

## Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
383.1	Planning Focus Limited		<p><b>Amend</b> the zoning of the following properties in Ohinewai from Rural Zone to Industrial Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 52 Lumsden Road (Lot 3 Deposited Plan 474347)</li> <li>• 56 Lumsden Road (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 474347)</li> <li>• 58 Lumsden Road (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 474347)</li> <li>• 109 Tahuna Road (Part Allotment 436A Parish of Whangamarino)</li> <li>• 147 Ohinewai South Road(Lot 1-3 Deposited Plan 15270)</li> <li>• Ohinewai South Road; (Part Allotment 36 Parish of Taupiri)</li> <li>• 159 Ohinewai South Road; (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 63073)</li> <li>• 181 Ohinewai South Road; (Part Allotment 36 Parish of Taupiri)</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the zoning the following properties from Country Living Zone to Industrial Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 123 Ohinewai South Road, Ohinewai</li> <li>• 101 Ohinewai South Road, Ohinewai</li> <li>• 117 Ohinewai South Road, Ohinewai</li> </ul>	Accept in part	4	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>183 Ohinewai South Road; (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 90412 and Allotment 816 Taupiri Parish and Part Allotment 817 Taupiri Parish)</li> </ul> See the map attached to the submission.			
1224.12	Ambury Properties Limited	Oppose	The submission seeks the rezoning of land south of Ohinewai and east of the Waikato Expressway, from Rural to Industrial. The site is not well suited to industrial use as it is neither adjacent to the Expressway interchange nor the NIMTR and all access would be through Ohinewai Village. The industrial traffic will have adverse amenity and potential traffic safety effects on the residential and community facilities in the village, including Ohinewai School.	Accept in part	5	
1207.2	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	Oppose	<p>The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clearly in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by WDC as they stated.</p> <p>The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are: Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living Zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all.</p> <p>The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature - to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option - to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people. The fact that the submitter actually said there isn't sufficient industrial zoned land in Huntly is widely untrue as there is Huntly West and Huntly South currently industrial zoned and applicable/appropriate for industrial use.</p> <p>Also the wording "subject land is suitably located with regard to the residential neighbourhood of Huntly while being sufficiently distant to avoid adverse effects associated with industrial activities" is incredibly insulting to the people who live in Ohinewai whereby the submitter</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>basically says they don't care about the impact on the existing residents in the areas they have submitted for industrial development.</p> <p>The School: There is a school on the main road proposed for development - there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school - currently at a 70k /zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads, etc. What about the impact on the children, the parents and the staff who utilise this road - there are "adverse effects" which the submitter doesn't seem to care about. The Environment: The properties the submitted identified are below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living there. The concern is also for the impact on the environment - the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the Highway- there is a very real concern about run-off and impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the express way is dominated by thin topsoil over Tau po pumice. This</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community of Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done.</p> <p>As mentioned, industrial development west of SH 1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land.</p> <p>Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH - the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the Community.</p> <p>Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>			
1145.14	Ohinewai Area	Oppose	Same as FS1207.2 above	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	Committee(2018)					
1277.22	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	It is anticipated that the H2A project, including the Hamilton – Waikato Spatial Plan, the Huntly Spatial Plan, and the Pokeno Spatial Plan will inform decisions about the location, timing and form of future development. Decisions on the rezoning of land within the H2A corridor should be deferred until the relevant component of the corridor plan is complete to avoid undermining this important strategic planning process.	Accept in part	5	
1293.24	Department of Conservation	Oppose	The Director-General considers that this change in zoning would be inappropriate due to the property's proximity to and the potential flood hazard risk. We note that flood hazards have not yet been mapped by the Waikato District Council. These areas flow into Lake Waikare and into Whangamarino wetland which is a significant RAMSAR wetland site. The change in zoning which may cause an increase in industrial contaminants and other adverse effects for the catchment.	Accept in part	5	
1191.1	Shand Properties	Support	Shand Properties supports this submission insofar that the land use that would arise from it would support the development of Ohinewai and would make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure. However, Shand Properties are of the view that zoning of the specific properties as sought should be evaluated as part of a wider consideration of zoning and land use for Ohinewai as a whole including the	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Shand Properties land on Ohinewai North Road. Shand Properties notes that while supporting some industrial intensification at Ohinewai, the requested rezoning of the land on Ohinewai South Road from rural to industrial may be less appropriate due to its proximity to land zoned rural residential in the Proposed District Plan.			
1108.165	Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Oppose amendment in principle.	Accept in part	5	
1393.1	Michael and Susan Keleher	Support	We agree that the properties stated in the submission are more desirable for industrial use due to location, ease of access and current neighbouring activities which include an LPG cylinder filling facility, a bulk fertilizer spreading operation and a private airstrip.	Accept in part	5	
1391.1	Konini Farms Limited	Oppose	As a resident of Ohinewai South Rd I believe this is to be the wrong area for Industrial Zone.	Accept in part	5	
1390.1	Paul Tubic and Wayne Cooper	Oppose	Our property lies on the river side of Ohinewai South, slightly north of the subject properties on Ohinewai South Road, between the subject property and the Tahuna Road interchange. We chose to live in Ohinewai, on a small rural acreage because of the quiet rural lifestyle rezoning the land south of us to Industrial will allow for increased heavy traffic	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>and noise level past our property and all residences including the school, which lies between use and the access to the expressway.</p> <p>We attended a blueprint meeting late 2018 at which it was expressed by the community that we did not want Ohinewai to be an Industrial area but predominantly Rural, Country Living and Residential housing.</p>			
1392.1	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	<p>The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanization is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables more development than currently provided for must be planned to ensure that adverse effects (for example, on the transport network) including cumulative effects, are identified and addressed. The effects upon surrounding transport infrastructure from the rezoning have not been addressed.</p>	Accept in part	5	
1394.2	Iain and Lurissa Macdonald	Support	Support provided we are included in the re-zoning to light industrial.	Accept in part	5	
1395.1	Catherine Maher	Oppose	I live in Ohinewai South Road and the impact to me and my neighbours would be huge. We are living in a rural environment and to have industrial on this road is not	Accept in part	5	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>wanted and not desired. There is plenty of industrial zoning land all around Huntly- just that the submitter wants SHI visibility for advertising, as well as ease of access- with no regard to the people impacted by this. The comment that he doesn't want to impact the residents of Huntly, and by implication that the residents of Ohinewai are deserving the same regard.</p> <p>There is also a school on this road and it's dangerous enough with the existing truck traffic going past the school.</p> <p>The Blueprint feedback from the community was Rural Residential and everyone opposed Industrial. The land on Lumsden Road is already under review with Sleepyhead.</p>			
1396.5	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	<p>This submission seeks the rezoning of eleven properties in Ohinewai from Rural or Country Living to Industrial. The Ralph Estates have mineral in, or in close proximity, to these properties, which would effectively be sterilized if the properties were developed for industrial use.</p> <p>If the land is developed in accordance with the zonings sought, the practical effect is that the Ralph Estates would not be able to enter the land and mine the minerals beneath the surface. In addition, any rezoning of land that is adjacent to land in which the Ralph Estates have mineral interests would have the same effect, because of the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Granting the relief sought in this submission will not promote the sustainable management, or achieve the efficient use and development of, Ohinewai's natural and</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>physical resources (including the minerals lying underneath the surface land) pursuant to sections 5 and 7 of the RMA. It is not the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the changes to the provisions sought, in particular the assessment of the benefits and costs of the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions.</p>			
1398.10	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in Part	<p>Future Proof supports the submission in part because the proposal provides employment opportunities for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly, through the provision of industrial land. We also note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ration and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects the use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p>			
1399.7	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetlands and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept in part	5	
1045.20	Auckland/Waikato Fish	Oppose	Oppose the change in zoning due to the proximity to sensitive wetlands and outstanding natural features.	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	<i>and Game Council</i>					
<i>1400.1</i>	<i>Douglas Dobbs</i>	<i>Support</i>	For future growth of the industrial area close to motorways and main roads would be perfect. I feel that to be on the boundary of an Industrial zone would be unsuitable for Country Living.	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>5</i>	
<i>1313.12</i>	<i>Perry Group Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	The proposal will assist with meeting the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. The proposal will also provide for the social and economic needs of the Huntly community. and it is important that sufficient industrial land is provided to allow for future growth.	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>5</i>	
<i>1388.81</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>5</i>	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1206.3	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support in part	The submission by Ohinewai Land Ltd identifies a 'Proposed Growth Area' around and east of the Waikato Expressway interchange at Ohinewai. Factors such as industrial demand, developable density, natural hazards, transport connectivity and infrastructure servicing (amongst others) should be considered in determining the exact areas to be rezoned within the 'Proposed Growth Area.' This should be the subject of a structure planning exercise for the 'Proposed Growth Area' to provide an overarching approach to land use planning in and around Ohinewai.	Accept in part	5	
428.1	Ohinewai Land Limited (including addendum)		<b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan to include a growth area at Ohinewai in accordance with the plan attached to the submission.	Reject	5	No
1207.3	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	Oppose	This submitter clearly does not live in the Ohinewai area. If they did, they would realize that the business zone, is in fact an error, and the current land use is village living. Also they mention 'council services'. There are no council services at Ohinewai, no water, not waste water, no storm water systems for rainwater from roofs. There isn't even broadband internet available (must to frustration of current residents). Also they clearly do not understand soil types. The soil on the Western side of the express way is dominated by thin topsoil over Taupo pumice. This is	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			highly draining, and means stock are well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. The points made is regard to Submission 804, are also valid for this request. Therefore the OAC does not support this request.			
