

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Leasa Pearson
Date: Tuesday, 28 April 2026 6:38:57 pm

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

Full name of submitter Leasa Pearson

Contact name (if different from above) Leasa Hubbard

Email address

Address for service

Contact phone number

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

Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (PC37) – Rider Park Structure Plan

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? I could not

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that - (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition? I am

Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission? I do

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? Yes

Do you support the proposed change(s)? I oppose

The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are (give details):

Specific Provisions of Private Plan Change 37

My submission relates to the following proposed changes and additions to the Waipā District Plan:

Section 2A (Medium Density Residential Zone): I oppose the inclusion of the Rider Park Structure Plan area within the Medium Density provisions, specifically where it allows for intensified urban development (up to 1,250 dwellings) on land currently zoned Rural and Deferred Residential.

Section 15 (Infrastructure, Hazards, Development, and Subdivision): I oppose the proposed amendments that seek to facilitate large-scale development in this area before the "Third Bridge" and other critical transport network solutions are operative.

Section 21 (Assessment Criteria): I oppose the proposed assessment criteria for the Rider Park Structure Plan, as they do not adequately mitigate the detrimental effects on local amenity, construction noise, and traffic congestion for existing nearby residents.

Appendix S1 (Future Growth Cells - C5): I oppose the amendment to the C5 Growth Cell that seeks to "uplift" the Deferred Residential status and rezone the Rural balance ahead of the 2035 timeframe identified in the District Plan.

The Rider Park Structure Plan (Appendix 2 of the Application): I oppose the overall layout, density, and sequencing as shown in the indicative structure plan, particularly the lack of guaranteed infrastructure triggers for transport and local services.

My submission is

URGENT NOTE: I request that Council waive the time limit for this submission under s37 of the RMA, as this brief delay causes no prejudice and the matter is of high public interest.

1. General Position

I oppose Private Plan Change 37 (PC37) in its entirety. This proposal to rezone approximately 98.6 hectares for the Rider Park Structure Plan is premature, inappropriately scaled, and fails to adequately address the cumulative effects on the Cambridge community and infrastructure.

2. Prematurity and Infrastructure Deficit

The proposal is fundamentally premature. Cambridge is currently under extreme infrastructure pressure. Many residents, including myself, are concerned that existing roads, transport links, and local services are at a breaking point. It is irresponsible to approve a development of this magnitude—bringing forward growth intended for 2035—before a third bridge and wider network solutions are fully operational.

3. Inappropriate Scale and Density

The proposed medium-density residential zoning is entirely out of keeping with the established character and "feel" of Cambridge and the Leamington edge. The shift from a rural/equine landscape to high-intensity urban development does not respect the surrounding neighborhood and will result in a permanent loss of amenity, privacy, and openness.

4. Detrimental Effects on Nearby Residents

As a nearby resident, I will be directly and detrimentally affected by:

Construction Impacts: I do not accept that residents should absorb years of avoidable noise, vibration, dust, and heavy vehicle movements. This prolonged disruption will severely impact our quality of life and wellbeing.

Traffic Congestion: The injection of approximately 1,250 additional dwellings will cause significant congestion on a roading network that is already struggling. This poses safety risks and degrades the level of service for current users.

5. Community Wellbeing and Statutory Responsibility

The Council is bound by law to consider the collective wellbeing of the community. This proposal prioritizes developer interests over the stability of our local infrastructure and the character of our town. I urge the Council to act on behalf of its residents and decline this proposal until such time as the town's infrastructure is actually ready to support it.

I seek the following decision/s from Council

I seek that the Waipā District Council:

1. Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.
2. In the alternative, should the Council be minded to approve any part of the plan change, I seek that it be deferred until such time as the "Third Bridge" and associated transport network upgrades are fully funded, consented, and operational.
3. Impose stricter performance standards and setbacks for the boundary interface with existing residential properties to protect the privacy and amenity of current residents.
4. Implement comprehensive construction management triggers that strictly limit noise, dust, and heavy vehicle movements to standard business hours, with independent monitoring paid for by the developer.
5. Require a significant reduction in density to ensure the development is consistent with the established character of the Leamington/Cambridge area, rather than the high-intensity "urban" model currently proposed.

