

From: [Peter Skilton](#)
To: [Rebecca Gray](#); [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: FW: External Sender: Proposed Private Plan Change - Rider Park PC 37 Structure Plan
Date: Monday, 4 May 2026 10:38:54 am

Peter Skilton Team Leader District Plan **Waipā District Council**

[www.waipadc.govt.nz](#)

MOB: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 29 April 2026 1:23 pm
To: Peter Skilton [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: External Sender: Proposed Private Plan Change - Rider Park PC 37 Structure Plan

Kia Ora Peter,

1. Contact Phone Number: [REDACTED]
2. Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission: No
3. Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at Council Hearing) in support of your submission: No
4. If others make a similar submission, would you consider making a joint case with them at the hearing: Possibly
5. Does your submission support, support in part or oppose PC37: oppose the PC37

On Wed, Apr 29, 2026 at 11:29 AM Peter Skilton <Peter.Skilton@waipadc.govt.nz> wrote:

Kia ora Sommer

I confirm receipt of your late submission to PC37.

To make sure we have the appropriate information about your submission can you answer the following questions for me.

1. Contact Phone Number
2. Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
3. Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at Council Hearing) in support of your submission
4. If others make a similar submission, would you consider making a joint case with them at the hearing
5. Does your submission support, support in part or oppose PC37

This information is a mandatory requirement of the Resource Management Act for submissions (see attached form).

Please feel free to contact me with any issues arising.

Ngā Mihi

Peter Skilton Team Leader District Plan **Waipā District Council**

[www.waipadc.govt.nz](#)

[REDACTED]

From: Sommer Gisborne [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 29 April 2026 10:15 am
To: Ngira Simmonds [REDACTED] >
Cc: Peter Skilton <[REDACTED]>
Subject: External Sender: Proposed Private Plan Change - Rider Park PC 37 Structure Plan

CYBER SECURITY WARNING: This email is from an external source - be careful of attachments and links. Please follow the Cybersecurity Policy and report suspicious emails to Servicedesk

Tēnā koe e te rangatira Ngira, kua āpiti hoki i a Peter Skilton

E mihi ana ki a koorua.

Yesterday as I was driving home from Te Aroha, I was trying to submit my submission for PC change 37. Admittedly trying to submit while in transit was hard in certain parts of cell coverage.

Knowing the submission deadline was yesterday at 5pm, could you please pass this onto the people, who will include this submission too.

Appreciate your assistance in this matter,

Sommer Gisborne

=====

This electronic message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If this message is not intended for you, do not use, read, distribute or copy it. Please contact the sender immediately and delete the original message and any attachments. Before opening or using attachments, check them for viruses and effects. Waipā District Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its electronic messages have been scanned and are free of viruses, however takes no responsibility for affected messages or attachments.

=====

Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waipa



Proposed Private Plan change - Rider Park PC 37 Structure Plan Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to submit in this proposed PC 37 plan change for Rider Park.

Please see my submission from an indigenous perspective, not as an official response from the local Iwi, but as a constituent, who cares about the kaitiakitanga of which Iwi have been responsible for over 30+ generations in Waipaa.

1. Alignment with key Iwi aspirations

a. Protection of cultural landscapes and wāhi tūpuna

Iwi expectations around protecting culturally significant sites, particularly the **pā site and associated features**. Seeking amendments so that these areas are **identified and protected at structure plan level**, rather than deferred to later consent stages.

- This aligns strongly with iwi aspirations for **early recognition and spatial acknowledgement of whakapapa and history**, rather than relying on developer discretion.
- The call to amend the Structure Plan Image to show the pā site provides **visibility, certainty, and mana** to these cultural landscapes.

Iwi benefit: Cultural values are embedded in planning documentation, not treated as an afterthought.

b. Strengthening the greenbelt as more than a token reserve

The **narrow, fragmented, and ambiguous greenbelt configuration**, particularly:

- The **strip along the Waikato River**, and
- The **western interface adjoining Addison Kingsley Reserve**.

It seeks:

- Widening reserve areas
- Clarification of reserve purpose
- Improved connectivity within the open space network

These changes directly reflect iwi aspirations that greenbelts should function as **living cultural landscapes and ecological corridors**, not simply leftover buffers.

Iwi benefit: Moves the greenbelt closer to a *values-based landscape* that supports kaitiakitanga, cultural connection, and intergenerational wellbeing.

c. Support for native planting and tikanga-aligned ecology

Highlighting a **tension between proposed fast-growing exotics and the Cultural Impact Assessment's preference for native vegetation**. It asks for reconsideration of exotic planting due to:

- Cultural incongruence
- Long-term maintenance risks
- Potential ecological harm

This is significant for iwi, as native planting is directly linked to **cultural identity, mātauranga Māori, and customary relationships with land**.

Iwi benefit: The draft gives formal weight to tikanga-informed ecological outcomes, not just engineering or visual amenity.

2. Where concerns remain

a. Greenbelt risks becoming a “maintenance liability” rather than a cultural asset

Seeking clarity on **Council responsibilities for accepting restored gullies and reserves**, it also implicitly flags a risk:

- That greenbelt areas may be **engineered stormwater solutions** rather than culturally-enriched landscapes.
- That long-term governance, resourcing, and iwi partnership in management are **not yet defined**.

