

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Joshua Brian Rene Cox
Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2026 9:29:36 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 Joshua Brian Rene Cox

Contact name (if different from above) Joshua Brian Rene Cox

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

PC37 Rider Park Structure Plan Area

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):

I oppose Proposed Private Plan Change 37 – Rider Park in its current form.

While I acknowledge the need for additional housing capacity in the Waipā District, the proposed plan change fails to adequately address critical infrastructure constraints, particularly within Leamington and the wider Cambridge transport network, and inappropriately shifts risk to the community and Council.

The scale, density, and timing of the proposal are not supported by existing or committed infrastructure, and the plan change does not provide sufficient certainty that all necessary upgrades will be fully funded, delivered, and completed by the applicant prior to development impacts being felt.

My submission is

1. Introduction and Overall Position

1.1

I oppose Proposed Private Plan Change 37 – Rider Park in its current form.

1.2

While I acknowledge the need for additional housing capacity in the Waipā District, the proposed plan change fails to adequately address critical infrastructure constraints, particularly within Leamington and the wider Cambridge transport network, and inappropriately shifts risk to the community and Council.

1.3

The scale, density, and timing of the proposal are not supported by existing or committed infrastructure, and the plan change does not provide sufficient certainty that all necessary upgrades will be fully funded, delivered, and completed by the applicant prior to development impacts being felt.

2. Insufficient Leamington and Cambridge Infrastructure Capacity

2.1

The proposed rezoning would enable at least 1,250 dwellings, plus neighbourhood centres and associated commercial activity. This represents a step change in population, traffic, and service demand concentrated on Leamington, an area that already experiences:

- Peak hour congestion
- Limited arterial road redundancy
- Constrained bridge crossings of the Waikato River
- Pressure on three waters infrastructure
- Limited public transport penetration

2.2

The plan change relies heavily on future staging, future agreements, and future upgrades, rather than infrastructure that is demonstrably in place or contractually secured.

2.3

Without fully funded, legally binding infrastructure delivery mechanisms embedded in the plan change itself, the proposal creates a significant risk of adverse effects being externalised to existing residents and ratepayers.

3. Waikato River Crossings and Bridge Capacity

3.1

The Waikato River is a major physical and transport constraint for Cambridge and Leamington. All north–south connectivity relies on a small number of bridge crossings, which are already critical network pinch points.

3.2

The plan change does not adequately address:

- Whether existing bridges can accommodate the increased traffic demand
- Whether additional bridge capacity is required
- The timing, funding, and delivery of any new or upgraded river crossings

3.3

Any development of this scale must explicitly account for additional bridge connections or capacity enhancements across the Waikato River, including:

- New bridge infrastructure, or
- Significant upgrades to existing crossings

3.4

These works are not optional. They are fundamental network requirements arising directly from the proposal and must be fully funded by the landowner and developer, not deferred to Council, NZTA, or future ratepayers.

4. Transport Connectivity Beyond Leamington

4.1

The proposal is assessed largely within a localised transport frame, yet the scale of development has regional implications.

4.2

There is insufficient consideration of how Rider Park integrates with wider transport networks, including:

- Hamilton–Auckland road corridors
- Access to Hamilton and Auckland airports
- Future inter regional and commuter rail opportunities
- Regional freight and logistics movements

4.3

Without strong, realistic connections to these wider networks, the development risks:

- Increasing private vehicle dependency
- Adding pressure to already constrained corridors
- Undermining mode shift and emissions reduction objectives

4.4

A development of this size should be explicitly planned as part of a wider regional transport system, not treated as a self contained residential enclave.

5. Funding Responsibility and Infrastructure Risk

5.1

I strongly oppose any plan change that enables development ahead of infrastructure certainty.

5.2

All infrastructure required to mitigate the effects of PC37 must be:

- Fully funded by the landowner and developer
- Delivered in advance of, or concurrently with, development
- Secured through enforceable planning provisions, not reliance on future agreements

5.3

This must include, but is not limited to:

- Road upgrades and intersections
- Bridge works and river crossings
- Three waters upgrades
- Public transport infrastructure
- Active transport connections

5.4

Development contributions and high level assurances are not sufficient for a proposal of this scale and complexity.

6. Prematurity and Cumulative Effects

6.1

The proposal brings forward development that was previously identified for later release, without adequate demonstration that:

- Earlier growth areas are fully serviced and delivered
- The cumulative effects of concurrent developments are manageable
- Network resilience is maintained

6.2

Approving this plan change prematurely risks fragmented growth, reactive infrastructure investment, and long term inefficiency.

7. Relief Sought

I seek that Waipā District Council:

- a) Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37; or
- b) In the alternative, substantially amend the plan change to require:
 - Explicit provision for additional Waikato River bridge capacity
 - Binding infrastructure delivery and funding conditions
 - Demonstrated integration with regional transport networks
 - Clear assurance that no infrastructure costs fall to Council or ratepayers
- c) Defer consideration until comprehensive, independently verified infrastructure and transport solutions are in place.

8. Conclusion

8.1

PC37, as currently proposed, places growth ahead of infrastructure, assumptions ahead of certainty, and community risk ahead of developer responsibility.

8.2

Without fundamental changes, the proposal undermines sound resource management, equitable infrastructure funding, and long term urban resilience for Leamington, Cambridge, and the wider Waipā District.

I seek the following decision/s from Council

I seek that Waipā District Council:

- a) Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37; or
- b) In the alternative, substantially amend the plan change to require:
 - Explicit provision for additional Waikato River bridge capacity
 - Binding infrastructure delivery and funding conditions
 - Demonstrated integration with regional transport networks
 - Clear assurance that no infrastructure costs fall to Council or ratepayers
- c) Defer consideration until comprehensive, independently verified infrastructure and transport solutions are in place and fully funded by the developer.

Attachments