1145.16	Ohinewai Area Committee (2018)	Oppose	Same as FS1207.3 above.	Accept	5	
1277.27	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	It is anticipated that the H2A project, including the Hamilton – Waikato Spatial Plan, the Huntly Spatial Plan, and the Pokeno Spatial Plan, will inform decisions about the location, timing and form of future development. Decisions on the rezoning of land within the H2A corridor should be deferred until the relevant component of the corridor plan is complete to avoid undermining this important strategic planning process.	Accept	5	
1224.10	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	The submission requests inclusion of a growth area at Ohinewai that includes the property on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads that is the subject of the Ambury Properties rezoning submission.	Reject	5	

<b>Submission number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Support / oppose</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is</b>	<b>Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence</b>
1345.95	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	The relief the submitter is seeking is unclear. Genesis is not sure as to whether Ohinewai is being proposed for residential or industrial growth. The map attached to the submission includes the area owned by Genesis referred to as "Scott Farm" and includes the HPS ash ponds. Genesis is not supportive of land near the ash ponds being rezoned for any urban growth.	Accept	5	
1293.26	Department of Conservation	Oppose	The Director-General considers that this change in zoning would be inappropriate due to the property's proximity to and the potential flood hazard risk. We note that flood hazards have not yet been mapped by the Waikato District Council. These areas flow into Lake Waikare and into Whangamarino wetland which is a significant RAMSAR wetland site. The change in zoning which may cause an increase in industrial contaminants and other adverse effects for the catchment.	Accept	5	
1191.7	Shand Properties	Support	Shand Properties supports the identification of a growth area at Ohinewai. This will require a wider consideration of zoning and land use for Ohinewai as a whole, including the Shand Properties land on Ohinewai North Road	Reject	5	
1108.164	Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated	Oppose	Oppose amendment in principle	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	(Waikato-Tainui)					
1331.3	David and Tiffany Whyte	Oppose	This zoning requests is shown in Figure 3. As you can see it is a massive rezoning request. Enveloping a large area of land. It seems to be unsubstantiated by anything but speculation and conjecture written by someone who is clearly not familiar with Ohinewai. Given its lack of concrete information it is very difficult to provide concrete information to counter the argument. Thus we would say that given that Ohinewai is a combination of Village living, Rural-Residential and Rural, a change to a Growth Area zone seems to counter all that Ohinewai is about.	Accept	5	
1389.2	David and Tiffany Whyte	Oppose	This zoning request is shown in figure 3. As you can see it is a massive zoning request. Enveloping a large area of land. It seems to be unsubstantiated by anything but speculation and conjecture written by someone who is clearly not familiar with Ohinewai. Given its lack of concrete information it is very difficult to provide concrete information to counter the argument. Thus we would say that given that Ohinewai is a combination of Village living, Rural-residential and Rural, a change to a Growth Area zone seems to counter all that Ohinewai is about.	Accept	5	
1401.7	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	It is my understanding that this proposal has been modified from the whole of Ohinewai to the areas next to the Ambury submission. The argument against high growth area, is the same as that it outlined above for the high density living. Thus I am not	Accept in part	5	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>against development of the land, but against development in a high density housing style. Village living does seem appropriate development.</p> <p>I am unsure of high growth area implications for industrial development and would be reluctant to allow further industrial development than that in the Ambury Plan.</p>			
1392.2	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	<p>The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanization is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables more development than currently provided for must be planned to ensure that adverse effects (for example, on the transport network) including cumulative effects, are identified and addressed. The effects upon surrounding transport infrastructure from the rezoning have not been addressed.</p>	Accept	5	
1395.2	Catherine Maher	Neutral	<p>The proposed area has changed since the original submission and still covers a large area of good farmland. It would be a shame to turn this land into industrial. It would be a shame for Sleepyhead to build all these new houses when they could be in a worse place than they were in Auckland i.e. an industrial zone?</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Makes no sense to me to inflict this upon the people of Ohinewai, especially potential new people. Would help grow the idea of a slum estate having it sit within an industrial area. This isn't what the image was depicted to the community by Sleepyhead.</p> <p>Also, this growth goes against the feedback from community as part of the</p>			
1396.6	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	<p>This submission seeks the inclusion of a "growth area" at Ohinewai. This area is not suitable for urban growth because the Ralph Estates have an unfettered right to enter much of the surface land in Ohinewai to mine the minerals beneath the surface. Identification of a "growth area" is not suitable in those circumstances.</p> <p>Granting the relief sought in this submission will not promote the sustainable management, or achieve the efficient use and development of, Ohinewai's natural and physical resources (including the minerals lying underneath the surface land) pursuant to sections 5 and 7 of the RMA. It is not the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the changes to the provisions sought, in particular the assessment of the benefits and costs of the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions.</p>	Accept	5	
1398.7	Future Proof Implementat	Oppose in part	<p>Future Proof opposes the submission in part as it is unclear what the submitter is actually requesting. We also do not believe that adequate analysis has been undertaken as to</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	ion Committee		<p>how the proposal meets Future Proof Strategy principles or how it complies with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>We are of the view that insufficient information and evidence has been provided to allow the requests to proceed.</p> <p>In particular, we seek to better understand what land use activity and zonings are being requested. If it is industrial land then information and analysis should be provided on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once these matters are understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>If the request is for residential land, the Future Proof does not support this as we of the view that this is contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that residential development at Ohinewai has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.			
1399.8	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetlands and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept	5	
738.1	Shand Properties		<b>Amend</b> the zoning of approximately 61ha of land adjacent to Ohinewai North Road, as depicted in Appendix A of the submission, from Rural Zone to Country Living Zone.	Reject	6	No
1293.44	Department of Conservation	Oppose	The Director-General considers the rezoning of this land would be inappropriate to the potential flood hazard risk in this area. We note that a flood hazard assessment has not been completed in the district.	Accept	6	
1277.106	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	The supply and location of large lot residential and rural residential land must be considered strategically across the whole district. The district plan must give effect to Policy 6.17 and Implementation Method 6.1.5 under the WRPS. Given the location of this land adjacent to the Waikato River, rezoning should not be considered until updated hazards information is available.	Accept	6	
1224.11	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	The submission requests that that 61ha of the Shand properties site be rezoned from Rural to Country Living. This would provide support for the development of Ohinewai as a mixed-use village adjacent to the major transport infrastructure of the NIMTR and the Waikato	Reject	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Expressway interchange and supporting the larger township of Huntly. This request is broadly consistent with the Ambury Properties submission which seeks a mixture of Industrial, Residential and Business zoning on land to the east of the transport corridor at Ohinewai.			
1207.9	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	Support	<p>This re-zoning was that identified by the community at the Blue Print meeting. This aligns to the requirement of the community for larger developments of 5000 m2 as per Country Living. We also agree that the road, being ex SH 1, is of high enough quality to support the resulting extra traffic from rural-residential sections. Thus in principle OAC supports this submission. However it is not without our concerns. These are:</p> <p>Environment: As identified by the proposal, there is a concern about the impact to the environment, the Waikato River and the people already there. The current land levels are below that required by Council to allow for building. To build on this land would be requiring the land to be built up substantially to meet the required levels. This would have a direct impact onto the people around it during this process and it would need to be considered as part of the environment impact. And with the potential of flooding down the Waikato River, there is a lot more houses and people at risk of potential impact if this should ever occur.</p>	Reject	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Currently experienced at certain points along the Ohinewai North and South Roads right up to Rangiriri is flooding during the wet months, even with stop banks in place. So we would request that there is consultation and work done with the surrounding affected community to find out how this development could go ahead with the least amount of impact i.e. dirt, noise, hours of work, location of houses to existing houses, access points, etc.			
145.5	Ohinewai Area Committee (2018)	Support	Same as FS1207.9 above	Reject	6	
1349.4	Allen Fabrics Ltd.	Support	The area is partially in use now as lifestyle residential. Direct access to the Huntly's commercial area without having to use the expressway will give the town a much-needed boost.	Reject	6	
1108.154	Te Whakakitea o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Oppose amendment in principle	Accept	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1331.1	David and Tiffany Whyte	Support	<p>This zone request will have a big impact on our life, since our property at 38, directly borders the rural land, sought to be re-zoned. The impact for example will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Increased traffic on our dead end, low traffic road</li> <li>•Increased noise from building and subdivision</li> <li>•Increased noise from neighbours who will have stereo's, animals, kids, motorized equipment like lawnmowers, drones, motorbikes, etc.</li> <li>•More stress as likely to complain about how I don't mow my verge (I am growing soil biologically, which requires long grass)</li> <li>•etc</li> <li>•etc</li> </ul> <p>Thus to be frank, I don't want any development. Furthermore the son associated with the business is a difficult, unreasonable person to deal with, for example declining my request to pick up walnuts from under a farm tree that were going to waste.</p> <p>But, in saying that, you will be surprised to say that I am ethically forced to agree with this zone change. This is for a number of reasons:</p> <p>At the community blueprint meetings, a strong message from the community was that they wanted Ohinewai to be lifestyle blocks, and high quality housing. This zone change is inline with community wishes.</p>	Reject	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			I own a lifestyle block. This was carved out off another block. Thus by preventing others from carving up the land into lifestyle blocks, I would be behaving hypocritically. NZ has a lack of housing crisis. Basically there isn't enough houses. Therefore to prevent more wise development, I would be contributing to the crisis, since those buying a new build lifestyle block, are creating more homes, thus helping ease the supply problem. So again it would be unethical to not support this application.			
1389.3	David and Tiffany Whyte	Support	Same as FS1331.1 above	Reject	6	
1206.5	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support in part	The submission by Ohinewai Land Ltd identifies a 'Proposed Growth Area' around and east of the Waikato Expressway interchange at Ohinewai. Factors such as residential demand, developable density, natural hazards, transport connectivity and infrastructure servicing (amongst others) should be considered in determining the exact area to be rezoned within the 'Proposed Growth Area.' This should be the subject of a structure planning exercise for the 'Proposed Growth Area' to provide an overarching approach to land use planning in and around Ohinewai.	Accept in part	6	
1395.3	Catherine Maher	Support	This submission fits with the feedback of the community at the Blueprint meeting for Country Living at 5000sqm.	Reject	6	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Whilst it's a shame to see good farmland go, if it is developed then it is what the community said is suitable. There are concerns though over the land suitability with the drainage, soil type, etc.			
