agriculture and, in particular, food production." This sentiment is not carried into the Waikato 2070.</li> <li>7. Section 01.3 Our District: Amend the vision for a 'livable' district should be amended to recognise values relating to food security.</li> <li>8. Section 01.5 Our Growth, The stages of growth set out in section 01.5 are useful descriptors of the evolving nature of the district, and notably rural production is a strong influencer. However the submitter seeks that recognizing the rising in food production demands locally, nationally and internationally, Pukekohe Hub and awareness of food security concerns in section 01.5.</li> <li>9. Section 02.2 Our Rich Soils The submitter supports the recognition of highly productive soils and the need to protect these from further subdivisions and development. However the submitter seeks that rural production values and food security must be integrated into the vision, and the Pukekohe Hub should, be provided for in section 02.2.</li> <li>10. Section 02.3 Our People The submitter seeks acknowledgement of rural sectors as</li> </ol> |                          |

contributing to the social fabric of the community, and will play a role in maintaining and creating employment opportunities.

11. Section 02.4 Our Climate The submitter seeks that section 02.4 be amended to note the need for rural production systems to be resilient and adaptable, recognising that food production will be affected in both known and unknown ways.
12. Section 02.8 Our Economy The submitter supports the recognition that the rural sector needs to be 'protected, built on and promoted'.
13. Natural Environment Map (p.20) The submitter seeks the inclusion of the Pukekohe hub in the Natural Environment Map
14. Focus Area 3.1 Grow our communities The submitter supports this focus area, particular the direction to "Deliver well-planned and people-friendly communities" and specific points (2) focusing infill development, \*5) higher density development in town centres and (3) support rural communities by maintaining services. The submitter also supports the direction to Promote sustainable and cost-effective land-use patterns, particularly the specific point of (1) recognizing climate change and the need to respond and support the direction of sustainable land use. The submitter also seeks that this point be amended to reference the need to protect the District's high class soils to protect food supply.
15. Focus area 3.2 Build our Businesses The submitter supports the direction to support existing businesses to grow and attract new businesses to the district, particularly the specific point (6) to support primary industries which underpin the Waikato economy.
16. Focus area 3.3 Embrace our Identity The submitter supports the direction to Protect our Environment, particularly the specific points (1) encouraging sustainable and resilient land use patterns, (5) restrict multi-lot residential subdivision in rural areas outside of identified growth areas and (6) clustering of industrial activities outside of the rural area. The submitter also supports the recognition in point (4) that land uses that utilize highly productive land should be encouraged and other uses restricted. However, the submitter seeks the addition of an additional direction that recognizes the particular food production values of the district.
17. Focus area 3.4 Empower our People The submitter supports the directions in this focus area.
18. Section 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan The submitter notes that 57% of the high class soils within the proposed growth cells are located in and around Tuakau, approximately 7.5% of the Pukekohe Hub area. The submitter raises concerns with the location direction of growth and the promotion of low density developments and considers this inappropriate.
19. Section 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan The submitter supports a planning approach that promotes more intensive residential development and thereby a more efficient use of the urban land resource.
20. Sections 04.4 (Mangatawhiri & Mangatangi Development Plan), 04.5 (Meremere, Mercer

Development Plan). 04.6 (Te Kauwhata Development Plan), 04.7 (Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan), 04.9 (Taupiri Development Plan), 04.10 (Ngaruawahia Development Plan) and 04.11 (Te Kowhai Development Plan)

21. The submitter notes that with the exception of Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi, the growth areas do not impact current horticultural areas, however they do intersect with high class soils. The submitted also noted that there is growing horticultural activity occurring in the north western part of the Mangatawhiri growth area(s), and the council should be mindful of any future development.
22. Section 04.11 Te Kowhai Development Plan The submitter notes that there is some horticultural activity occurring in Te Kowhai and high class soils. Development should be mindful of the impacts on existing horticultural land uses and the productive potential of high class soils.

**Submission 38 Future Proof Implementation Committee**

|   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 38                                    |
| Submitter Name  | Future Proof Implementation Committee |
| Summary of Submission   |                                       |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Future Proof is supportive of Waikato 2070 and its approach of providing strategic long term direction for the growth of the District. This will allow Waikato District Council to start prioritising its investment while ensuring that communities are well supported and are thriving places to live.</li> <li>2. There is a significant amount of change occurring at the present time through Central Government policies, the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan initiative and proposed new funding/financing and urban development legislation. It will be important for Waikato 2070 to be actively monitored and updated where necessary.</li> <li>3. Future Proof strongly supports the approach of mapping through development plans the Waikato District’s growth areas. The provision of general staging and timing is strongly supported.</li> <li>4. Having an overview development staging and timing across the whole District would be useful as this would allow a collective view and allow Council to assess development from a financial viability and Council balance sheet perspective. This level of detail is not yet provided for, but it will be a very useful lens through which the Council can determine what it can realistically service and afford. This may influence scale, staging and timing of some areas.</li> <li>5. Future Proof are of the view that the document could have a much stronger emphasis on tangata whenua values, principles, aspirations and roles and responsibilities and encourage use of macrons on Maori word used.</li> <li>6. Strongly support the ‘our growth section’ as it provides history and context for the Strategy. Recommend however greater reference to the wider context that Waikato 2070 is operating within, including links to other strategic documents and national policy. There should also be greater reference to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato (Vision and Strategy). Would also like to see cross boundary issues and influences to be covered, including Waikato’s relationship with Auckland, Hamilton, Waipa, as well as Matamata-Piako and Hauraki Districts.</li> <li>7. Future Proof supports the opportunities outlined in section 2 of the Strategy, which covers the four wellbeing. Future Proof however believes that the environment should have more prominence in the focus areas. This point was also made by Future Proof’s tangata whenua advisory group Nga Karu Atua o te Waka. Suggest that the focus areas of ‘Embrace our Identity’ and ‘Empower our People’ could be combined and a new focus area of ‘Protect and Enhance our Environment’ could be inserted. This would achieve better alignment with the LGA and RMA. Tangata whenua values and aspirates could be added under these two sections as well, but should also be peppered throughout the</li> </ol> |                                       |



focus areas.

8. In Section 3.1 under 'Grow our Communities,' Future Proof suggests that a new implementation approach be added as follows: "Avoid having development open on too many fronts where it is not possible to efficiently service these areas." Would also like to see an implementation action which involves working with Future Proof partners on cross-boundary issues.
9. Future Proof generally supports the growth areas identified where these align with the direction of the Future Proof Strategy. Future Proof would like to see however Waikato 2070 incorporate a vision, role and function for each of the growth areas identified to help people see the purpose these areas serve in relation to one another, the wider district and the sub-region/region.
10. Future Proof would also like for the Strategy to consider having some form of indicative urban limits. These can be flexible and responsive, but it is important to signal the extent of future growth envisaged as this provides certainty from an infrastructure and servicing point of view.
11. Future Proof supports the provision of industrial land where this is in general alignment with the Future Proof Strategy and the RPS. It is important that residential growth areas also have employment land. It would be useful to include the size of each industrial cluster/area in the development plans. Future Proof is of the view that some further work is required to better understand industrial land demand and supply in the Waikato District. This will help provide a stronger rationale for choosing certain areas for industrial development.
12. Future Proof is of the view that having development spread too widely and open will reduce Council's ability to effectively service all of these areas and place a financial burden on Council and its communities. Thought should be given to prioritizing some of the growth areas and decisions may need to be taken around which places should be grown having to infrastructure servicing, ability to pay as well as market preference.
13. Future Proof has a general concern about some of the population figures used. Some projections seem to vary significantly with the Housing and Business Capacity assessment and the Future Proof Strategy. Future Proof would like to ensure that the figures that Waikato District are using have been verified and based on reasonable evidence and sound assumptions. Future Proof would also like to better understand of some of the areas identified for growth are elite soils, given the current consideration of the Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land.
14. Suggest that it would be useful to include community infrastructure on the development plans, especially schools.
15. Future Proof supports the Tuakau development plan, but has some concern about the extent of low density residential development on the outskirts of Tuakau. Much of this land has been incorporated in the PWDP, however careful consideration should be given considering Tuakau has rail and other public transport opportunities, which could

- be undermined if residential development is scattered and low density in nature. Strongly support provision of higher density development in the town centre.
16. Generally support the Pokeno Development Plan and Town Centre Plan, but question the extent of development to the east whilst acknowledging some of this is historical. Development should be focused in and around Pokeno on the western side. Strongly support the development of a reasonable town centre in Pokeno and provision of higher densities in and around the town centre.
  17. Future Proof does not support industrial development occurring at Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi. This is inconsistent with the Future Proof Strategy and RPS. It is not close enough to any residential areas to provide local employment. This area is not on the rail line and will rely on the expressway and State Highway 2. It is difficult to see the benefits of allowing industry to locate away from established settlements and is unlikely to be efficient and effective from an infrastructure servicing point of view.
  18. Understand the need to acknowledge the role that Meremere and Mercer may play in the future. However considering investigations in terms of suitability are still underway, are of the view it may be premature to be identifying industrial land in these locations.
  19. Future Proof supports the Te Kauwhata Development plan and opportunities for local employment should be provided.
  20. Future Proof strongly supports the redevelopment of Huntly. Would like to see higher densities within the township given its proximity to rail.
  21. Future Proof is conditionally supportive of industrial land at Ohinewai because of the employment opportunities and skills training it could provide for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. However, Future Proof is of the view that further evidence is needed, and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess whether this is the right location for industrial land. Do not support residential development at Ohinewai as we are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly. We support Waikato 2070 in its approach of not zoning residential land at Ohinewai.
  22. Taupiri is not an identified growth area in the Future Proof Strategy. The possible future population of Taupiri outlined in Waikato 2070 is significantly different to what has been outlined in the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment and the Future Proof Strategy. Are of the view that further discussions with the Future Proof partners should be had before the level of residential and industrial growth that is identified in the Strategy is confirmed.
  23. Future Proof strongly supports the Ngaruawahia Development Plan. We support higher densities in the town centre, close to rail and other public transport. Suggest that the Strategy bring forward some of the development planned for Ngaruawahia as all of the development in and around the town centre is signaled for the 10-30 year period.
  24. While Future Proof supports Waikato District selecting a village to grow such as Te Kowhai, this is based on the proviso that investigations are completed, servicing is in

place and there is Future Proof partner agreement to this approach. Given the proximity of Te Kowhai to the Hamilton boundary, it is important that any development is of a form and scale that it can be integrated into the City's infrastructure networks in the future. Future Proof is of the view that there are two important things that must occur before this area is further developed: 1. Building on the work of the Ngaruawahia and Surrounds Structure Plan and the Te Kowhai Blueprint, a detailed structure plan / infrastructure plan or similar should be prepared for the whole area which looks out over 30 years and considers what services are required (three waters, transport and community facilities). 2. The area should be properly serviced by infrastructure or a plan put in place for this to happen before the area is signaled for further growth.

25. This will allow for a planned approach and will mean that the area can realise its growth potential. Waikato DC should work closely with Hamilton City Council, the NZ Transport Agency and other partners on the development of this area.
26. Future Proof supports the provision of further industrial land at Horotiu given that this is already identified as a strategic industrial node and there is strong demand for industrial land in the Waikato District. The additional residential development at Horotiu is not supported at the present time given the demand for industrial land and the proximity to the boundary with Hamilton City. It is important that any land use changes are carefully worked through so that a better integration between land use and future infrastructure can be achieved and any environmental effects managed.
27. Future Proof supports the Raglan Development Plan and in particular the provision for higher densities close to the town centre. This provides for a wider range of housing typologies in Raglan and may help to address the housing supply and affordability issues evident in this community.
28. We strongly encourage Waikato District to continue working with Kāinga Ora and various community housing providers.
29. Future Proof is of the view that the Strategy document would benefit from a section which follows the Identifying Where and When Growth Can Occur chapter. This should look at the next steps, implementation, monitoring and review.
30. Future Proof suggests that Waikato 2070 should indicate that it will be reviewed and updated once the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan work, in particular the river communities and metro spatial plans, is complete, and once the Future Proof Strategy Phase 2 Update is finished.

Hearing – Verbal submission (Ken Tremaine):

1. Submitter spoke on the importance of the Waikato 2070, and recognises that this is only the initial document and further work and improvements to the strategy will be undertaken over time.
2. Submitter encouraged the continued work on the Waikato 2070, and any further work to ensure it “fits” with other processes will occur and be resolved over time.

