

Summary of Decisions Requested by Submissions

Proposed Plan Change 31 – Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell

By Submitter

1 October 2026

Contents

Contents.....	2
Reader's Guide	4
How to read the summary.....	4
How to make a further submission.....	5
Submitter Details	6
Submitter 01 – Faull, Kim	7
Submitter 02 – Cavanagh, Ronan	8
Submitter 03 – McKinnon, James	8
Submitter 04 – Keighley, Morgan	9
Submitter 05 – Faull, Dylan	11
Submitter 06 – Bowers, Robyn	12
Submitter 07 – Brown, David Hugh	13
Submitter 08 – Davies, Daniel	13
Submitter 09 – Crawshay, Graham.....	13
Submitter 10 – Vesseur, David	14
Submitter 11 – Gedye, Bevan	15
Submitter 12 – Gedye, Emma.....	17
Submitter 13 – Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	18
Submitter 14 – Latham, David	19
Submitter 15 – Ward, Max & Kirsten	21
Submitter 16 – Te Awamutu – Kihikihi Community Board	22
Submitter 17 – Ministry of Education	24
Submitter 18 – Waikato Regional Council	25
Submitter 19 – Clunies-Ross, Beverly.....	29
Submitter 20 – Bromell, Kearin.....	30
Submitter 21 – Walsh, Paula	32
Submitter 22 – Middleton, Colleen & Norman	32

Submitter 23 – Harris, Ben	35
Submitter 24 – O’Shaughnessy, Danielle.....	36
Submitter 25 – McIvor, Michael & Brenda	37
Submitter 26 – Director-General of Conservation	40
Submitter 27 – Dolan, Shane & Ruth	43
Submitter 28 – Malcolm, Helen.....	47
Submitter 29 – Vallings, John Edward	48
Submitter 30 – KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	48
Submitter 31 – Hollinshead, Darrell	49
Submitter 32 – Tervit, Barry.....	50
Submitter 33 – Lenaarts, Alwyn.....	51
Submitter 34 – McIvor, Christine & Eric, and Bailey Ingham Trustees Ltd	51
Submitter 35 – Mexted, Monique & Brent.....	52
Submitter 36 – Ellis, Tracy	53
Submitter 37 – Peterson, Christine	53

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the 37 submissions received, and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered by submitter number. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by submitter. If you would like to see all the submissions lodged by topic on the proposed plan change, then refer to “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 31–Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell by Topic”.

Call for further submissions opens on 1 October 2026. The closing date for making further submissions is **15 October 2026. No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number, and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 1/3) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission.

EXAMPLE:

Submission 1/3

- 1 is the submitter number
- 3 is the submission point number

How to read the summary

- This summary is ordered by submitter number. The summary lists all of the submission points made by all the submitters.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular topic then you need to refer to the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 31 - Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell by Topic”.
- For your information separate spell checks have been carried out on the Topic and Submitter reports. In the event of there being any discrepancy the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 31 - Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell by Submitter” will prevail.

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in Proposed Plan Change 31 greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices at Cambridge and Te Awamutu, as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange31.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipā District Council.

We have made the decision to redact the contact details of all submitters. We have done this because increasingly people are expressing privacy concerns with having their contact details publicly available. If you need to contact a submitter Council can provide their details to you on request

Please email districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz to request the contact details of the original submitter.

Submissions can be:

Posted to:	Waipā District Council Private Bag 2402 Te Awamutu 3840
Delivered to:	Waipā District Council – Te Awamutu Office 101 Bank Street Te Awamutu
Delivered to:	Waipā District Council – Cambridge Office 23 Wilson Street Cambridge
Emailed to:	districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Submitter Details

By Surname	Submission Number
Faull, Kim	01
Cavanagh, Ronan	02
McKinnon, James	03
Keighley, Morgan	04
Faull, Dylan	05
Bowers, Robyn	06
Brown, David Hugh	07
Davies, Daniel	08
Crawshay, Graham	09
Vesseur, David	10
Gedye, Bevan	11
Gedye, Emma	12
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	13
Latham, David	14
Ward, Max & Kirsten	15
Te Awamutu – Kihikihi Community Board	16
Ministry of Education	17
Waikato Regional Council	18
Clunies-Ross, Beverly	19

By Surname	Submission Number
Bromell, Kearin	20
Walsh, Paula	21
Middleton, Colleen & Norman	22
Harris, Ben	23
O'Shaughnessy, Danielle	24
Mclvor, Michael & Brenda	25
Director-General of Conservation	26
Dolan, Shane & Ruth	27
Malcolm, Helen	28
Vallings, John Edward	29
Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	30
Hollinshead, Darrell	31
Tervit, Barry	32
Lenaarts, Alwyn	33
Mclvor, Christine & Eric, and Bailey Ingham Trustees Ltd	34
Mexted, Monique & Brent	35
Ellis, Tracy	36
Peterson, Christine	37

Submitter 01 – Faull, Kim

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
1/1	Amenity	Support in Part	I support the intent of providing additional housing in Te Awamutu, however I have concerns about how the proposed medium density development will affect neighbouring properties. I am particularly concerned about the loss of privacy from higher density housing and potential overlooking and the introduction of tightly grouped townhouse-style housing directly adjoining existing properties and the potential impacts on privacy, amenity, and neighbourhood character.	Plan change be approved subject to a lower-density transition and appropriate landscaping, planting, setbacks, building height and design controls are provided along the Wallace Terrace boundary.
1/2	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	I support the intent of providing additional housing in Te Awamutu, however I have concerns about how the proposed medium density development will affect neighbouring properties. I am particularly concerned about the increased traffic on Wallace Terrace and potential road connections near my property.	Plan change be approved subject to limited road connections to Wallace Terrace, use of road design details to encourage low-traffic local access only, with the primary access to the development directed to Pokuru Road.
1/3	Infrastructure	Support in Part	I support the intent of providing additional housing in Te Awamutu, however I have concerns about how the proposed medium density development will affect neighbouring properties. I am particularly concerned about the drainage corridor along the boundary between my property and the plan change area, which likely drains toward the existing stormwater pond. I consider this an opportunity to provide an appropriate buffer between existing and new development.	Plan change be approved subject to the drainage corridor along the Wallace Terrace boundary be retained and formalised as reserve land or a landscaped stormwater corridor to provide a buffer between existing and new development.
1/4	Amenity	Support in Part	I support the intent of providing additional housing in Te Awamutu, however I have concerns about how the proposed medium density development will affect neighbouring properties. I am particularly concerned about the impact of intensive townhouse-style development on the existing character of Wallace Terrace, which is currently characterised by large	Plan change be approved subject to further clarification is provided on the location of reserve areas, road layout, and expected lot sizes and housing types within the development.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			sections and low-density housing.	

Submitter 02 – Cavanagh, Ronan

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
2/1	General	Support	More Public Litter Bins: With 28 hectares of new housing and a brand-new Reserve Zone being built, the council must install plenty of public litter bins around the new parks, reserves, and walkways to keep our town clean and prevent rubbish dumping. Council-Provided Household Rubbish Bins: Instead of relying on expensive private companies and private bags, the council needs to introduce a universal, council-run wheelie bin service for rubbish.	More Public Litter Bins: With 28 hectares of new housing and a brand-new Reserve Zone being built, the council must install plenty of public litter bins around the new parks, reserves, and walkways to keep our town clean and prevent rubbish dumping. Council-Provided Household Rubbish Bins: Instead of relying on expensive private companies and private bags, the council needs to introduce a universal, council-run wheelie bin service for rubbish.
2/2	General	Support	Focus on Cheaper Rates: I want a cheaper rates bill. To keep costs low and make it affordable this time, the council should focus just on a standard rubbish service instead of adding an organic food waste service. A streamlined council rubbish bin service will work best and keep things cheaper for residents.	Focus on Cheaper Rates: I want a cheaper rates bill. To keep costs low and make it affordable this time, the council should focus just on a standard rubbish service instead of adding an organic food waste service. A streamlined council rubbish bin service will work best and keep things cheaper for residents.

Submitter 03 – McKinnon, James

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
3/1	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	The new collector road in this growth cell could replace Fairview Road as the main throughfare from Puniu Rd to Rewi St, this is a good thing as the speeds people travel down Fairview Road are too high, and the new road can be designed so that vehicles travel at safer speeds. The intersection of Wallace Terrace, Teasdale St and Downes St would be a	The structure plan should include changes to the Wallace/Teasdale/Fairview/Downes Streets intersection, both at interim and final stages of development of the structure plan area, to ensure that it does not have any adverse effect on traffic safety in Te Awamutu, and also to take advantage of opportunities to improve traffic safety

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			safety hazard if Fairview Road remained the main route and more traffic was coming through the intersection from Wallace Terrace. The transportation assessment seems to assume that through traffic will remain on Fairview Road, but this is unlikely to be the case with the new road being flatter and more direct, and in fact should be discouraged by turning Downes St into a cul-de-sac once the road has been completed all the way through from Puniu to Rewi. This will have a beneficial effect on road safety overall in Te Awamutu. If the road is not constructed through Centennial Park at the same time as the staged housing development as proposed in the transportation plan, and Wallace Terrace is used as a main exit from the plan area, then changes will likely need to be made to the Wallace/Teasdale intersection as currently drivers travelling through the intersection from Fairview to Downes often do not look left for traffic coming from Wallace, and more traffic coming from Wallace will increase the likelihood of crashes.	overall.