1387.823	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	6	
1398.8	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Oppose	Future Proof does not support the proposal for Country Living at Ohinewai. It is a Future Proof Strategy principle that development is encouraged to locate adjacent to existing urban settlements and nodes in both the Waikato and Waipa Districts and that rural-residential development occurs in a sustainable way to ensure it will not compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern or create demand for the provision of urban services. It is also a Strategy principle	Accept	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>to encourage development in established settlements to support existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy 6.17 of the RPS states that management of rural-residential development in the Future Proof area will recognise the particular pressure from and address the adverse effects of rural-residential development in parts of the sub-region, and particularly in areas within easy commuting distance of Hamilton.</p> <p>The proposed country living development is contrary to a number of the objectives, policies and methods in the RPS. In particular, it is outside of the urban limits in Map 6.2 (Section 6C) and it is inconsistent with Policy 6.17 on rural-residential development.</p> <p>The Proposed Waikato District Plan aims to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy at the local level. The PDP has attempted to avoid indiscriminate subdivision of rural land as well as ensuring that rural-residential development does not compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern (as contained in the RPS) or create demand for the provision of urban services. The proposal is contrary to the intent of the Proposed Waikato District Plan and will undermine it if accepted.</p>			
1139.139	Turangawae wae Trust Board	Oppose	Oppose amendment in principle.	Accept	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1397.1	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	<p>The Waikato District Council has committed to notifying Stage 2 of the PWDP, natural hazard provisions. A key element of that process will be to identify areas of significant flood risk and residual risk. At the time of lodging this further submission, the Stage 2 provisions have not been publicly notified. Shand Properties Limited's land appears to be in a residual risk area.</p> <p>Mercury seeks to ensure that strategic decisions relating to change in land uses and intensification are based on an accurate understanding of natural hazard risks, including flooding risk within residual risk areas protected by stop bank infrastructure. In the absence of appropriate natural hazard and flood risk provisions, it is Mercury's view that it is inappropriate to intensify land uses or locate sensitive uses in residual risk areas.</p>	Accept	6	
1202.122	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	<p>The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.</p>	Accept	6	
764.1	Ambury Properties Limited		<p><b>Amend</b> the zoning of the property at 231 Tahuna Road and 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai from Rural Zone to Industrial, Business and Residential Zone as shown</p>	Reject	5	Yes

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>on the plan attached to the submission (see Attachment I of the submission).</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> the Ohinewai Structure Plan attached to the original submission in a new 'Appendix 13' within the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission.</p>			
1224.13	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	<p>Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.</p>	Reject	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
FS1224.1	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	<p>This document forms an addendum to the further submission provided in support of Ambury Properties Limited (APL) original submission [No 764]. The original submission lodged by APL was broad in nature in that it sought industrial, business and residential zoning over its holdings located on Tahuna, Lumsden and Balemi Roads with the support of a Structure Plan embedded in the Waikato District Plan and further modification of the provisions to support these changes.</p> <p>Specifically, APL sought the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rezone the property from Rural to Industrial, Business and Residential as shown on the plan included as Attachment 1 to the submission.</li> <li>2) Amend Objective 4.1.2(a) and Policy 4.1.3(a) to support the infrastructure, development and use of the Property as sought in the submission.</li> <li>3) Include a new policy for Ohinewai to provide a policy framework for the subdivision, use and development of the industrial, business and residential areas of the properties.</li> <li>4) Amendments to other objectives and policies, or inclusion of new objectives and policies as necessary to provide for the subdivision, use and development of the property.</li> <li>5) To include an Ohinewai Structure Plan in Appendix 13 of the Proposed Plan.</li> </ol>	Reject	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>6) Any further relief as maybe necessary to support Ambury's relief.</p> <p>In the first-round notification of submissions, a further submission was lodged in support of the original submission to refine the Zoning Plan and Framework Plan. That further submission was dated 16 July 2019. This further submission is an addendum to, and does not replace, that further submission. As the submissions for Ohinewai have been notified a second time and the nature of the original submission is broad, the purpose of this further submission addendum is to provide more detail on how the provisions of the plan are sought to be modified to provide for the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>APL have been in discussion with Ohinewai Lands Ltd (OLL) who have sought rezoning of their land through Submission No 428. The land they are seeking to rezone for residential purposes adjoins APL land to the south, across Tahuna Rd. APL and OLL are cooperating in relation to investigations and assessments of their respective rezoning proposals. If the OLL rezoning is implemented there would be merit in adjusting the APL rezoning and the associated structure plan to reflect the urban development to the south of Tahuna Rd.</p> <p>There may be other necessary consequential amendments to building setbacks and access arrangements on Tahuna Rd if the OLL rezoning is approved.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			The following are the amendments to the text of the Proposed District Plan that are the detailed modifications to provide for the proposed rezoning. The amendments are shown as red strikethrough for deletions and red underline for additions.			
1206.6	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support in part	The submission by Ohinewai Land Ltd identifies a 'Proposed Growth Area' around and east of the Waikato Expressway interchange at Ohinewai. Factors such as residential demand, developable density, natural hazards, transport connectivity and infrastructure servicing (amongst others) should be considered in determining the exact area to be rezoned within the 'Proposed Growth Area.' This should be the subject of a structure planning exercise for the 'Proposed Growth Area' to provide an overarching approach to land use planning in and around Ohinewai.	Reject	5	
1202.123	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.	Accept	5	
1207.10	Ohinewai Area	Neutral	The Ohinewai community have been in consultation with Sleepyhead and their representative Gaze Consulting over the land zoning changes. The people directly affected by	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	Committee (2019)		<p>this are on Lumsden Road and their quality of life and enjoyment of their properties will be absolutely adversely affected by this proposal. Whilst it has benefits to the community and local towns i.e. Huntly, Rangiriri, Te Kauwhata, etc., the direct impact cannot be denied.</p> <p>There are concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise pollution</li> <li>- Light pollution</li> <li>- Air pollution</li> <li>- Dust whilst the subdivision is being undertaken</li> <li>- Visual deterioration of industrial/commercial/petrol station installation</li> <li>- Sound impacts</li> <li>- Reverberation of the traffic and rail crossing being installed.</li> <li>- Future increased traffic</li> <li>- etc</li> </ul> <p>None of the above can be mitigated for the people who live here. This is a quiet area, albeit with the traffic from the mill down the road, but this is acceptable to the occupants. They do not believe that any potential gains made for Sleepyhead and the wider community is worth it for their peace of mind and quality of life.</p> <p>There are concerns about the lack of "entertainment" and access to it for the families who will move here.</p> <p>There are concerns about the support network for the</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>families moving here - they are used to living in environment where they have their families nearby, their churches, their sport teams, their colleges, shops, doctors, police, ambulance, etc. - to move to such a quiet area without that infrastructure at all is a huge ask and we wonder about the future impacts to Ohinewai this will bring.</p> <p>Sleepyhead have said that they want to create a "work/live estate" environment as is in Europe. This has proven not to work in many many countries where, if the industry falls away- what is left in its vacuum? There are no-go areas in the UK where this has happened. There are no guarantees in Sleepyhead's future as much as they believe they will survive. Companies fail all the time and whilst Sleepyheads track record is good, though they too have gone through tough times, there are no guarantees. Do people in NZ all want to live and work together? It's a laudable thought but so many of us wouldn't- we want space after work to have freedom away from the work environment. How many people will be attracted to the live/work scenario that is proposed here - very different to the current "slice of pavlova" kiwi way of thinking. While it is noble that Sleepyhead want to provide affordable housing for their employees, one must be realistic about where people would spend their money. For example would a first home purchaser prefer to spend ~\$s00k for a modern small two bedroom home (based</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>upon what is currently on offer at Lakeside Development at Te Kauwhata) or would they prefer to spend ~\$250k for a older larger home and much larger section in Huntly? Or would an established family prefer to buy a small modern home in high density housing, or a lifestyle block for similar price? So there is significant risk that employees would choose to live elsewhere in the district, enjoying the kiwi way of life, instead of purchasing HOH. This would result in very negative outcomes for Ohinewai as the HOH area becomes a market and social failure.</p> <p>We do not support High Density Housing - this flies directly in the face of the people's feedback of Country Living. Whilst everyone is pragmatic about the need for residential housing for Sleepyhead, the HOH in a rural setting is very out of place and we wonder if this would work.</p> <p>Conversely, there are positive outcomes for other parts of the community being the school, employment opportunities, potential land price rises.</p> <p>There is a long road ahead for this submission and the outcomes are not yet known. This is why we do not support nor oppose this submission at this point in time.</p>			
1145.22	Ohinewai Area	Neutral	Same as FS1207.10 above	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	<i>Committee (2018)</i>					
1277.51	<i>Waikato Regional Council</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	It is anticipated that the H2A project, including the Hamilton – Waikato Spatial Plan, the Huntly Spatial Plan, and the Pokeno Spatial Plan, will inform decisions about the location, timing and form of future development. Decisions on the rezoning of land within the H2A corridor should be deferred until the relevant component of the corridor plan is complete to avoid undermining this important strategic planning process.	<i>Accept</i>	5	
1191.2	<i>Shand Properties</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	Shand Properties supports this submission insofar that the land use that would arise from it would support the development of Ohinewai and would make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure. However, the proposed structure plan relates only to the specified site. Shand Properties are of the view that the zoning sought should be evaluated as part of a wider consideration of zoning and land use for Ohinewai as a whole including land to the west of the Waikato expressway such as the Shand Properties land on Ohinewai North Road. Such wider consideration would for example allow the appropriateness of the requested residential zoning at the subject site to be considered in a wider Ohinewai context including servicing requirements.	<i>Reject</i>	5	
1387.1124	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use	<i>Accept</i>	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.			