3. Submitter recommends that Waikato-Tainui and Tainui Group Holding be brought on board, with particular regard to Hopuhopu.

**Submission 39 2SEN Ltd and Tuakau Estates Ltd**

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 39                              |
| Submitter Name  | 2SEN Ltd and Tuakau Estates Ltd |
| Summary of Submission   |                                 |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support in part the proposal, in particular the forward planning for growth, communities and industry.</li> <li>2. Oppose parts of 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan which do not align with zonings in the Proposed District Plan. Amend 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan so that the submitters' site is coloured orange and noted as a 1-3 year timeframe.</li> <li>3. Delete reference to proposed densities and determine densities at the time that rezoning is proposed. Amend all maps to more clearly reflect the purpose of the grey colouring and how it relates to existing urban and rural zones.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Cath Heppelthwaite):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would like the residential area on the south side of Dominion Road to be extended to the entirety of the site.</li> <li>2. Would like the strategy to reflect what was identified in the PDP.</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission(s):</p> <p><b>Cath Heppelthwaite</b> on behalf of 2SEN Ltd and Tuakau Estates Ltd</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. growth boundaries shown in the growth strategy do not align with the WPDP</li> <li>2. All maps are unclear regarding differentiating between rural land uses and urban and uses outside of the identified growth cells - amend to make clearer</li> <li>3. 30+ year time-frame for Dominion Rd is inconsistent with the WPDP</li> <li>4. Specifying density for a 30+ year timeframe is overly prescriptive and in respect to the Dominion Rd growth cells it does not align with the Franklin District Growth Strategy and Plan Change 16</li> <li>5. Modify map 4.1 to include the submitters site in a 1-3 year timeframe</li> <li>6. Delete reference to the proposed densities, development density should be determined by the WPDP</li> </ol> |                                 |

**Submission 40 Nick Hall**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Submission Number:   | 40        |
| Submitter Name   | Nick Hall |
| Summary of Submission  |           |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend 04.4 Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi Development Plan to further utilise existing infrastructure such as State Highway 2, the school and hall, the convenience store/dairy, and a former castle café and gas station.</li> <li>2. Amend 04.4 Mangatawhiri and Mangatangi Development Plan to further utilise the land for Country and Rural Living and expand the village.</li> <li>3. See submission for map of proposed Country Living and existing infrastructure.</li> </ol> |           |

### Submission 41 Huntly Community Board

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 41                     |
| Submitter Name   | Huntly Community Board |
| Summary of Submission  |                        |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the new industrial areas in Huntly 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan.</li> <li>2. Support new housing developments and intensification in Huntly where appropriate.</li> <li>3. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to consider or plan for existing or future green spaces.</li> <li>4. Amend the whole proposal to include the State Highway 1 interchange and the Kimihia Lakes project.</li> <li>5. Amend the whole proposal to include the Auckland to Hamilton corridor plan.</li> <li>6. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to develop the area behind the power station for suburban growth.</li> <li>7. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to not develop the Lake Puketirini housing.</li> <li>8. Do not support housing development at Rotowaro Road.</li> <li>9. Support land in 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to be opened up for light industry.</li> <li>10. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to put aside the land between industry and Kimihia as wetland/park.</li> <li>11. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to recognise and protect the speedway in Huntly.</li> <li>12. Amend the Kimihia Development in 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan from 10-30 years to a 1-10 year timeframe.</li> <li>13. Amend 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan to show the housing proposed as part of the Kimihia Development. Support the growth west of Lake Hakanoa.</li> <li>14. Amend the proposal to clarify whether brickworks are commercial or residential zones in both maps. Amend proposal to plan for garden use or park rehabilitation for when the Quarry reaches its end of life.</li> <li>15. Support the intensification of the urban area around the lake and CBD in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan. Support development around the back of Kimihia Lake.</li> <li>16. Support the two new housing areas in Huntly.</li> <li>17. Clarify why the supermarket/church area is marked as industrial while others are commercial in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan.</li> <li>18. Support the commercial development in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan.</li> <li>19. Support brickwork area in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan going into commercial or residential.</li> <li>20. Oppose the intensification in Huntly West in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan without a plan to minimize social deprivation.</li> </ol> |                        |

21. Amend the commercial marking in 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan to show the walkway, rather than next to the rail line.
22. Amend 04.8 Huntly Town Centre Plan to add a star to the location of the Huntly West Community Hub. Support walkway along the river bank in Huntly.
23. Amend 04.8 to show more than intensified housing for the next 50 years and add more promotion in 1-3 years for commercial and industrial.

#### Hearing

Verbal submission (David Whyte on Behalf of Huntly Community Board):

1. Huntly Community Committee supports greenfield residential, greenfield industrial intensification residential, spread of commercial and would like to see Huntly grow.
2. The expressway interchange should be identified on the map.
3. The Lake Kimihia development should have the 1-3yr timeframe.
4. The speedway should be identified as a significant activity so it is recognised so it can continue to operate.
5. Intensification of Huntly West will only intensify the social issues in the area.
6. The community does not support the Lake Puketirini greenfield development.
7. There is a missed opportunity of the Huntly South area: it should be identified as industrial.

Additional Written Submission:

Powerpoint presentation was spoken to.



**Submission 42 Ohinewai Area Committee Submission**

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 42                                 |
| Submitter Name  | Ohinewai Area Committee Submission |
| Summary of Submission   |                                    |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed 2070 plan has industrial zones along Lumsden Road (top page 32 in 2070 plan) for Ohinewai.</li> <li>2. Blueprint: Do not consider that the Community aspirations have not been understood by staff when developing this document.</li> <li>3. Appropriate residential development: The community envisioned this to be high quality lifestyle blocks with a mixture of other high quality housing. West of SH1 should be an area that is indicated for urban growth as lifestyle blocks, this is currently missing from the plan. Concern raised informally in the blueprint discussions that Ohinewai would become the dumping ground for Huntly and this appears to becoming a reality.</li> <li>4. Pedestrian access: Pedestrian and cycle access across the motorway and rail over bridge, especially for access to the school, assuming that there would be homes on both sides of the railway and expressway. This underpinning assumption has not been included in the 2070 plan, with one side effectively being relegated to industrial development.</li> <li>5. Creation of pathways along the riverbank connecting Ohinewai to Huntly: Map on page 32 is not of a scale to show walking tracks, and the map of Huntly on page 33 does have a walking track going north up the stop bank, assumedly to Ohinewai. Would like acknowledgement that there is a walkway link between Ohinewai and Huntly.</li> <li>6. Ohinewai North and Ohinewai South Industrial developments: The community appreciates that Lumsden Road already has industrial land and that Sleepyhead is undergoing the process to have this rezoned as an industrial site. Therefore to some degree industrial of Ohinewai North and South is fait accompli. Residents are concerned about the large size of the area identified around Lumsden Road for industrial development.</li> <li>7. Community supports the option of Sleepyhead to have housing nearby to house their workers. Although they don't support high density housing, as they consider it is excessive and not suited to the environment, the ability to have homes nearby is something they consider is a good idea. As Sleepyhead is investing significant effort to make the development appropriate, if they believe housing options are part of this then the community supports this development.</li> </ol> |                                    |

## Hearing

Verbal submission (David Whyte on Behalf of Ohinewai Area Committee):

1. Ohinewai would like to be a lifestyle block community; two maps were shown to identify the location.
2. Improved access is desired.
3. Ohinewai community would like to see some commercial land as well as some residential land (5000m<sup>2</sup>).
4. Ohinewai Area Committee does not support High Density housing.
5. Map was presented of where this could occur and the density it should be.

Additional Written Submission (Powerpoint):

1. Powerpoint presentation was spoken to.

**Submission 43 Hamilton City Council**

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 43                    |
| Submitter Name   | Hamilton City Council |
| Summary of Submission  |                       |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overall, HCC supports the preparation of a growth strategy. The Growth Strategy provides the ideal opportunity to set the scene for District-wide aspirations and provides the big picture of the how, when and where growth will be accommodated.</li> <li>2. HCC would like to support WDC in its need to move at pace on the Growth Strategy, and as such would like to use the Future Proof collaborative partnership to work through some of the issues in this submission and those of other parties. It is within the whole sub-region’s interest to ensure a robust Waikato District Growth Strategy, given its key location within the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Area (H2A).</li> <li>3. Giving effect to the Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato – The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, the under-production Metropolitan Spatial Plan, other H2A initiatives, the WRPS and the Future Proof Strategy, should be a key focus of the Growth Strategy.</li> <li>4. Section 2 is succinct and comprehensive, while highlighting the large range of differing issues the District faces and seeks to address through the Growth Strategy. The way the information on the map has been translated into the remainder of the Growth Strategy needs to be articulated. Superimposing these constraints over the top of the selected growth areas may help tell the story of how and where District-wide growth is being steered.</li> <li>5. This section, although referring to the Waikato River, does not appear to reference Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato – The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. This should underpin the production of any policy or resource management work within the Waikato Region. How the Growth Strategy gives effect to the Vision and Strategy should be emphasised. The Waikato River itself does not appear to have prominence within the Growth Strategy as a whole.</li> <li>6. Section 2 would be strengthened by referring to the requirements of other national or regional obligations such as NPS Freshwater Management, possible NPS Highly Productive Land and Healthy Rivers (Proposed Plan Change I Waikato Regional Plan).</li> <li>7. The ‘Direction’ list and the accompanying long list of implementation methods are not opposed by HCC. However, within the long list of 50 implementation points, some of the key messages of the Growth Strategy are hard to discern. The list could be reworked to allow the reader of the Growth Strategy to take away clear intention, ‘musts’ or biggest/best/most efficient opportunities that WDC is striving to deliver. Section 3 could take direction from Section 2 which has clear direct language about the negative outcomes WDC/Communities hope to avoid.</li> <li>8. Overall, the implementation list could be refined to offer perhaps 10 key principles, with</li> </ol> |                       |

- more direct statements relating back to the issues outlined in Section 2. The strategic direction could be enhanced to make clear which are the main locations for growth.
9. The identification of such areas should be given more prominence within the Growth Strategy, not just the individual maps.
  10. The Growth Strategy would be enhanced by explaining how the Priority Growth Areas are given primacy over the other growth areas. It is noted that there are also other significant areas of growth earmarked within the same time periods as the Priority Growth Areas. This may create difficulties with community expectations and funding of such a vast range of growth areas over similar timeframes. Over the next 30 years, approximately 14 locations have been identified for industrial growth. This would equate to a new industrial growth area coming forward every other year for the next 30 years. Creating this expectation may prove extremely difficult to deliver on and is contrary to the WRPS. The infrastructure needs of such a wide range of growth locations should be stated.
  11. It might be expected that a growth strategy would clearly highlight two or three priority growth areas, or its short, medium and long-term aspirations across the district as a whole. The draft Growth Strategy should be refined to do this.
  12. The good work undertaken by WDC to map the constraints should be used to paint the strategic picture as to why certain growth locations are favoured over others. Such work could help WDC to give effect to a future NPS on Highly Productive Land and will build in climate change and natural hazard resistance. Adding the known infrastructure constraints and opportunities to the selection process for Priority Growth Areas would provide a more robust and considered way forward.
  13. The work currently underway as part of the H2A Corridor Plan, including the Metropolitan Spatial Plan and 3 Waters Study is important to keep in mind.
  14. The draft document could benefit from considering the Government's work programme on the Urban Growth Agenda and infrastructure funding, as potential justification or delivery options to help deliver growth ambitions.
  15. The major element missing from the Growth Strategy is the evidence base that has guided the selection of the locations and the amount of growth within each location. HCC would like to see a sound evidence base supporting the changes, including the effect on sub-regional coordination of planning and infrastructure. Working out how the WRPS might change and describing this will strengthen the Strategy. The 'what' being planned is not clear from the Growth Strategy. Clarity of the 'what', including evidence will also help build in a proactive approach to the NPS on Urban Development Capacity.
  16. The Growth Strategy would be strengthened by providing information on the necessary infrastructure and its associated cost, or precursors that will be required to support a growth location. This is particularly necessary for those areas that are identified within the shorter term. Could be addressed by identifying for each location how, for example, the 3-waters will be managed, what transport infrastructure improvements will be

required, the 'soft' infrastructure needs, and clearly stating that development can only occur when these requirements are planned and underway. Identifying so many locations for growth would be a challenge for any district to service to an acceptable level.

