

	Waipā District Plan Proposed Plan Change 37 Further Submission Form Form 6 <i>Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991</i>
	To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 Phone: 0800 924 723 Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange37 Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
 Submissions close **5pm Thursday, August 13, 2026**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received:	_____
Document ref:	_____

1. Submitter details	
Full name of submitter:	Michael and Leisa Hurley
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	██████████
Email address:	██
Postal address: (required if no email address is provided)	██

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):
☐ I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.
☒ I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
My reason(s) are: We are the owners and occupiers of 19 Maungatautari Road. Our property is within the C5 Residential Growth Cell and directly adjoins the PPC37 plan change area. PPC37 would enable urban development immediately beside our property. We would therefore be directly affected by changes to our visual outlook, residential amenity and the existing rural character of the area, as well as by construction noise, dust and lighting, increased traffic, and potential effects on property access, servicing, stormwater and ecological values. We may also be affected by the consequences of rezoning and developing part of the C5 Residential Growth Cell separately from the remaining land, before the infrastructure requirements, development sequencing and integrated planning of the wider growth cell have been resolved. As owners and occupiers of an adjoining property within the C5 Residential Growth Cell, we would experience these effects more directly and to a materially greater extent than the general public. This further submission supports or opposes the specific submission points identified below. It is confined to matters raised in those original submissions and is consistent with our original submission opposing PPC37 in its entirety.

3. Attendance at Council hearing
(a) I wish ☒ OR do not wish ☐ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission. (b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing. Yes ☒ OR No ☐

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)
Signature of submitter:  Dated <u>10th August 2026</u> (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