Submitter 04 – Keighley, Morgan

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
4/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include traffic safety. The proposed development will introduce a substantial increase in vehicle movements into what is currently a relatively quiet residential area. This will increase safety risks for residents, pedestrians, cyclists, and children who use the street. During the construction phase there will also be a significant increase in heavy vehicles, trucks,	To stop the proposed subdivision and at very least keep our street a cul-de-sac and not a through fare.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			machinery, and contractor traffic. The increased presence of heavy vehicles on local residential roads raises concerns regarding road safety, visibility, noise, and the risk of accidents.	
4/2	Traffic	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include dust and air quality. The development of approximately 28 hectares of land will likely generate considerable dust during earthworks, roading, and construction activities. Dust has the potential to affect nearby homes, outdoor living areas, vehicles, and residents' health and wellbeing. I am concerned that neighbouring residents will bear the impacts of prolonged construction activity over an extended period.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require significant modifications and mitigation measures to address traffic safety.
4/3	Construction	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include noise and construction effects. The scale of the proposed development means residents can expect ongoing construction noise from earthworks, heavy machinery, trucks, contractors, and building activities. This will negatively impact the peaceful enjoyment of surrounding properties and reduce the amenity values that current residents have invested in and relied upon when purchasing their homes.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require significant modifications and mitigation measures to address construction impacts.
4/4	Infrastructure	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include pressure on Existing Infrastructure. I am concerned whether existing roads, stormwater systems, wastewater infrastructure, and other services have sufficient capacity to accommodate a development of this scale without negatively affecting existing residents. Council should ensure that all infrastructure upgrades are completed before development occurs and that existing ratepayers are not left carrying the	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require significant modifications and mitigation measures to address infrastructure capacity.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			costs associated with growth.	
4/5	Amenity	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include Loss of Neighbourhood Character. The proposed rezoning from Deferred Residential to Medium Density Residential represents a significant change in the character of the area. Existing residents purchased homes in a lower-density environment and may experience a loss of privacy, increased congestion, and reduced open-space character. The proposal appears to prioritise development intensity without adequately protecting the amenity and character values currently enjoyed by neighbouring residents.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require significant modifications and mitigation measures to address residential amenity concerns.
4/6	Amenity	Oppose	My family and I are concerned about the significant adverse effects this proposed development will have on our street, neighbourhood, and quality of life. Our concerns include Impact on Residential Amenity and Property Values. While I acknowledge that property values are not the primary consideration under planning legislation, I am concerned that the cumulative effects of increased traffic, noise, dust, construction activity, and higher-density development may negatively affect the desirability and enjoyment of existing residential properties.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require significant modifications and mitigation measures to address residential amenity concerns.

Submitter 05 – Faull, Dylan

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
5/1	Amenity	Support in Part	I largely support the development to support the growth of Te Awamutu. However, I would like there to be a small separation between the development and existing properties along this boundary. I'm suggesting a corridor/buffer zone/green belt with a width of 3-5 metres which could	Implementation of a small corridor between existing houses and the new development.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			support some planting (to give some privacy) and access to any utilities that would otherwise become difficult to access (water infrastructure or otherwise). I think this green belt could make the change easier to digest for all affected property owners on this boundary, given many of us will be hemmed in by houses on all sides in future, where currently some of the appeal of our sections is that they back onto farmland. My submission is meant as a compromise, to maintain some breathing room (as this is some of the reason we bought this house in the first place).	

Submitter 06 – Bowers, Robyn

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
6/1	Construction	Support in Part	The Proposal that the Collector Road won't be built until 70 houses are sold will add unacceptable traffic volumes of construction vehicles in our street. Our street, Wallace Terrace, is a mostly quiet and a peaceful area being a No Exit street. There are mostly retired people and family people living in the street and only an occasional truck uses the street for local delivery because it's designated as a 'non turning' street. Most of us drive carefully because of several Blind Spots with the terrain. I don't wish to see several months if not years of heavy vehicles and contractor vehicles using our street who probably won't drive to the conditions such as respecting the terrain etc. Speed Humps could also be a deterrence where the current western end of Wallace Terrace will join its proposed extension to encourage use of the Collector Road.	To ensure that a Collector Road was constructed into the Northern Area before any construction work on creating sections/houses was commenced. This could be road metal initially just so construction vehicles could use it and any extension to Wallace Terrace not be built until houses were sold. Ideally the proposed extension of Wallace Terrace stay as is and not be turned into a Through Road. Alternatively Speed Humps be installed to slow down traffic.

Submitter 07 – Brown, David Hugh

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
7/1	General	Support	I am in favour of this submission being excepted by the council. I believe Te Awamutu is in dire need of more land being made available for housing as there is a huge shortage. This plan appears to be of a high quality. The sections would be very popular for residents needing to build their home.	Grant the plan change in its current form.

Submitter 08 – Davies, Daniel

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
8/1	General	Support	I believe that the location of this proposed subdivision is in a great location, it is not disjointed from the town centre and should encourage foot movement into the town Centre. When I was building in Fairview estate a big attraction for clients was the above and we need to focus on getting foot traffic in the town to support retail with this plan change I'm confident this will help. The contour of the land will create an interesting landscape with the subdivision, and I can see this being a feature as you drive from the south.	Grant the plan change in its current form.

Submitter 09 – Crawshay, Graham

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
9/1	Traffic	Support	When the link road is opened between Rewi street and Punui / Pokuru road it will help to reduce traffic congestion in the Main Street and the bypass road roundabouts. To allow this plan change could have a positive impact on traffic	Grant the plan change in its current form.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			congestion ie get some truck and trailers out of the Main Street.	
9/2	Commercial	Support	All be it in the future all development creates employment for a large number of people across many professions and housing for everyone which is a national problem. Provide future employment and much needed housing that Waipa needs.	Grant the plan change in its current form.

Submitter 10 – Vesseur, David

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
10/1	General	Oppose	There is no need to change this particular land site to medium density housing. There are many other cells and sites to develop across Te Awamutu, for example, the huge area within Park and Golf Rd. The area within Park Rd, Golf Rd and Cambridge Rd. These areas have better traffic flow management and less impact for surrounding residents.	Reject the proposal for medium density house due to other more favourable areas to develop.
10/2	Railway	Oppose	The T4 cell area has traditionally formed a belt around the town and become a buffer zone between housing and the main northern trunk line. To develop housing here is an unreasonable proposition considering the proximity and activity on the trunk line. The proximity of the roading and housing area to the trunk line is inside the 60m vibration alert zone and the 100m acoustic control area. Why is this area being considered for housing next to a trunk line when there are other areas around the town more favourable for development.	Reject to proposal for medium density house due to concerns around proximity to railway.
10/3	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	Wallace Terrace is a quiet cul-de-sac. Houses and residents along this street have purchased their properties for this reason. We recently purchased our property in October 2025 for this very reason. Putting a local road through to 285 dwellings will significantly increase the thoroughfare traffic.	Maintain Wallace Terrace as a cul-de-sac. This could include blocking access to the medium density intensification area (Orange part on development map) and only allowing the grey part to have be accessed through Wallace Terrace.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			This street feeds directly into Teasdale St and Te Awamutu Primary school. This area is already very congested during the school day and pick up/drop off times. Increasing traffic through Wallace Terrace and Teasdale will directly impact safety of families and children. During the development of the subdivision, there will be multiple trucks and construction vehicles using this road. The road is not safe to use for these purposes.	
10/4	Traffic	Oppose	Having a collector road come out at Rewi St will further congest traffic along Rewi St and impact the congestion at the Rewi St, Alexandra St and Mutu St round about. Similar to my second point, there is a school along this road as well (St Patrick's) which will have to deal with increased safety risk.	Consider traffic implications for Rewi St and surrounding areas.

Submitter 11 – Gedye, Bevan

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
11/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to Wallace Terrace. This would fundamentally change Wallace Terrace from a quiet residential street into an access route for a development of approximately 310–362 dwellings. The transport assessment predicts thousands of vehicle movements per day from the development, and I do not consider the effects on Wallace Terrace residents have been adequately addressed.	I seek the further independent assessment of traffic impacts on Wallace Terrace.
11/2	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to	Amend the Structure Plan so that Wallace Terrace connection is limited to pedestrian, cycle, and emergency vehicle access only, and direct all other vehicles via the proposed collector road connecting to Rewi Street and Puniu

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Wallace Terrace that would fundamentally change Wallace Terrace from a quiet residential street into an access route for a development of approximately 310–362 dwellings. The transport assessment predicts thousands of vehicle movements per day from the development, and I do not consider the effects on Wallace Terrace residents have been adequately addressed. I am particularly concerned that Wallace Terrace will become a convenient shortcut between Rewi Street and Puniu Road, this represents a substantial and unwarranted change to our neighbourhood's character and safety. My concerns regarding ongoing traffic effects include increased traffic volumes, reduced safety for children, increased noise, loss of the quiet cul-de-sac character of Wallace Terrace, reduced privacy, and increased night-time lighting.	Road.
11/3	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to Wallace Terrace which will impact the Teasdale Street/Downes Street/Fairview Road/Wallace Terrace intersection. Having experienced several close calls at this intersection and the proposal to add development traffic to this intersection without proper assessment is a significant safety risk that has not been adequately addressed.	Require all necessary transport upgrades to be completed before development proceeds rather than from Stage 2.
11/4	Construction	Oppose	My submission relates to the proposed vehicle connection to Wallace Terrace and the transport provisions that would enable Wallace Terrace to be used as an access route during construction. Construction effects of concern are heavy vehicles, dust, vibration, noise, and road damage.	Provide vehicle access from the proposed collector road connecting to Rewi Street and Puniu Road during development.

Submitter 12 – Gedye, Emma

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
12/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to Wallace Terrace. This would fundamentally change Wallace Terrace from a quiet residential street into an access route for a development of approximately 310–362 dwellings. The transport assessment predicts thousands of vehicle movements per day from the development, and I do not consider the effects on Wallace Terrace residents have been adequately addressed.	I seek the further independent assessment of traffic impacts on Wallace Terrace
12/2	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to Wallace Terrace that would fundamentally change Wallace Terrace from a quiet residential street into an access route for a development of approximately 310–362 dwellings. The transport assessment predicts thousands of vehicle movements per day from the development, and I do not consider the effects on Wallace Terrace residents have been adequately addressed. I am particularly concerned that Wallace Terrace will become a convenient shortcut between Rewi Street and Puniu Road, this represents a substantial and unwarranted change to our neighbourhood's character and safety. My concerns regarding ongoing traffic effects include increased traffic volumes, reduced safety for children, increased noise, loss of the quiet cul-de-sac character of Wallace Terrace, reduced privacy, and increased night-time lighting.	Amend the Structure Plan so that Wallace Terrace connection is limited to pedestrian, cycle, and emergency vehicle access only, and direct all other vehicles via the proposed collector road connecting to Rewi Street and Puniu Road.
12/3	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I acknowledge that Te Awamutu needs to accommodate future growth, but I do not consider this proposal adequately	Require all necessary transport upgrades to be completed before development proceeds rather than from Stage 2.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			manages its effects on existing residents. The proposal includes a new road connection from the development to Wallace Terrace which will impact the Teasdale Street/Downes Street/Fairview Road/Wallace Terrace intersection. Having experienced several close calls at this intersection and the proposal to add development traffic to this intersection without proper assessment is a significant safety risk that has not been adequately addressed.	
12/4	Construction	Oppose	My submission relates to the proposed vehicle connection to Wallace Terrace and the transport provisions that would enable Wallace Terrace to be used as an access route during construction. Construction effects of concern are heavy vehicles, dust, vibration, noise, and road damage.	Provide vehicle access from the proposed collector road connecting to Rewi Street and Puniu Road during development.

