

## APPENDIX C – TABLE OF MARY BOURKE QUESTIONS AND COUNCIL STAFF RESPONSES

---

| Paragraph Reference | Question   | Council Comment/Response  |
|---------------------|--|---|
| 53                  | How can the proposed Mangaone Structure Plan be supported when it turns it's back on the C10 Growth Cell north of the Mangaone Stream and withholds access to services, keeping them within the Mangaone Precinct property boundaries and solely within their control? | <p>The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan has been designed to align with the C10 Growth Cell Master Plan. It does not 'turn its back' on the Henmar Trust land and instead provides both roading and service connections to the property at either the southern boundary (being via the Bardowie Industrial Precinct) or via the existing roading network (i.e. Zig Zag Road). These connections are deemed to be adequate to service the Henmar Trust land without the need for an additional local road running parallel between Zig Zag Road and the Mangaone Stream.</p> <p>The master plan identifies how services are to be available to the Henmar Trust land. PC14 does not withhold access to any services. Future resource consents for subdivision and development alongside the development agreement process will ensure that road access and services will be available for extension into the Henmar Trust land.</p>  |
| 54                  | How can the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan as currently presented be considered to be an efficient use of land and an efficient management of infrastructure required to service the C10 Industrial Growth Cell?   | <p>The Plan Change Application, including technical reports, and Council's assessment via the Section 42A Report, and alignment with the C10 Growth Cell Master Plan have adequately demonstrated roading and servicing is provided across the Growth Cell.</p> <p>The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan provides an indicative roading network which ensures that efficient use and development of the PC14 land occurs. This network provides the basis by which services infrastructure can be provided through to Zig Zag Road.</p> <p>The structure plan does not inhibit future industrial development within the Henmar Trust land. Zig Zag Road provides the appropriate link by which development and infrastructure servicing can be facilitated. Because of this there is no need for additional internal linkages to be provided via the Mangaone Structure Plan.</p> <p>The C10 Growth Cell Master Plan clearly notes that a Development Agreements are required. This applies to the developers of the Fonterra, Bardowie and Henmar Trust land. These agreements in line with the master plan will ensure connections are appropriate at the time of development therefore resulting in an efficient use of the land.</p> |

| Paragraph Reference | Question  | Council Comment/Response   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 55                  | Why has Council supported a Structure Plan that does not align with the Master Plan or with the District Plan?  | It is the opinion of the Council staff involved with PC14 that the Structure Plan does align with the Master Plan (as shown in Appendix B of Ms Bourke's evidence) and the District Plan.  |
| 77                  | Why has Council required a 75 metre setback between Area 6 (within Industrial zone) and Area 7 (Deferred Industrial zone, with underlying zoning of Rural) in the Hautapu Industrial Precinct and merely a 5 metre setback between the Mangaone Precinct (Industrial zone) and the Henmar Trust land (zoned Rural, located within C10)? | The boundary requirements between Area 6 & 7 in the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area reflect the stormwater management requirements designed for this area and shown on the structure plan. There is no 75m setback requirement specified. The rules instead prescribe a 15m setback from the rural zone boundary. This was in recognition of a number of existing sensitive non-industrial activities within Area 7.<br>The proposed 5m setback requirement for PC14 and the Henmar Trust land aligns with the existing setback provisions that apply between the southern boundary of the Henmar Trust land with the Bardowie Industrial Precinct. Refer Rule 7.4.2.2. |
| 78                  | Why should the Henmar Trust land not be provided with the same rural amenity protection being enjoyed by Area 7 of the Hautapu Industrial Precinct?   | Area 7 has four residential dwellings, and a horse boarding stables business that are located in close proximity to the Area 6 boundary. Through PC17 the 15m setback with the Rural Zone (i.e. Area 7 - Deferred Industrial Zone) was considered adequate and necessary to protect the existing sensitive activities.<br>There are no such sensitive activities along the Henmar Trust and PC14 boundary which warrant an internal boundary setback larger than 5m.   |
| 80                  | Why has Council failed to protect or enhance the rural amenity of industrial/rural interface with the Henmar Trust land and the wellbeing of the Henmar Trust occupiers?  | The interface in this location does not warrant anything additional than the existing and proposed provisions which address the rural/industrial interface.<br>The nature of the rural land use along the common boundary between the Henmar Trust and Fonterra land is grazing activities only. These activities are compatible with the type of activities provided for within the Industrial Zone at Hautapu. It is not clear how wellbeing of the occupiers of the Henmar Trust land is affected to the extent that protections beyond those proposed as part of PC14 or by the existing provisions of the Industrial Zone.  |
| 87                  | How does providing for a vague activity, where the definition includes undefined terms, meet the requirements of the RMA and protect  | The definition for 'Dry Industry' was created and implemented under PC17 and simply provides for industrial activities that do not use water. This is not vague.   |

