

Appendix 1- Summary of decisions requested in submissions by Topic to Proposed Private Plan Change 35 – Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre

20 July 2026

Contents

Submitter details	3
Further Submitter details	3
Recommendations to Submissions and Further Submissions by Topic	4
Topic 1 – Consultation and Engagement.....	4
Topic 2 – Urban Growth	4
Topic 3 – Transportation;	5
Topic 4 – Stormwater/ Flood Hazard Management.....	11
Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer	13
Topic 6 – Rezoning of the ROW leg of 650 Cambridge Road	18
Topic 7 – Performance Standards	19

Submitter details

Submission Number	Submitter
01	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA)
02	Waikato Regional Council (WRC)
03	Waipa District Council (WDC)
04	Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)
05	Jay E L Limited and Park Road Holdings Limited (Jay EL Ltd)

Further Submitter details

Submission Number	Further Submitter
FS 01	638 Limited
FS 02	Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)

Recommendations to Submissions and Further Submissions by Topic

Topic 1 – Consultation and Engagement

Topic 1 – Consultation and Engagement						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
4/1	FSNI	-	Neutral	FSNI as owner of the site was advised that the applicant intended to apply for a private plan change and neither reviewed nor provided feedback on this plan change prior to notification.	FSNI records that it has concerns with the plan change.	Accept
5/6	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	Wish to remain involve in the plan change process, including opportunity to respond to any amendments proposed through further submissions or hearings.	No specific relief sought	Accept

Topic 2 – Urban Growth

Topic 2 – Urban Growth						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
5/1	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	The proposal generally supports the growth strategy for the Te Awamutu area, and for the T11 area in particular. The change is likely to complement the surrounding area by: Providing additional retail choice for local residents;	No specific relief sought	Accept

Topic 2 – Urban Growth						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				Representing a more productive use of difficult residential land.		

Topic 3 – Transportation;

Topic 3 – Transportation						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
Subtopic – Implications on State Highway 3						
1/1	NZTA	-	Opposed in Part	Insufficient assessment of transport effects on the local and state highway roading networks. With the limited detail available NZTA cannot sufficiently assess the proposal or recommend mitigation as appropriate.	Either: - Decline PC35 on the basis that the applicant has not provided sufficient information to be able to assess the application; or - Prior to a hearing provide sufficient information to be able to assess the effects and any appropriate mitigation	Accept in Part
FS 2/1	FSNI		Support	Foodstuffs support requiring the Applicant to provide better information and robust modelling to understand the effects of the Plan Change, and the incorporation of robust and appropriate plan provisions to manage any and all potential adverse environmental effects of those activities.	Accept the submission point	Accept in Part

Topic 3 – Transportation

Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
1/2	NZTA	-	Oppose in Part	Development of Plan Change Area and Resulting Trip Generation: Applicants traffic assessment has not adequately assessed the potential number of trips generated by any future development enabled by the proposed plan change including the implications on the surrounding road network, namely SH3.	Current, proposed and future modelling for the SH3 roundabout through a Roundabout Capacity Assessment, including a 10 year-future assessment (including AM and PM assessments) is required.	Accept in Part
FS2/2	FSNI		Support	Foodstuffs support requiring the Applicant to provide better information and robust modelling to understand the effects of the Plan Change, and the incorporation of robust and appropriate plan provisions to manage any and all potential adverse environmental effects of those activities.	Accept the submission point	Accept in Part
1/3	NZTA	-	Oppose in Part	Transport Infrastructure Requirements: Applicants traffic assessment has not adequately assessed the potential number of trips generated by any future development enabled by the proposed plan change including specifically the impact on the SH3 roundabout to the west of the development.	Appropriate provisions should be identified within the proposed plan change to adequately address any implications to the state highway and surrounding network where required.	Accept in Part
FS2/3	FSNI		Support	Foodstuffs support requiring the Applicant to provide better information and robust modelling to understand the effects of the Plan Change, and the incorporation of	Accept the submission point	Accept in Part