Submitter 13 – Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
13/1	General	Support	HNZPT supports the recommendation in the archaeological assessment that the terrace, which is part of the pa site S15/332, at the northern extent of the growth cell be excluded from future development. We note that it has been identified as a Reserve Area on the proposed structure plan.	That Private Plan Change 31 be accepted as notified.
13/2	General	Support	HNZPT supports the recommendation in the archaeological assessment that the rest of the property requires an archaeological authority under the HNZPTA 2014 is applied for from HNZPT.	That Private Plan Change 31 be accepted as notified.
13/3	General	Support	HNZPT notes there are no issues from a cultural heritage perspective. HNZPT notes that the applicant is in contact with the appropriate tangata whenua representatives and committed to an ongoing relationship as the plan progresses.	That Private Plan Change 31 be accepted as notified.

Submitter 14 – Latham, David

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
14/1	Earthworks	Support in Part	Whilst acknowledging that the plans are marked "Indicative" none-the-less both the plan labelled Indicative Levels and the plan labelled Indicative Cut / Fill Diagram play an important and integral function in demonstrating the proposal as set out in the Application, the Sec 32 Evaluation and the suite of technical reports. Further, the proposed Cut in front of our property is of sufficient depth to give us some comfort around retention of the amenity we currently enjoy. If the cut is any shallower then our amenity will be significantly and adversely affected. We also note that there is no detail provided as to the treatment of the land following completion of the earthworks i.e.: is there to be a retaining wall, is there to be a batter slope, what would that gradient be? It is therefore imperative that the ultimate developer of the land follows the intent (with only minor variations) of the Earthworks plans attached within Appendix G of the Application.	That the two Earthworks plans are included alongside the Structure Plan for inclusion in the District Plan.
14/2	General	Oppose	The 2021 NPS-UD Housing Development Capacity Assessment found that Waipā will have a projected demand for new dwellings in the medium term of an additional 3400 dwellings (this is the mid-point in the projected range). Further, 90% of these will be in Cambridge and Te Awamutu. On the basis that the split between Cambridge and Te Awamutu will likely be 66%-34% this leaves the demand for Te Awamutu at circa 1040 dwellings. The remaining identified Growth Cells for Te Awamutu pre-2035 will have an approximate yield of 2000-2200 dwellings based on 20 units per ha. and utilising 50% of each cell area as 'developable'. It is clear that there is already sufficient land available for development without bringing the T4 cell forward. In the absence of any other substantive purpose described in the Application there is no compelling reason why the Applicant	Decline the Application.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			should not be required to wait a further 8 years for a zoning uplift.	
14/3	Amenity	Support in Part	The Structure Plan is deficient in that it does not illustrate the location of the landscaping carried out by Mrs Carol Fraser that was required by the Independent Commissioner following the Hearing relating to the consent for the installation of the power line to supplement power supply to Te Awamutu coming from the south and which generally is located alongside the NIMT Railway. The Application is deficient in regards to the above landscaping in that it does not discuss this issue and ultimately does not discuss what is to become of the landscaping that was required and does not discuss what consequential steps are to be taken to replicate the plantings should they be required to be removed under this proposal.	The Structure Plan to be amended to show the location of the required (at that time) landscaping established as a result of a decision by an Independent Commissioner. Information to be provided to demonstrate what mitigation measures are proposed should the above landscaping be required to be removed.
14/4	Traffic	Support in Part	As with the majority of Structure Plans within the District Plan the proposed roading layout needs to be illustrated on the Structure Plan. In this way it provides clear guidance to the ultimate developer as to the form of the future layout (minor alterations excepted), the location of proposed footpaths and cycleways should there be any, and for this particular proposal given the current contours, the location of likely earthworks in order to achieve the proposed roading layout.	The Structure Plan to be amended to illustrate the proposed roading pattern.
14/5	Amenity	Support in Part	We built our house some 13 years ago. We have dwellings on 3 sides of us but none of these could be described as close or intrusive. None-the-less due to the design of our home we not only have privacy but also a sense of open space. These attributes are complemented by our boundary treatment we chose to have (to the east - no fencing, to the north - low fencing, to the west - low hedging). Whilst acknowledging our extensive outlook it is abundantly clear that our amenity values of privacy and general open space are important to us. We accept that should PPC31 be approved and that the proposed earthworks alongside our property are undertaken as indicated on the Earthworks Cut and Fill Plan attached	Amend the Plan Change as follows: - Rule 2A.4.2.70 to be relabelled 2A.4.2.70(a). - Remove words 'Intensification Areas' from heading. - Add new Rule 2A.4.2.70(b) - Residential Activities within the Standard Areas identified on the T4 Structure Plan shall comply with the following: (a) For any new lots abutting properties which have frontage to Lola Lee Heights and Kacey Avenue only one dwelling is permitted, it shall be single level only and have a roof pitch of less than 15degrees. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			within Appendix G then our concerns will be somewhat alleviated. However, to reinforce the retention (as much as is possible) of the amenity values we currently enjoy we strongly submit that some form of restriction be placed on those proposed new lots that immediately abut the existing properties having frontage to Lola Lee Heights and Kacey Avenue (unknown but maybe between 10-12 proposed lots). It is considered that the most appropriate method would be to restrict each of the above proposed lots to one dwelling only, that this dwelling be single level only and be limited to a roof pitch of less than 15degrees. A Height Restriction could also be considered but it is suggested that this would be difficult to implement until such time as the earthworks are completed as they will be different for each lot.	

Submitter 15 – Ward, Max & Kirsten

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
15/1	Amenity	Support in Part	My wife and I live at 228 Kacey Avenue. We brought our section 12 years ago for two reasons: 1 - it was on the rural fringe of town 2 - It had uninterrupted views of Pirongia Mountain Our house was designed to maximise these features. Because we are at the lower end of Kacey Ave we potentially have a lot to lose regarding views obstructed by development. We are not opposed to development and growth (preferably not over our back fence!) but accept that the rural edge of town will always creep out. Appendix G, Structure Plan drawings for the T4 Growth cell show a Subdivision Concept indicative layout plan. This shows a community and stormwater reserve adjacent to our boundary. This being the case the proposed development is	No decision sought

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			unlikely to affect our views of Pirongia Mountain and, in part keep a green fringe adjacent to our boundary. Other plans in the appendix are not so clear as to where the reserves start and stop. If the plans were to change from what we understand to be correct, then we certainly want to be advised in the first instance. Prudent at this stage would be a quote recently made by Councillor Taylor in the local Te Awamutu Community news where he said, "district development shouldn't diminish the quality of life of residents" Exactly, we chose to live here for the environmental values it presents. Is it fair to (unfairly) interfere with those values?	

Submitter 16 – Te Awamutu – Kihikihi Community Board

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
16/1	Railway	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. The proposed development is very close to the railway line. We are concerned about reverse sensitivity effects on the railway line and seek that the rules / standards address this through requiring appropriate noise and vibration mitigation. The community has also expressed concerns about the safety of having houses located so close to a railway line.	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.
16/2	Amenity	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. We are also concerned about the impacts on the amenity of surrounding residents on Wallace	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Terrace, Ava Mae Drive and Mountain View Drive and seek that the rules/ standards to address those effects. We have been contacted by residents from these streets expressing their concerns and ask that these concerns be considered in full.	
16/3	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. The community is concerned about the traffic impact, particularly on Wallace Terrace as the only access to the site. Wallace Terrace will be opened to through traffic which will have a significant impact on residents. Redirecting this traffic through Wallace Terrace will alter its safety and functionality. Wallace Terrace was not designed to support this level of traffic. The surrounding roads, such as the Fairview Drive intersection were also not designed to absorb thousands of new daily vehicle movements.	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.
16/4	Reserve	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. The community has also expressed concerns over the loss of the BMX bike track at the park.	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.
16/5	Stormwater	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. The community has also expressed concerns over flooding from replacing pasture with residential development.	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.
16/6	Infrastructure	Support in Part	The Te Awamutu-Kihikihi Community Board support the plan change in principle because it is an appropriate location for future residential development due to it being adjacent to other residential areas. The community has also expressed concerns over the lack of infrastructure capacity with Te Tahī water treatment plant being offline and needing to rely on on-site rainwater tanks to ease the pressure on the stormwater	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			system.	
16/7	Traffic	Support in Part	The Station Road intersection is also problematic at the moment and having a new intersection very close to this, with increased traffic flow, could create significant traffic and safety issues. It could be a good opportunity to upgrade the Station Road intersection when constructing the new intersection for the development otherwise it may not be done for a number of years.	That Council approve the plan change subject to our concerns above being addressed through additional changes to the District Plan.

Submitter 17 – Ministry of Education

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
17/1	Construction	Neutral	Construction Traffic Effects: The Ministry considers there is potential for construction vehicle traffic to result in adverse effects in terms of safety on the students and teachers at local schools due to the increase in heavy vehicles on the surrounding network. The Ministry is concerned this will increase the safety risk for those walking and cycling to school and students getting in and out of cars at peak pick up and drop off times. The Ministry seeks that local schools be notified of the construction works duration to inform staff, students and families.	That suitable measures are included to mitigate potential and adverse construction transport effects on local schools and its students, especially with heavy vehicles travelling to and from the site. These may include: a) Notifying local schools detailed below prior to construction works occurring within 1km of the school; i) Te Awamutu Primary School ii) St Patrick's Catholic School (Te Awamutu) iii) Te Awamutu College b) Specified transport routes, minimising traffic on Teasdale Street.
17/2	Construction	Neutral	Future School Network Impacts: This opens the site for residential development which could enable 285 new dwellings. The T4 growth cell is near many schools in the district. The proposed increase in residential density has the potential to pressure the local school network. Through this submission, the Ministry requests ongoing consultation throughout the course of the development.	That suitable measures are included to mitigate potential and adverse construction transport effects on local schools and its students. These may include specified transport routes, minimising traffic on Teasdale Street.
17/3	Traffic	Neutral	Transportation Connectivity: The Ministry broadly agrees with the proposed walking and cycling provisions throughout	That suitable measures are included for public transport infrastructure.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			PPC31. There is currently no public transport within walking distance to the T4 growth cell. The Ministry notes that the design provided public transport infrastructure to be added later. Quality pedestrian and cycle connections through the development to existing neighbourhoods and schools, have health and safety benefits for children and reduce traffic generation at pick up and drop off times. Existing and potential future schools, and the communities they serve, should be well serviced by safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling links through the community. This includes safe and convenient connections to existing urban infrastructure. The proposed design has considered connectivity with the wider network, including education facilities in the design of the structure plan, and we support this.	

