



Plan No:	
File No:	65-07-67
Doc No:	
To:	

**FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR OPPOSITION TO,  
SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR PLAN CHANGE  
Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991  
(Form 6)**

To: Waipa District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840  
 101 Bank Street, Te Awamutu 23 Wilson Street, Cambridge  
 Ph 07 872 0030 Fax 872 0033 Ph 07 823 3800 Fax 07 823 3820  
 Email: submissions@waipadc.govt.nz

**\*\*Please note all sections of the following form need to be completed\*\***

**NAME OF PERSON MAKING FURTHER SUBMISSION:**

Full Name: Future Proof Implementation Committee .....  
 Address: 14 Spencer St, Remuera, Auckland 1050 .....  
 Postal Address For Service: As above .....  
 Phone: 09 5222563 ..... Email: ken@kentremaine.co.nz ..... Fax: 09 5234425 .....  
 Contact Person (name and designation if applicable): Ken Tremaine .....

**THIS IS A FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF OR OPPOSITION TO A SUBMISSION ON A PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN:**

Name of Proposed Plan Change: Proposed Private Plan Change 67 (Meridian 37) .....

**I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SUBMISSION OF:**

Name of original submitter: .....  
 Address: See submission attached .....  
 Submission Number: .....

Support  Oppose  (please tick)

**INDICATE WHICH PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE, TOGETHER WITH ANY RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSAL:**

.....  
 ..... See submission attached .....  
 .....  
 .....



**THE REASONS FOR MY SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION TO THE SUBMISSION ARE:**

..... See submission attached .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**I SEEK THAT THE WHOLE (OR PART) OF THE SUBMISSION BE ALLOWED (OR DISALLOWED): (give precise details ie describe exactly what part of the submission you wish to be allowed or disallowed)**

..... See submission attached .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**DO YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR FURTHER SUBMISSION?**

Yes  No  (please tick)

**IF OTHERS MAKE A SIMILAR SUBMISSION I WILL CONSIDER PRESENTING A JOINT CASE WITH THEM AT THE HEARING?**

Yes  No  (please tick)

**SIGNATURE:**

To be signed by submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter  
(NB. A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means).

Signed:.....  
Date:.....

**Note to person making further submission:**

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after lodging the further submission with the local authority.



Future Proof Implementation Committee  
c/o Ken Tremaine  
14 Spencer St  
Remuera  
AUCKLAND 1050

26 March 2010

Waipa District Council  
Private Bag 2402  
Te Awamutu 3840

**BY EMAIL TO:** [submissions@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@waipadc.govt.nz)

To Whom It May Concern,

This is a further submission by the Future Proof Implementation Committee ("FPIC") in **opposition** to Proposed Private Plan Change 67 (requested by Meridian 37 Ltd) to the Waipa District Plan ("PC67").

The FPIC is the implementation arm of the Future Proof Growth Strategy ("Future Proof" or "Strategy"). It should be noted that while the FPIC includes representatives from the Future Proof sub-regional councils of Hamilton City, Waipa and Waikato Districts, the Waikato Region as well as tangata whenua, that the Waipa District Council ("Waipa DC") as the PC67 administering authority, has abstained from forming a part of this further submission.

We understand that PC67 proposes to rezone 'Rural' zoned land on Raynes Road to the south of Hamilton City, to mixed use zones comprising a business park, rural residential land and visitor accommodation. **This conflicts with and undermines a number of Future Proof implementation initiatives and the long term land use plan in the sub-region which includes the land area affected in PC67.**

The FPIC expressed in its original submissions, the following concerns with PC67 in relation to Future Proof implementation:

- Transport issues namely the protection of the Southern Links corridor and the effect that increased traffic generation as a result of the plan change will have on the existing network
- Water supply issues particularly the water take from the Waikato River and associated allocation issues. Given the business park component of the PC67, water for industrial land purposes can be difficult to obtain.

