



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

29 January 2010

Waipa District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840

BY EMAIL TO: submissions@waipadc.govt.nz

To Whom It May Concern,

RE: Submission to Plan Change 67, Waipa District Plan

This is a 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") has abstained from forming a part of this 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's concerns with PC67 in relation to Future Proof implementation include:

- 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 have reiterated these matters in its submission; the content of which follows overleaf.

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

Sincerely,



Ken Tremaine
Future Proof Implementation Advisor

FPIC Submission:

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
1.	1 Background and 2 Proposed Development Concept, pages 1-4.	Oppose	<p>While the FPIC acknowledges that PC67 provides for the safeguarding of the parts of State Highways 1, 3 and 21 which relate to the New Zealand Transport Agency's ("NZTA") Southern Links Corridor Project and the land areas affected by the proposed runway extension by the Waikato Regional Airport Limited, the FPIC opposes the overall proposal and content of PC67 in its entirety.</p> <p>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"> 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. 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. 3. Would mean a less efficient and equitable approach to 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"). 4. Could compromise the integrity of the Future Proof Strategy's intended long term land use pattern. <p>The following details some of these points further:</p> <p>1a) Protection of the Southern Links Corridor The Southern Links Corridor is a significant transport project for the</p>	<p>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>

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>sub-region. Although PC67 proposes to safeguard parts of the State Highways that are relevant to the project, any further development in that area increases the reverse sensitivity issues for example that the NZTA will need to manage.</p> <p>1b) Increased Traffic Generation PC67's traffic assessment on modelling of trip generation and traffic flow demonstrates that the eventual development of the Plan Change will ensure that future development of the scale anticipated will not have a significant effect on the wider network and that it safeguards opportunities to ensure that the wider network will have adequate capacity to service long term development. However these issues are being considered in further detail by the Southern Sector Study. It would be prudent to await its outcomes before any further decisions in relation to PC67 are made.</p> <p>2) Southern Sector Study Furthermore the subject land area of PC67 is within the scope of the Southern Sector Study ("Study")¹ due for completion in March 2010. The Study is a priority action in the Future Proof Strategy and is part of the Strategy's aim to complete further work in order to better understand the relationship between land uses, and between land use, infrastructure and funding in the Southern Sector. In particular the aim of the separate Study into this area is to establish a collaborative planning strategy for the types of land uses to be provided including future zoning, infrastructure provision and potential staging requirements to sustainably manage the effects of the competing</p>	

¹ The Southern Sector is the land area to the south of Hamilton City and extending east of Temple View, north of Mystery Creek and west of Matangi. This area is experiencing significant growth from a range of land uses with transportation demands. The long term land use pattern for the Southern Sector has in large part been confirmed through the Future Proof Strategy. Local authority growth strategies undertaken by Hamilton City, and Waipa and Waikato District Councils have also identified their respective visions for the areas that make up the Southern Sector. There are also a number of entities with an interest in the area such as Meridian 37 being the proponents of PC67.

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>interests which exist in this area.</p> <p>The proposal would undermine the public processes that the Future Proof Strategy has already been through and there is a risk that if retained, would compromise or be inconsistent with the outcomes of the Study when completed. It would be prudent to await the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study first to see if it finds that there is inadequate industrial land supply in the Strategy around the Hamilton Airport area.</p> <p>3a) Efficient Infrastructure Provision</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>3b) Titanium Park</p> <p>In terms of the proposed business park component of PC67 in particular, the Future Proof Strategy has already anticipated such development with its inclusion of the proposed Titanium Park Joint Venture ("Titanium Park"). Titanium Park is adjacent to the Hamilton Airport and its uses are complementary and helpful to the Airport's operations in terms of managing reverse sensitivity issues.² By comparison PC67's business park proposal appears to be based on a generic assumption that all business activity apart from retail will be</p>	

² Titanium Park supports the airport and associated aviation and cargo activities and therefore supplements the long term viability of the airport where by comparison PC67 would not. Therefore it was reasonable that Titanium Park be included within the Airport Industrial land node in the Future Proof Strategy. Any additional land in that node, without awaiting the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study is likely to skew that supply.