Attachments

From: [Leasa Hubbard](#)
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: LATE SUBMISSION - Private Plan Change 37 - Leasa Pearson (Hubbard)
Date: Tuesday, 28 April 2026 6:43:27 pm

You don't often get email from leasahubbard01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

To the Waipā District Council Planning Team,

Please find below my submission regarding Proposed Private Plan Change 37 (PC37) – Rider Park Structure Plan.

1. Request for Waiver of Time Limit (Section 37 RMA)

I request that the Council exercise its discretion under Section 37 of the Resource Management Act to waive the time limit and accept this late submission. The brief delay in filing has not caused any prejudice to the process or other parties. Given the significant scale of this development and its long-term impact on the Cambridge community, the matters raised are of high public interest and deserve formal consideration.

2. Submitter Details

- **Full Name:** Leasa Pearson, Alyssa Hubbard, Ethan Hubbard
 - **Address for Service:** 48a Addison Street, Leamington, Cambridge
 - **Contact Phone:** 021449569
 - **Trade Competition:** I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
 - **Directly Affected:** I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition.
-

3. Specific Provisions of Private Plan Change 37

My submission relates to the following proposed changes and additions to the Waipā District Plan:

- **Section 2A (Medium Density Residential Zone):** I oppose the inclusion of the Rider Park Structure Plan area within the Medium Density provisions, allowing for up to 1,250 dwellings on land currently zoned Rural and Deferred Residential.
- **Section 15 (Infrastructure, Hazards, Development, and Subdivision):** I oppose amendments seeking to facilitate large-scale development before the "Third Bridge" and critical transport solutions are operative.

- **Section 21 (Assessment Criteria):** I oppose the proposed assessment criteria as they fail to adequately mitigate effects on local amenity, construction noise, and traffic for existing residents.
 - **Appendix S1 (Future Growth Cells - C5):** I oppose the amendment to "uplift" the Deferred Residential status ahead of the 2035 timeframe identified in the District Plan.
 - **The Rider Park Structure Plan (Appendix 2):** I oppose the overall layout, density, and sequencing, specifically the lack of guaranteed infrastructure triggers.
-

4. My Submission (Reasons for Opposition)

I oppose Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety for the following reasons:

- **Infrastructure Deficit:** The proposal is fundamentally premature. Cambridge is under extreme infrastructure pressure. Roads, transport links, and local services cannot cope with an influx of this scale before the **third bridge** and wider network solutions are in place.
 - **Inappropriate Scale:** The medium-density zoning is out of keeping with the established character of Cambridge and Leamington. It represents a permanent loss of amenity, privacy, and openness.
 - **Direct Detrimental Effects:** As a nearby resident, I will be impacted by years of avoidable construction noise, vibration, dust, and heavy vehicle movements.
 - **Traffic Congestion:** The addition of 1,250 dwellings will cause significant congestion on a network already at capacity, posing safety risks and degrading service levels for current users.
 - **Statutory Responsibility:** Council is bound to consider the collective wellbeing of the community over developer interests.
-

5. Decision Sought from Council

I seek that the Waipā District Council:

1. **Decline Private Plan Change 37 in its entirety.**
 2. **Alternatively:** Defer any approval until the "Third Bridge" and transport upgrades are fully funded and operational.
 3. Impose stricter performance standards and setbacks for the boundary interface with existing properties.
 4. Implement comprehensive construction management triggers with independent monitoring paid for by the developer.
 5. Require a significant reduction in density to remain consistent with the established character of the area.
-

6. Attendance at Hearing

- **I do wish to be heard** (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
- If others make a similar submission, **I will consider** presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Yours faithfully,

Leasa Pearson