Submitter 18 – Waikato Regional Council

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
18/1	General	Neutral	WRC acknowledges that the T4 Growth Cell is currently zoned Deferred Residential and is identified for future urban development post-2035 in the Waipā District Plan. As the plan change proposes to bring forward the timing of development of this growth cell indicated in the Future Proof Strategy 2024 and Waipā District Plan, the proposal represents an out-of-sequence development. The application does not include evidence that the plan change meets Criterion A(A) [Method UFD-M49 and APP13 Criteria A of WRPS Change 1]. We support the proposed use of residential intensification areas on the structure plan and associated rules to ensure minimum dwelling densities are achieved for the plan change	a) Provide further consideration of the proposed plan change in relation to WRPS Change 1 APP13 Criterion A(A). b) Retain the proposed use of residential intensification areas and associated rules to ensure minimum dwelling densities are achieved for the plan change area. c) Retain walking and cycling connections on the proposed structure plan.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			area. This gives effect to Policy UFD-P12 of WRPS Change 1 relating to density targets for the Future Proof area.	
18/2	Commercial	Neutral	We also support the inclusion of the walking and cycling connections shown on the proposed structure plan, and the Commercial Overlay areas and associated rules that provide for a limited range of small-scale commercial activities to meet the day-to-day needs of residents of the plan change area.	Retain the Commercial Overlay areas and associated rules that provide for a limited range of small-scale commercial activities to meet the day-to-day needs of residents of the plan change area.
18/3	Ecology	Neutral	Regarding the Ecological Impact Assessment, it is unclear how the conclusion about bats was reached, as there is no indication that any visual assessments of trees were conducted. The Assessment recommends that rules or standards could be included in the plan change requiring a site-specific bat survey and the preparation and implementation of a Bat Management Plan, however, such rules have not been included in the proposed plan change. Rather than deferring a site-specific survey and development of mitigation measures to a later stage of the process, we consider that bat surveys should be undertaken prior to any decision on the proposed plan change. The further ecological impact assessment should then be used to inform any recommended avoidance, remediation and mitigation measures, to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPS-IB) and the WRPS (Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter).	Undertake surveys to inform understanding of whether the site provides roosting, foraging or commuting habitat for long-tailed bats and any current use of the site by bats, and inform further assessment of ecological effects of the proposed plan change. Use the further ecological impact assessment to amend the proposed structure plan and plan change provisions to appropriately manage effects on bats and their habitat, in accordance with the NPS-IB and WRPS.
18/4	Ecology	Neutral	Regarding the Ecological Impact Assessment, WRC consider the assessment has the following limitations and further assessment is required: - The fish sampling reported was limited to three eDNA samples. - The eDNA samples were collected in winter, which is suitable for mudfish sampling but less effective for many other species. We consider that undertaking summer sampling would strengthen the results. - Important details about the mudfish population at this	- Provide further assessment of potential effects of proposed roading on the ecological integrity of Wetland 1. - Provide further clarity in relation to the proposed compensation for loss of natural inland wetland and how additional natural inland wetlands are proposed to be established. - Undertake additional targeted fish investigations sufficient to determine population size, distribution, habitat utilisation and long-term viability of black

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			site remain unknown. We recommend the site should be surveyed using Gee Minnow traps to determine the extent of mudfish presence. - The assessment states that as the ponds and drains on the plan change site have been determined artificial, they are considered to be of negligible ecological value. We do not consider this conclusion can be reached without pond sampling. - The key question is whether the ponds contribute to freshwater values, ecological function, or species habitat. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) places emphasis on indigenous biodiversity, habitat of indigenous fauna, and ecosystem health. If the ponds are confirmed as fish habitat or seasonal refuge habitat, they should be retained where practicable. If they are removed and fish are present, mitigation for lost habitat should be provided for. - We acknowledge the revisions to the proposed structure plan to reduce impacts on streams and wetlands, and we support the approach of protecting as many of the natural hydrological features from development as possible. We consider, however, that there are some remaining areas of uncertainty in relation to effects on wetlands, freshwater habitat loss and proposed compensation. We recommend further assessment be carried out of potential effects of proposed roading on the ecological integrity of Wetland 1. - The assessment proposes restoration of retained wetlands, creation of 2.12ha of new wetland habitat, riparian planting, and enhancement works. There are potential issues and uncertainties around the proposed compensation, as created wetlands are not equivalent to existing wetlands and take years to mature. The compensation model is therefore highly dependent on	mudfish and other indigenous fish species across the site prior to any decision on the proposed plan change, to inform further assessment of ecological effects of the proposed plan change. - Use the further ecological impact assessment to amend the plan change to appropriately manage effects on freshwater fish species. - If the investigations determine that the black mudfish population in the plan change area is significant, add a rule requiring a species-specific Black Mudfish Management Plan to be prepared and implemented. - The Black Mudfish Management Plan should also require retained wetlands and compensation wetlands to be legally protected and managed in perpetuity.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			optimistic restoration assumptions. Overall, the combination of natural wetland loss, major hydrological changes, and stormwater inputs raises the risk of permanent loss of black mudfish habitat and, ultimately, black mudfish from the plan change area.	
18/5	Stormwater	Neutral	The flood modelling undertaken as part of the plan change application provides sufficient information to inform the plan change process. We note, however, that future modelling/assessment could identify significant changes to the earthworks and subdivision layout to ensure flood hazard and stormwater management is undertaken appropriately.	No relief sought
18/6	Railway	Neutral	WRC note that the North Island Main Trunk culverts are a key flood/stormwater control for the proposed development. It is therefore important that KiwiRail remains involved to inform detailed design as appropriate.	No relief sought
18/7	Earthworks	Neutral	WRC's preliminary regional Acid Sulphate Soils Probability spatial layer1 indicates a high probability of acid sulphate soil occurrence in the western part of the site. We note that when disturbed (e.g. excavated) and exposed to oxygen, acid sulphate soil materials can produce sulfuric acid which can become mobilised following rainfall. Damage to infrastructure (e.g. concrete) and impacts on the environment (e.g. aquatic ecosystems) can result. The potential for the occurrence of acid sulphate soils at the site should be considered in relation to the proposed development and appropriate guidance for their management followed if identified on site.	No relief sought

Submitter 19 – Clunies-Ross, Beverly

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
19/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	While I understand that Te Awamutu needs more housing, I do not believe this proposal has adequately addressed the impacts it will have on existing residents and our neighbourhood. My main concerns relate to the safety of Wallace Terrace, which has a steep rise and limited visibility in places and wasn't designed to carry the level of traffic that could result from around 285 new homes.	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that Wallace Terrace will remain a safe residential street and will not become a through-road for traffic generated by the proposed subdivision. Alternatively include provisions that no vehicle access through Wallace Terrace if it would create a through-route for subdivision traffic.
19/2	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	While I understand that Te Awamutu needs more housing, I do not believe this proposal has adequately addressed the impacts it will have on existing residents and our neighbourhood. My main concerns relate to the safety of Wallace Terrace, which has a steep rise and limited visibility in places and wasn't designed to carry the level of traffic that could result from around 285 new homes.	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that an independent traffic assessment fully addresses the road's existing rise, limited visibility, pedestrian safety and the significant increase in vehicle movements that around 285 new homes are likely to generate. Alternatively include provisions that an independent peer review of the traffic reports is undertaken and include provisions that ongoing monitoring of traffic impacts throughout the development occur.
19/3	Infrastructure	Oppose	I am also concerned about whether the existing water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure has the capacity to support a development of this size, particularly given the current pressures on these services.	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that Water supply, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure has sufficient capacity before any development begins. Alternatively include provisions that infrastructure upgrades, including water, wastewater and stormwater services, are completed before development proceeds.
19/4	Stormwater	Oppose	I am concerned about the potential effects of increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that the effects of increased stormwater runoff and flooding have been independently assessed, with appropriate mitigation measures in place. Alternatively include provisions that an independent peer review of the stormwater reports is undertaken and include provisions that ongoing monitoring of stormwater impacts throughout the development occur.
19/5	Earthworks	Oppose	I am concerned about the potential effects of ground stability	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			and settlement.	comprehensive geotechnical investigations demonstrate that ground stability, land movement and drainage issues will not adversely affect neighbouring properties, including those immediately adjoining the site such as my property at 366 Wallace Terrace. Alternatively include provisions that an independent peer review of the geotechnical report is undertaken and include provisions that ongoing monitoring of land stability impacts throughout the development occur.
19/6	Amenity	Oppose	I am concerned about the long-term impacts of noise, light spill and the loss of privacy and neighbourhood amenity for those of us living immediately beside the site. I also believe the proposal should give greater consideration to the capacity of local schools and other community infrastructure to support this level of growth.	Decline the plan change in its current form until satisfied that appropriate setbacks, landscaping and planting are required along the boundary with existing homes to protect privacy, reduce noise and minimise light spill. Alternatively include provisions that larger setbacks and landscape buffers between new development and existing homes, and controls on building height, lighting and construction noise to protect neighbouring residents.