FS01

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

**Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Thursday, August 13, 2026**

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipā District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
91/1	Chris Kibblewhite	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring substantial residential development forward ahead of the Council's planned growth sequencing and before the necessary transport, water, wastewater and community infrastructure has been properly funded and delivered.	We seek that submission points 91/1, 91/2, 91/3, 91/4, 91/5, 91/6, 91/7 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
91/2		✓		We support this submission because approximately 1,250 additional dwellings would significantly increase traffic pressure on Cambridge's already-constrained river crossings and worsen congestion throughout Leamington and central Cambridge.	
91/3		✓		We support this submission because rezoning productive rural land for urban development would cause an irreversible loss of land currently supporting grazing and equine activities, without sufficient justification that this land must be developed now.	
91/4		✓		We support this submission because the proposed medium-density development is inappropriate at Cambridge's rural fringe and would adversely affect the open, semi-rural character, visual amenity and "town meets country" setting of Maungatautari Road and Leamington.	
91/5		✓		We support this submission because the additional traffic would increase safety risks for children walking and cycling to local schools on roads and intersections that are already constrained.	
91/6		✓		We support this submission because mature-tree removal, habitat fragmentation, increased artificial lighting and stormwater runoff may adversely affect nationally critical long-tailed bats and the wider Waikato River ecosystem. These effects should be avoided rather than left to uncertain future mitigation.	
91/7		✓		We strongly support this submission because introducing medium-density housing into an established equine area would create reverse-sensitivity effects involving noise, dust, odour, lighting and traffic, potentially constraining existing equine operations and undermining Cambridge's equine industry.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
218/1	Kate Fitz-John	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring development forward ahead of the planned post-2035 growth sequence and before adequate roads, schools, medical services and other essential infrastructure are available.	We seek that submission points 218/1, 218/3, 218/4, 218/5, 218/8, 218/9 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
218/3		✓		We support this submission because the Medium Density Residential Zone could enable substantially more than the stated 1,250 dwellings. The effects of the proposal must be assessed against its full permitted development capacity.	
218/4		✓		We support this submission because the transport assessment should model the full development capacity enabled by medium-density zoning, rather than a lower standard-residential scenario that may understate future traffic effects.	
218/5		✓		We support this submission because the additional traffic would increase risks for children and families crossing Shakespeare Street and using the already-constrained route across the narrow bridge. Safe pedestrian and cycling access has not been adequately demonstrated.	
218/8		✓		We support this submission because the loss of productive rural land has not been adequately assessed against the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and should not be approved without clear justification.	
218/9		✓		We support this submission because medium-density development beside the reserve would adversely affect its open rural character and amenity. Potential effects on long-tailed bats and sites of cultural and archaeological significance also require greater protection.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
227/1	James Nguyen & Leah Crawford	✓		We support this submission because approximately 1,250 additional dwellings, together with other planned growth in Leamington, would worsen congestion and place further pressure on Cambridge's limited river crossings, reducing the safety, reliability and resilience of the transport network.	We seek that submission points 227/1, 227/2, 227/3, 227/4, 227/5, 227/6, 227/7 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
227/2		✓		We support this submission because development of this scale would increase pressure on schools, recreational facilities, community amenities and essential services before the necessary upgrades have been funded and delivered.	
227/3		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would cause permanent loss of habitat used by nationally critical long-tailed bats. Future planting and predator control would not adequately address the immediate habitat loss, artificial-lighting effects or delay before replacement habitat becomes established.	
227/4		✓		We support this submission because the loss of rural land and green space, together with prolonged construction effects, would adversely affect biodiversity, ecological connections and the rural-edge character and identity of Leamington.	
227/5		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring development forward ahead of the planned post-2035 timeframe, extend beyond the identified C5 Growth Cell and substantially exceed its planned housing yield. This would undermine the Council's coordinated growth strategy and create an undesirable precedent for other out-of-sequence development.	
227/6		✓		We support this submission because critical infrastructure, staging and funding requirements should be resolved through clear and enforceable planning provisions before rezoning occurs, rather than being deferred to later resource consents or a private development agreement.	
227/7		✓		We support this submission because the cumulative effects of increased traffic, pressure on schools and services, and the irreversible loss of rural-edge character would materially affect the environment, amenity and wellbeing of existing residents, including us as adjoining landowners.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
238/1	Scott Montagu	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring development forward ahead of the planned growth sequence, creating unplanned infrastructure demands that could increase costs for ratepayers or reduce existing service levels.	We seek that submission points 238/1, 238/2, 238/3, 238/4, 238/5, 238/6, 238/7 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
238/2		✓		We support this submission because the Medium Density Residential Zone may enable more than the stated 1,250 dwellings. The proposal should be assessed against its full potential development capacity.	
238/3		✓		We support this submission because the transport assessment may understate future traffic by using a lower housing yield than the proposed zoning could enable. The resulting effects on congestion, road safety, school crossings and nearby residential streets have not been adequately assessed.	
238/4		✓		We support this submission because medium-density development directly adjoining the Town Belt reserve could significantly harm its rural character and amenity unless clear and enforceable boundary controls are imposed.	
238/5		✓		We support this submission because the narrow strip proposed beside the Waikato River may not provide a practical public walkway or an adequate buffer between private development and the river environment.	