17. Seems appropriate that the Growth Strategy foreshadows a more sub-regional approach to – at least – water supply and wastewater treatment, and if possible, mass transit considerations. This is on the basis that the Central Government has signalled the need for a different approach to waters management and the collaborative H2A work.
18. HCC supports the need for a growth strategy, and the long-term aspiration of the document is welcomed. The draft Growth Strategy should be expanded to include the evidence to support the approach taken, which often represents a move away from the WRPS and Future Proof Strategy. Growth Strategy should articulate the overall strategic priorities for growth, as at present, a vast range of growth areas are promoted.
19. Section 3 – Focus Areas The language and approach of Section 3 could be tightened up to make the intention clear and the message strong, to perhaps read more like a 'policy' or 'principle'. Some examples of an alternative approach to respond to HCC's comments are provided below as suggestions. Suggested response Page 20 'Ensure our communities have easy access to infrastructure and services' there is an opportunity to provide a clearer message as to what is sought and how it can be measured. 'Avoid development of un-serviced settlements'. Or the statement about infrastructure and services could list the infrastructure and services that are being referred to. Page 21 'Restrict multi-lot residential subdivisions in rural areas outside of areas identified for growth' Multi-lot residential subdivisions is an unclear phrase, and not used again within the draft Strategy. It is unclear if it includes rural residential subdivisions and as to why any subdivision within the rural areas is appropriate. Presumably in line with Section 6 of the WRPS and indeed the Waikato PDP, rural areas will be protected from non-rural subdivisions. 'Avoid ad-hoc residential/rural residential subdivisions of high-class soils'. This suggestion will follow more naturally on from the issues outlined in Section 2. Page 21 'Restrict residential development in areas at risk from natural hazards' This implementation item could be expanded to cover development in general. 'Restrict development in areas at risk from natural hazards'.
20. Section 4 - Evidence Base The key elements of evidence base which would bolster the Growth Strategy are as follows: a) the year allocated to the future population or a more detailed table as to how this might change over the time periods used in the document. Presumably the future population is based on 2070 projections, however, it appears all the residential growth is allocated within the next 30 years. This should be clarified and additional detail provided; b) Household numbers being projected. These would help determine how much land may be required to accommodate the growth and what the necessary infrastructure required to support it, might be; c) A quantification of the industrial land. This information would be useful for the District-wide and each

location. It would seem, although it is hard to quantify based on the information, that potentially an additional 15,000 hectares of industrial and commercial land is being suggested. How this quantum fits within the wider sub-regional scale should be justified, particularly given this appears to be providing perhaps twice as much land as has been identified by Market Economics as necessary across the entire sub-region, including Hamilton City and Waipa District I. Such a large additional provision should be justified.

d) Detail on current and future three waters servicing challenges, servicing solutions, provisions and funding in place to provide adequate services. e) Detail on the type of Industrial and commercial land uses activities that might be expected, potential water consumption and discharge characteristics and servicing provisions. f) How land use constraints, hazards, biodiversity, river and cultural restoration and enhancement opportunities have informed the growth strategy. Including how opportunities to address stormwater contaminant loading, increase overall climate resilience and create new green spaces have been considered.

21. Maps (pages 24-38) General each location includes an infographic on the population, being the current and possible future population and a location description. It would be helpful if these pages could be refined as follows: a) The description of each location should include some context as to what the location is currently like, its character, opportunities, constraints, key features combined with a vision or an aspiration as to what is sought over the 50-year period. The document currently describes where the town is; b) the legend to the maps, groups commercial and industrial land together. This is a broad grouping and raises some concerns about the intent of the classification shown on the maps. For example, whilst an area might be acceptable as industrial land, it might not be appropriate from a large format retail or retail. Some of the towns within the Waikato already struggle to attract retailers/shoppers, a situation that could be worsened if large format retail were to be accommodated on the outskirts of town or indeed in a largely rural area. Additionally, the RPS and Future Proof Strategy both identify Hamilton as the primary retail location within the sub-region, supported by a network of thriving town centres. The Strategy should be amended to provide confidence that this principle is being adhered to; c) It is unclear if the draft Strategy reflects the proposed zonings within the Waikato District PDP. In some locations the PDP zoning is reflected, but not in other locations. For example, the industrial land shown at Ohinewai, Taupiri, Mangtawhiri and Mangatangi, Ngaruawahia and Horotiu appears to reflect aspirations of some submitters to the Waikato PDP or potentially have arisen from the Waikato District Blueprints work. The selection of the growth location needs to be justified and supported by robust evidence. If the locations had been incorporated in the PDP they would be supported by a thorough s32 report which justified their selection as a growth location, sites promoted by submission would not yet have had that level of rigor. The Growth Strategy should be clear as to the origin of its selected growth locations. We need to understand how cumulatively, they will affect

industrial land supply and demand for industrial/commercial land in the sub-region.  
Individual Maps

22. Sub-Regional Growth Map (pages 24-25) The map is difficult to read. Perhaps the map could be simplified to use words to describe the current and future vision for the growth locations. Te Kowhai, Managatawhiri and Mangatangi are all identified as growth locations on subsequent maps, but are not illustrated in the sub-regional picture. The map currently illustrates business clusters, but not residential growth locations. The map therefore only tells part of the story. This map also uses different languages such as 'business clusters' and has a more detailed legend showing uses such as 'furniture and architecture products cluster' and 'high powered vehicle clusters', terms which are not shown in the location maps or indeed, seemingly referenced elsewhere. At present this map is inconsistent with other maps in the draft Strategy. It is also unclear whether the map is intended to show the current state, future state or a mixture of both. These matters should be clarified and made consistent.
23. Map 4.6 Te Kauwhata and Map 4.11 Te Kowhai A significant amount of residential growth is planned in Te Kauwhata and Te Kowhai. However, there is a seemingly small amount of employment land, and indeed none for Te Kowhai identified. It is noted that one of the issues Waikato District has sought to avoid is the creation of 'dormitory commuter district with people travelling to Auckland, Hamilton and Tauranga for work and services, which will have negative long-term impacts on our communities' (page 15, section 2.8 draft Growth Strategy). HCC would like to have confidence that dormitory suburbs won't be created in these locations. If these locations are to be earmarked for such significant growth, the justification for such growth should be supplied, but also further thought should be given to the crucial elements of place-making for live, work and play communities.
24. Map 4.5 Meremere/Mercer; Map 4.7 Huntly and Ohinewai; Map 4.9 Taupiri and Map 4.10 Ngaruawahia (An Industrial/Commercial String of Beads) The cumulative effects of the industrial/commercial growth areas shown in these locations is essentially creating a string of beads along SH1 or former SH1. The WRPS (Section 6) specifically includes policies and principles which seek to avoid this form of development. It is a development form which creates issues with infrastructure servicing, impacts on the safety and efficiency of the road network, and creating a meld of places with no distinct character. This ribbon type development is not efficient in terms of moving people away from private vehicle use and is not efficient to service with infrastructure. It is suggested that not all of these growth areas are needed and that WDC identify those which are of higher priority and actively plan to not allow ribbon development along the road corridor.
25. Map 4.11 Te Kowhai As mentioned above, significant amounts of residential development are proposed for Te Kowhai. It is proposed to grow the location from 500 people to 4,000 people, a town the current size of Raglan. This area is very close to

Hamilton's boundary and with such significant growth promoted, it is concerning to HCC that the Strategy is silent on the hard and soft infrastructure to support such growth. It is noted that in the Waikato District LTP2, servicing the village with reticulated services from Hamilton City was considered as the preferred option, however, no approach has been made to Hamilton City to ensure the village can be serviced efficiently and affordably. We do note that this topic has been discussed in the more recent WDC/HCC growth governance group meetings, but only at a very conceptual level. The provision of urban sized sections of 450 square metres is also of interest to HCC. Whilst HCC did not support the WDC approach within the PDP to create 'rural residential' scale lots of 1,000 square metre or 3,000 square metre lots, it is a big change to the 450 square metre lots now proposed. We encourage and support full residential density growth. However, when combined with the scale of such residential land earmarked and the singular type of land use proposed, this does raise some concerns. There is the possibility that this new growth location will be developed concurrently to already planned growth cells within the City. Sub-regionally, we want to avoid 'competition' between growth cells particularly where the locations are very close to one another. We need to better understand how Te Kowhai will be serviced, not just with waters but with transport and community infrastructure, and how the demand projections have been derived.

#### Hearing

#### Verbal submission:

1. Supports the strategy.
2. Would like to see the evidence base that supports the strategy.
3. Commented on a boundaryless approach to planning and would like to see how the strategy could talk to this in relation to infrastructure.
4. Would like to see features on the natural map carried through to the township maps.
5. Would like to see highlighted the key takeaways on what the district wants. An indication for each growth area should show the hard and soft infrastructure.
6. Would like to see priority growth areas rather than showing all the growth areas.
7. There are a lot of locations shown on the map in relation to Industrial nodes. Would like to see how these have been identified some seem reactive to developer needs and submissions on the District Plan.



**Submission 44 Ambury Properties Limited**

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 44                        |
| Submitter Name  | Ambury Properties Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                           |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partially support the Waikato 2070</li> <li>2. Submitter notes the pressure that the Waikato District is experiencing as Hamilton and Auckland continue to grow and refer to their economic and social impact assessment that have been undertaken and provided to Council in support of their proposed rezoning at Ohinewai.</li> <li>3. Submitter seeks amendments so the strategy will effectively provide a sound strategic and policy basis to support the development of the Sleepyhead Estate at the Ohinewai site.</li> <li>4. The submitter notes that the 'Introduction' states that it implements the initiatives included in the 'Blueprints' and that the Blueprint for Ohinewai shows the Sleepyhead site as a mixed use area. Submitter notes that this is not reflected in the strategy as it does not recognise the residential part of the development. This inconsistency may cause confusion.</li> <li>5. The submitter considers residential components to be vital to 'mixed use community'.</li> <li>6. Submission addresses Action OH5.2</li> <li>7. Rezoning request addresses traffic noise and visual effects</li> <li>8. Submitter states that consultation with school confirms their support of the development</li> <li>9. Submitter generally supports description of opportunities within Section 2.0 of the strategy. In particular 2.7 (NIMT and Waikato Expressway). See submission for exact wording generally supported. Submitter notes that it does not give enough weight to opportunities from corridors given inherent abilities of corridors within the golden triangle.</li> <li>10. Submitter distinguishes development from others.</li> <li>11. Submitter requests additional wording to 2.7 (end of first paragraph). See submission for exact wording.</li> <li>12. Submitter supports section 2.8, to the extent that it refers to the need to identify and promote new industrial areas and activities to create employment to avoid a dormitory commuter district. Submitter links this to the development and seeks that villages (rather than just towns) are recognised for growth potential. See submission for amended wording sought.</li> <li>13. Submitter supports direction of Focus Area 3.1 – Grow our Communities, well-planned and people friendly communities.</li> <li>14. Submitter supports direction of 3.2 – Build our Business, identification of new strategically located industrial clusters, new area for service industries and training of</li> </ol> |                           |

local people. Submitter is working with education providers to upskill the area workforce.

15. Submitter supports direction of 3.3 but seeks amendments to points 1, 5 and 6 under 'Protect our Environment' to ensure long term aspirational qualities of the strategy (especially 4.0) are recognised.
16. Amendment sought to Point 1 is to give flexibility to growth in villages. Amendment sought to points 5 and 6 are for consistency with Section 4 growth areas and for flexibility to accommodate the Sleepyhead development.
17. Submitter supports Section 4.7 and 3-10 year timeline of site development. Submission provides reasons for development east of Expressway for Ohinewai, being; NIMTR access and existing Country Living zoned land/facilities.
18. Submitter highlights the importance of residential development at Ohinewai for 'mixed-use community' that provides additional affordable housing and compact urban form. Submission refers to an urban design report provided to Council for rezone request. Submitter provides information from Housing and Business Assessment – Future Proof (2018) to quantify benefit of housing provision.
19. Submitter states that amenity interface with eight houses on Lumsden Road will be managed by way of building setbacks and landscaping and a 100m greenspace buffer will exist between industrial and residential.
20. Submitter states job creation from development of 2,000-2,500.
21. Submitter highlights price point of housing and states that capacity shortfall and old housing stock at Huntly means that workers would purchase at Te Kauwhata or Pokeno. This would lead to dormitory town, need for travel and undermine Huntly's commercial/service role.
22. Development residential component means efficiency through less travel, 'live-work-play', consistent with urban form of the strategy, benefits to Huntly's residential market through increase demand by workers and assist workers into affordable housing.
23. Submitter request amendments to Plan 4.7 (refer to plan attached to submission) to reflect residential component and housing up to two levels.