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>located in an industrial zone. This is not necessarily the case.</p> <p>3c)Over-Supply of Industrial Land It is important to consider that industrial land over supply would be a significant economic issue for the sub-region as it carries substantial servicing and related cost³ implications for the Airport industrial node area of the Waipa district compared with establishing similar activities in other locations in the district such as at Cambridge or Te Awamutu. Additional industrial land as proposed could also skew the current supply.</p>	
2.	2 Proposed Development Concept, pages 3-4.	Oppose	<p>The FPIC opposes the general nature of the proposal forming the basis for PC67. Specifically the FPIC considers that PC67 should not be retained by Waipa DC because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 	<p>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 in March 2010, and its findings and implications are released, discussed and analysed.</p>

³ The quantum of industrial land in the Future Proof Strategy are closely linked to the Strategy's partner councils' LTCCPs and the ability of those councils to finance trunk services and fund the depreciation of assets. PC67 is surplus to the quantum already provided in the Strategy framework which enables the councils to look at how industrial land is to be serviced within their relevant LTCCPs. These decisions cannot be left to the market as the region is required to have a 30 year land use plan in place as part of transport planning under the LTMA 2003. The sub-regional land use pattern feeds into the regional process.

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>proposed, within the airport noise contour (as it currently is).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Hamilton City Council ("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. 	
3.	4 Environmental Effects 4.3 <i>Landscape and Visual Effects</i> , page 10.	Oppose	<p>PC67's assessment of landscape and visual effects states that the proposed rural residential area will form a north facing enclave of development with a strong association with the Waikato River and the residential development on the opposite bank within the Tamahere area. Also the proposal promotes "greater flexibility" than would ordinarily apply to a rural residential development but that the arrangement of the actual development will be determined through the subdivision resource consent process.</p> <p>The FPIC opposes this finding as it promotes further rural residential land use over and above what is already anticipated and provided for in the Strategy for the sub-region. The proposal would represent an over supply of this land use type and is inconsistent with the Future Proof Strategy principles of a more compact urban form for the sub-region and community expectations and values toward tighter controls to Rural Residential development.</p>	Disregard the finding in the PC67 assessment of landscape and visual effects on the rural residential component of its proposal.
4.	4 Environmental Effects 4.4 <i>Water Supply</i> , page	Oppose	The water supply effects finding is that there are several options that will ensure that the eventual development is adequately served in terms	Require more detail on how the PC67 proponents are dealing with the allocation issues on water

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
	11.		<p>of both volume and quantity including the provision of trickle feed supply to complement roof water, existing on site bores, additional bores, on site storage in tanks and ponds, reticulation of total on site capacity.</p> <p>Future Proof's concern is that these options rely on water takes from the Waikato River which have a number of existing allocation issues. Water for Industrial land purposes is even more difficult to obtain than that for residential development for example and this is not adequately acknowledged in the PC67 report.</p>	takes from the Waikato River.
5.	6 Statutory Plans, pages 21-40.	Oppose	<p>PC67 claims to be consistent with the provisions of the operative Waikato RPS. However given that Change 2 is currently proceeding through the Schedule 1 RMA 1991 processes, the FPIC consider that PC67 would be in a stronger position with the long term direction that the regional council and sub-regional councils are taking with growth management and a long term land use pattern, if it had sought to be consistent with the proposed aims, objectives and policies of Change 2 in the same vein that HCC is seeking to align aspects of its City Plan (through Variation 21 for example) with the Future Proof Strategy and Change 2.⁴</p> <p>The Future Proof Strategy underwent a very comprehensive consultation and hearings process. Its adoption by the Strategy partners and its launch in September instituted a collaborative agreement on the need to better manage the rapid growth that is occurring in the sub-region. The long term view of the Strategy and its position as the interface of council planning obligations under the RMA</p>	Disregard the PC67 report's claims of consistency given the implications that the plan change would have on Future Proof Strategy and Change 2's implementation.