Submitter 20 – Bromell, Kearin

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
20/1	Amenity	Oppose	When developments are built with the right roads, services and site preparation from the start, they become good places for people to live. When corners are cut or important issues aren't fully worked through, the problems often don't show up until years later. My concerns are about making sure this development is planned properly for everyone who will live here and for the people who already call this part of Te Awamutu home.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that the development includes appropriate landscaping, setbacks and design measures that help it fit in with the existing neighbourhood.
20/2	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	Wallace Terrace already has limited visibility because of the rise in the road, and I struggle to see how it can safely cope with the amount of extra traffic a development of around 285	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that an independent traffic assessment confirms Wallace Terrace can safely cope with the increase

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			homes will generate. Road safety needs to be looked at carefully not only for drivers but for children walking or cycling to school, pedestrians, emergency vehicles and the wider community.	in traffic, taking into account the rise in the road, limited visibility and the safety of drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and school children.
20/3	Construction	Oppose	Wallace Terrace already has limited visibility because of the rise in the road, and I struggle to see how it can safely cope with the amount of extra traffic a development of around 285 homes will generate. Road safety needs to be looked at carefully not only for drivers but for children walking or cycling to school, pedestrians, emergency vehicles and the wider community.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that construction traffic and works are carefully managed to reduce disruption and keep local roads safe.
20/4	Infrastructure	Oppose	I'm also concerned about whether the infrastructure is ready for a development of this size. Water, wastewater and stormwater systems need to have the capacity before new homes are built, not after. As a builder, I've seen how expensive and disruptive it can be when infrastructure struggles to keep up with growth.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure has enough capacity to support the development before any new homes are built.
20/5	Earthworks	Oppose	The site itself also needs careful consideration. Ground conditions, drainage and stormwater management are things that have to be right from the beginning. If they're not, the effects can last for decades and impact both new homeowners and neighbouring properties.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that independent geotechnical investigations confirm the site is suitable for development and that earthworks and drainage will not create problems for neighbouring properties or future homeowners.
20/6	Stormwater	Oppose	The site itself also needs careful consideration. Ground conditions, drainage and stormwater management are things that have to be right from the beginning. If they're not, the effects can last for decades and impact both new homeowners and neighbouring properties.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that stormwater management is designed to minimise the risk of flooding, erosion and long-term maintenance issues.
20/7	Amenity	Oppose	I also think Council needs to consider the wider impact on the community. Growth doesn't just mean more houses, it also means more pressure on roads, schools, parks, community facilities and essential services. Good developments are about creating neighbourhoods that are safe, well connected and supported by the infrastructure people need. I support Te Awamutu growing and I know more housing is needed. My concern is making sure it is done properly. From	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that the staging of the development is linked to infrastructure upgrades so that community services, roads and utilities keep pace with growth.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			what I've read, I don't believe this proposal has yet demonstrated that the transport network, infrastructure and site conditions have been fully addressed. I believe these matters deserve further independent assessment before any rezoning or development proceeds.	

Submitter 21 – Walsh, Paula

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
21/1	Railway	Support in Part	A negative impact on the proposed dwellings because of noise and vibration which are health and safety issues, review the distance that houses are from the railway line.	Council carefully consider the plan change after taking into account my concerns
21/2	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	The traffic will have a negative impact on Wallace Terrace, a street not designed for this type of use - redirecting traffic will alter its safety and functionality, it is not designed to support this level of traffic. I propose that Wallace Terrace becomes a cul-de-sac to create an attractive and safe street for the residents and the roads from Punui and Rewi Streets be the first step in this endeavour, definitely not after the development has started.	Council carefully consider the plan change after taking into account my concerns
21/3	Reserve	Support in Part	I am concerned about the possible loss of the BMX track at the park and the impact the traffic will have on the overall look, safety and appeal of this very well used space.	Council carefully consider the plan change after taking into account my concerns

Submitter 22 – Middleton, Colleen & Norman

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
22/1	Reserve	Oppose	Proposed reserve layout: We are concerned that the information made available as part of Proposed Private Plan	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to ensure that the final

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			Change 31 does not clearly identify the location of the proposed reserve land in relation to the proposed residential areas. We have noted inconsistencies between the maps and diagrams provided in the publicly available documentation and request the final plan confirms the location opposite 212 Kacey Avenue.	Structure Plan clearly and consistently identifies the location of reserve land opposite 212 Kacey Avenue.
22/2	Ecology	Oppose	Loss of mature trees, birdlife, habitat and carbon storage: We are concerned that the proposed development will result in the removal of established mature trees, leading to the loss of habitat, a decline in local birdlife and biodiversity, and the loss of the environmental benefits these trees currently provide. The mature trees and existing landscape contribute significantly to the outlook and character of the area. They also provide important natural functions, including carbon storage, shade, temperature moderation and support for local ecosystems.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to ensure that existing mature trees wherever practicable are protected and any necessary tree removal to be carefully staged, with appropriate replacement planting undertaken.
22/3	Amenity	Oppose	Building height and neighbourhood character: We consider that this scale of development is incompatible with the existing character of our neighbourhood and would create an overbearing and visually dominant environment for adjoining residents. The proposal does not provide an appropriate transition between the existing residential area and the proposed medium-density development. Greater consideration should be given to the interface between existing homes and future higher-density housing to ensure that the established character, outlook and amenity of the area is not unnecessarily compromised.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to provide strengthened privacy protections through building design controls, and reduced building heights adjacent to existing residential properties.
22/4	Amenity	Oppose	Privacy and overlooking: We are concerned that the proposal will reduce the privacy currently enjoyed by existing residents and diminish the use and enjoyment of private outdoor living spaces. Additional controls should be considered where new development directly adjoins existing residential properties, including appropriate setbacks, landscaping and building design measures to reduce overlooking effects.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to provide strengthened privacy protections through building design controls, and reduced building heights adjacent to existing residential properties.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
22/5	Amenity	Oppose	Shading and loss of sunlight: Buildings of up to 11 metres may still result in increased shading of neighbouring properties, particularly during winter months. Reduced access to sunlight would adversely affect outdoor living areas, gardens and the overall amenity of our property. We believe that the potential shading effects on existing homes should be properly assessed and that additional controls should be considered where necessary to protect existing residential amenity.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to reduce building heights and require larger setbacks along existing residential boundaries.
22/6	Amenity	Oppose	Loss of residential amenity: We are concerned that the cumulative effects of increased building bulk, reduced privacy, increased activity and higher residential density will fundamentally change the character of the area and reduce the residential amenity currently enjoyed by existing homeowners.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to: - reduce building heights adjacent to existing residential properties - require larger setbacks along existing residential boundaries - provide strengthened privacy protections through building design controls
22/7	Infrastructure	Oppose	Water supply and treatment capacity: We are concerned that the proposal does not adequately address whether Te Awamutu's existing drinking water supply and treatment infrastructure has sufficient capacity to support a development of this scale. Before additional residential development of this magnitude is enabled, we believe there should be clear evidence that there is adequate capacity to provide a secure, reliable and compliant drinking water supply for both existing and future residents without compromising current levels of service.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that drinking water treatment and supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity before development proceeds.
22/8	Amenity	Oppose	Construction effects: If the proposal proceeds, construction is likely to occur over an extended period. We are concerned about the impacts of earthworks, dust, noise, vibration and construction traffic on nearby residents and the disruption this will cause to the surrounding community.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure construction effects are appropriately managed to minimise disruption to existing residents.
22/9	Amenity	Oppose	We are also concerned that the prolonged construction period may adversely affect the marketability of our property. If we were to sell our home while construction is underway,	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure construction effects are appropriately managed to minimise disruption to existing residents.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			prospective purchasers may be deterred by the scale and duration of the works, resulting in a reduced pool of buyers and potentially affecting the price that could reasonably be achieved. While we acknowledge that property values are influenced by many factors, we consider the potential effect on the enjoyment, marketability and value of our property to be a relevant consequence of the proposed development.	

Submitter 23 – Harris, Ben

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
23/1	Earthworks	Oppose	Stability during construction: I am concerned that the earthworks required for the development, together with changes to stormwater management, excavation, and the operation of heavy machinery, could adversely affect the stability of the bank. In particular, I am concerned that excavation at the base of the bank, soil disturbance, and construction-related vibration may increase the risk of land movement or slope instability.	Decline the plan change unless satisfied through independent and comprehensive geotechnical assessment, that the bank within the proposed Future Community Reserve Area (2.32 ha) can remain stable during and after construction. Alternatively, include within the District Plan provisions: - A detailed independent geotechnical assessment of the bank and surrounding area. - Confirmation that the proposed earthworks, stormwater management, and development will not increase the risk of slope instability or landslips. - Appropriate engineering design and mitigation measures to ensure the long-term stability of the bank. - Ongoing monitoring, where necessary, to protect neighbouring properties, future residents, and the public from the risk of land instability.
23/2	Earthworks	Oppose	Long-term stability following development: I am also concerned about the long-term stability of the bank once the earthworks have been completed. Recent landslip events in New Zealand have demonstrated that modifications to natural slopes, combined with increasingly frequent and	Deline the plan change unless satisfied through independent and comprehensive geotechnical assessment, that the bank within the proposed Future Community Reserve Area (2.32 ha) can remain stable during and after construction. Alternatively, include within the District Plan provisions:

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			intense rainfall events, can increase the likelihood of slope failure. I consider it important that the Council is satisfied, through robust geotechnical assessment, that the proposed works will not create an unacceptable risk of slips or instability affecting the reserve, neighbouring land, or future residents.	- A detailed independent geotechnical assessment of the bank and surrounding area. - Confirmation that the proposed earthworks, stormwater management, and development will not increase the risk of slope instability or landslips. - Appropriate engineering design and mitigation measures to ensure the long-term stability of the bank. - Ongoing monitoring, where necessary, to protect neighbouring properties, future residents, and the public from the risk of land instability.

Submitter 24 – O’Shaughnessy, Danielle

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
24/1	Traffic	Support in Part	Access for an additional 70 dwellings cannot reasonably be described as property access on a local road. Without the Rewi Street collector intersection, Wallace Terrace becomes the sole external connection, forcing it to operate as a collector despite being a cul-de-sac designed only for local property access.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include within the District Plan provisions to ensure Rewi Street collector link to be constructed and operational before any subdivision proceeds.
24/2	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	The actual, potential, and cumulative traffic effects on Wallace Terrace have not been adequately assessed through the documents and contain contradictory statements about traffic distribution and staging. The applicant’s own urban designer confirms this functional change, describing Wallace Terrace as being converted “from a long cul-de-sac to a more useful connecting street.” This is a fundamental change in road function that was not disclosed in the public notice, and the notified rules contain no standards protecting Wallace Terrace’s intended function. Wallace Terrace is a local road not engineered for heavy construction vehicles or repeated heavy axle loads.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include within the District Plan provisions to prohibit Wallace Terrace from being used for vehicle access at any stage, and to allow Wallace Terrace to be used only for pedestrian and cycle access to any new developments.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			My preferred outcome is that Wallace Terrace is not used for vehicle access at any stage and is retained solely for pedestrian and cycle connectivity to any new development.	
24/3	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	While I support residential development of the T4 Growth Cell, I do not support the rezoning sought because the proposal relies on Wallace Terrace as the sole vehicle access for the first stage of development. Wallace Terrace is a local road, not designed or intended to function as a through route or collector road, and the notified rules do not protect its intended function.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include within the District Plan provisions to ensure that Wallace Terrace remains a local road in both designation and function, and development must not depend on it operating as a collector route.

