

Waipā District Plan FS01

Proposed Private Plan Change 36

Further Submission Form

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange36 | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm Thursday, September 10, 2026**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	7 September 2026
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter:	Sarah Burns
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	
Email address:	
Postal address: (required if no email address is provided)	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):

☒ **X** I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public

My reason(s) are: I live at 6 Ryburn Rd opposite the proposed development

3. Attendance at Council hearing

(a) I wish ☐ **X** to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.

(b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
Yes ☒

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)

Sarah Burns

Signature of submitter: Dated 07/09/26
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change to the Waipa District Plan that this further submission relates to is/are as follows:

Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support ✓	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council:
<i>Example</i> 20/1	<i>Jo Smith</i>	✓		<i>It is important for people's health and well-being that there are rules in the Plan to control noise.</i>	<i>Retain current Plan provision on noise.</i>

Attachment to Further Submission Form 6 — Proposed Private Plan Change 36

FS01

Submitter: Sarah Burns, 6 Ryburn Road, Ōhaupō

Continuation of Section 5 of the Further Submission Form. Refer to page 1–2 of the form for submitter details, standing, and attendance.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision(s) Sought
8/1	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises the cumulative effects on existing residents along Ryburn Road and the lack of assessment of sightlines and existing driveway locations. I agree with this concern, but consider it should not be limited to properties directly adjacent to or opposite proposed access points. Existing residents along Ryburn Road between the proposed access point and the SH3 intersection are affected by the cumulative increase in traffic and should be included in any assessment of these effects.	That a detailed assessment of cumulative effects, driveway locations, sightlines, and safety impacts be required for all properties along Ryburn Road between the proposed access point and the SH3 intersection, not only those adjacent to access points.
8/2	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises legitimate concerns about the safety of the proposed entrance location on Ryburn Road, including turning conflicts and reduced visibility.	That an independent road safety audit be undertaken and alternative access arrangements be investigated.
8/3	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises legitimate concerns about the capacity of Ryburn Road to safely accommodate the increased traffic and heavy vehicle movements this development would generate.	That road widening, safe passing opportunities, and provision for pedestrian and cycling safety be required, and that these costs not fall on existing ratepayers.
8/4	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises the same stormwater and drainage concerns set out in my own submission. The proposed reliance on soakage and roadside swales has not been tested, and this point correctly identifies that runoff may affect Ryburn Road and neighbouring properties, including through surface ponding, erosion, and pressure on a drainage system that does not currently exist at the top of Ryburn Road.	That a comprehensive stormwater assessment be required, including climate-resilient design and protection of downstream receiving environments.
8/5	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises construction effects that are consistent with the concerns set out in my own submission regarding the multi-year construction programme this development would involve.	That a mandatory Construction Management Plan be required before any earthworks or subdivision activity begins.
8/6	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point raises the same water supply concerns set out in my own submission. The existing trickle-fed supply on the southern side of Ryburn Road has not been shown to be sufficient for 40 additional connections, including firefighting requirements, and I agree that ratepayers should not bear the cost of resolving this gap.	That water supply, emergency service access, and long-term maintenance obligations be fully addressed before rezoning proceeds, at no cost to existing ratepayers.
8/7	Michaela Glaspey	Support	This point summarises the transport safety, stormwater, and infrastructure concerns raised throughout this submission, all of which are consistent with the concerns set out in my own submission.	That Proposed Private Plan Change 36 be declined in its current form.
7/1	Kirsty Steeghs	Support	This point raises a legitimate question about whether there is genuine disinterest from O2, O3 and O4 landowners, which the further submissions from Darragh and Dunn and Edwards confirm there is not. The Waipā District Growth Strategy identifies O2, O3 and O4 as the planned basis for future large lot residential growth in Ōhaupō. The PC36 site is not included within that strategy. This directly undermines the applicant's justification for departing from the council's designated growth framework, which is a central ground of my own opposition.	That Proposed Private Plan Change 36 be declined.
26/1, 26/2, 26/3, 26/4	John Darragh and Ross Dunn	Support	I am the submitter at 6 Ryburn Road (submission 6), directly opposite the plan change site. My own submission raised the applicant's reliance on an assumption that growth cell landowners are not intending to develop in the short to medium term. This further submission point confirms that the O4 landowners themselves dispute that characterisation, and that substantial work has already been undertaken to progress O4. This directly undermines the	That Proposed Private Plan Change 36 be declined.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision(s) Sought	FS01
			applicant's justification for departing from the council's designated growth framework, which is a central ground of my own opposition.		
23/1, 23/2, 23/3	FT Edwards and Estate R.P. Edwards	Support	These points confirm, from an O3 growth cell landowner, that the applicant's assertions about landowner intentions are factually inaccurate. This is directly relevant to the strategic planning framework issue raised in my own submission, and reinforces the position that the applicant has not demonstrated why this proposal should proceed ahead of land already identified for growth.	That Proposed Private Plan Change 36 be declined.	
14/1, 14/2, 14/3	Clinton Worters	Support	Clint has direct working knowledge of this land from time spent on it under the previous owner. His observations on ponding in the southwest corner, the clay layer close to the surface, and flooding on the farm west of the railway line are consistent with what I have raised in my submission regarding stormwater and flood risk.	That soakage testing and flood modelling be completed, and that the effects on downstream flooding, including the capacity of the culvert under the railway line, be assessed before any decision is made.	
14/6	Clinton Worters	Support	This point provides firsthand historical confirmation of dabchick breeding on the site over several years, consistent with the ecological concerns raised in my own submission.	That the ecological values of the ponds, including dabchick habitat, be properly assessed and protected.	
22/1, 22/2	Alasdair Hugh Nicholl	Support	These points corroborate the longstanding presence and breeding of dabchick on the site, which is directly relevant to the ecological concerns raised in my own submission regarding the applicant's ecological assessment.	That the ecological values of the ponds, including dabchick habitat, be properly assessed and protected.	
22/6	Alasdair Hugh Nicholl	Support	This point confirms, from a nearby landowner, that the southwest corner of the site experiences considerable inundation in moderate to high rainfall. This is consistent with the flooding and stormwater concerns raised in my own submission.	That the southwest corner of the site not be built on, and that flood modelling be completed before any decision is made.	
21/1, 21/2, 21/3, 21/4, 21/5, 21/6	Monie Farms Limited	Support	These points raise detailed concerns about downstream flooding, drainage recovery time, and the reliability of the applicant's hydraulic modelling within the wider catchment. This reinforces the concerns raised in my own submission that the stormwater and flood modelling relied upon by the applicant remains incomplete and untested.	That further investigation of downstream effects be required, and that hydraulic modelling be validated against historic flood events, before any decision is made.	
29/1 - 29/17	Gavin Longstaff and Sarah Wyatt	Support	These points provide detailed, firsthand evidence from downstream landowners of existing flooding within the peat catchment, and raise legitimate concerns about the applicant's reliance on theoretical modelling rather than observed catchment behaviour. This is directly relevant to the flooding and stormwater concerns raised in my own submission.	That independent peer review of the applicant's stormwater and hydraulic modelling be required, and that downstream properties be no worse off than they are today.	