

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Marijn Anne-Lies Roberts
Date: Monday, 6 April 2026 10:01:33 am

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 Marijn Anne-Lies Roberts

Contact name (if different from above)

Email address

Address for service

Contact phone number

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

Proposed Private Plan Change 37 - Rider Park Structure Plan

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 not

Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission? I do

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 support in part

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

Rezoning of the 45ha of C5 growth cell from Deferred Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Rezoning 52 hectares of land adjoining this zone,.

My submission is

A phenomenal amount of work has gone into preparing the documentation for the proposed plan change and I have to commend the owners of Milan Park for trying to drive change for the better. However, the documentation in my view inadequately clarifies why the current zoning is deemed inadequate.

Why do we need to rezone C5 now and not in 2035?

Are the currently prioritised growth zones Cambridge North, C1, C2, C3, C4 and C6 insufficient to cater to population growth until 2035? Especially in light of the Waipa 2050 Growth Strategy specifying the need to focus on areas north of the river, due to better connectivity to public amenities and Hamilton.

The P37 documentation outlines the need for additional housing, due to increased growth (based of economic modelling from 2022, which is nearly 4 years old), but doesn't address if there is any ability to increase the housing capacity in current growth zones. And if the collective agreement is that we need to prioritise the development in the South East of Cambridge, what Waipa infrastructure projects (water, public transport, roading, etc.) will be prioritised to handle a significant increase in residents in this area?

Why change the C5 zone boundaries?

Why is the south/southwestern part of the current C5 deferred zone no longer suitable for inclusion? And what makes the newly added area – in particular the area north/northeast, adjacent to the green belt, reserve, Pā site and Waikato river – more suitable? Both from a geological, as well as cultural and ecological point of view. Is the wider Waipa community really served better by rezoning an area of (some) cultural and ecological significance into a Medium Density Residential Zone? Why not expand this zone further east instead of north as indicated with purple on the image attached?

I understand the need for Cambridge to expand, and if point 1 gets adequately addressed/answered have no objections to the rezoning of the 45ha of C5 growth cell from Deferred Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Rezoning 52 hectares of land adjoining this zone, in particular the northern half of this area (from the gully, adjacent to the pa site and up to the Waikato) feels flawed. This area provides breathing space to the area, for indigenous flora and fauna, and residents. Living close, I've always experienced this space as one of the hidden gems of Cambridge.

And IF it were to change that newly identified northern area from rural to residential;

Why MDRZ on this particular area, considering:

- terrain/ground profile → sloping + stormwater run-off to tributary/Waikato River.
- the single main road in/out → I'm struggling to see how this improves public mobility/connection to amenities. There's talk of a pedestrian (+ cyclist) connection on the north side, but current infrastructure would limit capacity. A better solution would be to extend Addison Street into this part of the zone, but that's not considered.

Why develop over areas of cultural/archeological significance, encroaching in an area with natural/biodiversity significance. Why not designate that area for a reserve, for people to enjoy green space, and connect to the river. And focus urban development more on the flat pasture land east of the proposed zone?

The District Plan identified the original C5 growth cell as having a dwelling capacity of approximately 732 dwellings (at 61ha, pretty much all of it developable land). The Structure Plan for Rider Park aims to provide for a conceptual development capacity of at least 1,250 dwellings (at 98ha, of which a not insignificant portion is taken up by gully and river bank). That's an increase of roughly 60% of land, but more than 70% of housing. Why not apply an increase in housing density in current growth zones where more significant amenities and transport options are already in place or worked on?

I seek the following decision/s from Council

- A reconsideration of the plan change of the 52ha north/east of the C5 growth cell. Don't extend the zone all the way to the river, but consider sections of land to the east of the proposed zone (highlighted in purple on the map attached).

- An explanation as to why an increase in housing density as proposed in PC37 cannot be considered for current growth cells (Cambridge North, C1, C2, C3, C4 and C6), allowing C5 to be deferred until 2035.
- A clear outline of the Waipa District projects that will be prioritised to ensure the C5 area will indeed become a development that has good accessibility - by way of public or active transport for the estimated 3,000+ people living there between their housing and jobs, community services, natural/open spaces.

For reference: I live on Kingsley Street, and my closest bus stop is a 13 min walk (0.9km), my closest cafe 16 min (1.1km), closest supermarket 27 min walk (1.8km). For people in Rider Park, especially in the section closest to the river, I anticipate those walking distances would be at least 5-10 mins longer, and cycling would be challenging for some (due to terrain of the section closer to the river). The proposed neighbourhood centre will address proximity to some of these amenities, but not all (e.g. public transport connections).

Attachments

Please upload any file attachments here