Submitter 25 – McIvor, Michael & Brenda

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
25/1	Reserve	Oppose	Uncertainty regarding the proposed reserve layout: We are concerned that the information does not clearly identify the location of the proposed reserve land in relation to the proposed residential areas and there are inconsistencies between the maps and diagrams.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to ensure that the final Structure Plan clearly and consistently identifies the location of reserve land and residential areas and resolves any inconsistencies between plans and supporting documentation.
25/2	Ecology	Oppose	Loss of mature trees, birdlife, habitat and carbon storage: We are concerned that the proposed development will result in the removal of established mature trees, leading to the loss of habitat, a decline in local birdlife and biodiversity, and the loss of the environmental benefits these trees currently provide. The mature trees and existing landscape contribute significantly to the outlook and character of the area. They also provide important natural functions, including carbon storage, shade, temperature moderation and support for local ecosystems.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to ensure that existing mature trees wherever practicable are protected and any necessary tree removal to be carefully staged, with appropriate replacement planting undertaken.
25/3	Amenity	Oppose	Building height and neighbourhood character: We consider that this scale of development is incompatible with the	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to provide stronger

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			existing character of our neighbourhood and would create an overbearing and visually dominant environment for adjoining residents. The proposal does not provide an appropriate transition between the existing residential area and the proposed medium-density development. Greater consideration should be given to the interface between existing homes and future higher-density housing to ensure that the established character, outlook and amenity of the area is not unnecessarily compromised.	transition controls between existing residential properties and future medium-density development.
25/4	Amenity	Oppose	Privacy and overlooking: The potential for upper-storey windows, balconies and outdoor living areas to overlook neighbouring properties is a significant concern. We are concerned that the proposal will reduce the privacy currently enjoyed by existing residents and diminish the use and enjoyment of private outdoor living spaces. Additional controls should be considered where new development directly adjoins existing residential properties, including appropriate setbacks, landscaping and building design measures to reduce overlooking effects.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to provide strengthened privacy protections through building design controls, reduced building heights adjacent to existing residential properties, and substantial landscaping and boundary planting.
25/5	Amenity	Oppose	Shading and loss of sunlight: Although the District Plan includes height-in-relation-to-boundary standards, buildings of up to 11 metres may still result in increased shading of neighbouring properties, particularly during winter months. Reduced access to sunlight would adversely affect outdoor living areas, gardens and the overall amenity of our property. We believe that the potential shading effects on existing homes should be properly assessed and that additional controls should be considered where necessary to protect existing residential amenity.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to require larger setbacks along existing residential boundaries.
25/6	Amenity	Oppose	Loss of residential amenity: We are concerned that the cumulative effects of increased building bulk, reduced privacy, increased activity and higher residential density will fundamentally change the character of the area and reduce the residential amenity currently enjoyed by existing homeowners. Existing residents have chosen to live in this	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend the proposal to: - provide stronger transition controls between existing residential properties and future medium-density development - amend the proposal to provide strengthened privacy

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			area based on the current environment, outlook and residential character. While we acknowledge that growth is necessary, this should not occur without appropriate consideration of the effects on those already living in the area.	protections through building design controls - reduce building heights adjacent to existing residential properties - provide substantial landscaping and boundary planting - to require larger setbacks along existing residential boundaries.
25/7	Infrastructure	Oppose	Water supply and treatment capacity: We are concerned that the proposal does not adequately address whether Te Awamutu's existing drinking water supply and treatment infrastructure has sufficient capacity to support a development of this scale. The community is aware of the challenges and investment required to maintain and upgrade the Te Awamutu water treatment plant and associated water infrastructure. Before additional residential development of this magnitude is enabled, we believe there should be clear evidence that there is adequate capacity to provide a secure, reliable and compliant drinking water supply for both existing and future residents without compromising current levels of service. We understand that there are already sites for over 2000 residential units consented to in Te Awamutu.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure that drinking water treatment and supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity before development proceeds.
25/8	Amenity	Oppose	Construction effects: If the proposal proceeds, construction is likely to occur over an extended period. We are concerned about the impacts of earthworks, dust, noise, vibration and construction traffic on nearby residents and the disruption this will cause to the surrounding community.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure construction effects are appropriately managed to minimise disruption to existing residents.
25/9	Amenity	Oppose	We are also concerned that the prolonged construction period may adversely affect the marketability of our property. If we were to sell our home while construction is underway, prospective purchasers may be deterred by the scale and duration of the works, resulting in a reduced pool of buyers and potentially affecting the price that could reasonably be achieved. While we acknowledge that property values are influenced by many factors, we consider the potential effect on the enjoyment, marketability	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, ensure construction effects are appropriately managed to minimise disruption to existing residents.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			and value of our property to be a relevant consequence of the proposed development.	

Submitter 26 – Director-General of Conservation

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
26/1	Ecology	Oppose	There are some concerns with the approach taken in the Ecological Impact Assessment included in the plan change regarding bats. If bats are present, protection measures could be incorporated into PC31 provisions as part of the decision (such as management of locations of various elements to minimise effects). It is considered prudent for a precautionary approach to be taken with a site-specific survey to be carried out prior to any decision on the plan change is made. Following the results of the site survey, the EIA should then inform an effects management response in accordance with the NPS-IB, and WRPS provisions and provisions should be proposed within PC31 provisions	Undertake a 'site specific survey' to properly understand the presence of bats within the site. Use this to inform an effects management response and to establish provisions within the plan as necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and Waikato RPS. The Department requests Waipa District Council engage a Suitably Qualified Bat Ecologist to peer review the Ecological Impact Assessment. Any alternative or consequential relief.
26/2	Ecology	Oppose	eDNA surveys at three locations across the subject site were used to inform the Ecological Impact Assessment. The DG's freshwater expert notes the New Zealand Freshwater Fish Database (NZFFD) records in the wider catchment (Pūniu River and tributaries upstream of the site) have recorded eleven native freshwater species, including three Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable and six At Risk species, as well as kōura/freshwater crayfish. This means that the fish community in the streams and wetlands across the site could be more diverse than the four species recorded in the eDNA samples. Hence, the DG considers more survey necessary.	Undertake more in-depth survey monitoring to better understand the mudfish population present within the site and to understand the presence of any other freshwater fish that may be present. Use the information gathered to inform decisions on wetlands and potential wetland removal and to establish an effects management framework for provisions within PPC31. Any alternative or consequential relief.
26/3	Ecology	Oppose	It is considered that a site-specific survey should be carried out prior to any decision being made on this application. The DG supports, in principle, the proposed management	If bats are identified within the site, it is requested that a comprehensive set of objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria/information requirements relating to

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			measures outlined in the Ecological Impact Assessment, including restoration and mitigation planning to manage the effects of light spill and pre-vegetation clearance surveys. However, the DG considers that additional measures are required to ensure all potential adverse effects on long-tailed bats (LTB) are appropriately managed. These include: - The effects of lighting from residential dwellings and streetlights. - An increase in predator numbers within the site. - If bats are identified within the site, an effects management framework that implements the effects management hierarchy should be established. This should be clearly signalled through a transparent planning framework within PC31 provisions, as required under section 77E of the RMA.	ecological values within the plan change area, particularly relating to long-tailed bats and their habitat, and measures to protect, maintain and enhance those values. These provisions should reflect the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment (including any updates required to address the matters discussed in this submission). The DG is interested and seeks engagement with Waipā District Council to assist drafting these provisions prior to a hearing and directs Waipā District Council to Objective 7.3.9 and Policies 7.3.9.1 and 7.3.9.2 adopted through Plan Change 14. No development within the structure plan should commence until such time as the BMP has been certified. The BMP should include, but not be limited to, the following matters: - Identification of all confirmed or potential bat roost trees within the structure plan area based on presence of roosting features and any other relevant information which is available; - Tree removal methodology and timing for all confirmed or potential bat roost trees which are proposed to be removed, with regard to the Department of Conservation “Protocols for minimising the risk of felling occupied bat roosts”, produced by the NZ DOC Bat Recovery Group 2024, or any other update to that document; - Details of proposed effects management including any offsetting or compensation to ensure that the development of the T4 Growth Cell structure plan achieved a no net loss outcome for long-tailed bat habitat values. This would include: - o The legal mechanisms proposed to ensure the ongoing protection of the compensation area - o Planting and maintenance specifications; - o An implementation programme for the habitat

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				enhancement; ○ A methodology and maintenance programme for artificial roost boxes and the creation of new roosting habitat; ○ A methodology and programme for predator control and monitoring; ○ How the financial contribution to predator control in the wider landscape will be undertaken. - Procedures for the certification, review, and amendment (if necessary) of the BMP, including an opportunity for DOC to comment; - The requirement for the BMP to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person. Any alternative or consequential relief.
26/4	Ecology	Oppose	The PPC indicates that c. 0.35 ha of wetlands will be lost as part of the implementation of the subdivision, and that this will be balanced by the provision of an additional 2.12 ha of wetland elsewhere within the T4 Growth Cell. However, created wetland cannot be assumed to have the same value and ecological function as natural wetland. Black mudfish (At Risk- declining under the NZTCS) are present within one of the wetlands on site. From page 20 of the Structure Plan (Appendix G), it appears that this is where the wetland is proposed to be lost (a portion through the middle of the wetland to provide for a road around the edge of the site). Black mudfish populations have been significantly impacted by wetland loss, and remaining populations are fragmented throughout patchy habitat. Removal of a portion of this wetland would result in loss of mudfish habitat and further fragmentation of the population. There is little or no sound evidence of successful translocation of mudfish to new habitats, so mitigation of mudfish habitat loss by moving mudfish to new habitat would have uncertain outcomes. It should be noted that Gambusia were detected at two of the	It is noted that no provisions have been included for the management of black mudfish. It is recommended that a black mudfish management plan be established within the policy framework, matters of discretion, and information requirements of PPC31. This black mudfish management plan should include: - A clear objective for how the effects on black mudfish are going to be managed; - Monitoring of mudfish populations; - Implementation of restoration measures; - Measures to limit the spread of gambusia and/or other pest fish across the wetlands; - Procedures for the certification, review, and amendment (if necessary) of the management plan, including an opportunity for DOC to comment; and - The requirement for the management plan to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person. With relation to culverts, it is recommended that measures are included in the PPC31 provisions to ensure that culverts are designed in line with the New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			eDNA sampling sites. Gambusia are a pest fish that is known to attack mudfish and compete with them for food. While connectivity between habitats is generally positive for freshwater species, opportunities to limit spread of gambusia would be beneficial, especially to mudfish habitat. The proposed plan change also indicates that c. 75m of stream would require culverting to enable road development. It is important that any culverts are designed in accordance with the NZ Fish Passage Guidelines to ensure appropriate fish passage is provided.	No development in the PPC31 structure plan shall commence until such time as the black mudfish management plan is certified. Any alternative or consequential relief.