1108.127	Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Inappropriate.	Accept	5	
1394.1	Iain and Luressa Macdonald	Support	Support provided we are included in the re-zoning to light industrial.	Reject	5	
1391.2	Konini Farms Ltd	Support	Good development area for Ohinewai.	Reject	5	
1396.1	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	This submission point seeks the rezoning of 231 Tahuna Road and 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial, Business and Residential Zone. Ambury	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>intends to relocate and consolidate the New Zealand Comfort Group Limited (NZCG)'s Auckland operations onto the site.</p> <p>The Ralph Estates oppose this submission point because it has mineral interest in, or in close proximity, to these properties that would effectively be sterilized if the properties were rezoned to provide for urban uses. If the land is developed, whether it is in the manner proposed by Ambury or in any other manner consistent with the urban zonings sought, the practical effect is that the Ralph Estates would not be able to enter the land and mine the mineral beneath the surface. In addition, any rezoning of land that is adjacent to land in which the Ralph Estates have mineral interests would have the same effect, because of the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Granting the relief sought in this submission will not promote the sustainable management, or achieve the efficient use and development of, Ohinewai's natural and physical resources (including the minerals lying underneath the surface land) pursuant to sections 5 and 7 of the RMA. It is not the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the changes to the provisions sought, in particular the assessment of the benefits and costs of the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1405.1	Suzanne Stow	Oppose	The loss of our rural outlook. The traffic volumes. The noise factor. What will happen to rates, water services and valuation.	Accept	5	
1401.1	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	<p>Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal. The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b> This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction tracks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school.</p> <p>This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say,</p>	Reject	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p> <p><b>Density of housing</b></p> <p>It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.</p> <p>Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?</p> <p>Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>summer months. They also have the space for gardens, hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks. So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p> <p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.</p>			
1402.1	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	<p>Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook.</p> <p>Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.</p>	Accept	5	
1403.1	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	<p>Noise- traffic-Further info required</p> <p>Operational Noise-Further info required</p> <p>Rural Aspect-Further info required</p> <p>Amenities-Further info required</p>	Accept	5	
1406.1	Daniel and Rebekah Holmes	Oppose	<p>We require more information, regarding traffic, amenities and the effect of our rural lifestyle.</p>	Accept	5	
1399.1	Auckland/Waikato Fish	Oppose	<p>Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	<i>and Game Council</i>					
1045.19	<i>Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	Oppose due to the proximity to sensitive wetlands and Outstanding Natural Feature	<i>Accept in part</i>	5	
1398.1	<i>Future Proof Implementation Committee</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<p>Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and</p>	<i>Accept in part</i>	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
764.2	Ambury Properties Limited		<p><b>Amend</b> Objective 4.1.2 Urban growth and development as follows:  <i>(a) Future settlement pattern is consolidated in and around existing and planned towns and villages in the district.</i>  AND  <b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission.</p>	Reject	5	Yes
1206.7	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support	The future settlement patterns of the District should be consistent with the outcomes of the Auckland-Hamilton Corridor Plan, Future Proof Strategy Phase 2 review and relevant structure plans including existing and planned urban areas.	Reject	5	
1387.1125	Mercury NZ	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1224.14	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.	Reject	5	
1207.11	Ohinewai Area Committee	Neutral	The Ohinewai community have been in consultation with Sleepyhead and their representative Gaze Consulting over the land zoning changes. The people directly affected by this are on Lumsden Road and their quality of life and enjoyment of their properties will be absolutely adversely affected by this proposal. Whilst it has benefits to the community and local towns i.e. Huntly, Rangiriri, Te Kauwhata, etc., the direct impact cannot be denied. There are concerns about: - Noise pollution	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Light pollution</li> <li>- Air pollution</li> <li>- Dust whilst the subdivision is being undertaken</li> <li>- Visual deterioration of industrial/commercial/petrol station installation</li> <li>- Sound impacts</li> <li>- Reverberation of the traffic and rail crossing being installed.</li> <li>- Future increased traffic</li> <li>- etc</li> </ul> <p>None of the above can be mitigated for the people who live here. This is a quiet area, albeit with the traffic from the mill down the road, but this is acceptable to the occupants. They do not believe that any potential gains made for Sleepyhead and the wider community is worth it for their peace of mind and quality of life.</p> <p>There are concerns about the lack of "entertainment" and access to it for the families who will move here.</p> <p>There are concerns about the support network for the families moving here - they are used to living in environment where they have their families nearby, their churches, their sport teams, their colleges, shops, doctors, police, ambulance, etc. - to move to such a quiet area without that infrastructure at all is a huge ask and we wonder about the future impacts to Ohinewai this will bring.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Sleepyhead have said that they want to create a "work/live estate" environment as is in Europe. This has proven not to work in many many countries where, if the industry falls away- what is left in its vacuum? There are no-go areas in the UK where this has happened. There are no guarantees in Sleepyhead's future as much as they believe they will survive. Companies fail all the time and whilst Sleepyheads track record is good, though they too have gone through tough times, there are no guarantees. Do people in NZ all want to live and work together? It's a laudable thought but so many of us wouldn't- we want space after work to have freedom away from the work environment. How many people will be attracted to the live/work scenario that is proposed here - very different to the current "slice of pavlova" kiwi way of thinking. While it is noble that Sleepyhead want to provide affordable housing for their employees, one must be realistic about where people would spend their money. For example would a first home purchaser prefer to spend ~\$s00k for a modern small two bedroom home (based upon what is currently on offer at Lakeside Development at Te Kauwhata) or would they prefer to spend ~\$250k for a older larger home and much larger section in Huntly? Or would an established family prefer to buy a small modern home in high density housing, or a lifestyle block for similar price? So there is significant risk that employees</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>would choose to live elsewhere in the district, enjoying the kiwi way of life, instead of purchasing HOH. This would result in very negative outcomes for Ohinewai as the HOH area becomes a market and social failure.</p> <p>We do not support High Density Housing - this flies directly in the face of the people's feedback of Country Living. Whilst everyone is pragmatic about the need for residential housing for Sleepyhead, the HOH in a rural setting is very out of place and we wonder if this would work.</p> <p>Conversely, there are positive outcomes for other parts of the community being the school, employment opportunities, potential land price rises.</p> <p>There is a long road ahead for this submission and the outcomes are not yet known. This is why we do not support nor oppose this submission at this point in time.</p>			
1191.3	Shand Properties	Support	Shand Properties supports this submission as it provides clear policy support for development of localities such as Ohinewai, which are dependent on the planned provision of services in order for more intensive future settlement and development to occur.	Reject	5	
1401.2	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal.	Accept in part	5	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p> <p>This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction tracks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school.</p> <p>This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say, given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p><b>Density of housing</b>  It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.  Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?  Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer summer months. They also have the space for gardens, hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks.  So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.			
1402.2	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook. Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.	Accept	5	
1403.2	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	Noise- traffic-Further info required Operational Noise-Further info required Rural Aspect-Further info required Amenities-Further info required	Accept	5	
1399.2	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept	5	
1398.2	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in part	Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.</p>			
764.3	<b>Ambury Properties Limited</b>		<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 4.1.3(a) Location of development as follows:</p> <p><i>(a) Subdivision and development of a residential, commercial and industrial nature is to occur within <u>existing and planned</u> towns and villages where infrastructure and services can be efficiently and economically provided for.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission.</p>	Reject	5	Yes
1224.15	<i>Ambury Properties Limited</i>	Support	<p>Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient</p>	Reject	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.</p>			
1207.12	Ohinewai Area Committee	Neutral	<p>The Ohinewai community have been in consultation with Sleepyhead and their representative Gaze Consulting over the land zoning changes. The people directly affected by this are on Lumsden Road and their quality of life and enjoyment of their properties will be absolutely adversely affected by this proposal. Whilst it has benefits to the community and local towns i.e. Huntly, Rangiriri, Te Kauwhata, etc., the direct impact cannot be denied. There are concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise pollution</li> <li>- Light pollution</li> <li>- Air pollution</li> <li>- Dust whilst the subdivision is being undertaken</li> <li>- Visual deterioration of industrial/commercial/petrol station installation</li> <li>- Sound impacts</li> <li>- Reverberation of the traffic and rail crossing being installed.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>- Future increased traffic - etc</p> <p>None of the above can be mitigated for the people who live here. This is a quiet area, albeit with the traffic from the mill down the road, but this is acceptable to the occupants. They do not believe that any potential gains made for Sleepyhead and the wider community is worth it for their peace of mind and quality of life.</p> <p>There are concerns about the lack of "entertainment" and access to it for the families who will move here.</p> <p>There are concerns about the support network for the families moving here - they are used to living in environment where they have their families nearby, their churches, their sport teams, their colleges, shops, doctors, police, ambulance, etc. - to move to such a quiet area without that infrastructure at all is a huge ask and we wonder about the future impacts to Ohinewai this will bring.</p> <p>Sleepyhead have said that they want to create a "work/live estate" environment as is in Europe. This has proven not to work in many many countries where, if the industry falls away- what is left in its vacuum? There are no-go areas in the UK where this has happened. There are no guarantees in Sleepyhead's future as much as they believe they will survive. Companies fail all the time and whilst Sleepyheads track record is good, though they too</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>have gone through tough times, there are no guarantees. Do people in NZ all want to live and work together? It's a laudable thought but so many of us wouldn't- we want space after work to have freedom away from the work environment. How many people will be attracted to the live/work scenario that is proposed here - very different to the current "slice of pavlova" kiwi way of thinking. While it is noble that Sleepyhead want to provide affordable housing for their employees, one must be realistic about where people would spend their money. For example would a first home purchaser prefer to spend ~\$s00k for a modern small two bedroom home (based upon what is currently on offer at Lakeside Development at Te Kauwhata) or would they prefer to spend ~\$250k for a older larger home and much larger section in Huntly? Or would an established family prefer to buy a small modern home in high density housing, or a lifestyle block for similar price? So there is significant risk that employees would choose to live elsewhere in the district, enjoying the kiwi way of life, instead of purchasing HOH. This would result in very negative outcomes for Ohinewai as the HOH area becomes a market and social failure. We do not support High Density Housing - this flies directly in the face of the people's feedback of Country Living. Whilst everyone is pragmatic about the need for</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>residential housing for Sleepyhead, the HOH in a rural setting is very out of place and we wonder if this would work.</p> <p>Conversely, there are positive outcomes for other parts of the community being the school, employment opportunities, potential land price rises.</p> <p>There is a long road ahead for this submission and the outcomes are not yet known. This is why we do not support nor oppose this submission at this point in time.</p>			
1191.4	Shand Properties	Support	Shand Properties supports this submission as it provides clear policy support for development of localities such as Ohinewai, which are dependent on the planned provision of services in order for more intensive future settlement and development to occur.	Reject	5	
1206.8	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support	The future settlement patterns of the District should be consistent with the outcomes of the Auckland-Hamilton Corridor Plan, Future Proof Strategy Phase 2 review and relevant structure plans including existing and planned urban areas.	Reject	5	