- The efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure provision. Developing in areas where the sub-regional settlement pattern is set is more cost and time efficient and effective than trying to provide infrastructure to support un-planned developments.
- The oversupply of industrial in the sub-region.
- The related economic implications associated with the oversupply of industrial land. In particular the servicing and relative costs compared to establishing similar activities in other locations in the Waipa District such as Cambridge or Te Awamutu.
- The provision already made in the Future Proof Strategy for the Titanium Park Joint Venture business park development, and the concern that any additional industrial land in the PC67 area will skew the supply.
- The proposed Rural Residential development area being inconsistent with Future Proof principles and community expectations of tighter controls on Rural Residential development in the sub-region, and provisions in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement: Proposed Change No.2 (Future Proof) ("Change 2") which further supports this approach.
- The cumulative effects to the integrity of the Future Proof Strategy, the district growth strategies and intended plan changes from the Strategy's partner councils to give effect to Future Proof outcomes and the overall consistency with Change 2, if PC67 is retained as notified.

The FPIC's concerns with these issues remain. Therefore in this further submission the FPIC supports the original submissions of the Hamilton City Council ("HCC"), the New Zealand Transport Agency ("NZTA"), and Environment Waikato ("EW") where they have made similar points and opposes the original submissions of those which conflict with them. The content of our further submission follows overleaf.

The FPIC is also willing to appear in support of its further submission. If others make a similar further submission we would also be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the submissions hearings on PC67.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ken Tremaine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Ken Tremaine  
**Future Proof Implementation Advisor**

**FPIC Further Submission:**

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
<p>Caroline Eve 400 Raynes Rd RD2 HAMILTON 3282</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The FPIC opposes Caroline Eve’s submissions to support PC67 and its reasons.</p> <p>Despite PC67 proposing a business park environment providing for warehousing and distribution, this is in excess to forecasted need for such land use in the subject area. The Future Proof Strategy has already anticipated business park development in the area with its inclusion of the proposed Titanium Park Joint Venture which is adjacent to the Hamilton Airport with uses that are complementary and helpful to the Airport’s operations in terms of managing reverse sensitivity issues and therefore supplementing the long term viability of the Airport. By comparison PC67 and its proposed business park would not enable this. Furthermore, without awaiting the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study, any additional industrial land to what has been provided for in the Airport Industrial land node in the Future Proof Strategy, is likely to skew that supply.</p> <p>Also Caroline Eve’s point on supporting PC67 because the property would be serviced by low impact infrastructure and therefore would have no additional demand on public infrastructure is too simplistic.</p> <p>One of the aims of the Future Proof Strategy is to put in place a long term, sustainable land use pattern. This involves identifying for example, residential and industrial land in order to ensure that infrastructure can be put in place in a timely manner and appropriate funding for it can be obtained. There is sufficient industrial land and rural residential land supply within the Strategy and the proposed business park, visitor accommodation area, and rural residential enclave is surplus to needs.</p>	<p>Decline Caroline Eve’s request to accept PC67 and include land at 400 Raynes Rd (the submitter’s land) within the PC67 subject land area and for it to be zoned Industrial.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
<p>The Narrows Landing 431 Airport Rd RD3 HAMILTON</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The FPIC rejects The Narrows Landing’s support of PC67 and its reasons.</p> <p>PC67 does not, as The Narrows Landing have submitted, promote an integrated development.</p> <p>PC67 also does not promote the increased integration of business activities and support the economic growth of the Airport as a strategic employment node and nor is it known whether the development would not have additional demand on public infrastructure.</p> <p>PC67 should not be retained and supported because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It advances the notion of its location being in an area of ‘strategic’ advantage and increased business and industrial activity. However the ‘strategic direction’ of development in this area should align with the Future Proof Strategy as agreed by the Strategy’s partner councils – including Waipa DC.</li> <li>• Its business park component could lead to pressure on the Council and on Hamilton City Council for other urban services and facilities to be provided.</li> <li>• The potential for the area’s future conversion to urban use is also frustrated if any form of residential development (as proposed with the rural residential enclave) is permitted at this stage. Furthermore it is inappropriate to have development as proposed, within the airport noise contour</li> </ul>	<p>Decline The Narrows Landing’s submission that PC67 be accepted that its land at 431 Raynes Rd be included within the PC67 area and be subject to Industrial and Visitor Accommodation zoning.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>(as it currently is).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed visitor accommodation area would also constitute development within the airport noise contour which is inappropriate. In addition the size of the proposed accommodation area would likely result in the increased urbanisation of the PC67 land area and in turn create further pressures on both Waipa DC and HCC for more residential land use and development there. A large-scale visitor accommodation area such as that proposed is more appropriately located in an area like the Hamilton CBD where it can be better supported by ancillary facilities and entertainment.</li> </ul>	
<p>Hunter Clyde Partnership 400 Raynes Rd HAMILTON 3282</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The FPIC opposes the submissions made by the Hunter Clyde Partnership for the same reasons that it rejects similar submissions made above by Caroline Eve and The Narrows Landing.</p> <p>PC67 does not promote an integrated development and its rezoning would not better reflect the existing environment.</p> <p>As stated above PC67 should not be accepted by Waipa DC because:</p> <p>PC67 should not be retained and supported because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It advances the notion of its location being in an area of 'strategic' advantage and increased business and industrial activity. However the 'strategic direction' of development in this area should align with the Future Proof Strategy as</li> </ul>	<p>Decline the Hunter Clyde Partnership's submission to accept PC67.</p> <p>Also decline the Hunter Clyde Partnership's request to include its land at 431 Raynes Rd within the PC67 area and for it to be rezoned as Industrial and Visitor Accommodation areas.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>agreed by the Strategy's partner councils – including Waipa DC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its business park component could lead to pressure on the Council and on Hamilton City Council for other urban services and facilities to be provided.</li> <li>• The potential for the area's future conversion to urban use is also frustrated if any form of residential development (as proposed with the rural residential enclave) is permitted at this stage. Furthermore it is inappropriate to have development as proposed, within the airport noise contour (as it currently is).</li> <li>• The proposed visitor accommodation area would also constitute development within the airport noise contour which is inappropriate. In addition the size of the proposed accommodation area would likely result in the increased urbanisation of the PC67 land area and in turn create further pressures on both Waipa DC and HCC for more residential land use and development there. A large-scale visitor accommodation area such as that proposed is more appropriately located in an area like the Hamilton CBD where it can be better supported by ancillary facilities and entertainment.</li> </ul>	
Titanium Park JV PO Box 614 Auckland	4	Oppose	The FPIC opposes the plan change in its entirety. The amendments suggested would allow PC67 to proceed and as stated above there is no current justification for the zoning and additional development types proposed in PC67.	Decline Titanium Park JV's submission to accept PC67 with amendments.
NZTA	12	Support	The FPIC supports the NZTA's submissions to reject PC67 in its	Accept the NZTA's submission that PC67 be