Submitter 27 – Dolan, Shane & Ruth

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
27/1	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	Wallace Terrace – the safety measures the applicant's own experts required are missing from the rules: - Rule 15.4.2.91B triggers the extension of Wallace Terrace at the first subdivision with reliance on Wallace Terrace - The applicant's ITA said this was acceptable subject to conditions that are not in the rules - The application's own drawings show the double standard - The interim route along Teasdale Street serves Te Awamutu Primary School - No traffic counts exist for Wallace Terrace - Concern the cost of changes to Wallace Street fall on existing residents	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require the Wallace Terrace extension not to be constructed or opened until pedestrian, cycle and traffic speed management measures on the existing street (designed in consultation with residents, addressing the Teasdale Street school route and the Wallace Terrace / Teasdale Street / Fairview Road intersections, and approved by Council) are implemented — consistent with the applicant's ITA s9.2 and staging memo. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/2	Traffic	Support in Part	The “interim” reliance on Wallace Terrace may in practice be long-term: - The Rewi Street link requires a road through Centennial Park (a recreation reserve), a Reserves Act 1977 change	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, change non-compliance with the transport triggers in Rule 15.4.2.91B to be a non-complying activity, and deletion or substantial narrowing of criterion 21.1.15.13A(b),

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			with public participation, replacement of the existing rail bridge with a new 16.0m structure, a retaining wall on Station Road, and 5,000m² of park land. - The park's well-used facilities are affected - The 70/150 dwelling caps are soft	so the 70/150 dwelling caps cannot be exceeded before the Rewi Street connection exists. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/3	Commercial	Support in Part	Commercial centres and the eastern interface – all interim traffic uses Wallace Terrace: - Both Commercial Overlay (Neighbourhood Centre) areas sit in the Northern Area, which will access via Wallace Terrace until Rewi Street linkage exists - It is unclear whether the ITA's Wallace Terrace traffic assignment includes any commercial trips.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require No activity within a Commercial Overlay (Neighbourhood Centre) area until the Rewi Street collector connection is open to traffic and reduced centre operating hours adjoining existing homes. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/4	Amenity	Support in Part	Commercial centres and the eastern interface: - provisions exceed the evidence - The notified provisions contain no interface controls — height, setback or landscaping — specific to the eastern boundary of the plan change	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, introduce interface controls for lots adjoining the eastern boundary of the growth cell (a single-storey height limit or equivalent recession plane, a minimum building setback from the shared boundary, and landscaping), consistent with the transition the applicant's own urban design concept identified (Appendix C, p.6). Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/5	Railway	Support in Part	Rail corridor – protections shown on drawings should be rules: - We support the 100m rail noise insulation rule (2A.4.2.44A) and the 60m vibration alert area - The no-build strip along the rail boundary exists only on the drawings - KiwiRail's requirement that no stormwater discharge towards the rail corridor (the site drains that way, and the tracks sit below site level) is deferred to future consents - Te Awamutu already has examples of this line running near dwellings, and the structure plan repeats the pattern: the westernmost lots would sit within the 100m rail noise corridor and the 60m vibration alert area	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include rules securing no structures within the Environmental Buffer (or within 5m of the rail boundary) without consent and no stormwater discharge towards the rail corridor. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/6	General	Support in	110kV line – protections shown on drawings should be rules:	Decline the plan change in its current form.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
		Part	- The recently constructed 110kV Waipā Networks sub-transmission line runs the length of the site's western edge, yet it does not appear on the T4 Structure Plan itself - Electricity matters are otherwise deferred entirely to subdivision consent - It is concerning that homes will be located in close proximity to a 110kV sub-transmission line - the plan should show the 110kV line on the Structure Plan and control the outcome through building orientation, setbacks, landscaping and compliance with the applicable electrical safe-distance requirements (NZECP 34:2001) secured as rules	Alternatively, include the 110kV sub-transmission line on the T4 Structure Plan. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/7	Infrastructure	Support in Part	Water supply – the evidence predates the loss of Te Tahī: - The Three Waters Assessment was issued on 23 July 2024, on hydraulic modelling from November 2023 (Appendix B, revision record; s4.3)—before the February 2026 storm destroyed the Te Tahī plant - We acknowledge that Council's PC31 FAQ addresses the issue, however, there has been no updated servicing assessment. The supply option of feeding the first 74 lots from the existing 100mm main in Wallace Terrace and the firefighting flows, were tested only against the pre-storm network - The fix is simple a rule that development proceeds only once Council or Waikato Waters Limited confirms in writing that supply (including firefighting supply) is available	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include a water supply readiness rule: no subdivision or development until Waipā District Council / Waikato Waters Limited confirms in writing that reticulated water supply (including firefighting supply to SNZ PAS 4509:2008) is available for the relevant stage; rainwater tanks not to be relied on for firefighting supply. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/8	Stormwater	Support in Part	Stormwater & Flooding: - The flood modelling should be tested with realistic climate change and culvert blockage scenarios, and the stormwater approach secured in the provisions rather than “confirmed at subdivision consent.” - The new road connection and the low-lying lots sit on the overland flow path from Wallace Terrace; unless it is	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, include catchment-wide stormwater modelling (climate change and culvert-blockage scenarios) with the first subdivision of each Area, and formal identification and design of the existing Wallace Terrace overland flow path. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			formally identified and designed for, the flood risk created is to the new subdivision itself. - The rezoning should not be locked in on the assumption that a consent not yet obtained will be granted by Waikato Regional Council; if it is declined or modified, the layout, yield and stormwater scheme all change.	
27/9	Earthworks	Support in Part	Ground conditions: - The proposed engineering responses should be secured through the provisions in regard to peat and compressible soils, moderate liquefaction zones, and predicted settlements. - The indicative cut/fill diagram shows cuts and fills exceeding 4m on soils described as sensitive and difficult to work. That means a prolonged bulk earthworks period immediately below existing homes on the eastern boundary — yet the rules contain no earthworks, dust or vibration management requirements.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, require a Construction Traffic Management Plan for each stage, keeping heavy construction traffic off Wallace Terrace except where no practicable alternative exists, and an earthworks, dust and vibration management plan for each stage of bulk earthworks. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.
27/10	General	Support in Part	Less intensive alternatives were never evaluated: - The section 32 options evaluation compares only four procedural routes to the same outcome. No alternative zonings were assessed. - Alternatives suggested standard Residential Zone; Large Lot Residential; Medium Density without the intensification areas; or rezoning the Southern Area only, retaining the deferral over the Northern Area until the Rewi Street link is secured	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, amend to have a less intensive zoning that still delivers housing: a) Residential Zone with a structure plan; b) Large Lot Residential Zone (as for T6); c) Medium Density Residential Zone with the Residential Intensification Areas deleted; or d) rezoning of the Southern Area only, retaining the Deferred Residential Zone over the Northern Area until the Rewi Street collector connection is legally secured and physically constructed. Any further, alternative or consequential relief necessary to address the matters raised.

Submitter 28 – Malcolm, Helen

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
28/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	The intersection of Wallace Terrace, Downe Street, Fairview Road and Teasdale Street is already a confusing and dangerous intersection. Heavy traffic crosses from Rewi Street to Puniu Road, often at some speed, despite the less than desirable layout of the intersection. Add to this Te Awamutu Primary School being only a short distance along Teasdale Street and students from both Te Awamutu College and St Patrick's are seen to use this route also. This means there is a lot of pedestrian, cycle and vehicular traffic at busy times of the day, for children to get to and from schools.	Either reject this "Proposed Private Plan Change 31 - Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell" entirely, or at the very least to only agree to strict conditions that address these concerns
28/2	Amenity	Oppose	The plan provided shows eventual access to the proposed subdivision via both Rewi Street and Puniu Road. It is hard to understand why permission should be granted to provide access via Wallace Terrace, greatly disturbing the safety and wellbeing of the existing residents as well as presenting further safety issues. It is absolutely wrong that a developer's profits should over-ride the rights of rate paying residents. If the subdivision does go ahead, I urge the Council most strongly not to allow access via Wallace Terrace, but to make it a condition that developers put in place these alternative access points prior to the development starting.	Either reject this "Proposed Private Plan Change 31 - Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell" entirely, or at the very least to only agree to strict conditions that address these concerns
28/3	Railway	Oppose	With consideration to the future residents of this subdivision, the proximity of part of the plan to the railway corridor must surely be ill advised. It is hard to believe this is legal when considering the excessive noise and the safety of those who live along this part of the subdivision. Are they planning a future slum, where low-cost housing is built for those who cannot afford to live elsewhere? I believe the Council has a responsibility to see that this does not happen for obvious reasons. A rail corridor can be used for many positive purposes without including housing. With no shortage of suitable land for subdivision, why repeat this mistake from	Either reject this "Proposed Private Plan Change 31 - Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell" entirely, or at the very least to only agree to strict conditions that address these concerns

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			the past.	

Submitter 29 – Vallings, John Edward

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
29/1	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	My objection to this proposal (PC31) is the use of Wallace Terrace as an access road. As a resident of Wallace Terrace, I have observed first-hand the problems with the intersection at the start of Wallace Terrace. This is the junction of Fairview, Teasdale, Downes, and Wallace. I could go into more detail on this but suffice to say this problem would only intensify if this development proceeded. Additionally, keeping Wallace Terrace as a non-through street maintains the current street environment that attracted us to this special street. If Wallace Terrace is slated as a cul-de-sac, if Puniu Road and Rewi Street are slated as access ways, then I would support this proposal.	Wallace Terrace to be retained as a cul-de-sac with Puniu Road and Rewi Street established as the accesses.