Topic 3 – Transportation						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				robust and appropriate plan provisions to manage any and all potential adverse environmental effects of those activities.		
Subtopic – Traffic Upgrades to Access 1						
3/1	WDC	Rule 6.4.2.22.d	Support in Part	The inclusion of Rule 6.4.2.22.d and its requirement for transport upgrades to be provided is supported subject to amendments being incorporated which more clearly outline the extent of intersection upgrade works that will be necessary. The amendments (as identified by the relief sought) will ensure that appropriate connectivity is provided and that the safety and efficiency of Cambridge Road is not compromised.	That Rule 6.4.2.22.d be amended to read: d. Prior to any activities (excluding construction) commencing within Area B, the following transport upgrades are required: i. A shared pedestrian walking / cycling path along the southern side of Cambridge Road outside Area A and along the western side of Access 1 <u>including a shared walking / cycling facility across Access 2.</u> ii. A Pedestrian <u>facility facilities</u> across Access 1 to provide connection between Area A and Area B iii. Traffic signals at Upgrading of the intersection of Cambridge Road and Access 1 <u>to include:</u> <u>Traffic signals; and</u> <u>A dedicated left turn lane for westbound traffic on Cambridge Road;</u> <u>Accommodation of tracking curves for a 19m semi-trailer truck without crossing traffic lanes occupied by other vehicles.</u> <u>Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities across Cambridge Road; and</u> <u>Vesting of land as road in the event that the required intersection upgrades</u>	Accept in Part

Topic 3 – Transportation						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
					<u>cannot be accommodated within existing road reserve.</u> Or any other relief considered necessary and appropriate to address the issues raised by this submission.	
FS1/1	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the inclusion of the various traffic elements necessary for the upgrade of the intersection at Cambridge Road and Access 1 prior to the development of Area B into Rule 6.4.2.22.d for clarity.	Accept the Plan Change with following amendment (red text) to Rule 6.4.2.22.d.i, to read: <u>A shared walking/cycling path along the southern side of Cambridge Road outside Area A including a shared walking/cycling facility across Access 2 and along the western side of Access 1;</u>	Accept in Part
FS2/4	FSNI		Oppose	Foodstuffs support the inclusion of requirements for necessary transport upgrades prior to the commencement of activities within Area B. However, these need to be accommodated within the existing road reserve, without vesting of any additional land from Area A. The relevant land in Area A is required for the safe and efficient operation of Foodstuffs' activities within Area A, particularly in light of the replacement of trade and building supply activities in Area A with smaller retail tenancies. The loss of land and/or carparking in Area A could have significant adverse effects on the ongoing safe and efficient operation of Foodstuffs' activities in Area A.	Reject the submission point	Reject

Topic 3 – Transportation						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
4/5	FSNI	Traffic Upgrades	Support in part	The Plan Change requires upgrades at the Cambridge Road intersection prior to any activities commencing within Area B. The design and implementation of these upgrades could adversely affect both future construction works and day to day operation of the Pak'n Save, particularly servicing and deliveries to the site.	The Plan Change is amended to ensure the design and implementation of any future traffic upgrades will not adversely affect the ongoing and future operation of the Pak'n Save at 670 Cambridge Road.	Accept in Part
Subtopic – Vehicle Access Points onto the ROW						
4/4	FSNI	Vehicle Access	Support in part	The location of the three new "indicative vehicle access points" to serve 638 Cambridge Road, in particular the southern-most crossing, have the potential to affect the existing and future use of accesses from the right of way to 670 Cambridge Road, including servicing the existing Pak'n Save and traffic movements / construction of any future e-commerce facility to be established.	The location of the proposed access points should be reconsidered to ensure that construction and day to day operation of the existing and upgraded Pak'n Save is not unduly affected. Delete or amend the location of the indicative access points illustrated on the site plan and located on the eastern boundary of Area B.	Accept
Subtopic – Carparking						
4/6	FSNI	Car parking provisions	Support in part	FSNI is concerned that: - Development within Area B does not include sufficient carparking; - The splitting of the existing Mitre 10 in Area A into smaller	Robust analysis is provided that demonstrates sufficient carparking is provided. The plan change is amended to reduce building Gross Floor Area limits to an appropriate level where	Accept in Part

