

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Kate Fitz-John
Date: Monday, 27 April 2026 7:37:40 pm

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 Kate Fitz-John

Contact name (if different from above) Kate Fitz-John

Email address [REDACTED]

Address for service [REDACTED]

Contact phone number [REDACTED]

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

Proposed Private Plan Change 37 – Rider Park Structure Plan (PC37)

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

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):

Rezone land zoned Deferred Residential (45.71 ha within the C5 Growth Cell) and Rural (52.89 ha) to Medium Density Residential Zone
 Change and add provisions within sections 2A (Medium Density Residential Zone), 15 (infrastructure, hazards, development and subdivision) and 21 (assessment criteria) of the Waipā District Plan
 Amend Appendix S1 – Future Growth Cells (relating to the C5 Growth Cell)

My submission is

- The proposed development is out of sequence with planned growth. The area is not identified for development until after 2035. Future growth areas identified in the Waipa District Plan have been strategically staged to ensure essential infrastructure such as schools, supermarkets, roads and medical centres are delivered alongside population growth. Leamington and Cambridge are simply not equipped to support development at this scale at this time. Particularly given the pressure already on the bridges and through the town centre.

- To establish well-functioning communities, residential development must be supported by an adequate supply of commercially zoned land. This does not appear to have been sufficiently addressed. Carter's Flat is the only new commercial area identified in Cambridge; however, given its historical use as an industrial area, there will be delays in transitioning the zone to commercial use. This is further compounded by the high cost of industrial-zoned land in Hautapu.
- In order to establish well-functioning communities, which is a core principal of the National Policy Statement, Urban Development, residential development needs to be supported by a supply of commercial zoned land. This does not appear to have been adequately addressed. Carter's Flat is the only new commercial zoned area identified in the District Plan, however given its primary use has historically been industrial, there will be delays in transforming this zone to commercial, which is compounded by the price of industrial zoned land in Hautapu.
- Although there are conflicting statements in the application and specialist reports regarding the quantum of proposed houses, we understand the additional houses to be in the vicinity of 1250. However, under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), the actual number of dwellings could be considerably higher. A substantial number of additional homes (double - 2500) could be built as permitted activities (cant be stopped), with further intensification possible through non-notified restricted discretionary resource consents.
- What assurance can the applicant give us that 1250 represents the maximum cap on residential development?
- The ITA does not appear to have taken into account the MDRZ zoning; which is significantly different to the standard 'residential zone' provisions which were likely relevant when this assessment was done. Has the roading network been properly modelled to reflect the full development capacity enabled under MDRS? This is a fundamental issue that must be addressed.
- Traffic congestion is already a concern and will be significantly worsened by this proposal. What specific measures are being put in place to ensure children and families can safely cross Shakespeare Street on their way to school and or town centre? At present, it is very difficult to safely cross Shakespeare Street (unless there is a specific pedestrian crossing that requires cars to stop and give way). Personally, as residents of Addison Street, it is very difficult to safely cross Shakespeare Street and feels really unsafe walking into town via Achilles Ave as the bridge is so narrow and there is a lot of traffic (often driving very quickly). Going the other way (Cook Street) takes too long and there are still issues with safe pedestrian crossings.
- Turning right into Shakespeare Street (via Addison Street) is unsafe and difficult, during most hours of the day. Considering Council's Roading departments stance and resistance for new vehicle crossing created as part of innocuous resource consent applications, we can't understand how increasing traffic movements, on an already congested street, represents a functional and safe option; despite the mitigation measures suggested by the traffic engineer.
- The introduction of traffic lights at Wordsworth/Shakespeare Street is likely to exacerbate congestion rather than resolve it.
- We request absolute certainty (beyond all doubt) that a future connector road will not be established at the end of Addison Street. This must be formally embedded in the District Plan as a Prohibited

Activity in order to preserve the natural character of the street, particularly as a key part of the green belt.

- The loss of highly productive soils is another serious concern. The proposal appears inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), and no adequate assessment has been provided to address this. Why was a NPSHPL report not submitted with the application?
- The impact on the reserve must be properly considered. It currently has a valued rural character, which will be significantly compromised if medium-density residential zoning is allowed to directly adjoin it. There is also the issue of protecting the native bats in the area and pa sites at the end of Addison Street.

I seek the following decision/s from Council

Decline the application

Attachments