

Q1 Full name

Short Text Sam and Alisa Coleman

Q2 Company name

Short Text

Q3 Email address

Email sajdcoleman@gmail.com

Q4 Phone number

Number 21301381

Q5 Contact name and address for service of person making the submission

Multi Choice Different details

Q6 Contact postal address for communications, please include postcode.

Short Text Louise Feathers, PO Box 1462, Hamilton 3240

Q7 Contact email address

Email louise@feathers.co.nz

Q8 Contact phone number

Number 224444082

Q9 Do you want to be heard in support of your submission?

Multi Choice Yes

Q10 If yes, If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing?

Multi Choice Yes

Q11 Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?

Multi Choice No

Q12 If yes, are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Multi Choice

Q13 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows

Long Text 1. Overall Plan Change

Q14 My submission is that

Long Text Support in Part / Oppose in Part
a) The submitter supports the uplift of the deferred status of the land to enable it to be developed for industrial purposes. However, the Plan Change (PC17) should include all land within the Te Rapa North Industrial Zone (TRNIZ) with the deferred status to ensure an integrated approach to the creation of a well-functioning urban environment.

b) As it stands, by excluding some areas of the TRNIZ, PC17 does not achieve the directives of NPS-UD, requiring a strategic approach to land development (Objective 6) as it leaves developable land 'out of the picture'. The inclusion of all land would not only achieve strategic development, but would also go further in terms of 'making up' the

shortage of industrial land supply in the medium term as directed by Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.

c) The s32 assessment does not discount Option 4 "Live Zone the entirety of the TRNIZ." The s32 assessment (pages 13-14) says that live zoning the entire area has the same benefits as the proposed option (Option 3) and it appears to say that the only implication may be the river crossing. The river crossing affects only a small portion of the TRNIZ and is not a reason for excluding land from the SP area.

Q15 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council

Long Text Oppose the Plan Change unless the Plan Change area is widened to include all land in the TRNIZ.

Q16 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q17 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows

Long Text 2. Structure Plan

Q18 My submission is that

Long Text Oppose in Part

a) The Structure Plan fails to include all land within the TRNIZ and therefore does not represent a coordinated, efficient nor integrated approach to development. This conflicts with RPS UFD Objective 1 which seeks an integrated, sustainable and planned urban area.

b) The exclusion of some land from the Structure Plan area is likely to result in ad hoc development, or no development of the excluded land, which has the consequence of a poorly functioning urban environment overall. Unlocking the entire area in this Structure Plan will enable the coordinated and efficient delivery of infrastructure to the entire area, ultimately realizing a well-functioning urban environment.

c) The location of the river crossing will have an impact on roading networks. However according to the PPC17 Figure 5 (page 28 of the HG application report), the northern river crossing is located in the northern extent of the TRNIZ and will not largely affect the roading or development layout of the wider / majority of the TRNIZ. This is therefore not a reason to exclude the rest of the TRNIZ from the Structure Plan and Plan Change process.

Q19 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council

Long Text Reject the Plan Change unless the Structure Plan is amended to include all of the TRNIZ.

Undertake consequential assessments and thereafter proposed objective, policy and rule updates to reflect the entire TRNIZ, required to inform the Structure Plan.

Q20 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q21 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows

Long Text 3. Transportation

Q22 My submission is that

Long Text Oppose.

a) There is no assessment of the transportation effects of the PC17 and Structure Plan on Meadow View Lane. This includes no assessment or details on:

- Whether the proposed PC17 area south of the existing Fonterra operation will be accessed via Meadow View Lane;
- What effects this may have on the road network, including the intersection of Meadow View Lane with Pukete Road;
- Effects on the amenity of existing residential and rural residential properties along Pukete Rd and Meadow View Lane;
- Effects on the safety of existing users on Meadow View Lane; and
- Whether a road stopping process will be undertaken as the 'restricted access' point as shown on the proposed Structure Plan.

b) Related to the above, Provision 12.5.1a imposes a vehicle access restriction stating that:

"Lot 1 DPS 85687 and Lot 5 DPS 18043 shall achieve vehicle access via the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site onto Te

Rapa Road and shall be restricted from achieving vehicle access onto Meadow View Lane. This rule shall not apply once the Deferred Industrial Zone overlay is removed from all properties along Meadow View Lane."

This however has not been assessed or mentioned, in any PC17 documentation and therefore it is not understood why this has been proposed.

c) All land zoned TRNIZ on Meadow View Lane should be included in the PC17 and Structure Plan, so all transportation effects can be considered, with mitigation such as intersection treatment and roading upgrades can be identified in an integrated manner. Provision 3.9.3.2 'Transport Infrastructure Improvements' would need to be augmented to include any requirements for Meadow View Lane and Pukete Road.

