

Summary of decisions requested in submissions to Proposed Private Plan Change 33 – Hautapu Area 7

June 26, 2025

Contents

Reader's Guide.....	3
How to read the summary	3
How to make a further submission.....	4
Submitter details.....	5
(1) Maxwell, A B	6
(2) West, J V	7
(3) Kama Trust	8
(4) Waipā District Council	11

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the four (4) submissions received on Proposed Private Plan Change 33 – Hautapu Area 7 (PC33) and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered by submitter number. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by submitter.

Call for further submissions opens on **June 26, 2025**. The closing date for making further submissions is **5pm Thursday July 10, 2025**. **No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 1/3) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission.

EXAMPLE:

Submission 1/3

1 is the submitter number

3 is the submission point number

How to read the summary

- This summary is ordered by submitter number. The summary lists all of the submission points made by all the submitters.

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in the plan change greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices at Cambridge and Te Awamutu, as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange33.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipā District Council.

We have made the decision to redact the contact details of all submitters. We have done this because increasingly people are expressing privacy concerns with having their contact details publicly available. If you need to contact a submitter Council can provide their details to you on request. **Please email districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz to request the contact details of the original submitter.**

Submissions can be:

- Posted to:** Waipā District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Te Awamutu Office
101 Bank Street
Te Awamutu
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Cambridge Office
23 Wilson Street
Cambridge
- Emailed to:** districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Submitter details

By Surname	Submission Number
Maxwell, A B	1
West, J V	2
Kama Trust	3
Waipā District Council	4

(1) Maxwell, A B

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
1/1	Structure plan notations	Proposed S5.9X –Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	In part	The proposed structure plan for Area 6 and Area 7 shows the Riparian Management Plan for the southern side of the Mangaone stream, "goes through the property of 404 Peake RD", which IS NOT in Area 7. The "20 metre Riparian Management plan and building setback" should run south of the boundary line between 404 Peake Rd and Area 7, not from the Mangaone stream.	That the rule, maps and relevant wording be changed to show the ":20 metre Riparian Management Plan and Building Setback" to be on the south side of 404 Peake Rd boundary and Area 7.

(2) West, J V

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
2/1	Whole of plan change	Not specified	Oppose	Oppose bringing forward deferred industrial to live industrial – • we as the Bruntwood Community are subjected to an extra five extra years of light, noise, visual and traffic pollution • it is prime agricultural land and should be protected as long as possible as directed by national government policy There is no need to bring this area of deferred industrial land to live industrial, as excess industrial land is currently available and will be available in the next five years. The applicant led council and submitters to believe at the hearing they had no need and would not do this.	To deny the request to bring Plan Change 33 of deferred industrial to live industrial.

(3) Kama Trust

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
3/1	Whole plan change	Not specified	In part	PC33 is conditionally supported subject to: a) Plan provisions being incorporated to protect against adverse effects on the Kama Trust land within the C9 Growth Cell by ensuring: i. Any potential adverse effects on the transport network arising from PC33 are appropriately mitigated; ii. Any potential adverse water supply, stormwater and wastewater effects arising from PC33 are appropriately mitigated; and b) Retaining the sequencing trigger in Appendix S1 of the ODP for the C9 Growth cell in respect of Area 7.	Either that PC33 is: a) Approved if Kama Trust's matters of concern are satisfactorily addressed; or b) Declined if their matters of concern are not satisfactorily addressed; and c) Such other additional relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.
3/2	Amendment to sequencing for subdivision and development of Area 7	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(a)	Oppose	Opposes the introduction of rules proposing that subdivision and development of Area 7 occurs in conjunction with Area 6 under a co-ordinated subdivision consent application process incorporating both Areas 6 and 7.	That Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(a) and all related provisions be deleted.
3/3	Amendment to sequencing for subdivision and development of Area 7	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(b)	Oppose	PC33 seeks to rewrite a critical sequencing trigger in the ODP, introduced through PC17. Appendix S1 – Future Growth Cells includes the following provision in relation to the C9 Growth Cell: <i>The deferred status of the Industrial Zone (Area 7) can be uplifted via a plan change once Area 6 of the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area has reached 80% development (i.e. 80% of the developable land area is the subject of s.224 certificates) or by 31 March 2030, whichever occurs sooner.</i> This is a necessary control, which was carefully considered through the PC17 process, and the 'backstop' of 31 March 2030 is critical. Amending the date to 31 March 2026 significantly disrupts the intended sequencing approved under PC17.	That Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX(b) and all related provisions be deleted.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
3/4	Unacceptable Transport Effects	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Oppose	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW requires the first subdivision of Area 6 to vest the entire length of the proposed road between Hautapu Road and Area 7 shown on the Hautapu Structure Plan as "Road 4". A rule is unnecessary and opposed.	Rules to be incorporated within PC33 to ensure that any adverse effects on Area 6 arising at the time that the road connection between Area 6 and Area 7 occurs, are adequately addressed.
3/5	Unacceptable Transport Effects	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	In part	The Hautapu Structure Plan lists the following as an item to give effect to the structure plan: <i>Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6</i>	That text on the Hautapu Structure Plan be amended as follows: <i>Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6 Area 7.</i>
3/6	Unacceptable Transport Effects	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about any further adverse effects on the wider transport network due to the additional traffic that PC33 will generate.	PC33 is amended as necessary to ensure these potential effects are addressed.
3/7	Unacceptable Three Waters Effects	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about the manner in which wastewater is proposed to be managed under PC33 given Area 7 is located 'downstream' of Area 6.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.
3/8	Unacceptable Three Waters Effects	Not specified	In part	The submitter has significant concerns about the manner in which stormwater is proposed to be managed under PC33. The technical material to support PC33 also promotes integration with Area 6 by potentially removing the stormwater device on Area 6, and relocating it, significantly expanded, to within Area 7 where it will serve both areas. The proposal under OC33 would result in significant inefficiencies, requiring redesign of the stormwater system for Area 6. PC33 refers to old soakage relates which were tested at a significant distance from Area 7.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.
3/9	Unacceptable Three Waters Effects	Not specified	In part	The submitter is concerned about how potable water is proposed to be supplied to Area 7 under PC33 and how it affects Area 6.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.
3/10	General	Not specified	In part	PC33 is not supported by sufficiently up to date and	Such relief and/or consequential