Topic 3 – Transportation						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				tenancies will cumulatively generate higher demand for carparking than currently exists; and Expansion of the centre to include Area B will exacerbate existing issues where Pak'n Save carparking is used by customers of other tenants within the centre.	the analysis demonstrates a shortfall or adverse effects in terms of: - the use of the Pak'n Save carpark; or - the safe or efficient circulation of traffic within the centre or immediate network. The Plan Change is amended to ensure sufficient carparking is provided within Areas A and B to cater for the new, or changes to existing, activities in those areas, including if necessary, by reducing allowable building GFA.	

Topic 4 – Stormwater/ Flood Hazard Management

Topic 4 – Stormwater/ Flood Hazard Management;						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
Subtopic – Flood Hazard Assessment and Stormwater						
2/1	WRC	-	Neutral	The General Civils and Three Waters Report (Appendix F to the plan change request) does not provide any information as to how the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood level at the site boundary is approximately 46.95m (47.17m in Moturiki Datum) was derived or for what climate scenario it is valid for.	Provide further detail as to how the 1% AEP flood level at the site boundary was calculated and what climate scenario this level is valid for.	Accept in Part
2/2	WRC	-	Neutral	The flood maps and modelling that have informed the General Civils and Three Waters Report (Appendix F to the plan change request) significantly underestimates flooding. It seems the flood maps were generated using a static downstream water level boundary and may not take flows from the upstream Mangaohoi catchment into account.	That more detail is provided on the flood model configuration, including: 1. Where the downstream boundary has been positioned; 2. How the upstream Mangaohoi catchment has been accounted for.	Accept in Part
2/3	WRC	-	Neutral	Te Miro Water has recently completed a flood modelling study of the Mangapiko and Mangeohoi Streams at Te Awamutu. This model represents the best available flood information for the site.	That more robust analysis is provided to demonstrate that the site can be developed without: 1. increasing the flood levels in the floodplain at the plan change site; or	Accept in Part

Topic 4 – Stormwater/ Flood Hazard Management;

Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				The model shows that a significant portion of Area B is within the floodplain of the Mangaohoi Stream. This represents a larger portion of the site compared to the flood maps appended to the General Civils and Three Waters Report. Displacement of flood waters through filling of the site will result in an increase in flood levels on approximately 160 properties and an increase in flow in the Mangaohoi Stream downstream of the floodplain.	2. increasing flows in the Mangaohoi Stream downstream of the site.	
5/4	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	All stormwater and flooding effects will be managed on-site with no impacts up or downstream of the site in any storm event.	Expectation that: - all stormwater and flooding effects are managed on-site; and - there will be no impacts up or downstream of the site.	Accept in Part
Subtopic – Infrastructure Capacity						
5/2	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	Seeks to gain an understanding of how PC35 may influence future funding expectations or allocations. The submitter expects that there will be efficiencies gained to the T11 growth cell DC as these areas share transport and other infrastructure funded by DCs.	No specific relief sought.	Reject

Topic 4 – Stormwater/ Flood Hazard Management;						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
5/3	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	Will there be any potential effects on existing or planned infrastructure servicing that may affect Waipiko Landing directly.	No specific relief sought	Reject

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
Subtopic - Ecological Values						
3/2	WDC	Rule 6.4.2.22.c	Support in Part	The ecological impact assessment submitted with PC35 provides a number of recommendations that relate to: • Preparation of a restoration plan; • Protection of nesting birds; • Bat management protocols • Fauna Management Timelines The proposed rules do not provide opportunity for these recommendations to be implemented at the time development of Area B occurs. There are no other rules in the Waipā District Plan which would enable ecological effects of the type	That Rule 6.4.2.22.c be amended to read: <u>Prior to construction activities commencing within Area B:</u> i. <u>An Ecological Management Plan for Area B is provided which implements the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment (prepared by Ecology New Zealand Limited) forming part of PC35 as they relate to:</u> • <u>Restoration plan of wetland and 100 year flood risk zone;</u> • <u>Protection of nesting birds; and</u> • <u>Bat management protocols.</u> <u>A Landscaping plan is provided for with the landscaping buffer and restoration planting area as shown on the Te</u>	Accept in Part