Q23 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council

- Long Text
1. Reject the Plan Change unless the PC17 and Structure Plan is amended to include all of the TRNIZ.
 2. Undertake a consequential ITA assessment (widen the scope to include Meadow View lane and Pukete Road) and thereafter amend the proposed objective, policy and rules to reflect the ITA recommendations
 3. Delete provision 12.5.1a.

Q24 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q25 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows

Long Text 4. Infrastructure

Q26 My submission is that

Long Text Support in part.

a) The PC17 documents outline options for the provision of infrastructure, such as a Fonterra coordinated approach with HCC, and interim/on lot solutions. This approach is represented in proposed provision 3.9.2.6 "Wastewater and Water Networks" (refer text below) which is supported.

Provision 3.9.2.6 states:

- Development of the Te Rapa North Industrial Structure Plan area will be progressively enabled based on the capacity of the public network.
- The first land use or subdivision consent application for the Structure Plan area will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Plan that details the methods of water supply and conveyance as well as wastewater treatment and management, including any upgrades or new infrastructure that may be required to the public network.
- All subsequent development will refer to this plan and contribute to the completion of its proposed network, in a manner that is coordinated and does not compromise the capacity of existing service users.
- Early interaction with Council by developers is encouraged to coordinate the construction of these assets with the sequencing of urban development and to enable any assets that are private initially, to be vested in future.

Q27 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council

Long Text Retain proposed provision 3.9.2.6

Q28 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q29 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows

Long Text 5. Proposed Zoning Map

Q30 My submission is that

Long Text Oppose in part.

The zoning maps show the uplift of the deferred status from the Proposed PC17 area. As per earlier submission points, the uplift of all land with the deferred status is sought.

Q31 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council

Long Text Reject the Plan Change unless the zoning maps are amended to remove the deferred status from all land.

Q32 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q33 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows:

Long Text 6. Rule 9.3- Activity status

Q34 My submission:

Long Text Oppose.

No provision is made for existing residential, rural-lifestyle or farming activities.

Q35 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council:

Long Text Add:
"tt. Existing residential, rural lifestyle and farming activities as at (the date of this plan change) = Permitted" (in the industrial zone).

Q36 Do you have another topic to submit on?

Multi Choice Yes, I'd like to continue my submission

Q37 The specific provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are as follows:

Long Text 7. Rule 12.3.1

Q38 My submission:

Long Text Support.

Removal of concept development consents and staging is supported as it simplifies the planning process

Q39 I seek the following decision from the Hamilton City Council:

Long Text Accept deletion of Rule 12.3.1 and related provisions.

Q40 File upload

File Upload https://haveyoursay.hamilton.govt.nz/download_file/408



Sam and Alisa Coleman
Private landowners within TRNIZ.

SUBMISSION ON PC17

Provision/Area	Support/Oppose	Reasons for Submission Point	Decision Requested
1. Overall Plan Change	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	<p>a) The submitter supports the uplift of the deferred status of the land to enable it to be developed for industrial purposes. However, the Plan Change (PC17) should include all land within the Te Rapa North Industrial Zone (TRNIZ) with the deferred status to ensure an integrated approach to the creation of a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>b) As it stands, by excluding some areas of the TRNIZ, PC17 does not achieve the directives of NPS-UD, requiring a strategic approach to land development (Objective 6) as it leaves developable land 'out of the picture'. The inclusion of all land would not only achieve strategic development, but would also go further in terms of 'making up' the shortage of industrial land supply in the medium term as directed by Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>c) The s32 assessment does not discount Option 4 "Live Zone the entirety of the TRNIZ." The s32 assessment (pages 13-14) says that live zoning the entire area has the same benefits as the proposed option (Option 3) and it appears to say that the</p>	Reject the Plan Change unless the Plan Change area is widened to include all land in the TRNIZ.



		only implication may be the river crossing. The river crossing affects only a small portion of the TRNIZ and is not a reason for excluding land from the SP area.	
2. Structure Plan	Oppose in Part	<p>a) The Structure Plan fails to include all land within the TRNIZ and therefore does not represent a coordinated, efficient nor integrated approach to development. This conflicts with RPS UFD Objective 1 which seeks an integrated, sustainable and planned urban area.</p> <p>b) The exclusion of some land from the SP area is likely to result in ad hoc development, or no development of the excluded land, which has the consequence of a poorly functioning urban environment overall. Unlocking the entire area in this Structure Plan will enable the coordinated and efficient delivery of infrastructure to the entire area, ultimately realising a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>c) The location of the river crossing will have an impact on roading networks. However according to the PPC17 Figure 5 (page 28 of the HG application report), the northern river crossing is located in the northern extent of the TRNIZ and will not largely affect the roading or development layout of the wider / majority of the TRNIZ. This is therefore not a reason to exclude the rest of the TRNIZ</p>	<p>Reject the Plan Change unless the Structure Plan is amended to include all of the TRNIZ.</p> <p>Undertake consequential assessments and thereafter proposed objective, policy and rule updates to reflect the entire TRNIZ, required to inform the Structure Plan.</p>