238/6		✓		We support this submission because stormwater runoff from a large medium-density development could adversely affect water quality and worsen erosion in the adjoining reserve, waterways and Waikato River environment.	
238/7		✓		We support this submission because potentially significant effects on long-tailed bats should be avoided and mitigated through clear, enforceable rules governing habitat, lighting and long-term monitoring, rather than relying mainly on compensation.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
215/1	Paul & Lynette Garland	✓		We support this submission because, like the Garlands, our property is within the C5 Growth Cell. Developing part of C5 ahead of the planned sequence would undermine its integrated planning and create uncertainty for the remaining landowners.	We seek that submission points 215/1, 215/2, 215/3, 215/4, 215/5, 215/6 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
215/2		✓		We support this submission because development of 1,200–1,300 dwellings would place significant additional pressure on Cambridge's bridges, schools, healthcare, emergency services and community facilities before adequate infrastructure is available.	
215/3		✓		We strongly support this submission because the proposed Maungatautari Road access would directly affect our neighbouring properties through increased traffic, congestion, safety risks, noise, lighting and disruption.	
215/4		✓		We support this submission because turning our rural-edge neighbourhood into a principal entrance to a large subdivision would adversely affect our outlook, privacy, openness, residential amenity and established rural character.	
215/5		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would result in the irreversible loss of highly productive soils without sufficient justification that this land must be urbanised now or that its loss is consistent with the Council's long-term growth strategy.	
215/6		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would add to the cumulative pressure on Cambridge's transport network, schools, healthcare, services and community infrastructure, directly affecting existing residents.	
178/1	Claire Scouse	✓		We support this submission because the wider Māori cultural landscape and mana whenua values may not be adequately protected by focusing only on mapped archaeological sites.	We seek that submission points 178/1, 178/2, 178/3, 178/4, 178/5, 178/6, 178/7 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
178/2		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 could cause habitat loss, fragmentation, runoff and wildlife displacement. These effects should be avoided through enforceable ecological protections.	
178/3		✓		We support this submission because the cumulative effects of stormwater, sediment and contaminants on tributaries and the Waikato River have not been adequately quantified or addressed.	
178/4		✓		We support this submission because stronger setbacks, planting and monitoring are needed to protect the ecological, recreational and landscape values of the Town Belt and river margins.	
178/5		✓		We support this submission because additional traffic would increase risks for children, pedestrians and cyclists using Maungatautari Road and other key school routes. Safety upgrades should precede development.	
178/6		✓		We support this submission because the capacity of local schools to accommodate substantial population growth has not been adequately demonstrated.	
178/7		✓		We support this submission because adjoining residents, including us, could experience prolonged construction noise, vibration, dust, waste and contamination. Clear and enforceable controls are required.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
56/1	Ava Pyper	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring development forward before adequate wastewater, stormwater, water and roading infrastructure is funded and operational.	We seek that submission points 56/1, 56/2, 56/3, 56/4, 56/5 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
56/2		✓		We support this submission because the additional traffic would worsen congestion and safety risks on Maungatautari, Shakespeare and surrounding roads, directly affecting our access and neighbourhood.	
56/3		✓		We support this submission because development of this scale would significantly alter Leamington's rural-edge character and directly affect our outlook and amenity as adjoining landowners.	
56/4		✓		We support this submission because the proposal's effects on habitat, ecological connections and other environmental values have not been adequately avoided or mitigated.	
56/5		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would permanently remove productive rural land without sufficient justification for bringing its urbanisation forward.	
271/1	Leasa Hubbard	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 is premature and inappropriately scaled, and its cumulative effects on Cambridge's infrastructure, community and rural character have not been adequately addressed.	We seek that submission points 271/1, 271/2, 271/3, 271/4, 271/5 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
271/2		✓		We support this submission because growth planned for after 2035 should not proceed before the third bridge and associated transport-network upgrades are funded, consented and operational.	
271/3		✓		We support this submission because medium-density development would replace the established rural and equine landscape, permanently affecting our outlook, privacy, openness and amenity as adjoining landowners.	
271/4		✓		We support this submission because we could experience years of construction noise, vibration, dust and heavy-vehicle movements immediately beside our property, adversely affecting our quality of life and wellbeing.	
271/5		✓		We support this submission because approximately 1,250 additional dwellings would worsen congestion and safety risks on an already constrained road network, directly affecting our access and neighbourhood.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
220/4	Lucy Holdaway	✓		We strongly support this submission which raises concern about the removal of a tree line bordering the sports fields and dog park that may have provided habitat, commuting or foraging value for long-tailed bats. We understand that this row of large trees was felled in or around July 2025, approximately eight months before PPC37 was publicly notified in March 2026. That timing is a matter of legitimate concern. Where potentially important bat habitat appears to have been removed shortly before a major private plan change was publicly notified, the Council should require a full and independent investigation into the circumstances, timing and ecological consequences of that removal. The issue is not simply whether trees were removed. The issue is whether the ecological values of the site have been materially altered before the plan change was notified and before submitters, Council, DOC and the Panel had the opportunity to properly assess the full ecological effects of urbanising this land. If vegetation with bat habitat value was removed before PPC37 was lodged or notified, then the current ecological assessment may not represent the true pre-development ecological baseline. That would be a serious evidential deficiency. It would also reinforce the concern raised by DOC and other submitters that ecological protection cannot safely be left to later consenting stages, voluntary management plans or broad assurances from the applicant. The timing does not itself establish improper conduct, but it creates a material evidential issue as to whether the current ecological assessment accurately reflects the pre-clearance baseline. That issue should be independently investigated before PPC37 is determined.	We seek that submission point 220/4 be allowed. Before any decision is made on PPC37, Council should require an independent investigation into the removed tree line's ecological significance, its use by long-tailed bats and any effect its removal had on the ecological baseline, together with disclosure of any pre-clearance ecological, arboricultural, bat-survey or vegetation assessment.
