

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards
Date: Thursday, 2 July 2026 11:27:54 am
Attachments: [REF261243470.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 FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards

Contact name (if different from above) Ged Edwards and Peter Edwards

Email address

Address for service

Contact phone number

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

PC 36

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):

See attached submission

My submission is

See attached submission

I seek the following decision/s from Council

See attached submission

Attachments

[PC 36 Submission - FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards.pdf](#) (323 kb)

Submission

To: Waipa District Council
From: Simone Williams and Gareth Moran (Nicklin CE)
Date: 2nd July 2026
Subject: Submission on Private Plan Change 36 – Waipa District Council

1.0 Introduction

This submission is made on behalf of FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards in relation to Private Plan Change 36 - Ōhaupō Large Lot Residential Extension to the Waipā District Plan. FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards are herein referred to as the 'submitters'.

The submitters are located at 72 Great South Road, Ōhaupō, which is located within the Ōhaupō O3 Growth Cell. They are longstanding Ōhaupō family with a strong connection to the local community. The O3 Growth Cell forms part of the existing planned growth framework for Ōhaupō and is identified for future large lot residential development.

Private Plan Change 36 seeks to rezone approximately 21.505 hectares of land at 4336 Ōhaupō Road and 5, 7 and 13 Ryburn Road from Rural Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone to create approximately 40 lots. The proposal also seeks to insert the Ōhaupō South Structure Plan and remove the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor Landscape Overlay from the plan change area.

The submitter does not oppose the planned and coordinated growth of Ōhaupō. However, the submitter opposes PC36 as notified because it seeks to introduce a new large lot residential growth area outside the existing identified growth cells, ahead of land that already forms part of the District Plan growth framework.

This submission sets out:

1. The background context for FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards' interest in PC36.
2. The planning process undertaken to date in relation to the O3 Growth Cell.
3. The submitter's concerns with PC36.
4. The specific submission points and relief sought.
5. Relief sought

2.0 Background

The submitter has a direct interest in PC36 because the plan change seeks to establish an additional large lot residential growth area outside the existing identified Ōhaupō growth cells, thereby introducing out-of-sequence expansion that is not aligned with the established spatial growth strategy as set out in Waipā 2050 and the Future Proof Strategy, including the planned staging and sequencing of development within the O2, O3 and O4 growth cells in Ōhaupō in the Waipā District Plan.

These growth cells are all identified for future development from 2035 and beyond, unless there is earlier demand for housing in Ōhaupō. The submitter's understanding is that, from 2019 and subsequent to the



subdivision, development and uptake of Ridgehaven (identified as Growth Cell 1) that further demand for housing was identified in Ōhaupō.

Based on this demand recognition, the submitter has been actively progressing the development of their property over a number of years, including through discussions with other growth cell landowners, preliminary design work, and pre-application engagement with Waipā District Council, with recorded meeting notes held in Council's records as PG/0232/20 and more recently, PG/0040/26.

Their landholding alone could contribute to the supply of 25 Large Lot Residential Zoned properties, as evidenced in subdivision scheme plan drawings submitted to Waipā District Council as part of their prior engagement.

The submitter has therefore invested time and cost over a number of years in progressing development options in reliance on the existing planned growth areas for Ōhaupō.

Accordingly, when the submitter became aware that PC36 had been notified, this came as a significant surprise and only first became aware of the proposal from a letter in the post from Waipā District Council dated 4th June 2026. The submitter had not been consulted by the applicant prior to notification. The submitter is particularly concerned that, despite this lack of consultation, the application appears to rely on assertions regarding the development intentions of existing growth cell landowners.

In the submitter's view, those assertions are factually inaccurate insofar as they relate to the submitter's position and do not reflect the work already undertaken to progress the future development of the O3 Growth Cell.



Figure 1: Location of the submitter's landholding within the Ōhaupō O3 Growth Cell, shown in the context of the existing Ōhaupō township and Deferred Zone Growth Cells

3.0 Planning Context

The submitter's concern is not with growth in Ōhaupō in principle. The concern is that PC36 seeks to advance a new large lot residential live zoning outside the identified growth cells in Ōhaupō.



In its current form, PC36 does not reflect good planning practice. It seeks to advance an unanticipated growth ahead of existing deferred growth cells, without a clear economic or land supply assessment demonstrating that this additional capacity is required, or that it will not displace demand from the existing O2, O3 and O4 growth cells.

In our view, if additional large lot residential land is required to respond to demand in Ōhaupō, consideration should first be given to land within the existing identified growth cells, rather than advancing Rural Zoned land outside designated growth for Ōhaupō.

The submitter is concerned that PC36 has the potential to affect the timing, feasibility, and delivery of the existing growth cells, particularly if PC36 satisfies short to medium term housing demand that would otherwise support the activation of those areas.

The submitter is also concerned that the application appears to rely on the position that existing growth cell landowners do not intend to undertake subdivision or development in the short to medium term which creates concern that the plan change may erode the work already undertaken to progress the uplift of the O3 Growth Cell.

In order to protect the future development opportunity for land already identified within the O2, O3 and O4 growth cells, PC36 should not be approved unless it is demonstrated that the plan change will not defer, displace, or undermine the planned development of those areas.

The submitters seek that PC36 be declined as notified.

In the alternative, if Council is minded to approve PC36, the submitter seeks amendments and/or further assessment to ensure that PC36 does not prejudice the development pathway for the existing Ōhaupō growth cells in the short to medium term.

Table 1 below sets out the submission points for each relevant matter raised by the submitter.