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
PO Box 973 Waikato Mail Centre HAMILTON 3240			<p>entirety.</p> <p>The FPIC agrees with the NZTA's submissions that PC67:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poses actual and potential adverse effects on existing and future State Highway infrastructure</li> <li>• Is inconsistent with the Future Proof Growth Strategy</li> <li>• Provides a Business Park, Rural Residential development and tourist accommodation outside of the proposed urban limits and in excess of forecasted demand</li> <li>• Will have a significant impact on the sustainability of existing infrastructure as well as an impact on proposed industrial land being developed in other, more appropriate locations.</li> </ul> <p>The FPIC submitted similar points in its original submission. If PC67 is retained as notified, its proposal to rezone its subject land area from 'Rural' to the mixed land uses of a business park, rural residential and visitor accommodation areas pose a number of implications for Future Proof implementation. Specifically PC67:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gives rise to transport concerns in relation to the sufficiency of protection of the Southern Links corridor and the related issue of increased traffic generation on the existing network.</li> <li>2. Does not accord sufficient weight to the need to await the outcomes or findings of the Southern Sector Study as it pertains to the PC67 area.</li> <li>3. Would mean a less efficient and equitable approach to</li> </ol>	<p>rejected in its entirety.</p> <p>Alternatively, the FPIC request that Waipa DC oppose the proposal in the first instance given its potential impact on a number of Future Proof implementation actions which the Council as a Strategy partner has agreed to see implemented in its district plan and LTCCP. Retaining PC67 as notified is inconsistent with this approach.</p> <p>It would also be prudent to delay a decision on PC67 until the Southern Sector Study is completed and its findings and implications are released, discussed and analysed.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>infrastructure provision by Waipa DC than if it were planned or already provided for in the likes of the Future Proof Strategy settlement pattern or the Waipa DC's Long Term Council Community Plan ("LTCCP").</p> <p>4. Could compromise the integrity of the Future Proof Strategy's intended long term land use pattern.</p>	
<p>Findlay Family Trust C/- D&amp; P Findlay PO Box 56 HAMILTON</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>Support in part.</p>	<p>The FPIC supports the Findlay Family Trust's submission to decline PC67.</p> <p>The FPIC agrees per the Findlay Family Trust's submission points that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC67 will have significant adverse effects on the State Highway and that the traffic assessment undertaken for PC67 does not consider the broader roading network.</li> <li>• The Southern Links work is not complete and that its particular location will affect proportion of land to industrial and rural.</li> <li>• The Southern Sector Study will provide some direction on roading in the PC67 subject area</li> <li>• PC67 is inconsistent with the Future Proof growth Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>On the Findlay Family Trust's submission point that PC67 does not demonstrate insufficient supply of rural residential lots to meet demand, the issue is that PC67 proposes further rural residential development at all. PC67 promotes further rural residential land use over and above what is already anticipated and provided for in the Future Proof Strategy for the sub-region. PC67 represents an over</p>	<p>Accept the first part of the Trust's submission request to Waipa DC that PC67 be declined.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			supply of this land use type and this is inconsistent with Future Proof Strategy principles of a more compact urban form for the sub-region and community expectations and values for tighter controls on rural residential development.	
Hamilton City Council Private Bag 3010 HAMILTON	16	Support	<p>The FPIC supports HCC's submission points that PC67 be declined because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is inconsistent with provisions of the Future Proof Growth Strategy and the Waikato RPS</li> <li>• There is no adequate justification for an additional growth node outside of the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• The cumulative impacts of development outside Future Proof settlement pattern may be set a precedent and undermine the Future Proof strategy</li> <li>• There is already sufficient industrial land available in the subject area and there will be oversupply risks</li> <li>• Visitor accommodation should be located within existing settlements like the Hamilton CBD where it can be better supported by ancillary facilities and entertainment</li> <li>• Developments of the scale proposed should be located around already developed areas with adequate infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Of the adverse effects it poses on the existing transport network and airport operations</li> <li>• It does not support water allocation for uses outside the agreed settlement pattern</li> <li>• There is little evidence to support that the proposal will not generate demand for additional urban services</li> </ul>	Accept HCC's submission to decline PC67.