191/1	Dion Williams	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would enable substantial development outside the Council's planned growth sequence and distant from much of Cambridge's existing infrastructure and employment, undermining coordinated urban growth.	We seek that submission points 191/1, 191/2, 191/3, 191/4, 191/5 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
191/2		✓		We support this submission because the proposed local road upgrades would not resolve the wider congestion and river-crossing constraints already affecting residents south of the Waikato River.	
191/3		✓		We support this submission because development of this scale could significantly affect the adjoining stream, gully, native birds and long-tailed bats through habitat disturbance, increased human activity, lighting and stormwater runoff.	
191/4		✓		We support this submission because the effects of large-scale earthworks and development on the adjoining historic pā and other sites of cultural significance have not been adequately resolved.	
191/5		✓		We support this submission because large-scale urban development beside the river, reserves and existing rural-edge properties would cause substantial and irreversible harm to the area's landscape character, visual outlook and amenity.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
146/1	Ray & Maxine Nelson		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. It consists largely of broad, unsupported assertions about housing capacity and a "well-functioning urban environment" while failing to confront the serious and well-documented consequences of PPC37, including premature and fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, inadequate transport and water infrastructure, pressure on schools and community services, loss of rural character and productive land, ecological effects, and substantial impacts on adjoining properties such as ours. The claimed benefits are aspirational rather than demonstrated, and approving the expanded development area would compound the proposal's scale, infrastructure demands and planning deficiencies. Submission point 146/1 therefore provides no credible planning basis for overriding the Council's established growth sequencing or approving PPC37.	We seek that submission point 146/1 be disallowed and that PPC37, including the expanded development area sought by the submitters, be declined in its entirety.
73/1	Natasha & Jack Blunden		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its general endorsement of PPC37 is unsupported by any credible planning, infrastructure, transport or environmental evidence. Instead, it assumes that development should proceed and focuses on desirable design features such as solar power, EV charging, rainwater tanks and sustainable covenants. These matters do not remedy the proposal's fundamental deficiencies, including premature and fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, inadequate infrastructure and transport capacity, ecological harm, loss of rural character and substantial effects on adjoining properties such as ours. Private covenants would also provide no adequate substitute for clear and enforceable planning provisions. Submission point 73/1 therefore provides no sound basis for approving PPC37.	We seek that submission point 73/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
183/1	Heather Colgan		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its support for rezoning rests on an unsubstantiated assertion that there is strong demand for low-to-medium-cost housing in Leamington, without evidence that PPC37 would deliver genuinely affordable housing or that this location is appropriately sequenced and serviced. The submission fails to address the proposal's fundamental deficiencies, including transport and infrastructure constraints, fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, ecological effects, loss of rural character and the direct impacts on adjoining properties such as ours. Indeed, its requests for environmental protection, traffic calming, reserves, commercial facilities and energy measures highlight significant shortcomings in the proposal rather than justify its approval. These suggested additions would not remedy PPC37's underlying planning, infrastructure and environmental defects. Submission point 183/1 therefore provides no credible basis for rezoning Rider Park.	We seek that submission point 183/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
22/1	Roddy Kerr		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its support for PPC37 relies on broad assumptions that growth is inevitable and that the development would complement Leamington, without providing credible planning, transport, infrastructure or environmental evidence. Suggesting that residents could use Kaipaki Road to travel to Hamilton merely shifts additional traffic onto another rural route and does not address Cambridge's existing congestion, bridge constraints or road-safety problems. The submission's reliance on Council planners to provide parks, shops, amenities and public transport also fails to establish how these facilities would be funded, delivered or secured. Indeed, its request for bus infrastructure highlights a significant deficiency in the proposal rather than providing a justification for approval. The submission does not address premature and fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, infrastructure limitations, ecological harm, loss of rural character or the direct effects on adjoining properties such as ours. Submission point 22/1 therefore provides no credible basis for approving PPC37.	We seek that submission point 22/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
32/1	Ashleigh Smith		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its support for PPC37 is based on general impressions that new housing, green spaces and river access would be beneficial, without providing credible planning, transport, infrastructure or environmental evidence. More significantly, the submission itself acknowledges that a new school, shops, a third bridge and public transport would be required to accommodate the additional population. These are major infrastructure deficiencies, not minor matters that can safely be addressed after rezoning. The submission provides no evidence that these facilities are funded, secured or capable of being delivered before development occurs. It also fails to address the premature and fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, ecological effects, loss of rural character and direct impacts on adjoining properties such as ours. Submission point 32/1 therefore highlights fundamental shortcomings in PPC37 rather than providing a credible basis for its approval.	We seek that submission point 32/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