1387.1126	Mercury NZ	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.			
1401.3	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	<p>Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal. The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p> <p>This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction tracks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school. This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say, given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p> <p><b>Density of housing</b></p> <p>It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.</p> <p>Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?</p> <p>Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer summer months. They also have the space for gardens, hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks.</p> <p>So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p> <p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.</p>			
1402.3	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	<p>Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook.</p> <p>Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.</p>	Accept	5	
1403.3	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	<p>Noise- traffic-Further info required</p> <p>Operational Noise-Further info required</p> <p>Rural Aspect-Further info required</p> <p>Amenities-Further info required</p>	Accept	5	
1399.3	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	<p>Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.</p>	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1398.3	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in part	<p>Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> </ul>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.</p>			
<b>764.4</b>	<b>Ambury Properties Limited</b>		<p><b>Add</b> a new policy for Ohinewai to provide a policy framework for the subdivision, use and development of the Industrial, Business and Residential zoned land at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai, as sought in the submission.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Policy 4.1.13 Huntly to provide a policy framework for the subdivision, use and development of the Industrial, Business and Residential zoned land at 231</p>	<i>Reject</i>	5	Yes



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai, as sought in the submission. AND <b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission			
1224.16	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.	Reject	5	
1207.13	Ohinewai Area Committee	Neutral	The Ohinewai community have been in consultation with Sleepyhead and their representative Gaze Consulting over the land zoning changes. The people directly affected by this are on Lumsden Road and their quality of life and enjoyment of their properties will be absolutely adversely	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>affected by this proposal. Whilst it has benefits to the community and local towns i.e. Huntly, Rangiriri, Te Kauwhata, etc., the direct impact cannot be denied. There are concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise pollution</li> <li>- Light pollution</li> <li>- Air pollution</li> <li>- Dust whilst the subdivision is being undertaken</li> <li>- Visual deterioration of industrial/commercial/petrol station installation</li> <li>- Sound impacts</li> <li>- Reverberation of the traffic and rail crossing being installed.</li> <li>- Future increased traffic</li> <li>- etc</li> </ul> <p>None of the above can be mitigated for the people who live here. This is a quiet area, albeit with the traffic from the mill down the road, but this is acceptable to the occupants. They do not believe that any potential gains made for Sleepyhead and the wider community is worth it for their peace of mind and quality of life. There are concerns about the lack of "entertainment" and access to it for the families who will move here. There are concerns about the support network for the families moving here - they are used to living in environment where they have their families nearby, their</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>churches, their sport teams, their colleges, shops, doctors, police, ambulance, etc. - to move to such a quiet area without that infrastructure at all is a huge ask and we wonder about the future impacts to Ohinewai this will bring.</p> <p>Sleepyhead have said that they want to create a "work/live estate" environment as is in Europe. This has proven not to work in many many countries where, if the industry falls away- what is left in its vacuum? There are no-go areas in the UK where this has happened. There are no guarantees in Sleepyhead's future as much as they believe they will survive. Companies fail all the time and whilst Sleepyheads track record is good, though they too have gone through tough times, there are no guarantees. Do people in NZ all want to live and work together? It's a laudable thought but so many of us wouldn't- we want space after work to have freedom away from the work environment. How many people will be attracted to the live/work scenario that is proposed here - very different to the current "slice of pavlova" kiwi way of thinking. While it is noble that Sleepyhead want to provide affordable housing for their employees, one must be realistic about where people would spend their money. For example would a first home purchaser prefer to spend ~\$s00k for a modern small two bedroom home (based upon what is currently on offer at Lakeside Development</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>at Te Kauwhata) or would they prefer to spend ~\$250k for a older larger home and much larger section in Huntly? Or would an established family prefer to buy a small modern home in high density housing, or a lifestyle block for similar price? So there is significant risk that employees would choose to live elsewhere in the district, enjoying the kiwi way of life, instead of purchasing HOH. This would result in very negative outcomes for Ohinewai as the HOH area becomes a market and social failure.</p> <p>We do not support High Density Housing - this flies directly in the face of the people's feedback of Country Living. Whilst everyone is pragmatic about the need for residential housing for Sleepyhead, the HOH in a rural setting is very out of place and we wonder if this would work.</p> <p>Conversely, there are positive outcomes for other parts of the community being the school, employment opportunities, potential land price rises.</p> <p>There is a long road ahead for this submission and the outcomes are not yet known. This is why we do not support nor oppose this submission at this point in time.</p>			
1191.5	Shand Properties	Support in part	Shand Properties supports the provision of a new policy for Ohinewai, but this should not be site-specific and should take into account the whole of Ohinewai, including Shand Properties' land	Accept in part	5	

<b>Submission number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Support / oppose</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is</b>	<b>Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence</b>
1108.128	Waikato Tainui	Oppose	Inappropriate amendment	Accept	5	
1202.46	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. This area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Whilst the Transport Agency is open to reviewing the sub-regional settlement pattern, this is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.	Accept	5	
1387.1127	Mercury NZ	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5	
1396.2	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	This submission point seeks the inclusion of a new policy for Ohinewai to provide a policy framework for the	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>subdivision, use and development of the Industrial, Business and Residential zoned land at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai, as sought in the submission. Ambury intends to relocate and consolidate the New Zealand Comfort Group Limited (NZCG)'s Auckland operations onto the site.</p> <p>The Ralph Estates oppose this submission point because it has mineral interests in, or in close proximity to, these properties that would effectively be sterilized if the properties were developed in the manner sought in the submission.</p> <p>If the land is developed, either as proposed by Ambury or in any other manner consistent with the urban zonings sought, the practical effect is that the Ralph Estates would not be able to enter the land and mine the minerals beneath the surface. In addition, any rezoning of land that is adjacent to land in which the Ralph Estates have mineral interests would have the same effect, because of the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>			
1401.4	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	<p>Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal. The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction trucks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school.</p> <p>This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say, given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p> <p><b>Density of housing</b></p> <p>It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.</p> <p>Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?</p> <p>Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer summer months. They also have the space for gardens, hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks.</p> <p>So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p> <p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1402.4	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook. Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.	Accept	5	
1403.4	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	Noise- traffic-Further info required Operational Noise-Further info required Rural Aspect-Further info required Amenities-Further info required	Accept	5	
1399.4	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept	5	
1398.4	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in part	Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.			
764.5	Ambury Properties Limited		<p><b>Amend</b> objectives and policies to enable the subdivision, use and development of the property at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai as sought within the submission.</p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Add</b> objectives and policies to enable the subdivision, use and development of the property at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai as sought within the submission.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission.</p>	Reject	5	Yes
1224.17	Ambury Properties Limited	Support	Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient	Reject	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.			
1387.1128	Mercury NZ	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5	
1207.14	Ohinewai Area Committee	Neutral	The Ohinewai community have been in consultation with Sleepyhead and their representative Gaze Consulting over the land zoning changes. The people directly affected by this are on Lumsden Road and their quality of life and	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>enjoyment of their properties will be absolutely adversely affected by this proposal. Whilst it has benefits to the community and local towns i.e. Huntly, Rangiriri, Te Kauwhata, etc., the direct impact cannot be denied. There are concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise pollution</li> <li>- Light pollution</li> <li>- Air pollution</li> <li>- Dust whilst the subdivision is being undertaken</li> <li>- Visual deterioration of industrial/commercial/petrol station installation</li> <li>- Sound impacts</li> <li>- Reverberation of the traffic and rail crossing being installed.</li> <li>- Future increased traffic</li> <li>- etc</li> </ul> <p>None of the above can be mitigated for the people who live here. This is a quiet area, albeit with the traffic from the mill down the road, but this is acceptable to the occupants. They do not believe that any potential gains made for Sleepyhead and the wider community is worth it for their peace of mind and quality of life. There are concerns about the lack of "entertainment" and access to it for the families who will move here. There are concerns about the support network for the families moving here - they are used to living in</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>environment where they have their families nearby, their churches, their sport teams, their colleges, shops, doctors, police, ambulance, etc. - to move to such a quiet area without that infrastructure at all is a huge ask and we wonder about the future impacts to Ohinewai this will bring.</p> <p>Sleepyhead have said that they want to create a "work/live estate" environment as is in Europe. This has proven not to work in many many countries where, if the industry falls away- what is left in its vacuum? There are no-go areas in the UK where this has happened. There are no guarantees in Sleepyhead's future as much as they believe they will survive. Companies fail all the time and whilst Sleepyheads track record is good, though they too have gone through tough times, there are no guarantees. Do people in NZ all want to live and work together? It's a laudable thought but so many of us wouldn't- we want space after work to have freedom away from the work environment. How many people will be attracted to the live/work scenario that is proposed here - very different to the current "slice of pavlova" kiwi way of thinking. While it is noble that Sleepyhead want to provide affordable housing for their employees, one must be realistic about where people would spend their money. For example would a first home purchaser prefer to spend ~\$s00k for a modern small two bedroom home (based upon what is currently on offer at Lakeside Development</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>at Te Kauwhata) or would they prefer to spend ~\$250k for a older larger home and much larger section in Huntly? Or would an established family prefer to buy a small modern home in high density housing, or a lifestyle block for similar price? So there is significant risk that employees would choose to live elsewhere in the district, enjoying the kiwi way of life, instead of purchasing HOH. This would result in very negative outcomes for Ohinewai as the HOH area becomes a market and social failure.</p> <p>We do not support High Density Housing - this flies directly in the face of the people's feedback of Country Living. Whilst everyone is pragmatic about the need for residential housing for Sleepyhead, the HOH in a rural setting is very out of place and we wonder if this would work.</p> <p>Conversely, there are positive outcomes for other parts of the community being the school, employment opportunities, potential land price rises.</p> <p>There is a long road ahead for this submission and the outcomes are not yet known. This is why we do not support nor oppose this submission at this point in time.</p>			
1191.6	Shand Properties	Support in part	Shand Properties supports the provision of a new policy for Ohinewai, but this should not be site-specific and should take into account the whole of Ohinewai, including Shand Properties' land	Accept in part	5	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1396.3	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	<p>This submission point seeks the inclusion of a new policy for Ohinewai to provide a policy framework for the subdivision, use and development of the Industrial, Business and Residential zoned land at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai, as sought in the submission. Ambury intends to relocate and consolidate the New Zealand Comfort Group Limited (NZCG)'s Auckland operations onto the site.</p> <p>The Ralph Estates oppose this submission point because it has mineral interests in, or in close proximity to, these properties that would effectively be sterilized if the properties were developed in the manner sought in the submission.</p> <p>If the land is developed, either as proposed by Ambury or in any other manner consistent with the urban zonings sought, the practical effect is that the Ralph Estates would not be able to enter the land and mine the minerals beneath the surface. In addition, any rezoning of land that is adjacent to land in which the Ralph Estates have mineral interests would have the same effect, because of the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept	5	
1401.5	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	<p>Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal.</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p> <p>This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction tracks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school.</p> <p>This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say, given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p><b>Density of housing</b>  It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.  Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?  Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer summer months. They also have the space for gardens, hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks.  So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township.</p> <p>The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.			
1402.5	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook. Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.	Accept	5	
1403.5	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	Noise- traffic-Further info required Operational Noise-Further info required Rural Aspect-Further info required Amenities-Further info required	Accept	5	
1399.5	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept	5	
1398.5	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in part	Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul> <p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.</p>			
764.6	<b>Ambury Properties Limited</b>		<p><b>Add</b> an Ohinewai Structure Plan such as Attachment 2 within the submission as a new Appendix 13 in Chapter 29 Appendices.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the Proposed District Plan as necessary to support the relief set out in the submission.</p>	<i>Reject</i>	5	Yes
1224.18	<i>Ambury Properties Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<p>Since APL's primary submission was lodged, further site investigations and master planning of its land at Ohinewai has been undertaken. This has led to amendments to the masterplan that underpins the rezoning request. The layout remains essentially the same, but the area of proposed Industrial zoning has been reduced from 89ha to 71ha. The Business zoning area has remained the same but has been reconfigured to create a more useable and efficient rectangular shape on the corner of Lumsden and Tahuna Roads. The Residential zoned has increased from 51ha to 96ha but a large part of the land at the eastern end of the site has been found to be not developable so the</p>	<i>Reject</i>	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			residential yield will remain limited to approximately 1000 houses. Attached to this further submission is an updated Zoning Plan and Framework Plan that replaces the Zoning and Framework plans lodged with the original submission, together with a Masterplan Summary document.			