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				assessed by the impact assessment to be managed. It would be appropriate for these matters to be addressed as part of any resource consent application lodged for development of Area B.	Awamutu. <u>Planting</u> shall consist of an appropriate mixture of trees, shrubs and/or ground cover plants.	
FS1/2	638 Ltd		Support in Part	Mitre 10 supports the inclusion of an Ecological Management Plan to reinforce and require the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Ecological Assessment prior to the development of Area B.	Accept	Accept in Part
3/6	WDC	Rule 6.4.1.2.a	Support in Part	In response to other relief sought additional matters of control in Rule 6.4.1.2.a are needed to enable consideration of and the imposition of conditions relating to intersection upgrades, pedestrian facilities and ecology.	That the first bullet point of the matters of control in Rule 6.4.1.2.a is amended to read: Safe and efficient operation of the immediate transport network, <u>including intersection upgrades and the upgrading / provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities internal and external to the development site.</u>	Accept in Part
FS1/6	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the change to the wording of the matters of control to provide greater specificity regarding the upgrades required to enable the development of Area B.	Accept the Plan Change with the following amendment (red text) to the first bullet point for the matters over which Council reserves its control , to read: Matters over which Council reserves its control are: ▪ Traffic safety and road improvement works (with reference to the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the application documents for Plan Change 53 to the	Accept in Part

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
					Operative District Plan, dated 1997) Safe and efficient operation of the immediate transport network, including intersection upgrades and the upgrading/provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities internal and external to the development site along the southern side of Cambridge Road outside Area A and within Access 1; and	
3/7	WDC	Rule 21.1.6.1	Support in Part	Rule 21.1.6.1.b requires amendment to reference ecological enhancement as a matter to be considered in assessing landscaping proposals.	That Rule 21.1.6.1.b is amended to read: The extent to which proposed and existing landscaping contributes to <u>ecological enhancement</u> , the amenity of the site and manages effects on the amenity of adjoining residential zoned sites and open space .	Accept in Part
FS1/7	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the inclusion of an Ecological Management Plan to reinforce and require the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Ecological Assessment prior to the development of Area B.	Accept the Plan Change with amendments that the Ecological Management Plan recommendations are only relevant for the development of Area B.	Accept in Part
FS2/6	FSNI		Oppose in Part	Proposed requirements for ecological enhancement are driven by the Plan Change's inclusion of Area B in the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre, where the rule subject of the submission would apply across the entirety of Area A and Area B. The Rule should be limited in application to Area B only.	Reject the submission point insofar as it would apply to activities in Area A.	Accept

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
3/8	WDC	Rule 21.1.6.1	Support in Part	A new subrule (e) is needed for Rule 21.1.6.1 to ensure that the management of effects on ecological values is a listed matter of control.	That a new subrule e. is added to Rule 21.1.6.1 to read: <u>The extent to which effects on ecological values are managed through landscaping, wetland restoration, protection of nesting birds and bat management protocols.</u>	Accept in Part
FS1/8	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the inclusion of an Ecological Management Plan to reinforce and require the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Ecological Assessment prior to the development of Area B.	Accept the Plan Change with amendments that the Ecological Management Plan recommendations are only relevant for the development of Area B.	Accept in Part
FS2/7	FSNI		Oppose in Part	Proposed requirements for ecological enhancement and protection are driven by the Plan Change's inclusion of Area B in the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre, where the rule subject of the submission would apply across the entirety of Area A and Area B. The Rule should be limited in application to Area B only.	Reject the submission point insofar as it would apply to activities in Area A.	Accept
Subtopic – Landscaping						
4/3	FSNI	Appendix S6	Support in Part	The identification of landscape buffers within Area A on the site plan and the introduction of new landscaping standards (Rule 6.4.2.22.c): Effectively requires the provision of landscape buffer to mitigate development of Area B; and	Delete the landscape buffer area from the site plan and delete the new landscaping Rule 6.4.2.22(c).	Accept in Part

