

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Stuart van Vugt
Date: Monday, 29 June 2026 9:02:30 pm
Attachments: [REF261234769.pdf](#)

CYBER SECURITY WARNING: This email is from an external source - be careful of attachments and links. Please follow the Cybersecurity Policy and report suspicious emails to Servicedesk

Full name of submitter Stuart van Vugt

Contact name (if different from above) Stuart van Vugt

Email address

Address for service

Contact phone number

This is a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Waipā District Plan

Private Plan Change 36 - Ōhaupō Large Lot Residential Extension

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? I could not

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that - (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition? I am

Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission? I do not

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? Yes

Do you support the proposed change(s)? I oppose

The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are (give details):

See below

My submission is

1. Introduction

I oppose Private Plan Change 36 – Ōhaupō Large Lot Residential Extension, which seeks to rezone 21.50 hectares of rural land at 5, 7, and 13 Ryburn Road and 4336 Ōhaupō Road from Rural Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone, introduce the Ōhaupō South Structure Plan, and remove the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor overlay.

This proposal is inconsistent with the Waipā District Plan, the Resource Management Act 1991, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the strategic direction for rural character, landscape protection, cultural values, and safe transport corridors.

2. Grounds for Objection

A. Scenic Corridor of National Significance – Removal is Unacceptable

The State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor is recognized in the Waipā District Plan as containing:

“Prominent and memorable views to outstanding natural landscape features, the volcanic cones and nationally significant peat lakes.”

(Policy 25.3.5.2)

The proposal to delete this overlay is:

Short-sighted

Contrary to the District Plan’s landscape protection objectives

In conflict with RMA s6(b) – protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes

Professionally indefensible

A scenic corridor of national significance should never be removed from a District Plan rule for any reason—least of all for unnecessary residential development in an unsuitable location.

To write off a nationally significant scenic corridor for the sake of a developer’s profits—and council contributions tied to development—is poor planning practice, shameful, and unbelievably unprofessional. It undermines public trust in the integrity of the District Plan.

B. Peat Lakes – Global Rarity & National Pride

Peat lakes are diminishing worldwide, and New Zealand’s remaining peat lakes are:

Ecologically rare

Culturally significant

Scientifically important

Visually striking

The SH3 Scenic Corridor provides public visibility of these lakes, which is essential for:

Education

Awareness

Conservation

National identity

As New Zealanders, we should be proud of our peat lakes and showcase them.

This location provides views on both sides of SH3 of these ecological wonders—one of the reasons it was designated a scenic corridor of national significance in the first place.

Removing the overlay contradicts:

Waipā District Plan 25.3.5 – maintain views to landscape features

RMA s6(c) – protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats

Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato – protect and restore the river and its catchment

C. Rural Character & Amenity Loss (RMA s7(c))

Ōhaupō's southern entrance is a rural gateway, defined by:

Pastoral farmland

Open views

Low-density rural activity

A clear transition between township and countryside

Replacing 21.5 hectares of rural land with residential lots will:

Remove rural openness

Introduce suburban form inconsistent with Ōhaupō's scale

Erode the rural gateway character

Reduce amenity values protected under RMA s7(c)

Our rural areas are diminishing at an alarming and unnecessary rate.

Other countries—such as Germany—have protected productive rural land and landscapes by keeping residential development strictly within village and town boundaries, despite having far denser populations than New Zealand.

We should learn from good international planning practice, not repeat the mistakes of poor planning.

D. Unsuitable Location for Residential Living

This site is sandwiched between:

State Highway 3 (heavy freight, high speeds, congestion)

The North Island Main Trunk railway line (noise, vibration, safety constraints)

This is not a suitable location for residential living.

A far more appropriate location for residential expansion exists a short distance away in Te Awamutu, where:

Infrastructure capacity is higher

Growth is already planned

Noise and safety constraints are lower

Urban form is established

Ōhaupō should not be forced into premature, ad-hoc expansion.

E. Traffic Safety & SH3 Congestion

The extra traffic burden on Ryburn Road waiting to pull onto SH3 will:

Increase queue lengths

Cause dangerous turning movements

Add to congestion already worsened by:

Ōhaupō traffic lights

Speed bumps

Reduced speed zones

When a State Highway is burdened with kilometers of reduced speed zones, traffic lights, and speed bumps, traffic flow is severely impacted.

Adding a large residential development—significant in size compared to the existing Ōhaupō village—is very poor planning practice and contradicts:

Waipā District Plan transport safety objectives

RMA s5(2)(c) – avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects

WRPS Policy 6.1 – integrate land use and infrastructure

F. Cultural Landscape Values (Waipā District Plan 25.3.6)

Ōhaupō sits within a wider cultural landscape connected to:

Maungatautari

Pirongia

Kakepuku

Rangiāowhia

Ōrākau

The District Plan requires development to:

“Avoid adverse effects on cultural landscape values.”
(Policy 25.3.6.2)

PC36 introduces:

Large-scale earthworks

Residential intensification

Removal of rural landscape context

These effects conflict with:

RMA s6(e) – relationship of Māori with ancestral lands

Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato

G. Infrastructure Capacity & Stormwater Effects

Ōhaupō’s three-waters infrastructure is limited. Large-lot residential development increases:

Impermeable surfaces

Stormwater runoff

Flooding risk

The applicant’s assessments do not adequately address cumulative effects or long-term capacity. There is already notable problematic flooding during normal frequent rain events west of the railway, directly downhill from this proposed development site. This proposed development would like have massive further detrimental impacts on the amount of flooding here.

H. Inconsistency with Strategic Growth Planning

Ōhaupō is not identified as a major growth node in:

Waikato Regional Policy Statement

Waipā District Growth Strategy

Future Proof Strategy

PC36 is:

Developer-driven

Not community-led

Not aligned with staged, sustainable growth principles under the RMA

Contrary to NPS-UD, which requires strategic, infrastructure-aligned growth, not ad-hoc rural expansion

I seek the following decision/s from Council

I request that Waipā District Council:

Decline Private Plan Change 36 in full.

Retain the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor overlay.

Protect rural character and amenity at Ōhaupō's southern entrance.

Require a full township growth strategy before considering any large-scale rezoning.

Ensure cultural landscape values are upheld in accordance with Section 25.3.6 and RMA s6(e).

Require comprehensive traffic safety analysis for SH3 before any future rezoning.

PC36 is inconsistent with the Waipā District Plan, the Resource Management Act, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and the protection of rural character, cultural values, landscape integrity, and transport safety. The proposal represents inappropriate development and should be declined.

Attachments