#### Hearing

#### Verbal submission:

1. Submitter notes that Ohinewai is located on a key transport network.
2. Submitter notes there is no identification of the residential or business components within the Ohinewai growth cell(s).
3. Submitter seeks the inclusion of a greenfield residential component within the Ohinewai growth cells(s), as the submitter will not continue with the development if the residential component is not supported.

#### Additional written submission(s):

### **John Olliver**

1. Notes that the key issue is to recognise the residential component of the Sleepyhead Estate development in the Draft Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan (04.7).
2. The residential component of the development is a critical part of the overall commercial viability of the project.
3. It is noted that there is future residential development within and around Huntly, however it is not within greenfield areas and most of those areas are not zoned for residential development in the Proposed District Plan, so their timeframes will be lengthy and uncertain.
4. The master-planned development can readily manage issues such as the interface between residential and industrial areas to manage and avoid reverse sensitivity effects.
5. The growth area is located in/near an existing village and is close to Huntly and is connected via the roading network, and therefore will complement and support Huntly.
6. If residential development is not enabled, it will result in employment being separated from residential areas, leading to 'dormitory' suburbs.

### **Timothy James Heath**

1. The primary activity on the site will be a new 100,000sqm TCG factory (on a site of 37ha), which will eventually employ more than 1,000 staff.
2. Additionally, the development will provide for 132,000sqm of general industrial activity (on a further 26ha) with an estimated 43,400sqm (on 8.7ha) of commercial space, that could potentially support a further 1,000 jobs.
3. Two main goals for the development are to consolidate and expand its operations, and invest in affordable residential homes for their workers who typically earn lower wages.
4. The sought residential component will cover 52.2ha and provide approximately 1,100 homes. Two-thirds are considered to be high-density (terraced) homes. 54.8ha will be open space and reserve areas.
5. Benefits of the development include increased employment opportunities, improved amenity and infrastructure efficiencies, affordable housing options and improved retention and productivities.
6. The construction impact over the 10-year construction period: it has been estimated that this will contribute \$1.3 billion in NPV and create approximately 410 jobs per annum within the region. Locally, this level of development is likely to add \$100m over the 10-year period of construction and provide for an additional 42 jobs per annum.
7. The ongoing operational impacts are limited to the Sleepyhead operations.
8. The local catchment would support an additional 5,500sqm of retail GFA capturing a further \$35m in retail spend and provide an addition 1,088 jobs within Huntly/Ohinewai.
9. The proposal is unique, not accounted for in strategic planning documents, and therefore not expected to undermine the strategic planning nodes or planned residential developments.

10. The proposal is expected to generate an additional \$6.4m in convenience retail spending which can support 2,500sqm of floor space, supporting the existing Huntly Town Centre retail GFA.
11. The success of the proposed Discount Factory Outlet centre will be dependent on its ability to draw from the Auckland and Hamilton markets.
12. Home sale price of \$500,000 is cheaper than Auckland and new homes in Te Kauwhata.
13. The proposal promotes employment and retail in close proximity to its resident population, being located directly across SH1 from the existing Ohinewai village.
14. The proposal promotes the use of rail, and will support growth within the 'golden triangle'.
15. Additional dwelling demand for Huntly by 2046 is expected to be 1,047 dwellings. This excludes the positive impact the TCG development will have on the dwelling demand, which could potentially push this expected demand to around 1,700 dwellings.
16. The additional commercially feasible capacity in Huntly is expected to be approximately 463 dwellings under the high growth scenario, this leaves an overall shortage of 585 dwellings in Huntly excluding the increased demand resulting from TCG development, which would potentially increase Huntly's shortfall to over 1,000 dwellings.
17. The draft Waikato 2070 plans for almost a doubling of the current population from 7,000 to 13,500 people in Huntly and Ohinewai, which would require an additional 2,200-2,500 dwellings.
18. Enabling residential development will provide economic efficiencies in home to place of work travel and promote employment and retail in close proximity to resident population.
19. The residential component of the proposal is vital to the financial viability of the development as a whole.

**Submission 45 Ngati Tamaoho Trust**

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 45                  |
| Submitter Name  | Ngati Tamaoho Trust |
| Summary of Submission   |                     |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support whole proposal except for lack of mention for the maintenance and enhancement of the natural environment.</li> <li>2. Add to 01.3 Community Well-Being "environment is about maintaining and enhancing the natural environment while achieving the best community and economic outcomes."</li> <li>3. Add to Our Vision "a healthy environment is essential for the health and wellbeing of the people."</li> <li>4. Add to 03.1 Grow Our Communities Deliver...4. "blue/green infrastructure".</li> <li>5. Add to 03.1 Grow Our Communities Promote...4. "identify and protect sites and areas from future development."</li> <li>6. Amend 04.0 identifying where and When Growth Can Occur to properly identify geotechnically challenged areas and leave these out of the map.</li> <li>7. Amend 04.0 Identifying where and When Growth Can Occur to not identify areas of cultural significance to Mana Whenua as areas for future growth or be included into maps without proper engagement with Mana Whenua and an understanding of the nature of the sensitivity.</li> </ol> |                     |

**Submission 46 Ohinewai Lands Ltd**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 46                 |
| Submitter Name   | Ohinewai Lands Ltd |
| Summary of Submission  |                    |
| <p>1. Ohinewai Lands Limited has identified the potential for future growth at Ohinewai East due to its strategic location between Hamilton and Auckland and its proximity to the Waikato Expressway and the North Island Main Trunk Railway (NIMT). Master planning drawings for the site are attached to the submission (Attachment 2).</p> <p>2. Ohinewai Lands Limited is interested in the Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan as it relates to provision for future development in Ohinewai East. Two industrial clusters are shown at Ohinewai on the Development, one with frontage to Tahuna Road, Lumsden Road and Balemi Road (Ohinewai South Industrial Cluster) and the other with frontage to Balemi Road and Lumsden Road (Ohinewai North Cluster). The Ohinewai South Industrial Cluster extends to near the end of Balemi Road and it includes land which is owned by Ohinewai Lands Limited.</p> <p>3. Ohinewai Lands Limited supports the inclusion of ‘commercial &amp; industrial activity zones’ (Ohinewai South Cluster and Ohinewai North Cluster) in the Huntly &amp; Ohinewai Development Plan in Chapter 4.7.</p> <p>4. Ohinewai Lands Limited opposes the absence of ‘residential activity zones’ in Ohinewai East in the Huntly &amp; Ohinewai Development Plan in Chapter 4.7.</p> <p>5. The following amendments are sought to the Huntly &amp; Ohinewai Development Plan in Chapter 4.7 (page 32):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identification of residential activity zones located in Ohinewai East in accordance with the changes indicated on the annotated Huntly &amp; Ohinewai Development Plan in Attachment 4. The changes reflect the location and extent of the residential areas shown on the Framework Plan in Attachment 1.</li> <li>● Review and increase the possible future population figure to account for planned growth of industrial and residential activities in Ohinewai East.</li> <li>● Any other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</li> </ul> |                    |
| Hearing  |                    |
| Verbal submission (Ben Inger, Rachel DeLambert and David Peacocke):  |                    |
| <p>1. Highlighted the Blueprint plan for Ohinewai that included a variety of land uses.</p> <p>2. Ohinewai lands are not seeking a rezoning to PDP but would like to have the area identified in the strategy and future development.</p> <p>3. Sees a strong relationship to Huntly but would like to see residential as well to have a contemporary approach to land use planning.</p>   |                    |

4. Changes requested are as shown on the map.

Additional written submission (Powerpoint):

Powerpoint presentation was displayed outlining what was discussed in the submitters verbal submission.

**Submission 47 Rangatahi Ltd**

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Submission Number:  | 47            |
| Submitter Name  | Rangitahi Ltd |
| Summary of Submission   |               |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rangitahi Ltd, Scenic Properties 2006 Ltd and Raglan Land Company Ltd are part of a group of companies associated with members of the Peacocke family, who have lived and farmed in Raglan for over 30 years.</li> <li>2. Raglan Land Company Ltd has completed a 17-lot rural-residential subdivision, called Te Ahiawa, which is located off Wainui Road. Rangitahi Ltd is currently developing a large residential development on the Rangitahi Peninsula, which is being marketed as 'Rangitahi'. The Rangitahi site was rezoned following a private plan change and it is subject to the Rangitahi Structure Plan which is included in the Operative and Proposed Waikato District Plans. The anticipated time frame to fully develop the Rangitahi site is approximately 5-10 years. The submitters also own additional land in the Rangatahi/Raglan West area which is suitable for future urban development to accommodate medium to long term growth within the 50 year timeframe covered by the strategy. (Shown on Attachment I of the submission). Summary of areas supported and opposed and relief sought</li> <li>3. 6.1 The Submitters support the population projection for Raglan in the Raglan Development Plan in Chapter</li> <li>4. 4.13 Subject to review of the underlying data set and assumptions.</li> <li>5. 6.2 The Submitters oppose the absence of 'residential activity zones' in the locations of the Future Growth Area which is identified on the map in Attachment I. Inclusion of these areas is required to provide sufficient land to meet the population projections in the Raglan Development Plan in Chapter 4.13.</li> <li>6. 6.3 The Submitters oppose the lack of provision of land to be developed to meet demand in the 10-30 year period for residential activities.</li> <li>7. 6.4 The following amendments are sought to the Raglan Development Plan in Chapter 4.13 (page 38): Identification of residential activity zones located at Rangitahi South and Raglan West in accordance with the changes sketched on the annotated Raglan Development Plan in Attachment 3. Any other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Ben Inger, Tony McLauchlan and David Peacocke):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Talked to a presentation which highlighted the constraints of Raglan and limitations of future development.</li> <li>2. If Raglan continues to grow, more land area needs to be identified; the strategy does not</li> </ol> |               |



identify the steps to be taken to bring on new land online i.e. structure plans.

3. Has a map showing the potential growth areas that they would like to see included.

Additional written submission (Powerpoint):

Powerpoint presentation was displayed outlining what was discussed in the submitters verbal submission.

**Submission 48 Thorntree Orchards Ltd (Sir William Birch)**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Submission Number:  | 48   |
| Submitter Name  | Thorntree Orchards Ltd (Sir William Birch) |
| Summary of Submission   |  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter seeks that the growth area located between the existing Pokeno village and State Highway 2 needs to be rezoned for development (requesting a village zoning). The presence of a motorway is not an impediment to development in the view of the submitter.</li> <li>2. The submitter does not support the concept of a "Pokeno East Commercial" growth area</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Sir William Birch and Dobson Family):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would like their site to be identified for residential development and does not support commercial development.</li> <li>2. The original orchards are no longer productive and there is a shortage of water supply.</li> <li>3. Would like council to look at the population again as the demand is larger than what is proposed.</li> <li>4. Urban Economics have done some demand work which they would share as part of the PDP hearing evidence.</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission (Powerpoint):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Powerpoint presentation was displayed outlining what was discussed in the submitters verbal submission.</li> <li>10. Thorntree Orchards Ltd are seeking that their area of interest in Pokeno East be rezoned to Village from Rural (which is proposed in the PWDP) This will be formally addressed at (Hearing 25 Zone Extents) scheduled to take place this year</li> <li>11. The Waikato 2070 released for consultation in November 2019, identifies part of the area of interest as Pokeno East Commercial comprising "Commercial Industrial" activity zones, thus materially deviating from the Rural Zoning identified in the PWDP</li> <li>12. Thorntree Orchards Ltd have a strong preference for immediate Village Zoning to be applied over the area as this is a more logical use given the area's advantageous characteristics e.g location in relation to the existing urban core of Pokeno, topography, serviceability etc</li> <li>13. Whilst there are certainly merits to additional commercial/industrial land within Pokeno, we consider that expansion of the existing commercial/industrial areas in Pokeno represents a more logical option</li> </ol> |  |

**Submission 49 Havelock Village Limited**

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 49                       |
| Submitter Name  | Havelock Village Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter has concerns that the Waikato 2070 fails to provide for the expected and realistic future residential growth in Pokeno because:</li> <li>2. The population and growth projections are unrealistic;</li> <li>3. Inadequate and unsuitable areas are identified for future growth;</li> <li>4. The opportunities and constraints identification in the spatial planning for Pokeno is flawed and inconsistently implemented;</li> <li>5. There is a misalignment of proposed housing typologies to support growth with real world market demand;</li> <li>6. It fails to recognise the opportunity and likely growth anticipated as a result of the Auckland to Hamilton Corridor Strategy project;</li> <li>7. The Havelock site is not identified as an area for future residential growth.</li> <li>8. The submitter seeks that the Growth Strategy be amended to provide for the appropriate future growth for Pokeno by identifying the Havelock site as a location for future greenfield growth.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Mark Tollemache):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believes that the projection numbers for Pokeno are too light. The last few years have seen 200 homes per year constructed in Pokeno, suggests that Waikato 2070 allows for only 100 homes per year.</li> <li>2. Covenants are on properties so it is highly unlikely that infill will occur. It will take a long time for 4 story apartments to come to Pokeno.</li> <li>3. There is a significant gap in the data and believes that there are flaws in the constraints mapping.</li> <li>4. All of the growth areas in Pokeno are in the District Plan and no additional growth areas have been identified in the strategy.</li> <li>5. Believes that Havelock would be an ideal site as you can build on steep topography and would only have one developer to deal with, has better access to the town centre as opposed to growing East Pokeno and can more readily connect into infrastructure than East Pokeno (and will be developer funded)</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission (Powerpoint):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Powerpoint presentation was displayed outlining what was discussed in the submitters</li> </ol> |                          |

verbal submission.