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It conflicts with the principles of the settlement pattern identified in the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• It is important to discourage subdivision that will result in dwellings being established within the airport noise contour</li> <li>• It will erode the distinction between urban and rural uses.</li> </ul> <p>The FPIC made similar points in its original submission in opposition to PC67.</p>	
Environment Waikato PO Box 4010 HAMILTON EAST	32	Support	<p>The FPIC supports EW on the following points it made in its original submission in opposition to PC67:</p> <p>That:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC67 be declined in the first instance given its inconsistency with Future Proof and other strategic planning documents in Hamilton City and Waipa District affected by the subject area in PC67;</li> <li>• Consideration of PC67 be declined or deferred until the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study at the end of March 2010 are known and/or when the outcomes of the Southern Links Investigation are released;</li> <li>• Waipa DC have regard to Proposed Change No. 2 (Future Proof) to the Waikato RPS in its decision making.</li> </ul> <p>The FPIC supports these submissions by EW because it aligns with concerns set out in its original submission. Specifically the FPIC agrees with EW that PC67:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflicts with the Future Proof Strategy and its initiatives on</li> </ul>	<p>Accept EW's request that PC67 is declined (in the first instance).</p> <p>Alternatively, accept EW's request to defer a decision on PC67 until the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study and the Southern Links investigations are known.</p>

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Submission ID and Point	Support or Oppose	Further Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>land term land use and its efforts regarding the Southern Sector Study;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is inconsistent with Change 2 to the Waikato RPS</li> <li>• Would be unable to protect and maintain the adverse effects of inappropriate growth and development on the roading network.</li> </ul>	