From an iwi perspective, the concern is not just *who pays*, but **who holds authority, voice, and tikanga over these spaces** once vested.

Residual concern: Without explicit co-governance or partnership mechanisms, the greenbelt may fall short of iwi aspirations for rangatiratanga and relational stewardship.

b. Connectivity is still conceptual, not relational

Although the draft pushes for clearer pedestrian and cycle links within and through the greenbelt, these are framed primarily as:

- Transport connections
- Recreational networks

There is **no explicit framing of cultural connectivity** — such as linking people to:

- The river as a tupuna
- Pā sites as living heritage
- Stories, naming, or narrative landscapes

A gap between technical planning language and iwi worldviews.

Residual concern: The opportunity for the greenbelt to express identity, story, and place-making remains largely untapped.

c. Development pressure versus long-term cultural integrity

The submission is clearly concerned about **out-of-sequence development and infrastructure strain**, but from an indigenous standpoint, the deeper issue is:

- Whether accelerating development risks **compromising the integrity of the greenbelt** as a buffer between Leamington communities, the river, and cultural sites.

The draft raises the economic and infrastructure risks well, but mana whenua may still be concerned that **once zoning is established**, pressure to intensify adjacent to the greenbelt will grow.

3. Overall assessment - with an indigenous lens

Positive

- Stronger protection of wāhi tapu and cultural landscapes
- Pushback against minimalist or token greenbelt design
- Support for native planting and ecological integrity
- Greater certainty earlier in the planning framework

Ongoing tensions

- Governance and long-term stewardship of greenbelt land
- Cultural expression within open space design
- Balancing infrastructure function with whakapapa-based land relationships

Te Tiriti Mapping — Leamington (Greenbelt & Open Space Focus)

1. Partnership

Working together in good faith, early, and meaningfully

Submission position	Te Tiriti alignment	Implications for Leamington
Seeks early identification and protection of the pā site and associated features within the Structure	Upholds <i>partnership</i> by recognising iwi knowledge and interests at the strategic planning stage , not after key decisions are made	Signals that iwi are partners in shaping outcomes for Leamington, not consultees once development form is already fixed
Calls for clarification of the purpose, width, and function of the greenbelt and reserves	Supports partnership by requiring shared understanding of <i>why</i> land is set aside, not just <i>that</i> it is	Creates space for iwi aspirations (cultural landscape, whakapapa connections) to inform the design intent of the greenbelt
Questions reliance on Private Development Agreements (PDAs) to resolve	Aligns with partnership by resisting the deferral of critical matters to private, less transparent processes	Reduces risk that iwi interests are excluded from key decisions affecting the greenbelt and river margins

2. Participation

Ensuring Māori are involved in decisions that affect them

Submission position	Te Tiriti alignment	Implications for Leamington
Requests clearer mapping of reserves, green corridors, pedestrian and cycle links	Enables meaningful participation by making impacts visible and understandable	Allows iwi to engage on how the greenbelt will function physically and culturally, rather than reacting later
Raises concern about unclear long-term responsibilities for	Highlights participation gaps in future governance and stewardship decisions	Signals a need for iwi involvement beyond design — into management, maintenance, and monitoring
Identifies misalignment between technical/ecological reports and cultural impact assessment	Reinforces that participation includes cultural evidence being taken seriously alongside technical inputs	Avoids cultural advice being sidelined in favour of engineering or economic priorities

3. Protection

Safeguarding Māori interests, taonga, and future wellbeing

Submission position	Te Tiriti alignment	Implications for Leamington
Pushes back against narrow or fragmented greenbelt design, especially along the Waikato River margin	Protects taonga by strengthening buffers around culturally and ecologically significant landscapes	Supports the river's role as a tupuna, not merely a development edge

Supports reconsideration of fast-growing exotic planting, favouring native species consistent with the	Protects mātauranga Māori, biodiversity, and cultural identity	Reinforces native planting as a cultural and intergenerational obligation, not just an aesthetic choice
Seeks stronger controls around lighting (LMA), bat habitat, and ecological mitigation near cultural sites	Protects taonga species and the mauri of the environment	Aligns environmental protection with cultural protection, particularly near the pā site
Calls for developers — not Council — to bear costs of infrastructure and landscape creation	Protects Māori interests by reducing long-term public and cultural burden from early, accelerated development	Lessens the risk that iwi and the wider community inherit degraded or under-resourced green spaces

Overall Tiriti Assessment (Leamington Focus)

Where the this possible change supports Te Tiriti well

- Moves cultural and environmental protection **upstream** into strategic planning
- Challenges tokenistic or residual greenbelt outcomes
- Gives weight to Cultural Impact Assessment conclusions
- Recognises that the Waikato River margin and pā site require stronger, clearer protection

Where Tiriti risks remain

- Long-term **governance, co-management, and resourcing** of greenbelt areas is not yet explicit
- Cultural expression, narratives, and naming of green spaces are not directly addressed
- Participation risks re-emerging at the implementation stage if PDAs dominate delivery

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my whakaaro as a Waipaa Maaori Ratepayer,

Naaku noa naa,
Sommer Gisborne