Topic 5 – Ecological Values and Landscaping Buffer						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				May limit the ability to establish new vehicle crossings in the future.		
FS1/10	638 Ltd		Support	The landscaping buffer shown on the proposed Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre Plan generally aligns with the existing Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Site Plan. Mitre 10, however identified a minor discrepancy in the eastern corner of Area A, where the existing 'Site Plan' shows a smaller landscaping extent than that indicated in the proposed 'LFR Centre Plan'. The landscaping provision as proposed under Standard 6.4.2.22.c as part of this Plan Change should be amended (and is supported by Waipa District Council as per their submission point 3/2) to only relate to Area B.	Accept the Plan Change with the revised Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre Plan to reflect the 2026 consented Pak'nSave building footprint.	Accept in Part

Topic 6 – Rezoning of the ROW leg of 650 Cambridge Road

Topic 6 – Rezoning of the ROW leg of 650 Cambridge Road						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
4/7	FSNI	Maps	Support in Part	While new Area B is proposed to be zoned Commercial Zone, the plan change does not propose the rezoning of the right of way / “Access 1” which at present is included (together with Area B) in the Medium Density Residential Zone. It is appropriate that the whole of 638 and 670 Cambridge Road be consistently zoned Commercial Zone.	To rezone the ROW / Access 1 to Commercial consistent with the zoning of Area A and the proposed zoning of Area B.	Reject
FS1/11	638 Ltd		Support in Part	Mitre 10 agrees that this approach is appropriate and logical. However, approvals will need to be sought from the owners of 650 Cambridge Road to rezone the existing ROW to commercial, and to date, no correspondence from the owners of the site have been received.	Retain current zoning for 650 Cambridge Road pending agreement to rezoning from the owner of the ROW.	Reject

Topic 7 – Performance Standards

Topic 7 – Performance Standards						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
Subtopic – Maximum Building Heights						
3/3	WDC	Rule 6.4.2.3.a	Support in Part	The existing exceptions to the maximum building height for the land subject to the existing Te Awamutu Large Scale Retail Development Concept Plan specified in Rule 6.4.2.3.a have been made redundant by the new plan. The rule requires amendment as proposed by the relief sought to remove this redundancy.	That Rule 6.4.2.3.a be amended to read: a. On the land in Area A of subject to the Te Awamutu Large Format Scale Retail Development Concept Centre Plan contained in Appendix S6, no building or other structure shall penetrate a height plane of 15m and except that the Indicative Building Footprints shown on that plan and listed below must not exceed: building structure associated with units 12—14 • A4 and A5 = shown on that plan must not exceed 8m in height and the Bulk Retail timber Merchant <u>A3 = must not exceed</u> 12m in height.	Accept
FS1/3	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the revised wording of the height provision as it applies to the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre, as the existing District Plan wording would be rendered obsolete by the Plan Change.	Accept	Accept
Subtopic – Structure Plan Referencing						
3/4	WDC	Rule 6.4.1.2.a	Support in Part	Referencing the architect, drawing name and date of the plan in a rule is unnecessary. Removal of these references will simplify the rules.	That Rule 6.4.1.2.a be amended to read: Any development in general accordance with the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail	Accept