2. The presentation summarised the relief sought including: projections need to be revisited to take account of a real world analysis of market demand and building consent data; viability of intensification assumption and legal constraints of infill development; Pokeno East be removed as a growth area as it is highly fragmented and segregated from the town centre; and that Havelock North area be identified in the strategy to meet future housing demand.

### Submission 50 Whaingaroa Environmental Defence

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 50                               |
| Submitter Name   | Whaingaroa Environmental Defence |
| Summary of Submission  |                                  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend Our Vision – Thriving to take note of what communities are saying and to keep them better informed or delete this vision from the strategy.</li> <li>2. Amend Our Vision Liveable for communities to be sustainable and minimising environmental impact.</li> <li>3. Amend Our Vision Connected to mention public transport.</li> <li>4. Amend 01.5 Our Growth to have consistent Maori spelling and correct year (change 1840 to 1864).</li> <li>5. Amend 02.4 Our Climate to be much more developed in the final strategy and propose ways to convert methane-emitting animal farming to carbon-reducing uses such as orchards and vineyards, encouraging solar power, micro hydro and other renewable energies and moving away from 98% of transport in petrol burning cars to bikes, buses, electronic communication, shared cars, water transport and energy saving, such as improved insulation.</li> <li>6. Amend 02.7 Our Transport to clarify how freight is encouraged to transfer from road to rail.</li> <li>7. Amend 02.7 Our Transport for public transport seat provision to be at a level of 50% of traffic flows on each main route in the corridor and that congestion taxes to reflect the true costs of road and parking provision, rather than being subsidised by ratepayers.</li> <li>8. Amend 03.1 Grow Our Communities – Deliver well-planned and people-friendly communities (4) to propose how to overcome the closure suggestion of part of Bow Street, Raglan, and re-establish viable place-making groups.</li> <li>9. Amend 03.1 Grow Our Communities – Deliver well-planned and people-friendly communities (5) to clarify if the two-storey limit will be retained in Raglan and indicate how the uniformity of new buildings can be avoided to retain the current CBD character of varied heights and avoid blocking views of Karioi from the CBD.</li> <li>10. Amend 03.1 Grow Our Communities – Promote sustainable and cost-effective land-use patterns (1) to identify suitable low grade, steep land for forestry, fruit crops and other carbon absorbing land uses, preferable to also support restoration of biodiversity and also address the 11.7% contribution from transport. See submission for Fuel Types table.</li> <li>11. Amend 03.2 Build Our Businesses – Support existing businesses to grow and attract new businesses to the district (5) to ensure that new areas do not detract from the functioning of the CBD.</li> <li>12. Amend 03.2 Build Our Businesses – Help deliver inclusive growth (5) to clarify whether the growth is compatible with sustainability, but support the development of enterprises</li> </ol> |                                  |

such as Xtreme Zero Waste, Whaingaroa Harbour Care and Kaiwhenua Organics.

13. Support 03.3 Embrace Our Identity – Celebrate our history (1) in particular the further listing of protected sites and further protection.
14. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity – Celebrate our history (2) for heritage to take precedence over development if history reflection is not possible. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity – Celebrate our history (3) to seek solutions to tourism as a seasonal industry. Support 03.3 Embrace Our Identity – Protect our environment (2), (5), and (6).
15. Amend 04.13 Raglan Development Plan to be redrawn with the same detail as the other maps and the consultation relaunched .
16. Amend 04.13 Raglan Development Plan to mention current or predicted seasonal populations and the infrastructure needed to cope with them.
17. Amend 04.13 Raglan Development Plan to clarify why Greenslade Road, Raglan is shown unaltered. Amend the whole proposal to include initiatives from the Blueprint as follows: -RA1.1 arts and surfing. -RA2.1 referred to “local food production, energy self-sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches” -RA3.1 “Support a strong Maori culture, including education on the Treaty of Waitangi, respecting tangata whenua, and creating Te Reo signage” -RA4.2 Support the Whaingaroa Raglan Affordability Project. -RA4.4 Support the development of a community hub for locals, youth skills, cultural, health and wellbeing and environmental exchange (OMG Tech). Consider the Wi Neera Street old surgery building as an option. -RA4.5 Investigate the development of a recreation centre and bringing sports together. -RA6.1 Support initiatives by the tech and visitor sectors to address youth unemployment. -RA6.2 Promote the formation of a business hub for high tech promotion and exchange. -RA6.3 Consider how to support the community in creating additional and sustaining existing local jobs in tourism. Consider a bed tax to compensate for increased waste and to support housing affordability initiatives. -RA6.4 Investigate opportunities for short-stay courses. -RA6.5 Identify if, how much, and where, possible additional employment land for office development is needed beyond the zoning in the Proposed District Plan. -RA6.6 Identify if, how much, and where, possible additional employment land for retail development is needed beyond the zoning in the Proposed District Plan. -RA7.1 Extend walking and cycling networks, including to Whale Bay. -RA7.2 Improve traffic safety around the school. -RA7.3 Develop a parking strategy. -RA9.1 Investigate whether Harbour Board income is used locally. -RA9.2 Partner with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes.

Hearing

Verbal submission (John Lawson):

- I. Spoke about ways in which council can improve engagement for example, hold meetings

around the district and make meetings more friendly and inviting i.e. sit around a table and not make it a us vs them meeting.

2. Spoke about Habitat for Humanity and linking in to Blueprints
3. Opposed Gilmour Street bypass and explained why it is not suitable
4. Suggested that WDC should partner up with Raglan Naturally.

Additional written submission:

Powerpoint presentation was displayed with supporting imagery referenced in verbal submission.

**Submission 51 Thorntree Orchards Ltd**

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| Submission Number:   | 51                     |
| Submitter Name   | Thorntree Orchards Ltd |
| Summary of Submission  |                        |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the Proposed District Plan submission #54 in relevance to this submission.</li> <li>2. Clarify between alternative zonings for the area east of Pokeno, bounded by State Highway 2 to the north, Baird Road to the east and Avon Road to the south, whether the Proposed District Plan zoning applies or the 2070 proposal applies.</li> <li>3. Oppose 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan the area being zoned as commercial and industrial.</li> <li>4. Oppose within 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan any extension to the time period of 10 years which places pressure on landowners unable to make any plans for either residential development or industrial development.</li> <li>5. Clarify the certainty of the proposal to enable existing property owners to make decisions regarding their current circumstance and businesses and to know that a land use amendment would allow for residential subdivisions or industrial/commercial development.</li> <li>6. Amend 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan to rezone the affected area and integrate into Pokeno village as in submissions map.</li> </ol> |                        |



**Submission 52 Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board**

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 52                              |
| Submitter Name  | Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board |
| Summary of Submission   |                                 |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the vision and principles outlined in the proposal. Support the key themes outlined in 02.0 Our Opportunities and What We Must Treasure and recognise that many would have relevance to the Onewhero-Tuakau area.</li> <li>2. Clarify 02.0 Our Opportunities and What We Must on how the aspirations in this section will be achieved or linked to the focus areas.</li> <li>3. Support 03.4 Empower Our People – Increase capability and capacity (2) in relevance to the Onewhero-Tuakau community. Include the Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board in discussions of the early stages of planned implementation of local area blueprints and community plans.</li> <li>4. Support the proposal but note that there needs to be a corresponding improvement of infrastructure to support such development.</li> <li>5. Support rail station in 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan to support any future residential growth within the area and to minimise congestion on main highways.</li> <li>6. Clarify how 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan will first address current water pressure issues in the Tuakau Township and how further development will not worsen this.</li> <li>7. Amend 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan to occur initiatives to change the perception of Tuakau and create an improved identity before any future residential or employment development.</li> <li>8. Amend 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan to support the social well-being of the Tuakau community and ensure that there are a range of recreational, social and sporting activities for all ages without feeling like a ‘dormitory suburb’ to Pukekohe and Pokeno.</li> <li>9. Ensure the proposal becomes a living document and ensure the aspirations within the proposal are fulfilled in partnership with key stakeholders such as the Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board and ensure that the proposal is more than an urban development plan.</li> </ol> |                                 |

**Submission 53 Toni Hill**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Submission Number:   | 53        |
| Submitter Name   | Toni Hill |
| Summary of Submission  |           |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan for its general vision for the Pokeno area.</li> <li>2. Amend 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan to set aside plans for beyond 30 years,</li> <li>3. Amend 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan to instead allow the 450m2 development to remain as "village" growth areas and incorporate the area shown as commercial and industrial to the north of this residential area as village growth.</li> <li>4. Amend the whole proposal to group together industrial areas without interfering with residential and town centres.</li> <li>5. Amend 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan to develop the town square away from the main road.</li> <li>6. Amend 04.2 Pokeno Development Plan to develop Pokeno more accurately with the already existing culture. Implement already provided input for the growth already being experienced.</li> </ol> |           |

**Submission 54 Tainui Hapu**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Submission Number:  | 54          |
| Submitter Name  | Tainui Hapu |
| Summary of Submission   |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tainui supports a range of quality residential options available within the district which meets the needs and aspirations of hapu and iwi.</li> <li>2. Sectors of our communities are focusing on surviving homelessness and lack of employment and are unable to participate in decision making. Tainui, with the support of Education Providers, Council and the local business sectors are keen to establish training facilities in Whaingaroa to assist youth acquire knowledge and skills to gain employment locally. Tainui supports better connectivity and suggests that alternative historic routes to Raglan be explored.</li> <li>3. Tainui agrees that the wellbeing of people and their communities are intrinsically linked, however to achieve the best outcomes for diverse communities in our district, we must also include the wellbeing of the local environments without which a strong and resilient society is impossible to achieve.</li> <li>4. Tainui whanau hapu and iwi are distinct west coast communities who have a kaitiakitanga relationship with largely rural coastal blocks of land which are sought after by both locals and tourists. Respecting the rights of whanau hapu and iwi to live in papakainga on their own land contributes to the wellbeing of both the people and the land.</li> <li>5. While Tainui understands the need for infilling to cater for future urban growth, we do not support the 4 storey buildings becoming part of the Raglan township.</li> <li>6. Tainui has land suitable for a wide variety of business opportunities from industrial, to cultural and social enterprises. Our Tihei Mauriora Plan which includes a conference centre envisages providing jobs for up to 200 people when completed. We have the ability to develop new businesses and create economic and social opportunities for our local youth and their whanau. Support from the Council to implement the plan will help Tainui build a stronger economic base in the Whaingaroa/Raglan area.</li> <li>7. As the Waikato District has layers of Maori history, it is important that businesses especially tourist operators connect with tangata whenua before establishing businesses in areas which may be wahi tapu or have other cultural constraints. Support the strategies to protect our environment. Papakainga are largely multi-residential rural sites. We therefore ask that these be exempted from the developments listed in 03.3.</li> <li>8. Tainui support the direction and implementation process outlined in 03.4</li> <li>9. Tainui supports maintaining the current 10m height within the CBD and to maintain the</li> </ol> |             |

CBD to the current area as identified in PC 14 along with the Business overlay of Bankart Street and 8, 10, 12 Wainui Road. We see no place for 4 storey buildings.