Submitter 30 – KiwiRail Holdings Ltd

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
30/1	Railway	Support	KiwiRail supports Proposed Private Plan Change 31 – Te Awamutu T4 Growth Cell (PC31) on the basis that the applicant's agent (Mitchell Daysh) has previously consulted with KiwiRail in 2024 and has agreed to meet the following KiwiRail requirements: a) The distance from the rail corridor for which noise insulation is provided for noise sensitive activities will	Retain provisions regarding rail corridor

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			be 100m, to satisfactorily manage the potential for reverse sensitive effects. b) A vibration alert area extending up to 60m of the rail corridor will be mapped, which informs future landowners that they may experience vibration levels higher than would normally be expected because of proximity to the rail corridor. c) Provisions which prevent the establishment of structures within 5m of any boundary with the rail corridor, without the need for resource consent, including land within the indicated open space/natural wetland and stormwater reserve areas. d) Confirmation of intended measures to manage stormwater in the proposed plan change, as well as measures to secure their implementation. KiwiRail requires that there is no discharge of stormwater towards the rail corridor that could undermine rail infrastructure. e) Confirmation that any earthworks on the plan change site will be managed to prevent adverse effects on the rail corridor in relation to each of the four recommendations above.	

Submitter 31 – Hollinshead, Darrell

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
31/1	Construction	Support in Part	The submitter takes a neutral position on PC 31. The submitter does not oppose the planned growth of Te Awamutu or the general intent of bringing forward the T4 Growth Cell but seeks that his interests as an immediately adjoining rural landowner are recognised and addressed.	The southern interface of the PC 31 site is planned and managed in a way that recognises the adjoining Rural Zoned land and existing rural activities. Construction-related effects, including construction traffic, noise, vibration, dust and earthworks, should also be managed through appropriate construction management measures.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
31/2	Stormwater	Support in Part	The PC 31 material appears to identify and map a wetland on the submitter's land, outside the plan change area. It is not considered appropriate for the applicant to identify, classify and map features on land that is not subject to PC 31. The inclusion of this wetland mapping is opposed, and it is sought that the mapping is removed from the PC 31 material.	Any wetland identification, mapping, notation or description shown on the submitter's land outside the PC 31 site is removed from the PC 31.
31/3	Amenity	Support in Part	The submitter's land is currently used as an equine training and breeding facility, which is a typical activity within a rural zoned environment. Given PC31 will introduce an urban residential zoning directly adjoining the rural zone, there will be a new urban/rural interface (unless the submitter's land is considered for future rezoning). The residential development on the adjoining PC 31 land should therefore consider and accommodate appropriate interface treatment while the land remains in Rural Zone. This could include boundary setbacks, fencing or landscaping requirements where adjoining the submitters site.	The southern interface of the PC 31 site is planned and managed in a way that recognises the adjoining Rural Zoned land and existing rural activities. This should include appropriate rural/residential interface treatments to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects arising from the future residential environment. Such measures may include increased boundary setbacks, landscape planting, fencing and lighting controls along the southern boundary.

Submitter 32 – Tervit, Barry

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
32/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	If Wallace Terrace is used as a service road for the northern and southern end of the construction of T4 growth cell it would cause heavy traffic damage and inconvenience to residents who are used to living on a quiet no exit street. There would be more confusion at the cross Intersection at the eastern town end of Wallace Terrace. Vehicles fail to stop now at the Fairview Rd stop sign and fail to give way at the Downs Street give way. Teasdale Street is blocked am and pm at school times. This intersection of roads has a high volume of students from three schools, walking to and from school. Any increase in volume of heavy construction and other	Construct the collector road first and leave Wallace Terrace as a no exit road.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			vehicles will increase danger to children, residents and through traffic.	
32/2	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	With Wallace Terrace becoming a through road to the traffic, volume will increase to more than the Downs Street intersection can handle. If this development was to go ahead why not construct the collector road first and leave Wallace Terrace as a no exit road.	Construct the collector road first and leave Wallace Terrace as a no exit road.

Submitter 33 – Lenaarts, Alwyn

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
33/1	Construction	Oppose	When Fairview Estate opened there was continuous, increased traffic. During construction, large heavy vehicles interfered with private traffic and school traffic.	Wallace Terrace to not be used as only access. Two east/west exists to be opened and used for construction purposes.
33/2	Traffic	Oppose	This proposal envisages a very extensive development using Wallace Terrace as an entry/exit. Need for a roundabout for an already busy intersection. Long delays occur on Rewi Street/Puniu Road which causes concern. Teasdale Street will become busy and impact school traffic.	Developer to pay for roading configurations.

Submitter 34 – McIvor, Christine & Eric, and Bailey Ingham Trustees Ltd

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
34/1	Infrastructure	Oppose	There are lots of subdivision in progress in Te Awamutu at present. We are concerned about the problem Te Awamutu has with water supply already.	No decision sought.
34/2	Amenity	Oppose	There are lots of subdivision in progress in Te Awamutu at present. We are concerned this will devalue our property, as we purchased this property because of the open space,	To be able to see proposed plans, to be single storey houses.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			privacy and amazing views of Pirongia, Kakepuku and surrounding areas.	
34/3	Amenity	Oppose	There are lots of subdivision in progress in Te Awamutu at present. We are concerned about damage to the environment e.g. removal of well-established trees, bird life and sunlight to our property.	To know approximately what the time frame would be for this development as we get prevailing wind from this direction and will get dust and noise.

Submitter 35 – Mexted, Monique & Brent

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
35/1	Wallace Terrace	Support in Part	I support housing developments for our district. My concern is traffic flow and safety for Wallace Terrace residents and Te Awamutu Primary School -flow on speeds. Currently there is intersection at Downes & Teasdale Streets / Fairview Road / Wallace Terrace intersection that has poor visibility at intersection points and signage, being a staggered type intersection. Waipa District Council road signs on the central traffic island get clipped by traffic and backed over often by reversing heavy haulage trucks (the big units who discover that Wallace Terrace is a no exit street, and often at 4 am in the morning and have to reverse all the way back the hill, running over/damaging all the traffic road signs resulting in more cost to Waipa District Council. We feel sorry for the council road engineers up there all the time replacing the damaged signs. There needs to be more thought put into a re design of this intersection to improve traffic flow and safety, due to the increased vehicle trips as per the consultant report.	To redesign the staggered intersection as described above, to allow for better traffic flow with the increased volume of traffic from the northern site to flow in/out of Wallace Terrace.
35/2	Construction	Support in Part	I understand heavy machinery may use Wallace Terrace during site works. Our road surface is already below average condition (Bald seal), I would like to see a full prior check and review to ensure our seal is kept maintained after the	To ensure our road seal is not damaged in any way by heavy machinery working the site.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			development.	

Submitter 36 – Ellis, Tracy

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
36/1	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	I object to putting more traffic through Wallace Terrace. Part of the reason for buying up here is that it was quiet and peaceful. The intersection at the bottom of Wallace Terrace is already dangerous, and with more traffic, this will become far worse. The area could still be developed with Wallace Terrace remaining a cul-de-sac.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, for Wallace Terrace to remain a cul-de-sac.
36/2	Stormwater	Oppose	Several sections would be very small, which could cause flooding issues.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, for Wallace Terrace to remain a cul-de-sac.
36/3	Wallace Terrace	Oppose	There are already many developments in Te Awamutu with vacant sections.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, for Wallace Terrace to remain a cul-de-sac.
36/4	Infrastructure	Oppose	The water pressure on Wallace Terrace is already poor; with more properties, this could cause further problems	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, for Wallace Terrace to remain a cul-de-sac.
36/5	Reserve	Oppose	I am also concerned about where the reserve land is. Most of it is a steep bank which is not really any good for anything.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, for Wallace Terrace to remain a cul-de-sac.

Submitter 37 – Peterson, Christine

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
37/1	General	Oppose	Recent residential developments that have already been approved, together with those currently under construction around Te Awamutu, are more than sufficient to meet anticipated housing demand for many years. Analysis prepared by Future Proof concludes that there is a surplus of residential land capacity into the 2040s. Assessments	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			indicate that the wider district has sufficient allocated residential land supply to meet forecast growth over the next 30 years.	further stages of development are permitted.
37/2	General	Oppose	The proposed plan change is inconsistent with the strategic direction established through the Waipā 2050 Growth Strategy and the Future Proof Future Development Strategy, both of which seek to coordinate urban growth with infrastructure planning and long-term housing demand. Given the current and forecast residential land supply, there is no demonstrated need to bring this development forward ahead of the planned growth sequence.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/3	Infrastructure	Oppose	A significant concern is that infrastructure and community services are not yet adequately planned or funded to support this development. The proposal would place additional pressure on existing infrastructure.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/4	Traffic	Oppose	Traffic congestion is already an issue on the surrounding road network. The additional vehicle movements generated by this development are likely to increase congestion and reduce road safety. While a new roading may provide some improvement, it is unlikely to fully mitigate the increased traffic volumes.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/5	General	Support	We support the proposed staging of the development, with the northern area being developed before the southern area. This approach will help ensure that essential road connections and supporting infrastructure are completed before additional residential areas are opened.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/6	General	Oppose in part	The proposed layout, housing types and medium-density zoning should be carefully integrated with the existing surrounding residential neighbourhood. We support the	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
			proposed minimum lot size of 500 m ² for properties adjoining Lola Lee Heights and the surrounding established residential areas. Larger lot sizes along this interface would provide a more appropriate transition between the new development and the existing neighbourhood.	development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/7	Earthworks	Oppose	We have serious concerns regarding the proposal to cut approximately two metres down from the existing properties immediately behind properties on Lola Lee Heights, creating a steep embankment adjacent to boundaries. We support the cut to some degree, however, require more information and would prefer this to be sloping or provided with robust walling design. Without such protection, there is a risk that future landowners or developers could further modify the bank, increasing its height and steepness, potentially leading to instability and adverse effects on neighbouring properties.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/8	Amenity	Oppose	To protect the amenity and privacy of existing residents, we request that any dwellings directly adjoining the current residential properties be limited to single-storey buildings with a maximum roof pitch of 15 degrees. We request that this area be protected through a fixed development plan that provides an increased setback from existing properties.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/9	General	Oppose	The site is currently a productive dairy farming operation contributing to New Zealand's export economy. It comprises predominantly flat to gently undulating floodplains and low terraces with deep, fertile gley soils that are well suited to pastoral farming. A considerable amount of highly productive farmland around Te Awamutu and throughout the Waipā District has already been converted to residential development. In our view, this land should remain in productive agricultural use until at least 2035, consistent with the original planning framework and the Deferred Residential zoning.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone. Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.
37/10	General	Oppose	Future subdivision should remain consistent with the approved Development Area Plan.	Decline the Application and retain as Deferred Residential Zone.

Submission Number	Topic	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Relief Sought / Decision Requested
				Should the proposal proceed, we request that the development be staged appropriately, stronger protections be provided for adjoining properties, and infrastructure upgrades be completed before further stages of development are permitted.