

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Lena Carol Cox
Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2026 9:48:24 am

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 Lena Carol Cox

Contact name (if different from above)

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 (Rider Park)

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 not

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? No

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

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

1.1

The proposed rezoning of approximately 98.6 hectares of land from Deferred Residential and Rural Zones to Medium Density Residential Zone, enabling at least 1,250 dwellings within the Rider Park Structure Plan Area.

1.2

The associated transport and infrastructure provisions, including:

Reliance on existing Leamington and Cambridge road networks

Assumed adequacy of existing Waikato River bridge crossings

Staged infrastructure delivery reliant on future agreements rather than completed works

1.3

The absence of explicit plan provisions requiring:

Additional Waikato River bridge connections or capacity upgrades

Fully funded and delivered transport infrastructure prior to development impacts
Integration with wider regional transport systems, including Hamilton–Auckland road, airport, and rail networks

1.4

The lack of enforceable certainty within the plan change itself that all infrastructure upgrades required to mitigate adverse effects will be fully paid for by the landowner and developer, rather than deferred to Council or ratepayers.

My submission is

2.1

I oppose Proposed Private Plan Change 37 in its current form.

2.2

I make this submission from both a professional standpoint and as a mother of two school-aged children living in Leamington. My children already face a daily commute that is increasingly unsafe, due to current traffic volumes, limited road capacity, and constrained routes. The distance to secondary schooling is already significant, and the journey involves navigating congested roads and limited safe crossing points.

2.3

Existing transport conditions in Leamington are already under strain. Morning and afternoon peak periods coincide directly with school travel times, when children are most vulnerable. Increased traffic volumes resulting from this plan change will exacerbate safety risks, particularly for children walking, cycling, or being driven to school.

2.4

The plan change proposes a level of residential development that is not supported by current infrastructure capacity, yet relies on future staging and future funding mechanisms to address these impacts. From a safety and risk perspective—particularly where children are concerned—this approach is unacceptable.

2.5

Of particular concern is the lack of meaningful provision for additional Waikato River crossings. The river is a hard constraint, and existing bridges already operate as network bottlenecks. Increased population and vehicle movements without corresponding bridge capacity will further concentrate congestion, increase travel times, and heighten accident risk.

2.6

As a parent, I am deeply concerned that emergency response times, school travel reliability, and daily safety will deteriorate further if development proceeds without additional bridge infrastructure being delivered before impacts occur.

2.7

The plan change also fails to adequately consider wider transport connectivity, including:

Safe and efficient access to Hamilton and Auckland airports

Regional road resilience for employment, education, and health access

Future rail opportunities for commuters and students

Without realistic alternatives to private vehicle use, the proposal will increase car dependency, placing additional pressure on already constrained roads and undermining climate and safety objectives.

2.8

Critically, the plan change does not provide sufficient certainty that all infrastructure costs will be fully

borne by the landowner and developer. As both a ratepayer and a parent, I strongly oppose any outcome where existing residents subsidise growth-related infrastructure or absorb degraded safety and accessibility outcomes.

2.9

Good planning requires that growth is enabled only when infrastructure is in place, not promised. This is especially important where children's safety and daily wellbeing are directly affected.

I seek the following decision/s from Council

I seek that Waipā District Council:

3.1

Decline Proposed Private Plan Change 37 as currently drafted; or

3.2

In the alternative, require substantial amendments to ensure that:

Additional Waikato River bridge connections or capacity upgrades are explicitly provided for
All transport, three-waters, and associated infrastructure required by the development is fully funded and delivered by the landowner and developer

Infrastructure is completed prior to or concurrent with development, not deferred

Safe school travel, child safety, and peak-time congestion are explicitly addressed

The development is demonstrably integrated with regional transport systems, including airport and rail connectivity

3.3

Ensure that no infrastructure costs, safety risks, or transport inefficiencies are transferred to existing residents, families, or ratepayers.

Closing Statement

This submission is not opposed to growth in principle. It is opposed to growth that outpaces infrastructure, burdens ratepayers, compromises safety, and places children and families at increased risk. Until these matters are resolved with certainty, the proposed plan change should not proceed.

Attachments