10. Gilmore Street is too narrow as a main thoroughfare to West Raglan.
11. Tainui supports the use of public transport and electric charging stations in the township. Some strategy to sort out parking for visitors is urgent. Cycle lanes between Raglan and Hamilton need to be more visible. Negotiating with whanau and hapu, spaces for cycleways and trails needs to occur before plans are drawn as many of the areas illegally used and requested by the public are on Maori land or in close proximity to cultural sites. e.g., Whaanga and Te Akau
12. Tainui have lived with the negative impacts of poor decisions regarding wastewater discharges to sea. With Sea level rise, the wastewater infrastructure of coastal towns is at risk. A strategy to address these matters sooner rather than later

**Submission 55 Lakeside Development 2017 Limited**

|   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 55                                |
| Submitter Name  | Lakeside Development 2017 Limited |
| Summary of Submission   |                                   |
| <p>1. LDL is a residential property development company focused on rezoning and subsequently developing a 179ha parcel of land adjoining the southern edge of Te Kauwhata centre. LDL believes the draft Growth and Economic Development Strategy is a fundamentally important document for the Waikato region in general and Te Kauwhata in particular. As such, LDL supports the draft strategy at a general level. LDL had a private plan change approved in April 2018 which rezoned 194ha of land at Scott Road, Te Kauwhata to Residential. The development of Lakeside will deliver benefits, not only to its future residents, but also to the existing Te Kauwhata community by delivering: housing of approximately 1600 lots, a community hub, and public access to Lake Waikare offering recreational opportunities and creation of an Iwi Reserve. Submitter supports the following elements of the strategy: supports the provision of the Strategy for the valuable leadership around future development in the district and to give effect to the Futureproof and the National Policy Statement on urban development capacity; the identified growth nodes, particularly along the Waikato Expressway at Pokeno, Mercer, Te Kauwhata and Huntly due to their location, the nearly completed Waikato Expressway, established centres, rail and lifestyle choice; supports the vision of creating liveable, thriving and connected communities and sees their development as one of the keys to deliver this outcome by -increased housing supply and diversity of housing types; increased population will deliver on the communities 'thriving'; and connections in regards to the rail and the Waikato Expressway with the wider area. Section 4.0 of the draft strategy contains a series of Development Plans for particular Focus Areas.</p> <p>2. With respect to the Development Plan for Te Kauwhata, LDL supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ identification as Te Kauwhata as a Focus Area with a projected future population of 10,000 by 2070;</li> <li>▪ The identification of Lakeside as a location for residential growth;</li> <li>▪ The identification of a 1-3 year development timeframe for Te Kauwhata (although it is noted that the development is more likely to have a 1-5 year timeframe for completion of the development);</li> <li>▪ The identification of land on the western side of Te Kauwhata for commercial and industrial development;</li> <li>▪ Development up to 4 levels will enable redevelopment of sites in an efficient and effective fashion. also supports the development plan for Huntly and Ohinewai as the industrial clusters identified at Ohinewai will provide employment for residents of nearby communities such as those at Te Kauwhata and</li> </ul> |                                   |

Ngaruawahia.

3. Notwithstanding Lakeside's general support for the draft strategy there are two specific elements of the Te Kauwhata Development Plan that, in LDL's view, should be amended.
4. The first relates to the 450m<sup>2</sup> building type identified for the Lakeside Development. While it is recognised that this is a high level document and generic notations have been used, the 450m<sup>2</sup> building type does not accurately reflect the form of development that the Council has approved for the site through the plan change process, namely an average site size of 250m<sup>2</sup> in the higher density precinct and an average site size of 450m<sup>2</sup> in the medium density precinct. LDL seeks that the Te Kauwhata development plan is amended to clearly identify that the size shown is an "average" and to show the "average" of 250m<sup>2</sup> for the higher density precinct and 450m<sup>2</sup> for the medium density precincts. If the amendments are not made, this could result in difficulties for LDL when they apply for subdivision consents that comply with the provisions of the approved plan change but not the 450m<sup>2</sup> building type shown on the development plan. It could also result in the community having an unrealistic expectation as to how this land will be developed.
5. The second relates to the building types shown indicating only single level development will occur at Lakeside. This should be amended to show the potential for two level developments in accordance with the 8m height limit in the approved Plan Change.
6. LDL believes that the draft Growth and Economic Development Strategy is a much needed document which will provide all users with a clear understanding of the nature, form and location of future development in the Waikato District. However, amendments should be made to the Te Kauwhata Development plan so that the provisions identified on the plan given effect to the provisions of the Plan Change approved by the Council.

Hearing

Verbal submission (John Duffy):

1. Supports the Lakeside growth cell that has been identified in the growth strategy.
2. Agrees with the timeframe that has been assigned 1-3 years.
3. Notes the section size and density and would like the growth cell to be reflected as the two densities that Lakeside have: 250m<sup>2</sup> and 450m<sup>2</sup>.
4. Would like to see the height diagram corrected. Perhaps height specified where it is three stories and over and assume 1-2 stories elsewhere.

**Submission 56 Alison Cunningham**

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 56                |
| Submitter Name  | Alison Cunningham |
| Summary of Submission   |                   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend whole proposal to make areas available for equestrian use, e.g. beaches, especially in Raglan.</li> </ol> |                   |

**Submission 57 C M Huxtable**

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Submission Number:  | 57           |
| Submitter Name  | C M Huxtable |
| Summary of Submission   |              |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>2. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>3. Amend whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |              |

**Submission 58 Ian J Anderson and Gail M Anderson**

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 58                                 |
| Submitter Name  | Ian J Anderson and Gail M Anderson |
| Summary of Submission   |                                    |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>2. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>3. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |                                    |

**Submission 59 Angela Kimber**

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Submission Number:  | 59            |
| Submitter Name  | Angela Kimber |
| Summary of Submission   |               |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>2. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>3. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |               |



**Submission 60 Mike Bell**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Submission Number:  | 60        |
| Submitter Name  | Mike Bell |
| Summary of Submission   |           |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>2. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>3. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |           |

**Submission 61 Jenny Kelly**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Submission Number:  | 61          |
| Submitter Name  | Jenny Kelly |
| Summary of Submission   |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend 04.6 Te Kauwhata Development Plan map to look more accurate.</li> <li>2. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity to protect the natural, cultural and built heritage in the Te Kauwhata area, in particular viticulture and horticulture.</li> <li>3. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity - Celebrate Our History to clarify how this will be applied in Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>4. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity - Protect Our Environment to repurpose Lake Waikare. Amend the whole proposal to mention the immense cultural and tourist importance rates of Rangiriri. Amend the whole of proposal to remain the agricultural and horticultural aspects of the wider environment in the long term, especially areas of natural beauty.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 62 Kirriemuir Trustee Limited**

|                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Submission Number: | 62                         |
| Submitter Name     | Kirriemuir Trustee Limited |

**Summary of Submission**

1. Section 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan
2. The submitter seeks that substantial business, community, Council and Waikato Regional Council engagement to develop a comprehensive structure/concept plan for River Road in its entirety to enable an enviable physical and cultural reconnection to the river.
3. Section 04.1 Tuakau Development Plan
4. The submitter seeks that the timeframe for eastern industrial zone is 10-30 years and the western industrial zone is 1-3 years.
5. The submitter seeks a more diverse mixture of residential zoning, including village zoning taking into account physical constraints such as the typology especially for parts of Dominion Road, east of Harrisville Road, Barnaby Road and River Road.
6. The submitter notes that the Dromgools Rd growth area differs from the Proposed Waikato District Plan, as it includes the residential area west of Geraghtys Road.
7. The land west of the Dromgools Road growth area and south of the Buckland growth area should be included in the Waikato 2070. The land will consist of 8-12 Geraghtys Road, 42 Geraghtys Road, 46 Geraghtys Road, 50 Geraghtys Road, 52 Geraghtys Road, 54 Geraghtys Road, 74 Geraghtys Road, 76 Geraghtys Road (total of 51.667ha). This land is uneconomic for growing and grazing.
8. The submitter seeks river access for Tuakau within the next 50 years

Hearing

Verbal submission (Kelvin Norgrove and Ken Whyte):

1. Changes to make to the Tuakau Town Centre Plan.
2. Add walking and cycling links.
3. Switch timing of the two industrial cells.
4. Correct the residential zoning areas.
5. Extend the medium density area, add an additional residential area to the south, add a commercial area south (river road area) – all proposed recommendations are drawn on the circulated map.

Additional written submission(s):

**Kevin Norgrove** on behalf of Ken Whyte/Kirriemuir Trustee Limited

1. Modify location and/or timing of zonings in for the future residential and industrial development in Tuakau (bring forward timing of the Whangarata Rd Business Park, extend residential zone to the west of Geraghty's Rd, and mixed use zoning/residential off River Rd).
2. Add a mixed use zone along River Rd
3. Grow south to the river to provide better connection to the river
4. Supports medium density zone close to the town centre
5. Disregard existing industrial activities close to the river when considering the future growth of Tuakau towards the river
6. Indicate planned future walking/cycling connections to the Waikato River
7. Remove or reduce Buckland Rd growth areas due to high class soils
8. Have three zone densities, village, mixed use and medium density residential
9. Achieve stronger alignment with Blueprints initiatives

**Submission 63 Lesley Thornley**

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Submission Number:   | 63              |
| Submitter Name   | Lesley Thornley |
| Summary of Submission  |                 |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load.</li> <li>2. Support retention of 450m2 for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>3. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>4. Amend whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |                 |

**Submission 64 Rosser Thornley**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Submission Number:  | 64              |
| Submitter Name  | Rosser Thornley |
| Summary of Submission   |                 |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support 04.13 Raglan Development Plan in the Town Centre.</li> <li>2. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street, Raglan as a main thoroughfare. Request unclear but highlights the widened road on Bankart Street, Raglan for a heavier weight load.</li> <li>3. Support retention of 450m<sup>2</sup> for the existing living zones as indicated on the map and along with the potential timeframes.</li> <li>4. Support bus station remaining in front of the Raglan Public Library.</li> <li>5. Support further advancing the Trail Strategy 2016 and in particular the Raglan trails that are identified.</li> <li>6. Focus on transport issues for Raglan, particularly to and from reserves, beaches and Hamilton during peak season and the lack of car parks.</li> <li>7. Amend the whole proposal to inform on the intention of combating climate change and its effects on farming, housing, and transport.</li> </ol> |                 |

**Submission 65 Gabrielle Parson**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 65               |
| Submitter Name  | Gabrielle Parson |
| Summary of Submission   |                  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support whole proposal in general, particularly the capturing of the recent work through the Blueprints.</li> <li>2. Amend 01.3 Our District to include more about the natural environment value in terms of biodiversity etc. especially soil.</li> <li>3. Amend 01.3 Our District to mention the harbours. Amend 2.1 Our Natural Environment to mention the harbours.</li> <li>4. Amend 02.6 Our Culture to include the Treaty of Waitangi to create a stronger link and background.</li> <li>5. Amend 02.6 Our Culture to include more cultures besides Maori, such as Pakeha or NZ or multicultural/bi-cultural.</li> <li>6. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity - Promote our culture (3) to include working with the community in promoting tourism and include more detail.</li> <li>7. Amend 03.3 Embrace Our Identity - Celebrate our history (3) to include working with the community in promoting tourism and include more detail.</li> <li>8. Clarify 01.3 Community Well-Being to explain where the four pillars of a strong and resilient society came from, what the body of information, model and background is, or if this was just put together by Waikato District Council.</li> </ol> |                  |