1108.129	Waikato-Tainui	Oppose	Inappropriate amendment	Accept	5	
1396.4	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	<p>This submission point seeks the inclusion of a new policy for Ohinewai to provide a policy framework for the subdivision, use and development of the Industrial, Business and Residential zoned land at 231 Tahuna Road, 52, 56 and 58 Lumsden Road, Ohinewai, as sought in the submission. Ambury intends to relocate and consolidate the New Zealand Comfort Group Limited (NZCG)'s Auckland operations onto the site.</p> <p>The Ralph Estates oppose this submission point because it has mineral interests in, or in close proximity to, these properties that would effectively be sterilized if the properties were developed in the manner sought in the submission.</p> <p>If the land is developed, either as proposed by Ambury or in any other manner consistent with the urban zonings sought, the practical effect is that the Ralph Estates would not be able to enter the land and mine the minerals beneath the surface. In addition, any rezoning of land that is adjacent to land in which the Ralph Estates have mineral interests would</p>	Accept	5	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			have the same effect, because of the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.			
1401.6	David and Tiffany Whyte	Not stated	<p>Impressed in the way this proposed development, and the parallel construction of the foam plant has been occurring. WDC and Ambury appear to be minimizing disturbance to residents, and appear to be minimizing environmental impact. Thus I am cautiously optimistic about this proposal. The two issues that I would like to bring up are the existing railway bridge and density of housing.</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p> <p>This bridge is extremely narrow. Already there is significant truck traffic over this bridge associated with the 'rat run' of Tahuna road, the trucks servicing the farming community East of Ohinewai and trucking associated with the industry on Lumsden Road. Obviously if the proposed development goes ahead, then truck traffic will increase starting with construction tracks.</p> <p>This bridge was designed for small country roads with little traffic. Thus it is thin, and has no space for cyclists and to contemplate pedestrian access is just madness. It is used by cyclists, and in recent times by children biking to school.</p> <p>This bridge will also take more time than normal for upgrading because one side is NZTA responsibility being the Waikato Expressway on/off ramps. KiwiRail who are meritoriously difficult to work with, will want their say, given it goes over a railway. As well as WDC who will be</p>	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>the lead on the project. This will all result in a long lead time, and likely a long build time.</p> <p>Hence I would request that consideration is given to having the bridge rebuild/modified at the start of the project so it is completed in a timely manner. I note that Ambury has already considered widening/replacing the bridge, so doing this at the start of the project is within the realms of possibility.</p> <p><b>Density of housing</b></p> <p>It concerns me that the housing density is significantly higher than anything else comparable nearby, and the high density development of Lakeside in Te Kauwhata is not selling quickly.</p> <p>Using some 'back of envelope' figures, I would suggest the following. Homes start at Lakeside at \$500k for a two bedroom home, on an extremely small section and go up from here. What other alternative are available in the surrounding area?</p> <p>Family homes. From observation Polynesians highly value whanau. Thus we would expect this to influence their purchasing decisions. For \$250k you can purchase a traditional home in the less expensive parts of Huntly. These homes are ideal for whanau to come over to stay the weekend, with large rooms for mattresses to be placed on the floor. They also have space to put up a tent and have whanau over to stay during Christmas or warmer summer months. They also have the space for gardens,</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>hobbies or activities that they may enjoy. Loud music (assuming at sociable times) is also socially acceptable and due to more spread out living, impacts less folks. So there seems little incentive to spend twice the money on a house that doesn't facilitate whanau interactions. Thus I cannot see the high density housing being successful for these folks.</p> <p>If we look at the top end of the market \$500k will get you a lifestyle block. It might be a lifestyle block at the lower end of lifestyle blocks, but a nice beginner's lifestyle block. Now the kiwi dream is for land, so folks would like to experience this, over a purchasing a small home on a confined section.</p> <p>Given the commute times will be ridiculously low compared to Auckland, folks are likely to not see commuting from a lifestyle block within 15-30 minutes away as being an issue. Thus this opens up a lot of property that is potentially the family home.</p> <p>And if folks don't want a lifestyle block, there are plenty of nice homes in nice streets in the surrounding towns that sell for approximately \$500k.</p> <p>So to conclude, as much as the 'village life' concept seems wonderful on paper, I don't think that it will be attractive to employees or other potential purchaser given the alternative options in the area. Thus I cannot see the village life being a successful approach to housing at Ohinewai. If this is unsuccessful then it is highly likely it will turn into</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			ghetto/slum-like suburb, like what exists in areas of Huntly Township. The solution to this problem is to me not clear, as I don't fully understand the tools available to planners. However I might suggest village living zone is more appropriate than high density. Village living appears to be a success in the small pockets that exist in Ohinewai. It seems to have produced nice homes, on reasonable sized sections, that have maintained their value. Thus indicating that this zone could be rolled out in larger volumes.			
1402.6	Richard and Shanette Marsh	Oppose	Moved to present address for the peace and quiet of the Rural outlook. Concern about noise, traffic flow, sewage and water, whether our rates will rise to Industrial/Commercial.	Accept	5	
1403.6	Bruce Holmes	Oppose	Noise- traffic-Further info required Operational Noise-Further info required Rural Aspect-Further info required Amenities-Further info required	Accept	5	
1399.6	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Proximity to sensitive wetland and Outstanding Natural Feature, and potential effects on flood storage capacity and capacity requirements in surrounding areas.	Accept	5	
1398.6	Future Proof Implementation Committee	Support in part	Future Proof supports the submission in part because the industrial land component of the proposal provides employment opportunities and skills training for the	Accept in part	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Waikato District and in particular Huntly. We also note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortfall of serviced and developable employment land in the Waikato District.</li> <li>• The strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective.</li> <li>• The Waikato District has a very low job-resident ratio and high need for employment opportunities for those residing in Huntly and Te Kauwhata.</li> <li>• It is understood that industrial development at Ohinewai could help provide the catalyst and funding for an improved 3-waters infrastructure network to enable growth and development in the area.</li> </ul> <p>While we are generally supportive of industrial/employment land at this location in principle, we think that further evidence needs to be provided and analysis undertaken to be able to properly assess the proposal. In particular, we seek to better understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy</li> <li>• RPS analysis</li> <li>• Impact on other strategic industrial nodes</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity and costs</li> <li>• Impact on the transport network</li> <li>• Impact on Huntly</li> <li>• The nature of the economic benefits (for example how many new jobs are being created)</li> <li>• Impact on the environment</li> </ul>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Once we have this information we will then revise our position.</p> <p>When the matters outlined above are better understood, then informed decisions can be made in terms of integrated management and how the proposal effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources, as well as Part 2 matters, as contemplated by the RMA 1991.</p> <p>We do not support the residential component of the proposal as we are of the view that this contrary to Future Proof Strategy principles and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS). We are very concerned that this has the potential to undermine the growth and regeneration of Huntly.</p>			
1206.9	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support in part	Support in part. Seek that the part of the submission point that seeks an Ohinewai Structure Plan be allowed but that the extent of the structure plan be increased to the entire Proposed Growth Area rather than the submitter's property alone.	Accept in part	5	
1202.95	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement patter for the Future Proof sub region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.	Accept	5	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1387.1129	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5	
793.1	Ohinewai Area Committee		<b>Amend</b> the zoning of the properties 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 Ohinewai North Road, Ohinewai from Business Zone to Residential Zone.	Accept	7	No
1395.11	Catherine Maher	Support	Support- no sense being business now. Needs to be changed to Country Residential to fit the rest of the area	Accept	7	
1391.3	Konini Farms Ltd	Support	Residents are not correctly zoned.	Accept	7	
1191.12	Shand Properties	Neutral	The Business zoning of the sites in question is a continuation of the zoning applied to the sites in the Operative Waikato District Plan. The zoning should be	Accept	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			changed as part of a wider consideration of zoning and land use can be undertaken Ohinewai as a whole, including all the zoning changes requested through the Proposed District Plan process and the various strategic planning exercises currently underway.			
<b>804.2</b>	<b>PLB Construction</b>		Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to explicitly indicate that land to the north of Huntly (in and surrounding the Ohinewai area) possesses suitable qualities for being rezoned to Industrial Zone (e.g. location to SH1 for transport purposes, flat and sparsely populated).	<i>Reject</i>	7	No
1277.54	Waikato Regional Council	<i>Oppose</i>	WRC's maps indicate that this area is flood prone. Council should await hazards information to ensure that the flooding issue can be considered fully. The supply and location of large lot residential and rural residential land must be considered strategically across the whole district. The district plan must give effect to Policy 6.17 and Implementation Method 6.1.5 under the WRPS.	<i>Accept</i>	7	
1207.16	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	<i>Oppose</i>	The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clearly in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want industrial/heavy industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by wDC as they stated. The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are:	<i>Accept</i>	7	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living Zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all.</p> <p>PLB Construction: The Company making this submission are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle - they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively to have this area re-zoned Industrial/heavy industrial and the community have repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SHI facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community.</p> <p>The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature - to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>their response to proposed industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option - to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people.</p> <p>The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to - there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school - currently at a 70 k/hour zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads, etc.</p> <p>The Environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living there.</p> <p>The concern is also for the impact on the environment - the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the Highway- there is a very real concern about run-off and impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the express way is</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>dominated by thin topsoil over Taupe pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community of Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done.</p> <p>As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land.</p> <p>Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH -the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the Community.</p> <p>Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1145.7	Ohinewai Area Committee (2018)	Oppose	Same as FS1207.16 above	Accept	7	
1202.25	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub region. Whilst the Transport Agency is open to reviewing the sub-regional settlement pattern, this is best undertaken in development with other wider forums such as the Future Proof Growth partnership.	Accept	7	
1191.8	Shand Properties	Support in part	Shand Properties supports this submission insofar that the land use that would arise from it would support the development Ohinewai and would make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure. However, Shand Properties are of view that the provision of industrial and other zoning at Ohinewai should be evaluated as part of a wider consideration of zoning and landuse for Ohinewai as a whole, including the Shand Properties land on Ohinewai North Road.	Accept in part	7	
1108.189	Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato	Oppose	Oppose amendment in principle	Accept	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	<i>Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>					