		from the Structure Plan and Plan Change process.	
3. Transportation	Oppose	<p>a) There is no assessment of the transportation effects of the PC17 and Structure Plan on Meadow View Lane. This includes no assessment or details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the proposed PC17 area south of the existing Fonterra operation will be accessed via Meadow View Lane; - What effects this may have on the road network, including the intersection of Meadow View Lane with Pukete Road; - Effects on the amenity of existing residential and rural residential properties along Pukete Rd and Meadow View Lane; - Effects on the safety of existing users on Meadow View Lane; and - Whether a road stopping process will be undertaken as the 'restricted access' point as shown on the proposed Structure Plan. <p>b) Related to the above, Provision 12.5.1a imposes a vehicle access restriction stating that:</p> <p><i>Lot 1 DPS 85687 and Lot 5 DPS 18043 shall achieve vehicle access via the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site onto Te Rapa Road and shall be restricted from achieving vehicle access onto Meadow View Lane. This rule shall not apply once the Deferred Industrial Zone overlay</i></p>	<p>Reject the Plan Change unless the PC17 and Structure Plan is amended to include all of the TRNIZ.</p> <p>Undertake a consequential ITA assessment (widen the scope to include Meadow View lane and Pukete Road) and thereafter amend the proposed objective, policy and rules to reflect the ITA recommendations</p> <p>Delete provision 12.5.1a</p>



		<p><i>is removed from all properties along Meadow View Lane.</i></p> <p>This however has not been assessed or mentioned, in any PC17 documentation and therefore it is not understood why this has been proposed.</p> <p>c) All land zoned TRNIZ on Meadow View Lane should be included in the PC17 and Structure Plan, so all transportation effects can be considered, with mitigation such as intersection treatment and roading upgrades can be identified in an integrated manner. Provision 3.9.3.2 'Transport Infrastructure Improvements' would need to be augmented to include any requirements for Meadow View Lane and Pukete Road.</p>	
4. Infrastructure	Support in part	<p>a) The PC17 documents outline options for the provision of infrastructure, such as a Fonterra coordinated approach with HCC, and interim/on lot solutions. This approach is represented in proposed provision 3.9.2.6 "Wastewater and water Networks" which is supported.</p> <p><i>Provision 3.9.2.6 states:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Development of the Te Rapa North Industrial Structure Plan area will be progressively enabled based on the capacity of the public network.</i> - <i>The first land use or subdivision consent application for the Structure</i> 	Accept proposed provision 3.9.2.6



		<p><i>Plan area will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Plan that details the methods of water supply and conveyance as well as wastewater treatment and management, including any upgrades or new infrastructure that may be required to the public network.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>All subsequent development will refer to this plan and contribute to the completion of its proposed network, in a manner that is coordinated and does not compromise the capacity of existing service users.</i> - <i>Early interaction with Council by developers is encouraged to coordinate the construction of these assets with the sequencing of urban development and to enable any assets that are private initially, to be vested in future.</i> 	
5. Proposed Zoning Map	Oppose in part	a) The zoning maps show the uplift of the deferred status from the Proposed PC17 area. As per earlier submission points, the uplift of all land with the deferred status is sought.	Reject the Plan Change unless the zoning maps are amended to remove the deferred status from all land.
6. Rule 9.3- Activity status	Oppose	a) No provision is made for existing residential, rural-lifestyle or farming activities.	Add: "tt. Existing residential, rural lifestyle and farming activities as at <i>(the date of this plan change)</i> = Permitted (in the industrial zone).
7. Rule 12.3.1	Support	a) Removal of concept development consents and staging is supported as it	Approve deletion of Rule 12.3.1 and related provisions



		simplifies the planning process.	
8. Consequential	Oppose in part	a) The proposed planning provisions of 3.9 and Chapter 12 would need to be changed to reflect the uplift of the entire area. Consequential assessments and thereafter proposed objective, policy and rule updates will be required to reflect the entire TRNIZ.	Reject the plan change unless the PC17 is widened to include the entire area, and additional assessments are undertaken with amendments to the proposed provisions to reflect the development of the entire TRNIZ.