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				detailed technical assessments, including in relation to transport, Geotech and three waters. Much of the technical material is recycled from PC17.	amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.
3/11	General	Not Specified	In part	The relevant PC33 provisions require amendment because, as currently drafted, they: ▪ Are inconsistent with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA; ▪ Are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; ▪ Will not adequately avoid, remedy and mitigate the adverse effects associated with PC33 on the environment; ▪ Will not achieve integrated management of the effects of use, development or protection of land and associated resource of the Waipa District; ▪ Will not enable the efficient use and development of Kama Trust's land; ▪ Do not represent the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC33 or the operative objectives and policies, in terms of s.32 of the RMA; and ▪ Are not consistent with sound resource management practice.	Such relief and/or consequential amendments to PC33 as may be necessary to address Kama Trust's concerns.

(4) Waipā District Council

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
4/1	Activity status	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.WW. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	That the following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.WW: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>
4/2	Activity status	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.XX	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.XX. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	That the following text is added to the end of Rule 15.4.2.XX: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>
4/3	Activity status	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.YY. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	The following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u>

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
4/4	Activity status	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.ZZ	Neutral	The proposed ruleset as notified does not assign an activity status for activities that fail to comply with proposed new Rule 15.4.2.ZZ. An activity status needs to be assigned to each rule so that in the event of non-compliance the associated resource consent requirement is clear. In this instance the status that is associated for non-compliance should be consistent with other comparable rules in the Waipā District Plan.	That the following text is added to the end of Proposed Rule 15.4.2.ZZ: <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a discretionary activity.</u>
4/5	Riparian management plan	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY	Neutral	Proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY requires that as part of the first subdivision consent application involving land adjoining the Mangaone Stream, a Riparian Management Plan must be submitted for certification by WDC and subsequent implementation. It is not clear from the proposed rule: - What the minimum extent of the Riparian Management Area will be; or - When the required management plan is required to be implemented. In addition to this, any requirement to prepare and implement the management plan should also be triggered by any proposed development of land adjoining the Mangaone Stream. The rule should be amended to ensure that: - The minimum extent of the Riparian Management Area is identified and that this includes the Riparian Buffer and stormwater devices close to the stream. - The provision and implementation of the Riparian Management Plan occurs as part of the first subdivision or development in Area 7.	That proposed Rule 15.4.2.YY is amended to read as follows: A Riparian Management Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the first subdivision of Area 7 consent application or the first development involving land adjoining the Mangaone Stream for certification by the Waipā District Council and subsequent implementation. [...] a) Clarification (by way of mapping) as to the precise area and extent of the riparian management area. <u>At a minimum, this area shall include:</u> <u>The Riparian Buffer shown on the Structure Plan; and</u> <u>Any stormwater management device in close proximity to the Riparian Buffer.</u> [...]

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					g) Planting / Fencing Implementation Programme for giving effect to the Riparian Management Plan, noting that: i. Any works certified by the Plan shall be completed the sooner of either: ▪ Prior to approval of the first subdivision pursuant to section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991; or ▪ Within the first planting season following the completion of construction activities associated with the first development. [...] Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a non-complying activity.
4/6	Structure plan notations	Proposed S5.9X – Hautapu Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Neutral	The proposed structure plan image for Area 7 shows notations extending over land that does not form part of Area 7. This includes Rural land to the north, and Area 6. The Structure Plan applies solely to land in Area 7. Because of this, any notations that are placed over land outside of Area 7 should be deleted.	Remove “20m Wide Riparian Buffer” notation from Rural Zone properties outside of Area 7, and remove any notations over Area 6.
4/7	Structure plan notations	Proposed S5.9X – Area 6 and Area 7 Structure Plan	Neutral	The existing Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan map identifies “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” as text in the margin of the plan. This includes items that apply to Area 7 which have not been included on the proposed Structure Plan for Area 7. This can be addressed by adding an advice note which makes it clear that any subdivision or development in Area 7 is required to be in general accordance with all	Add an advice note to the proposed Area 7 Structure Plan as follows: Development within Area 7 is subject to both the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan (S5.9) and the Area 7 Structure Plan (S5.9.X).

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				information contained on both Structure Plans.	
4/8	Structure plan notations	S5.9 – Hautapu Structure Plan	Neutral	The existing Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan map identifies “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” as text in the margin of the plan. This includes items that apply to Area 7 which have not been included on the proposed Structure Plan for Area 7. This can be addressed by amending the text under the heading “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” (Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan) to include reference to Area 7 alongside Area 6.	That text within the Hautapu Structure Plan (S5.9) under the heading “Items to Give Effect to the Structure Plan” be amended as follows: ▪ Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road, including Peake Road intersection improvements, to be upgraded prior to development within Area 6 <u>or Area 7</u>. ▪ A right-turn bay and pedestrian/cycle crossing to be established at the Hautapu Road / Road 4 intersection prior to development within Area 6 <u>or Area 7</u>.