1331.4	David and Tiffany Whyte	Oppose	<p>We are owners of 50 Ohinewai South Road and 38 Ohinewai North Road, locations marked on figure 1. We reside at 38, and have purchased 50, currently as a rental, but we may choose to retire off our lifestyle block to the smaller section, with a wonderful outlook over the river at some future date. We totally oppose the request to turn a large proportion of Ohinewai South Rd into industrial zone. This is for the following reasons</p> <p>'Reasonable peace and enjoyment'.</p> <p>We aim to be excellent landlords and as part of this, we are very aware that we have a legal obligation to provide our tenants with 'reasonable peace and enjoyment of the property' (Residential Tenancies Act 1986)</p> <p>Turning the complete South end of Ohinewai South Road would significantly affect the peace and enjoyment of our tenants. This is because industrial areas are by definition, noisy and intrusive. Not only the obvious being the sounds of work, that will start early in the morning, and also continue through the weekend. But also the unobvious. For example, I have a very sensitive lung, presumably due to scar tissue of an injury occurring in my youth. When I drive through industrial areas of Hamilton I often get chest pains. This is because of the industrial processes that are</p>	Accept	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>releasing fumes, and other noxious gases (presumable within consented limits). If the land is re-zoned to industrial this would effectively mean I would be unable to retire into the property due to ill health effects. Thus the smells emanating from the industrial processes would also impact negatively upon the peace and enjoyment of the tenants since it significantly reduces enjoyment if you are exposed to nasty smells. There would be other intrusions such as, vibrations from machinery which come through the earth etc. These vibrations when I experienced them in Hamilton made me feel sick in the stomach, and clearly again massively reducing quality of life. Traffic noise is significant, especially at night. We live ~350 meters from SH1, and the train tracks. It always surprises me how 'loud' the heavy traffic and trains can become. It is not intrusive given we are 100's of meters away from the traffic. However moving this heavy traffic onto the road, outside a residential street, will significantly increase the traffic noise. Instead of being a quite dead end street, it would have loud, noisy heavy trucks, engine breaking, throughout the day and night. Since many heavily deliveries are made at night, or very early in the morning. H &amp; S of school children.</p> <p>There is a primary school, at maximum student capacity, almost directly opposite our property at 50 Ohinewai South Rd. There is significant H &amp; S implications if this area</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>was turned into Industrial. At least the following would be a concern:</p> <p>Heavy and light vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Locals and property owners tend to take care while driving, since they have to live with folk, who bad behaviour impacts. Where as contractors, the job becomes the most important thing, not keeping the peace.</p> <p>There is a classic example of this occurring currently in Ohinewai. There is a pre-existing industrial plant on Ohinewai South Road. A small business in the scheme of things. The company takes LPG from large storage facilities, and puts it into gas cylinders which are then delivered out into the community for bottled household gas supply (typically used for heating hotwater). The problem is that the folks who drive the associated trucks are very problematic as they drive legally, but unsafely. This is most obvious around school drop off and pick up times. The truck drivers don't take care like a local resident would most likely do. They have no kids at the school and unlikely to have whanau attending either. Thus they don't slow down or take the care that would be expected from an upright citizen.</p> <p>Figure 1, hopefully visually demonstrates the problem. The map shows from the path that trucks and traffic would take from the SH1 interchange, passed village living, community amenities</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>(School, Hall and Tennis club) and through a built up area (this area seems to be zoned rural, even though it is a mixture of small sections and small lifestyle blocks. Exposure to chemicals   toxins</p> <p>It is a fact of life that us humans are exposed to toxins our forefathers were not. Regularly we are finding chemicals thought safe, to be more toxic than realized. Children due to their low body mass, and still developing bodies, are far more susceptible to toxins than adults. Thus having an industrial zone extremely close to a primary school, where all traffic carrying industrial components, products and waste, would be very unwise. Spills occur, burning of rubbish occurs (and is very hard to stop), and out-gassing occurs. Thus it is highly likely that children will be exposed to carcinogen and toxic substances.</p> <p>Also Ohinewai School (as do any residents) obtain their water from rain water   roof collection.</p> <p>What this means is that dust from the industrial site, will settle over the surrounding areas, and land on roofs. When the rains comes this dust will be flushed into the water tanks of the school. Settle to the bottom and leach out into the drinking water.</p> <p>This dust will be a contaminate due to industrial processes, for example fine sawdust from woodworking, which can be high in VOC's (volatile organic compounds) or high in heavy metals (from the preservative process). Hence we will be feeding children through their drinking water</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>chemicals and compounds that are known carcinogens, and brain development inhibitors.</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>It shouldn't be surprising to know that the water table in Ohinewai is very close to the surface. At 38 Ohinewai North over winter it is ~ 2 meters from the surface, and slowly retreats over summer, to~ 4m below the surface. Thus any chemical spills will easily reach the ground water. This ground water flows toward the river. Thus when spills occur at the industrial sights (they after all will be humans working there), they will reach the ground water very quickly and flow into the river. This is completely against everything that is trying to restore the Waikato River back to a healthy state.</p> <p>The other issue is flood risk. Living myself on a flood plain, I am aware of the major contamination issues that will occur with a flood. Given we are an organic operation, we have few few sources of potential contamination. But any industrial sight is going to have way more risk associated with it. Since by nature they will have a whole host of hydrocarbon and chemical products.</p> <p>So in summary, allowing the land of Ohinewai South to be re-zoned into Industrial would radically alter the nature of Ohinewai South and its environs. It would also place residents at risk from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Destroy folks 'quite peace and enjoyment' of their properties</li> </ul>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Heavy traffic risks, especially to school children.</li> <li>•Tremendous increase in traffic</li> <li>•Noise pollution</li> <li>•Chemical pollution via smell</li> <li>•Chemical pollution via drinking water</li> <li>•Allow chemicals into the Waikato river</li> <li>•Increase risks associated with flooding</li> </ul>			
1389.1	David and Tiffany Whyte	Oppose	<p>We are owners of 50 Ohinewai South Road and 38 Ohinewai North Road, locations marked on figure 1. We reside at 38, and have purchased 50, currently as a rental, but we may choose to retire off our lifestyle block to the smaller section, with a wonderful outlook over the river at some future date. We totally oppose the request to turn a large proportion of Ohinewai South Rd into industrial zone. This is for the following reasons: Reasonable peace and enjoyment We aim to be excellent landlords and as part of this, we are very aware that we have a legal obligation to provide our tenants with 'reasonable peace and enjoyment of the property' (Residential Tenancies Act 1986). Turning the complete south end of Ohinewai South Road would significantly affect the peace and enjoyment of our tenants. This is because industrial areas are by definition noisy and intrusive. Not only the obvious being the sounds of work, that will start early in the morning, and also continue through the weekend. But also the unobvious. For example, I have a very sensitive lung, presumably due to scar tissue of an injury occurring in my</p>	Accept	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>youth. When I drive through industrial areas of Hamilton I often get chest pains. This is because of the industrial processes that are releasing fumes, and other noxious gases (presumably within consented limits). If the land is re-zoned to industrial this would effectively mean I would be unable to retire into the property due to ill health effects. Thus the smells emanating from the industrial processes would also impact negatively upon the peace and enjoyment of the tenants since it significantly reduces enjoyment if you are exposed to nasty smells. There would be other intrusions such as, vibrations from machinery which come through the earth etc. These vibrations when I experienced them in Hamilton made me feel sick in the stomach, and clearly again massively reducing quality of life. Traffic noise is significant, especially at night. We live ~350 metres from SH1, and the train tracks. It always surprises me how 'loud' the heavy traffic and trains can become. It is not intrusive given we are 100s of metres away from the traffic. However moving this heavy traffic onto the road, outside a residential street, will significantly increase the traffic noise. Instead of being a quiet, dead end street, it would have loud, noisy heavy trucks, engine braking, throughout the day and night. Since many heavy deliveries are made at night, or very early in the morning. H &amp; S of school children There is a primary school, at maximum capacity, almost directly opposite our property at 50 Ohinewai South Rd. There is significant H &amp; S</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>implications if this area was turned into Industrial. At least the following would be a concern: Heavy and light vehicle traffic Locals and property owners tend to take care while driving, since they have to live with folk. who bad behaviour impacts. Where as contractors, the job becomes the most important thing, not keeping the peace. There is a classic example of this occurring currently in Ohinewai. There is a pre-existing industrial plant on Ohinewai South Road. A small business in the scheme of things. The company takes LPG from large storage facilities, and puts it into gas cylinders which are then delivered out into the community for bottled household gas supply (typically used for heating hot water). The problem is that the folks who drive the associated trucks are very problematic as they drive legally, but unsafely. This is most obvious around school drop off and pick up times. The truck drivers don't take care like a local resident would most likely do. They have no kids at the school and unlikely to have whanau attending either. Thus they don't slow down or take the care that would be expected from an upright citizen. Figure I, hopefully visually demonstrates the problem. The maps shows from the path that trucks and traffic would take from the SH1 interchange, past village living, community amenities (School, Hall and Tennis Club) and through a built up area (this area seems to be zoned rural, even though it is a mixture of small sections and small lifestyle blocks. The request for zone change, would</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>be south of the area shown on the map. Exposure to chemicals/toxins It is a fact of life that us humans are exposed to toxins our forefathers were not. Regularly we are finding chemicals thought safe, to be more toxic than realised. Children due to their low body mass, and still developing bodies, are far more susceptible to toxins than adults. Thus havnig an industrial zone extremely close to a primary school, where all traffic carrying industrial components, products and waste, would be very unwise. Spills occur, burning of rubbish occurs (and is very hard to stop), and out-gasping occurs. Thus it is highly likely that children will be exposed to carcinogen and toxic substances. Also Ohinewai School (as do any residents) obtain their water from rain water/roof collection. What this means is that dust from the industrial site, will settle over the surrounding areas, and land on roofs. When the rain comes this dust will be flushed into the water tanks of the school, settle to the bottom and leach out into the drinking water. This dust will be a contaminant due to industrial processes, for example fine sawdust from woodworking, which can be high in VOC's (volatile organic compounds) or high in heavy metals (from the preservative process). Hence we will be feeding children through their drinking water chemicals and compounds that are known carcinogens, and brain development inhibitors. Water Quality It shouldn't be surprising to know that the water table in Ohinewai is very close to the surface. At 38</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>Ohinewai North over winter it is ~2 metres from the surface, and slowly retreats over summer to ~4m below the surface. Thus any chemical spills will easily reach the ground water. This ground water flows towards the river. Thus when spills occur at the industrial sites (they after all will be humans working there), they will reach the ground water very quickly and flow into the river. This is completely against everything that is trying to restore the Waikato River back to a healthy state. The other issue is flood risk. Living myself on a flood plain, I am aware of the major contamination issues that will occur within a flood. Given we are an organic operation, we have few sources of potential contamination. But any industrial site is going to have way more risk associated with it. Since by nature they will have a whole host of hydrocarbon and chemical products. So in summary, allowing the land of Ohinewai South to be re-zoned into Industrial would radically alter the nature of Ohinewai South and its environs. It would also place residents at risk from: Destroy folks' quiet peace and enjoyment' of their properties Heavy traffic risks, especially to school children Tremendous increase in traffic Noise pollution Chemical pollution via smell Chemical pollution via drinking water Allow chemicals into the Waikato River Increase risks associated with flooding Therefore we would request that this land use change to Industrial is not made.</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
<b>804.3</b>	<b>PLB Construction</b>		Add a preamble to Section 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones to refer to rezoning land in the Ohinewai area to Industrial Zone.	<i>Reject</i>	7	<i>No</i>