SUBMISSION POINTS			
Submission Point	Matter	Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Comments
1	PC36 as notified	Oppose	In its current form, PC36 does not represent an integrated planning outcome for Ōhaupō. The proposal seeks to advance an unanticipated and out-of-sequence large lot residential growth area ahead of the existing identified growth cells, without adequately assessing how that land relates to the planned staging, sequencing, and development of the O2, O3 and O4 growth cells. This does not reflect good planning outcome.
2	PC36 as notified	Oppose	The application does not appear to include detailed landscaping plans, masterplan including setbacks, or other plans demonstrating how future development would be accommodated on the site. In the absence



			of this information, it is difficult to understand how effects relating to landscape, visual amenity, reverse sensitivity, road frontage treatment, and site layout would be managed. This is of particular concern given the site is located within the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor, where a greater level of certainty would be expected in relation to amenity effects, landscape treatment, setbacks, and the integration of future development. Further, the application appears to rely on future subdivision design and later consent processes to manage a number of key effects, but these outcomes are not secured through specific PC36 provisions.
3	PC36 as notified	Oppose	The supporting technical assessments, including the landscape and transportation assessments, appear to assess the PC36 land in isolation. They do not adequately address how the proposed rezoning would impact the future development of the existing Ōhaupō growth cells, including the O2, O3 and O4 growth cells, or how future development of those growth cells has been contemplated in the assessment of effects.
4	PC35 as notified	Oppose	If PC36 is approved, consequential amendments may be required to protect the development pathway for existing growth cells in Ōhaupō in the short to medium term.
5	Removal of State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor Landscape Overlay	Oppose	PC36 seeks to remove the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor Landscape Overlay from the plan change area. The submitter is concerned that the application has not adequately recognised the importance of the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor in maintaining rural character, visual amenity, and the experience of entering and exiting Ōhaupō. The proposed large lot residential development is not currently contemplated by the District Plan for this site, and the removal of the overlay may result in development outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to rural character, rural amenity, and views from the SH3 Scenic Corridor.



			The Landscape and Visual Assessment considers a number of landscape and visual matters, including rural character, visual amenity, building placement, earthworks, fencing, building form, materials and landscape planting. However, it does not appear to provide a specific assessment against Appendix DG7 of the Waipā District Plan, which provides guidance for development within the State Highway 3 Scenic Corridor and other identified landscape areas. The Landscape and Visual Assessment also appears to rely on future subdivision design, landscape planting, building placement, building form, colours and materials, and height controls to manage effects. However, these matters are not secured through PC36 provisions or a detailed masterplan. In particular, it is unclear how future development would respond to the DG7 design principles relating to building location, scale, form and design, driveways and access, fencing, retaining structures and mitigation. It is recommended that Council obtain an independent peer review of the Landscape and Visual Assessment, including specific consideration of whether removal of the overlay is appropriate, and whether the proposed rezoning would maintain the rural landscape values and visual amenity outcomes sought by the District Plan.
6	National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)	Neutral	The application relies on PC36 supporting Waipā District Council to give effect to the NPS-UD. It is unclear whether the NPS-UD is relevant to PC36, or the extent to which it supports the rezoning of Rural Zone land to Large Lot Residential Zone. While the NPS-UD seeks to enable well-functioning urban environments, further consideration is required as to whether low-density Large Lot Residential rezoning achieves the urban development outcomes contemplated by the NPS-UD. It is noted that WDC has clearly defined urban boundaries. The subject site is not within these areas.

Table 1: Submission points



4.0 Relief Sought

The submitter seeks that PC36 be declined as notified.

If PC36 is to be approved, the submitter seeks that approval only be granted where it is demonstrated, through robust economic, land supply, landscape, transport, and planning evidence, that PC36 will not displace, defer, or undermine the planned development of the existing Ōhaupō growth cells, specifically including the O3 Growth Cell.

In particular, the submitter seeks that PC36 be declined unless it is demonstrated that:

- PC36 will not prejudice, defer, displace, or undermine the development pathway for the existing Ōhaupō growth cells;
- the cumulative land supply and housing demand effects of PC36 have been assessed and confirm that the additional large lot residential capacity proposed by PC36 will not delay, displace, or undermine the activation of the existing O2, O3 and O4 growth cells;
- the transport, landscape, visual of PC36 have been assessed cumulatively with the existing Ōhaupō growth cells uplifting in the short to medium term; and
- the Waipā District Plan continues to recognise the existing Ōhaupō deferred zoning/ growth cells as the planned basis for future large lot residential growth, including their potential activation in the short to medium term.

In the alternative, if PC36 is approved, the submitter seeks that the PC36 land is not live zoned ahead of the existing identified growth cells.

Instead, the PC36 land should be rezoned Deferred Large Lot Residential Zone, with live zoning only occurring once at least 80% of the developable land within the existing Ōhaupō growth cells has been developed, or once it is otherwise demonstrated through land supply and demand evidence that additional large lot residential capacity is required for Ōhaupō.

This submission sets out the submitter's position on PC36, including the reasons for opposition and the relief sought. Council's submission form is attached within **Attachment 1**.

FT Edwards & Estate R.P. Edwards wishes to be heard in relation to the above submission points.

Please contact us if you wish to discuss any of these points further or seek clarification.

Yours sincerely

Nicklin CE



Simone Williams

Senior Planner

0272543779

Simone.williams@nicklince.co.nz



Gareth Moran

Senior Planner

021745979

gareth.moran@nicklince.co.nz