104/1	Ian E Willers		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its support for PPC37 rests on a personal preference for directing Cambridge's growth toward Lake Karāpiro rather than on credible planning, transport, infrastructure or environmental evidence. The existence of a world-class sporting venue at Lake Karāpiro does not demonstrate that Rider Park is appropriately located, sequenced or serviced for large-scale medium-density development. Nor does it justify fragmenting the C5 Growth Cell or disregarding serious constraints involving river crossings, roading, water infrastructure, ecological effects, rural character and impacts on adjoining properties such as ours. The assertion that southward growth would benefit Cambridge in the long term is unsubstantiated and fails to address the substantial adverse effects of this particular proposal. Submission point 104/1 therefore provides no credible planning basis for approving PPC37.	We seek that submission point 104/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
81/1	James Seivwright		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its support for PPC37 rests on broad assertions that more housing is needed and that Leamington should expand simply because development is occurring elsewhere in Cambridge. These assertions provide no credible planning, transport, infrastructure or environmental justification for rezoning this particular land. Describing Rider Park as "as good a place as any" ignores the need for evidence-based site selection and fails to address the premature and fragmented development of the C5 Growth Cell, constrained river crossings and roading, water infrastructure, ecological effects, loss of rural character and direct impacts on adjoining properties such as ours. Submission point 81/1 therefore provides no credible planning basis for approving PPC37.	We seek that submission point 81/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
29/1	Bronwyn Page		✓	We strongly oppose this submission. Its general support for growth provides no credible planning basis for approving PPC37. The submission itself acknowledges that development would increase pressure on already-constrained childcare, schools, healthcare and local amenities, and that substantial additional infrastructure funding would be required. However, it offers no evidence that the necessary facilities are planned, funded or capable of being delivered before development occurs. A vague expectation that developers might contribute does not resolve these fundamental deficiencies or ensure that existing residents and ratepayers will not bear the consequences. Submission point 29/1 therefore highlights PPC37's unresolved infrastructure and servicing problems rather than justifying its approval.	We seek that submission point 29/1 be disallowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
253/1	Cambridge Community Board	✓		We support this submission because PPC37 would bring post-2035 land forward without demonstrating an immediate housing shortfall or adequately considering existing zoned growth areas. This would undermine coordinated growth sequencing and set an undesirable precedent.	We seek that submission points 253/1–253/10 be allowed and that the clarifications, assurances, enforceable safeguards, infrastructure triggers and monitoring sought by the Cambridge Community Board be required before any decision to approve PPC37 is made.
253/2		✓		We support this submission because the necessary transport, water and social infrastructure has not been shown to be available, funded and deliverable. Existing residents and ratepayers should not bear the resulting costs or reduced service levels.	
253/3		✓		We support this submission because PPC37's effects on the wider transport network, surrounding streets, school travel and pedestrian and cycling safety have not been adequately resolved. Required upgrades must be confirmed, funded and delivered before development proceeds.	
253/4		✓		We support this submission because medium-density development beside existing rural and low-density properties, including ours, could significantly affect privacy, outlook and amenity. Clear and enforceable controls are required for building scale, site coverage and appropriate transition areas.	
253/5		✓		We support this submission because converting rural land to urban development would cause permanent environmental and intergenerational effects. PPC37 does not adequately secure biodiversity enhancement, ecological connections, open space or long-term climate resilience.	
253/6		✓		We support this submission because highly productive soils are finite and their loss to urban development would be irreversible. PPC37 has not demonstrated a compelling present need for this land or that reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.	
253/7		✓		We support this submission because mana whenua values and cultural outcomes must be meaningfully reflected in the structure plan and enforceable provisions. Evidence of appropriate engagement and protection of cultural heritage has not been adequately demonstrated.	
253/8		✓		We support this submission because development should not precede the infrastructure needed to support it. Flooding, stormwater and climate-change risks must be assessed conservatively and addressed through enforceable provisions.	
253/9		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 requires clear staging triggers and enforceable "no-go" conditions preventing development if essential infrastructure or funding is not delivered. These safeguards should be established before rezoning occurs.	
253/10		✓		We support this submission because PPC37 has not justified accelerating deferred growth, rezoning productive rural land or departing from infrastructure-led sequencing. It is inconsistent with the community's reasonable expectations for coordinated and well-managed growth.	

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

FS01

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us WHY you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
270/1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Waikato	✓		We strongly support this submission because PPC37 would enable substantial urban development well ahead of the Council's planned growth sequence, despite other identified growth areas remaining available. Premature rezoning would undermine coordinated, infrastructure-led planning and permanently remove rural land without demonstrating that it is presently required to meet housing demand. Allowing private development interests to override the established growth strategy would create a damaging precedent for further fragmented and out-of-sequence development.	We seek that submission points 270/1 and 270/2 be allowed and that PPC37 be declined in its entirety.
270/2		✓		We strongly support this submission because PPC37 would place intensive urban development beside established rural and equine properties, including ours, creating serious and enduring reverse-sensitivity effects. New residents could object to ordinary rural activities involving animals, machinery, vehicles, dust, noise, lighting and odour, progressively constraining the reasonable use of neighbouring land. These conflicts cannot be adequately resolved by expecting existing landowners to modify lawful activities that pre-date the proposed development.	

**Submissions must be received by Waipā District Council
by 5pm on Thursday, August 13, 2026**