1207.17	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	<i>Oppose</i>	<p>The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clearly in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want industrial/heavy industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by wDC as they stated.</p> <p>The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are:</p> <p>Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living Zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all.</p> <p>PLB Construction: The Company making this submission</p>	<i>Accept</i>	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle - they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively to have this area re-zoned Industrial/heavy industrial and the community have repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SHI facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community.</p> <p>The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature - to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option - to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people.</p> <p>The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to - there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school - currently at a 70 k/hour zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased</p>			



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads, etc.</p> <p>The Environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living there.</p> <p>The concern is also for the impact on the environment - the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the Highway- there is a very real concern about run-off and impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the express way is dominated by thin topsoil over Taupe pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community of Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done.</p> <p>As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not</p>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land.</p> <p>Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH -the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the Community.</p> <p>Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>			
1145.11	Ohinewai Area Committee (2018)	Oppose	Same as FS1207.17 above	Accept	7	
1202.55	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub-region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other wider forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.	Accept	7	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
FS1387.1296	Mercury NZ	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7	
863.1	Ribbonwood Family Trust		<b>Amend</b> the zoning of the following properties at Ohinewai from Rural Zone to Country Living Zone bounded by Ohinewai South Road to the west and State Highway 1 (Waikato Expressway) to the east, including 53 Ohinewai South Road Ohinewai. (See map attached to submission).	Reject	6	No
1277.155	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	WRC's maps indicate that this area is flood prone. Council should await hazards information to ensure that the flooding issue can be considered fully. The supply and location of large lot residential and rural residential land must be considered strategically across the whole district. The district plan must give effect to Policy 6.17 and Implementation Method 6.1.5 under the WRPS.	Accept	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
1207.19	Ohinewai Area Committee (2019)	Support	The current map shows that 80% of the land at Ohinewai is Rural. Only a small portion of it around 53 Ohinewai South Road is actually Country Living. The patchwork is only applicable to Ohinewai South Road. Whilst we don't object to the rezoning to Country Living at 5000sqm sections, we do want to make it clear that this is in alignment with the land already surrounding this land, excluding the school next door. The rezoning will be complimentary to the school and surrounding land.	Reject	6	
1145.8	Ohinewai Area Committee (2018)	Support	Same as FS1207.19 above	Reject	6	
1179.1	Ribbonwood Family Trust	Support	Our original submission related to changing the land use status of 53 Ohiniwai South Road, Ohiniwai, from rural to rural country life-style living zoning. This submission is to change the current land use of #53 from rural to residential status. We further submit; that, if the final land use determination is country life-style living, the minimum permissible lot size is 2,500 square metres. Not the standard 5,000 square metre minimum rule in country life-style living. That is, relief from General Sub-division RDI (a)(1) 23.4.2 <b>Justification to change WDC land use on 53 Ohiniwai South Road, Ohinewai to residential zoning:</b>	Reject	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final version of the draft District Plan is intended to reflect WDC land use intentions for the next 10 years. The average person would form the belief that #53 and surrounding land in Ohiniwai will be residential by 2030. WDC has the benefit of being well informed; having access to a wide range of statistical information, data analysis and trends predictions</li> <li>• Residential expansion in Pokeno is explosive'. This development trend south along State Highway 1 and the main trunk railway line is self-evident. Available population and demographic data indicates that this expansion is likely to continue</li> <li>• It is now confirmed that a daily rail commuter service between Hamilton and Auckland will be established in 2020. There will be a commuter station in Huntly and in Te Kauwhata. Ohiniwai is approximately mid-way and close to SH 1 and main trunk line</li> <li>• WDC is supporting a large export manufacturing company to establish a new factory and residential accommodation for up to 500 workers in nearby Lumsden Road, in Ohiniwai</li> <li>• Land owners located on Ohiniwai North Road have made submissions to support a change in their land use zoning to residential</li> </ul>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sale and purchase agreement on 28 hectares of land located at 101 Ohiniwai South Road, Ohiniwai, is subject to the prospective purchaser securing a change in zoning from rural life-style living to part residential and part industrial land use (is being considered by WDC)</li> <li>• WDC plan to construct a domestic water supply line from Huntly to Te Kauwhata. This is likely to be close to Ohiniwai to service potential development in Lumsden Road</li> <li>• WDC also plan to develop a sewerage treatment plant north of Ohiniwai, to process effluent from Te Kauwhata and cease disposing of sewerage treatment by-product into a local lake in Te Kauwhata</li> <li>• The land contour at #53 Ohiniwai South Road is flat; the soil is fertile and free draining</li> <li>• The property is situated on the 'high ground' area on Ohiniwai South Road</li> <li>• There is an adjoining property between #53 and State Highway 1 freeway, that provides a buffer zone from noise and nuisance for residential living</li> <li>• Adjoining Ohiniwai Road, formerly SH 1, is in good condition and provides safe access/egress</li> <li>0 Access to high voltage mains power supply is at the gate</li> <li>Ohiniwai Primary School occupies the adjoining land on the North side. This close proximity is convenient for residents with young children</li> </ul>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ohiniwai Community Hall is also located in close proximity – walking distance</li> <li>• There is easy access to a nearby wetlands reserve area – Waikato River</li> </ul> <p><b>Justification for land lots at #53 to be a minimum of 2,500 square metres, within country living life-style zoning, if residential land use is not permitted as requested above:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contemporary rural life-style residents are less likely to have a pony, cow, pig, or like larger animal on their 5000 square metre block, than country life-style orientated families of 20 years ago</li> <li>• Current life-style trends are more centred on entertainment and recreational opportunities, with associated out-doors living areas, swimming pools and tennis courts. Smaller 2,500 metre square land areas appear to meet the needs of this life-style</li> <li>• Contemporary living styles on a 5,000 square metre block can lead to 'spare' under-utilised land being a burden to the resident. Regular mowing of larger areas of lawn adds to the consumption of fossil fuels and contributes to the accumulation of harmful emissions in the atmosphere. Further, unnecessary use of fertilisers can add to problems associated with nitrates leaching into the nearby Waikato River catchment</li> <li>• WDC could take the lead from other progressive District Councils in NZ that have adopted the 2,500</li> </ul>			

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			<p>minimum size blocks rule in rural lifestyle living zones. They are obviously aware of changing living expectations, the growing demand for smaller sized life-style blocks, the benefits associated with conserving fertile land for productive farming, and the cost benefits of economy of scale, in having more intensive use of local body provided domestic water supply and sewage disposal infra-structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land located at #53 Ohiniwai South Road, Ohinwai, has not been used as a productive poultry unit for 15 plus years. Equipment has been removed from the 5 former poultry sheds, that are now derelict and have a nil value according to a recent Registered Valuation</li> <li>• On-site domestic sewage treatment plants are more compact and efficient than previously – they work well on 2,500 square metre plots</li> <li>• On-site domestic water systems are also more efficient and reliable</li> </ul>			
1331.2	David and Tiffany Whyte	Support	<p>As a local I am not convinced that the council map is accurate. The zone request would appear to also include the school, which in my mind isn't possible. So may pay if there is any issue, to go back to the old school non digital maps to find the actual zone request.</p> <p>That aside, for reasons mentioned in the above submission, we support this change of zone. In fact we support his zone change more since (a) Personally impact is less, but</p>	Reject	6	



Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
			importantly (b) it sets the tone for the area, bringing about a consistent Rural-residential zoning through the area.			
1389.4	David and Tiffany Whyte	Support	As a local I am not convinced that the council map is accurate. The zone request would appear to also include the school, which in my mind isn't possible. So may pay if there is any issue, to go back to the old school non digital maps to find the actual zone request. That aside, for reasons mentioned in the above submission, we support this change of zone. In fact we support his zone change more since (a) Personally impact is less, but importantly (b) it sets the tone for the area, bringing about a consistent Rural-residential zoning through the area.	Reject	6	
1206.10	Ohinewai Land Limited	Support in part	The submission by Ohinewai Land Limited identifies a 'Proposed Growth Area' around and east of the Waikato Expressway interchange at Ohinewai. Factors such as residential demand, developable density, natural hazards, transport connectivity and infrastructure servicing (amongst others) should be considered in determining the exact area to be rezoned and the staging and sequencing of development within the 'Proposed Growth Area.' This should be the subject of a structure planning exercise for the 'Proposed Growth Area' to provide an overarching approach to land use planning in and around Ohinewai.	Accept in part	6	
1398.9	Future Proof Implementat	Oppose	Future Proof does not support the proposal for Country Living at Ohinewai. It is Future Proof Strategy principle that development is encouraged to locate adjacent to existing urban settlements and nodes in both the Waikato and	Accept	6	

Submission number	Submitter	Support / oppose	Summary of submission	Recommendation	Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is	Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence
	ion Committee		<p>Waipa Districts and that rural-residential development occurs in a sustainable way to ensure it will not compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern or create demand for the provision of urban services. It is also a Strategy principle to encourage development in established settlements to support existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy 6.17 of the RPS states that management of rural-residential development in the Future Proof area will recognise the particular pressure from, and address the adverse effects of rural-residential development parts of the sub-region, and particularly in areas within easy commuting distance of Hamilton.</p> <p>The proposed Country Living development is contrary to a number of the objectives, policies and methods in the RPS. In particular, it is outside of the urban limits in Map 6.2 (Section 6C) and it is inconsistent with Policy 6.17 on rural-residential development.</p> <p>The Proposed Waikato District Plan aims to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy at the local level. The PDP has attempted to avoid indiscriminate subdivision of rural land as well as ensuring that rural-residential development does not compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern (as contained in the RPS) or create demand for the provision of urban services. The proposal is contrary to the intent of the Proposed Waikato District Plan and will undermine it if accepted.</p>			

<b>Submission number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Support / oppose</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Section of Original s42A report where the submission point is</b>	<b>Submission addressed in Rebuttal Evidence</b>
1391.4	Konini Farms Ltd	Support	Needs changing as appropriate.	Reject	6	
1395.12	Catherine Maher	Support	Fits with the Blueprint community feedback for development of Ohinewai to be Country Living of 5000sqm lots.	Reject	6	
1396.7	The Ralph Estates	Oppose	<p>This submission seeks the rezoning of 53 Ohinewai South Road from Rural to Country Living. The Ralph Estates have mineral interests in this land which would effectively be sterilized if the property was developed for rural lifestyle living. This is because it would be impracticable for the Ralph Estates to exercise its right to enter the land and mine the minerals beneath the surface.</p> <p>Granting the relief sought in this submission will not promote the sustainable management, or achieve the efficient use and development of, Ohinewai's natural and physical resources (including the minerals lying underneath the surface land) pursuant to sections 5 and 7 of the RMA. It is not the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the changes to the provisions sought, in particular the assessment of the benefits and costs of the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions.</p>	Accept	6	