⁴ Section 74(2)(a)(i) of the RMA 1991 sets out that a territorial authority when preparing or changing a district plan, shall have regard to any proposed regional policy statement. This would require Waipa DC (if it had prepared PC67) to have regard to Change 2. However FPIC notes that PC67 had been prepared prior to the development and notification of Change 2 but that Change 2 was publicly notified before PC67. Therefore there is an argument that the PC67 proponents had some opportunity to amend its report to better align with Change 2.

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			<p>1991, LGA 2002 and LTMA 2003 mean that its outcomes and framework should, from a strategic viewpoint, be given more weight and consideration than the PC67 report writers have given it.</p> <p>Likewise the district's growth strategies and the district plans of adjoining councils and their intent to develop and notify plan changes that would more fully give effect to the Future Proof Strategy framework should have been given more consideration.</p>	
6.	8 Amendments to the Waipa District Plan <i>8.1 Planning Maps</i> , page 46.	Oppose	<p>The FPIC opposes the proposal to amend the Planning Maps in the Waipa District Plan to indicate the new mixed land use zones for the PC67 area from 'Rural' to that for a Business Park, Rural Residential, and Visitor Accommodation. The FPIC's concern is that if these proposed changes are retained as notified, they will compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern for the Airport area given its combined total of around 98 hectares of development. This is a substantial area.</p> <p>Further still, the proposed amendments could be found to conflict with the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study once it is completed.</p>	Oppose all proposed amendments to the Waipa District Plan planning maps to give effect to PC67 as notified.
7.	8 Amendments to the Waipa District Plan, <i>Amendments to Rural Policies, Objectives, Rules.</i>	Oppose	<p>Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing, and proposals for new, Rural policies, objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan.</p> <p>The suggested changes are inconsistent with the direction on Rural and Rural Residential issues in the Future Proof Strategy and in Change 2, particularly community expectations of tighter controls on Rural Residential development in the sub-region and the move towards a more compact urban form.</p>	Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing, and proposals for new, Rural policies, objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan.
8.	8 Amendments to the Waipa District Plan	Oppose	Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing, and proposals for new, Industrial policies, objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan.	Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing, and proposals for new, Industrial policies,

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
	<i>Amendments to Industrial Policies, Objectives, Rules.</i>		<p>As above, it has been explained that the Future Proof Strategy puts in place a land use pattern. This involves identifying business and industrial land in order to ensure that infrastructure can be put in place in a timely manner and appropriate funding can be obtained. There is sufficient industrial land supply within the Strategy and the proposed business park is surplus to needs.</p> <p>Titanium Park is an industrial business development which has been provided for in the Strategy because its uses are complementary with the Airport's operation. Titanium Park supports the Airport and associated aviation and cargo activities. It is also helpful in terms of managing reverse sensitivity issues. Any more industrial land in that node (such as that proposed in PC67) without awaiting the outcome of the Southern Sector Study, is likely to skew that supply.</p> <p>Also as stated above, it is important to remember that industrial land over supply would be a significant economic issue for the sub-region. An over supply of industrial land has servicing and relative costs' implications for the Airport area of the Waipa District compared with establishing similar activities in other (and more appropriate) locations in the Waipa District with the ancillary facilities and amenity to support the mixed land uses that PC67 proposes.</p>	objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan. It would be prudent to await the outcomes of the Southern Sector Study.
9.	8 Amendments to the Waipa District Plan <i>8.2 Amendments to Airport Business Policies, Objectives, Rules.</i>	Oppose	<p>Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing and proposals for new, Airport Business policies, objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan.</p> <p>The Future Proof Strategy has already provided for a business park in the vicinity of the Airport and there is no further need (bar the outcome of the Southern Sector Study) for another one of the scale proposed in PC67. Titanium Park was provided for because it is adjacent to the</p>	Oppose all of PC67's amendments to existing and proposals for new, Airport Business policies, objectives and rules to the Waipa District Plan.

	PC67 Report Provision(s)	Support or Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought from the Waipa District Council
			Airport; its uses were complementary to the Airport's operation and helped with managing reverse sensitivity issues. PC67 does not provide any of these advantages to the Airport or its operations.	