**Submission 66 Charlie Young**

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Submission Number:   | 66            |
| Submitter Name   | Charlie Young |
| Summary of Submission  |               |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Huntly Support for the inclusion of the Kimihia Lakes Special Activity Precinct (S.A.P.) in the Plan. The proposed activation time frame for the Kimihia Lakes S.A.P. be brought forward from 10-30 years to 3-10 years.</li> <li>2. Support for the Ohinewai Industrial Clusters (Sleepyhead) as proposed.</li> <li>3. Support for the Train and Bus Transport Centre 1-3 years.</li> <li>4. Support the Shand's property has been included as Commercial and Industrial 3-10 years.</li> <li>5. Add the future Expressway Interchange at McVie Road on roads and rail category in 3-10 years as designated in the Blueprinting process.</li> <li>6. There should be added new cycleway/walkway designations around the Special Activity Precinct that would link up to the Huntly Town center plan and Transport Centre for the whole of Huntly and Ohinewai that would link up the community to the Kimihia Lakes S.A.P. along with the "Great 7 Lakes" and River Trail Ride proposition.</li> <li>7. The map doesn't show or designate for a residential development adjacent to the Kimihia Lakes SAP. I request the addition of this feature into the 3-10 year plan. It should also include mixed use residential that includes the 450m3 lot designation along with multi-unit dwelling designation.</li> <li>8. Add Kimihia Lakes S.A.P. as an additional ""Priority Growth and Investment Zone"" for Huntly. (See linked gray boxes around town centre on map)"</li> </ol> |               |

**Submission 67 Collinsons**

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Submission Number:  | 67         |
| Submitter Name  | Collinsons |
| Summary of Submission   |            |
| <p>1. Raglan I would like to object to the horses being banned from Waikato beaches, Namely Raglan. It is increasingly difficult for riders to find places to safely ride without vehicles and other distractions. The urbanisation of areas and provision of cycle and mountain bike tracks has been to the detriment of the horses, the first means of transport in NZ. Please consider our request and either reopen the beach or enable riding on some other areas as well.</p> |            |

**Submission 68 Graham Harkness**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Submission Number:  | 68              |
| Submitter Name  | Graham Harkness |
| Summary of Submission   |                 |
| <p>1. Huntly Supports Lake Hakanoa Growth Cell of Housing at 400m2. But suggest it be identified in 1-3yrs.</p> <p>2. Supports the mixed use town Centre growth cell in Huntly.</p> <p>3. Supports Rayner road growth cell being rezoned to 400m2 or 450m2 for housing within 1-3yrs.</p> |                 |

**Submission 69 Unknown**

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Submission Number:  | 69      |
| Submitter Name  | Unknown |
| Summary of Submission   |         |
| <p>1. Supports the submission that the Huntly Community Board has submitted because they have consulted with our members.</p> |         |



### Submission 70 Huntly War Memorial Hall

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 70                       |
| Submitter Name  | Huntly War Memorial Hall |
| Summary of Submission   |                          |
| <p>1. Huntly: Supports the submission that the Huntly Community Board has submitted because they have consulted with our members.</p> |                          |

### Submission 71 Ian McAlley

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Submission Number:  | 71          |
| Submitter Name  | Ian McAlley |
| Summary of Submission   |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tuakau: Establish a train station at Tuakau to enable connection into Auckland. The location of the train line immediately adjacent to the town centre provides excellent integration of this transport service with the commercial heart of the town, in particular promoting use of non-vehicular transport in and around the town.</li> <li>2. Enable a greater level of in fill development in Tuakau to provide a variety of housing types to meet a wide cross section of the community. Increasing density around the existing town centre limits the need for expansion into the rural hinterland which includes highly productive soils.</li> <li>3. Te Kauwhata: Enable Te Kauwhata to grow via appropriate zoning and infrastructure provision as it is an area that already has established social and recreational resources that can be expanded and improved on, rather than having to build facilities to support growth. Further growing an established village/town avoids new communities not having recreational resources because the community has not grown to the point where recreational resources such as rugby or golf clubs become viable e.g. Pokeno</li> <li>4. Do not promote subdivisions at low densities such as 2500m<sup>2</sup>, this is inconsistent with Future Proof and the Regional Policy statement and leads to expanded and unnecessary subdivisions spreading onto rural land. Subdivision for residential purposes should be at residential densities and connected to appropriate services to avoid environmental degradation of the surrounding environment.</li> <li>5. Bring forward the establishment of a train station at Te Kauwhata in conjunction with the establishment of an Auckland/Hamilton commuter train service.</li> <li>6. Efficient growth in Te Kauwhata needs to be enabled to make use of the land resource that is available, providing concentrated growth in and around the existing settlement. Residential development densities must reflect the outcomes sought under Future Proof and required by the Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 72 Unknown**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Submission Number:   | 72      |
| Submitter Name   | Unknown |
| Summary of Submission  |         |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional discussions regarding the Pokeno Town Centre are required, particularly concerning the truck stop.</li> <li>2. I believe there needs to be more collaboration between NZTA, Regional Council and District Council to better connect reasons behind plan changes for the future. Off ramps and on ramps are very important to maintain effective traffic flow through the Pokeno village. This is important to keep businesses near the town centre vibrant, motivated and engaged in maintaining the "village" atmosphere of the town centre. Parking and amenities such as a library and a council facility need to be established immediately alongside the current businesses in town. Thought out plans for a centre that could in the future be servicing a local population of between 15,000 and 20,000 people. Do it right at the beginning to ensure the community is connected with its locals and those who are motivated to drop in as the travel to and leave Auckland via SH1 or SH2.</li> <li>3. Supports more housing choice, Town housing or multiple storied housing complexes with little maintenance around the town centre and the proposed railway siding for passenger traffic. Bus transport based at the town centre would allow people to leave vehicles at home to catch a train.</li> </ol> |         |

**Submission 73 John Lawson**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Submission Number:   | 73          |
| Submitter Name   | John Lawson |
| Summary of Submission  |             |
| <p>1. Raglan 4.13 The main road shouldn't be diverted via Gilmour and Stewart Streets.</p> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submitter noted the ways in which WDC can improve the engagement process. For example, hold meetings around the district, and create a comfortable environment. Remove the “us versus them” aspect of a meeting.</li> <li>2. Submitter noted the need to work with Habitat for Humanity.</li> <li>3. Submitter seeks further links in the Waikato 2070 to the Blueprints.</li> <li>4. Submitter notes that utilising Gilmour Street as a bypass is unsuitable.</li> <li>5. Submitter promotes further partnership between WDC and Raglan Naturally.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 74 Kim**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Submission Number:   | 74  |
| Submitter Name   | Kim |
| Summary of Submission  |     |
| <p>1. Huntly 4.7 and 4.8 I support the proposal that the Huntly Community Board has put through as it represents feedback that myself and members of the community have discussed.</p> |     |

**Submission 75 Mercer Community Committee**

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 75                         |
| Submitter Name  | Mercer Community Committee |
| Summary of Submission   |                            |
| <p>1. 3.3 Embrace our identity Support tourism development and work with tourism agencies to promote the districts diverse culture. Identify that Mercer's identity is changing and leading towards tourism which the community is embracing.</p> <p>2. Promote ecological and environmental protection and restoration &amp; cluster industrial activities in industrial zones and restrict them in rural areas. WDC have identified industrial growth in our reserve area, giving false indication for industrial growth.</p> <p>3. 3.1 Grow Our Communities Leverage existing transport networks, including walking and cycling infrastructure. Identify walkways. Identify Mercer as a freight hub.</p> <p>4. Identify Mercer Reserve as a recreational area. Nor are other recreational areas identified to balance the industrial, commercial and housing growth estimated.</p> <p>5. Ensure our communities have easy access to infrastructure and services. Identify the need for a 24hr public toilet in Mercer.</p> <p>6. Avoid development that leads to social isolation, promote the use of Mercer sports fields. 4.5 Mercer Include a brief description for Huntly Town Centre and Mercer &amp; Meremere. This demonstrates WDC lack of attention and recognition of these communities within their district. Include the Blueprint and H2A workshops in Mercers plan.</p> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Liam McGraph):</p> <p>1. The Strategy does not identify any of the current passive and active recreation areas.</p> |                            |

2. Would like to see a joint train project and have a bus stop identified.
3. Mercer could be identified as a tourism area with lots of planned projects identified.
4. Correct the commercial area identified on the map so it does not go over the reserve.
5. Would like to see town descriptors added for those that are missing some i.e. Mercer, Meremere and Huntly Town Centre.
6. Would like to see some residential development identified in Mercer.
7. Would like to see more time given in the future between closing of submissions and time for the hearing.

Additional written submission:

Powerpoint presentation was displayed referencing content covered in verbal submission.

**Submission 76 McLuskie**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Submission Number:   | 76       |
| Submitter Name   | McLuskie |
| Summary of Submission  |          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4.13 Raglan Please do not build 4 storeys high in Raglan. There definitely needs to be more focus on providing shared trails and available spaces for horse riders.</li> <li>2. Horse riders should not be singled out and banned from beaches.</li> <li>3. There should be promotion and encouragement for recreational activities that get our children outside in the fresh air and away from screens.</li> </ol> |          |

**Submission 77 Nick Hall**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Submission Number:  | 77        |
| Submitter Name  | Nick Hall |
| Summary of Submission   |           |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4.1 Tuakau Existing Motorsport infrastructure (Harrisville Motocross) should be protected from sensitive land use. Incorporate land adjacent to form part of the Special Activity Precinct enables buffering and potential like activities to further establish.</li> <li>2. 4.5 Meremere and Mercer Existing Motorsport infrastructure should be protected from sensitive land use activities, unless housing is integrated/inclusive with motorsport activities. Incorporate land utilized for motorsport at Dragway Rd to form part of the Special Activity Precinct enables buffering and potential like activities to further establish. Ensure that motorsport is protected where it is established.</li> <li>3. 4.7 and 4.8 Huntly Existing Motorsport infrastructure (Huntly Speedway) should be protected from sensitive land use activities.</li> <li>4. Incorporate more land adjacent to the speedway to form part of the Special Activity Precinct enables buffering and potential like activities to further establish. Ensure that motorsport is protected where it is established.</li> </ol> |           |

**Submission 78 Peter Thompson**

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Submission Number:  | 78             |
| Submitter Name  | Peter Thompson |
| Summary of Submission   |                |
| <p>1. Planning for Maramarua needs to encourage NZTA to think seriously about how they design the by-pass through Maramarua. They need to provide a single 'on and off' situation, which will encourage a service area beside the highway, and so support the district. Maramarua is currently a service area on this route, planning needs to ensure that it continues as such. Planning needs to provide land designated in such a way to encourage developers to realise the potential here.</p> |                |

**Submission 79 Unknown**

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Submission Number:  | 79      |
| Submitter Name  | Unknown |
| Summary of Submission   |         |
| <p>1. Pokeno supports the strategy in principle; I believe the time lines are set out too far.</p> <p>2. The development of the "CBD" and Market square should occur in a 2-5 year time frame, not the 3-10 years proposed. With the supermarket now going ahead, I would very much like to see some active planning and encouragement from council (using all their contacts) to develop the Main Street as a pleasant and welcoming destination for locals and tourists alike.</p> <p>3. Supports growing the commercial/industrial areas to ensure Pokeno becomes a sustainable community with local employment options. Therefore the 10-30 year timeframe proposed is far too long. A 5-15 year time frame would be much more acceptable for the employment growth cell.</p> |         |

**Submission 80 Shaun Jackson**

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Submission Number:   | 80            |
| Submitter Name   | Shaun Jackson |
| Summary of Submission  |               |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 3.2 Build Our Businesses Supports the concept, Interested to know how this is achieved.</li> <li>2. 3.3 Embrace our Identity Supports the concept. A number of our towns would be well served by having a stronger identity that we can all be proud of. Not only our identity but an environment that we can be proud of too.</li> <li>3. 4.1 Tuakau It is important that Infrastructure is ready to go when land is released for residential development. Bollard road development cells both should be in the 1-3years time frame.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal Submission (Shaun Jackson):</p> <p>Onewhero Tuakau Community Board - General Support for the ideas in principle. Ensure the document becomes a living document. Ensure it is more than just an urban development plan. Would like more information on how the ideas in the focus areas are going to be implemented.</p> <p>Shaun Jackson – Personally supports the growth and questions his site on Dominion Road being in the 30+ years; he would like this to be brought forward. Not sure about the Tuakau Industrial growth cells; they should both be in the 1-3 years’ time frame as the land is zoned and developer ready. A train station should be included in the Tuakau area.</p> |               |



**Submission 81 Brett Titchmarsh**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 81               |
| Submitter Name  | Brett Titchmarsh |
| Summary of Submission   |                  |
| <p>1. 4.1 Tuakau The population data appears inaccurate. Once additional residential land is rezoned the population should be higher than stated.</p> |                  |

**Submission 82 Claire McLennan**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Submission Number:  | 82              |
| Submitter Name  | Claire McLennan |
| Summary of Submission   |                 |
| <p>1. Tuakau Support the development cell on Dominion Road but would like the timing to be brought forward.</p> |                 |

**Submission 83 Papakura Local Board**

|   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 83                   |
| Submitter Name  | Papakura Local Board |
| Summary of Submission   |                      |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provision of transport infrastructure that links to the wider Auckland and Waikato networks is critical as growth occurs in Pokeno and Tuakau.</li> <li>2. Public transport links to the rail network needs to keep pace with growth, particularly in the Pokeno Area. The motorway network is already significantly congested. There may need to be dedicated bus links that link up with the Auckland commuter rail network and in the longer term train stations developed in outlying townships. Cycling links should also be included.</li> <li>3. Looking to the longer term, provision of an additional rail line may be required if rail freight volumes increase.</li> <li>4. Future open space and recreation infrastructure must be planned to benefit communities of Pokeno and Tuakau.</li> <li>5. Planning for adequate water and wastewater infrastructure also needs to be in place to support growth.</li> <li>6. Protection of high-class soils should be treasured.</li> <li>7. Public transport planning needs to provide connectivity to main transport hubs.</li> <li>8. To avoid Pokeno and Tuakau becoming sleeper suburbs to Auckland, the Strategy</li> </ol> |                      |

should provide opportunities for social procurement to increase capabilities and employment opportunities for local people, particularly the younger demographic.