Topic 7 – Performance Standards						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
					Centre Plan Scale Retail Development Concept Plan SK1-13 prepared by Woodhams/Meikle/Zhan Architects dated 21-04-06 prepared by Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects, referenced as DWG RC100-08, dated 26-06-2025 as contained in Appendix S6, and which <u>satisfies</u> <u>complies with</u> the <u>conditions included in the approved application</u> standards in Rule 6.4.2.22.	
FS1/4	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the removal of the references to the architect, drawing name and date as the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre would be inserted into Appendix S6 of the District Plan.	Accept	Accept
3/5	WDC	Rule 6.4.2.22	Support in Part	Referencing the architect, drawing name and date of the plan in a rule is unnecessary. Removal of these references will simplify the rules.	That Rule 6.4.2.22 be amended to read: Any development in general accordance with the Te Awamutu Large <u>Scale Format Retail Centre Plan Retail Development Concept Plan SK1-13 prepared by Woodhams/Meikle/Zhan Architects dated 21-04-06 prepared by Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects, referenced as DWG RC100-08, dated 26-06-2025</u> as contained in Appendix S6, and which complies with the following standards:...	Accept
FS1/5	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the removal of the references to the architect, drawing name and date as the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre would be inserted into Appendix S6 of the District Plan.	Accept	Accept

Topic 7 – Performance Standards						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
Subtopic – Matters of Control						
3/6	WDC	Rule 6.4.1.2.a	Support in Part	In response to other relief sought additional matters of control in Rule 6.4.1.2.a are needed to enable consideration of and the imposition of conditions relating to intersection upgrades, pedestrian facilities and ecology.	That the first bullet point of the matters of control in Rule 6.4.1.2.a is amended to read: Safe and efficient operation of the immediate transport network, <u>including intersection upgrades and the upgrading / provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities internal and external to the development site.</u>	Accept in Part
FS1/6	638 Ltd		Support	Mitre 10 supports the change to the wording of the matters of control to provide greater specificity regarding the upgrades required to enable the development of Area B.	Accept the Plan Change with the following amendment (red text) to the first bullet point for the matters over which Council reserves its control , to read: Matters over which Council reserves its control are: ▪ Traffic safety and road improvement works (with reference to the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the application documents for Plan Change 53 to the Operative District Plan, dated 1997) <u>Safe and efficient operation of the immediate transport network, including intersection upgrades and the upgrading/provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities internal and external to the development site along the southern side of Cambridge Road outside Area A and within Access 1;</u> and	Accept in Part
FS2/5	FSNI		Oppose in Part	The need for transport upgrades is driven by the Plan Change's inclusion of Area B, and enabling additional retail GFA within Area A	Reject the submission point insofar as it applies to existing or change to existing activities in Area A.	Accept in Part

Topic 7 – Performance Standards						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
				to “backfill” the area currently occupied by the building and trade supply activity. Any amendment to the provisions in this regard should be limited to the new area, and new activities, enabled by the Plan Change and not existing activities currently being undertaken.		
Subtopic – Activities in Area A						
4/2	FSNI	-	Neutral	The plan change assumes that Area A is “built out” and will not substantially change into the future. FSNI is concerned that the Plan Change as proposed could undermine their ability to establish or suitably integrate an “e-commerce” facility with the surrounding Large Format Retail Centre, particularly as it is proposed to be expanded to include 538 Cambridge Road.	That the Site Plan is updated to reflect newly proposed or consented activities in Area A, in the event such activities are proposed or consented during the Council's consideration of the Plan Change	Accept
FS1/9	638 Ltd		Support	As resource consent for the Pak'nSave click and collect facility was granted on 3 February 2026, and FSNI advise that they are constructing the facility, Mitre 10 considers it appropriate and logical to include this facility and the additional vehicle crossing in the Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre Plan.	Accept the Plan Change with the revised Te Awamutu Large Format Retail Centre Plan to reflect the 2026 consented Pak'nSave building footprint.	Accept

Topic 7 – Performance Standards						
Submission point	Submitter	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)	Recommendation (accept/accept in part/reject)
5/5	Jay EL Ltd	-	Neutral	The existing Mitre 10 building shares a significant interface with Waipiko Landing. Change in use could affect employment and amenity of nearby residents.	Further information to be provided on the future use of the existing Mitre 10 building.	Accept in Part