**Submission 84 Dr Lesley Topping**

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 84                                  |
| Submitter Name  | Dr Lesley Topping (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                     |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter notes that the development area in the northern Ngaruawahia growth area bounded by the railway, Old Taupiri Road and Hopuhopu is not appropriate because Old Taupiri Road has a gentler profile and faces northwest, and is therefore potentially valuable for future high value residential development. Furthermore, industrial development on the other side of the road would significantly decrease the value of the area and affect the livability and connectedness of the local community. This being said, industrial development would provide employment opportunities within Ngaruawahia. Therefore, the submitter seeks separation of the industrial area to the residential growth area by making access to the industrial growth area adjacent to the railway line, and keeping both sides of Old Taupiri Road only accessible for residential dwellers. Furthermore, a planted bund built from excess during land clearing could provide noise separation for residences on the eastern side of Old Taupiri Road.</li> <li>2. Establish a town entrance or other culturally significant enhancements that will celebrate Ngaruawahia.</li> <li>3. There is significant potential to enhance and utilize the Hakarimata Stairs for different activities, or as an Adventure Park.</li> </ol> |                                     |

**Submission 85 Kainga Ora**

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 85                           |
| Submitter Name  | Kainga Ora (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                              |
| <p>No written submission received</p> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission (Phil Stickney):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. N/A - No written submission received but Kainga Ora spoke at the hearing and tabled a written document. Supports the intent of the document.</li> <li>2. Suggests that it is not clear how the Strategy will be carried through into implementation. There is no background documentation, analysis or assessment to provide context around the settlement pattern or how it is linked to the community visioning in the blue prints.</li> <li>3. The specific details in the town development plans include details such as lot size, housing typology and height which might not be appropriate over the life of the strategy. It is not clear how the development plans consider trends that will address unique economic assessment.</li> <li>4. The Strategy is well-intentioned with the community and environmental components contained within Parts 1-3, but there is a leap to the development plans in Part 4.0 with no explanation or assessment.</li> <li>5. Part 4.0 of the Strategy is very specific. An analysis is needed of the proposed densities, typologies and timeframes were developed or the analysis that concludes that these types of development will be appropriate over the life of the Strategy.</li> <li>6. It is not clear how the Development Plans for each settlement have considered such trends in their approach to growth and how the development plans will positively address the unique economic and social circumstances that some settlements are experiencing.</li> <li>7. The submitter also considers that the nationwide trends of an ageing population, decreasing levels of home ownership and housing affordability constraints are key issues that the Strategy should consider in the context of the development of a spatial framework for growth for each settlement. Given that the Strategy encompasses economic, community and growth spheres, these are matters that the Strategy should actively seek to incorporate into analysis and responses.</li> </ol> |                              |

8. Concerns on what level of analysis has been used to underpin the growth patterns and outcomes the Strategy proposes. The submitter considers that the identified housing typologies, spatial distribution of growth and future land use patterns requires review and amendment to address gaps in the housing outcomes for current and future communities in order to achieve the intent and vision of the strategy.

**Submission 86 Karla Stevenson**

|   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 86                                |
| Submitter Name  | Karla Stevenson (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan Support the 10m max height within the Raglan CBD and to maintain the CBD to the area identified in Plan Change 14, along with the Business overlay of Bankart Street, and 8, 10 and 12 Bankart Street to retain the character as set out in the Raglan Design Guideline.</li> <li>2. Oppose the use of Gilmour Street as a main thoroughfare to avoid adverse health and safety impacts.</li> <li>3. Bankart Street was widened and designed to take heavier weight load with two roundabouts that facilitate a safer pathway for cross/bypass traffic to use.</li> <li>4. Retain the 450m2 for existing living zones.</li> <li>5. Support keeping the bus station in front of the Raglan Public Library.</li> <li>6. Advancement of the Waikato District Council Trail Strategy 2016.</li> <li>7. There is no mention of transport in Raglan, and this is an issue for Raglan.</li> <li>8. There is minimal information on how or what the Council is intending to do to combat climate change.</li> </ol> |                                   |

**Submission 87 David Whyte**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Submission Number:   | 87          |
| Submitter Name   | David Whyte |
| Summary of Submission  |             |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disconnect with previous planning: Initially told that the provision of green space on and around Lake Puketirini is not possible, however the Waikato 2070 proposes future development. This shows there is a lack of communication across the organization.</li> <li>2. Significant Natural Areas: Not aware of how SNAs were determined in the Proposed Waikato District Plan. If the Council had visited each site, they would identify that many of the SNA sites are places of weeds, gorse and such.</li> <li>3. Blueprint dilution: Assumption that the blueprints have been ignored. However the blueprint wasn't as simple, clear and focused as the community discussions.</li> </ol> <p>Hearing</p> <p>Verbal submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spoke to the process that was undertaken. Disappointed that the Blueprints were not highlighted in the document.</li> <li>2. Would like to see the blueprints kept simple and clean.</li> <li>3. Does not support the development around Lake Puketirini.</li> <li>4. Has concerns about the significant natural area process and how they were identified.</li> </ol> <p>Additional written submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Powerpoint presentation was displayed showing images of Lake Puketirini development areas, SNA mapping, and site visit images questioning the validity of SNAs including content covered in verbal submission.</li> </ol> |             |

**Submission 88 Chris Aitchinson**

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 88                                 |
| Submitter Name  | Chris Aitchinson (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                    |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan Strongly disagrees with the use of Gilmore Street, Steward Street as a main road/thoroughfare, to avoid adverse health and safety effects. Bankart Street was upgraded for this purpose.</li> <li>2. Support the 10m height within the Raglan CBD.</li> <li>3. Retain the location of the bus station in front of the library.</li> <li>4. Support all cycling and walking trails.</li> </ol> |                                    |

**Submission 89 Sarah Aitchinson**

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 89                                 |
| Submitter Name  | Sarah Aitchinson (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                    |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan Strongly disagrees with the use of Gilmore Street, Steward Street as a main road/thoroughfare, to avoid adverse health and safety effects. Bankart Street was upgraded for this purpose.</li> <li>2. Support the 10m height within the Raglan CBD.</li> <li>3. Retain the location of the bus station in front of the library.</li> <li>4. Support all cycling and walking trails.</li> </ol> |                                    |

**Submission 90 Ayla Aitchinson**

|   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 90                                |
| Submitter Name  | Ayla Aitchinson (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                   |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan Strongly disagrees with the use of Gilmore Street, Steward Street as a main road/thoroughfare, to avoid adverse health and safety effects. Bankart Street was upgraded for this purpose.</li> <li>2. Support the 10m height within the Raglan CBD.</li> <li>3. Retain the location of the bus station in front of the library.</li> <li>4. Support all cycling and walking trails.</li> </ol> |                                   |

**Submission 91 Archer Aitchinson**

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Submission Number:  | 91                                  |
| Submitter Name  | Archer Aitchinson (Late Submission) |
| Summary of Submission   |                                     |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 04.13 Raglan Development Plan Strongly disagrees with the use of Gilmore Street, Steward Street as a main road/thoroughfare, to avoid adverse health and safety effects. Bankart Street was upgraded for this purpose.</li> <li>2. Support the 10m height within the Raglan CBD.</li> <li>3. Retain the location of the bus station in front of the library.</li> <li>4. Support all cycling and walking trails.</li> </ol> |                                     |

**Submission 92 TerraFirma**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Submission Number:   | 92         |
| Submitter Name   | TerraFirma |
| Summary of Submission  |            |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TerraFirma owns approximately 27ha immediately south of Lake Puketirini in Huntly, which is proposed to be zoned Rural under the Proposed Waikato District Plan.</li> <li>2. Map 04.7 Huntly and Ohinewai Development Plan</li> <li>3. Lot sizes for standalone properties are proposed to be 450m<sup>2</sup>. It is noted that Waikato 2070 predominantly contemplates standalone lot sizes of 450m<sup>2</sup> throughout the district. More intensive development is proposed in the form of two and three level townhouses.</li> <li>4. The submitter supports the Waikato 2070 in principle.</li> <li>5. The rationale for 450m<sup>2</sup> lot size is not clear. The submitter is concerned that a one size fits all approach to lot sizes does not take sufficient account of the company's rezoning proposal and will not provide the best overall outcome for development at Puketirini.</li> <li>6. The submitter seeks the following:</li> <li>7. Most of the land on the northern perimeter benefits from proximity to Puketirini Reserve, views of Lake Puketirini and an elevated, north facing aspect. Less intensive housing will likely be less intrusive to the community enjoying the lake and surrounding walkways and cycleways.</li> <li>8. The extent of the respective Village and Residential Zones is not fixed although the submitter is of the opinion that larger lots should be established along the northern boundary, and extend towards the west and east.</li> <li>9. Larger lots on the reserve boundary will provide a smoother visual and amenity transition to the adjoining reserve than 450m<sup>2</sup> lots.</li> </ol> |            |



10. The topography along the boundary is considered better suited to larger lots.
11. The Village Zone lot sizes on Lake Puketirini can vary between 1,000m<sup>2</sup> to 3000m<sup>2</sup>, but can be reduced to an average of 1500m<sup>2</sup>.
12. The upper limit of the Residential lot sizes (1200m<sup>2</sup>) is not considered sufficient to provide flexibility on large lot, which is why the Village Zone is sought.
13. The Residential Zone could include multi-storey development.
14. The submitter wishes to develop a variety of lot sizes and housing types, to attract a variety of household demographics and avoid a homogenous and bland development.
15. Weavers Crossing.
16. This site is to the west of the Puketirini block and is not included in the Lake Puketirini development area shown in Map 04.7. This topography is not well suited to high intensity development and can cater self-sufficient storm water and waste treatment/disposal systems, and therefore a Village Zone. The submitter will proceed with the development at Weavers Crossing as soon as the site is rezoned.

Overall relief sought includes:

17. The Waikato 2070 is amended to clarify whether the standalone lot sizes notation is an average, maximum, or some other parameter.
18. That the Waikato 200 is amended to clarify that multi-storey development is not prohibited in the Lake Puketirini residential area.
19. That Map 04.7 is amended to note lot sizes ranging from 450m<sup>2</sup> to 3000m<sup>2</sup> for the Lake Puketirini area.
20. That the Weavers Crossing land is confirmed as being excluded from the Lake Puketirini area noted on Map 04.7.

Hearing

Verbal submission:

- I. Would like a variety of lot sizes shown for their growth cell. The 450m<sup>2</sup> lots one size fits all will not be sufficient. Would also like options in relation to development height. Submission to the district plan seeks a range of lot size options 450-3000m<sup>2</sup>. Also seeking rezoning of weavers crossing site which is not identified.

Additional written submission:

Powerpoint presentation was displayed showing two maps that the submitter spoke to.