| Paragraph Reference | Question   | Council Comment/Response   |
|---------------------|--|--|
|                     | and enhance the Mangaone Precinct itself and the sounding environment?   | This plan change is not seeking to relitigate PC17.<br>As outlined in the Section 42A Report the District Plan adequately requires resource consent for non-listed activities, activities requiring with discharges that need regional resource consent, bitumen plants, incineration activities and concrete batching plants. It is considered to be unnecessary to add any additional activities within the Section 7 activity lists as requested by Henmar Trust.                               |
| 96                  | Where is the discharge point? Has this been factored into the stormwater calculations?   | Harrison Grierson and Mr Coutts have provided a response on stormwater and discharge.  |
| 100                 | How can Council determine whether the Kiwifruit Block is appropriate to be live zoned to “Industrial” with no technical report to consider the downstream stormwater effects of rezoning this approximately 7.5ha property?  | As outlined in the Section 42A Report, the relevant technical reports have been provided and considered by the relevant staff through the resource consenting process of the site. No further information regarding this matter is required for Council to consider it appropriate to include this land in the rezoning.   |
| 102                 | Has fish passage this been accounted for in the Technical Reports? If not, how has the technical report accurately assessed the potential downstream flooding effects on the Henmar Trust property as fish passage is a legislative requirement and cannot be ignored? | Yes fish passage has been considered. Refer to the Section 42A and Harrison Griersons Stormwater Memo.   |
| 104                 | Why would the Council consider it appropriate to rezone to Industrial land that they know creates downstream flooding within the Henmar Trust property, and will receive worse flooding after industrial development?  | There is no evidence to support this claim that the rezoning will result in downstream flooding. Future development will be subject to on-site stormwater management requirements of the district plan and the Waikato Regional Plan. The resource consent process is the appropriate place to consider detailed design proposals for stormwater management. The rezoning of the land itself will not create downstream flooding. Refer to the Section 42A and Harrison Griersons Stormwater Memo. |
| 105                 | Why did Council request that the Kiwifruit Block be added to the PC14 with <b>NO</b> stormwater assessment?  | Stormwater assessment was undertaken at the time of granting the resource consent for the activity on the site and the plan change would not benefit from repeating this exercise. Refer to the Section 42A and Harrison Griersons Stormwater Memo.<br>Any further development within the Kiwifruit block will be subject to the requirements of   |

| Paragraph Reference | Question   | Council Comment/Response   |
|---------------------|--|--|
|                     |  | the district and regional plans relating to stormwater management and discharge of water into the Mangaone Stream.   |
| 110                 | Limiting these upgrades to activities being reliant on the Zig Zag Road access is naïve. To think that 12 tonne trucks using the Swayne Road access won't then go down Zig Zag Road to access the Hautapu Interchange is unrealistic. The only other route would be to go through Cambridge North Residential Area. Additionally, how do you define "reliant"? | <p>The new transport provision, Rule 7.4.2.46 includes requirements for the upgrading of Zig Zag and Swayne Roads.</p> <p>No heavy access to Swayne Road is proposed from the PC14 site.</p> <p>Under this new rule any requirement to commence upgrades to Zig Zag and Swayne Roads will be dependent on the access arrangements proposed through specific subdivision or development proposals and the associated resource consent process.</p> <p>In considering this question, it is assumed that the reference to use of 'reliant' refers to Rule 7.4.2.46. Further amendments to this provision have been suggested through the Right of Reply to add clarification.</p> |
| 113                 | Has Council considered the traffic effects of 12 tonne trucks using the Swayne Road access prior to the east west collector road or Zig Zag Road accesses being created?   | <p>The application includes an Integrated Transportation Assessment, and the C10 Master Planning process has included input from transportation engineers.</p> <p>In addition to this transport experts for Fonterra and Council do not consider that 12 tonne trucks using Swayne Road will generate any adverse transport safety or efficiency effects.</p> <p>Should a development propose to use heavy vehicles prior to the relevant upgrades being undertaken on the wider roading network, this will be assessed at the time of development.</p>  |
| 114                 | Has Council considered the traffic effects of the existing heavy vehicle entrance from the Kiwifruit Block and whether the proposed Mangaone Precinct may connect through to this access in the future?  | <p>The existing private and gated vehicle entrance from the Kiwifruit Block to Swayne Road was consented for specific use under resource consent for the site in 2018. No changes to this entrance are proposed or agreed to via PC14.</p> <p>The proposed Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan does not identify any connection to this existing entrance from the Mangaone Precinct and any future request would therefore require additional resource consents and assessments.</p>   |
| 115                 | Why did Council request that the Kiwifruit Block be included in PC14 with <b>NO</b> traffic assessment?  | <p>No changes to this entrance are proposed or agreed to via PC14.</p> <p>An Integrated Transportation Assessment was provided with the resource consent for this site.</p>  |

| Paragraph Reference | Question | Council Comment/Response   |
|---------------------|----------|--|
|                     |          | <p>Council staff are satisfied that any future traffic increase will require alteration to existing consents and/or new resource consents at which time effects can be appropriately assessed.</p> <p>Council requested the inclusion and rezoning of the Kiwifruit Block on the basis that it was land associated with and ancillary to an established industrial activity. PC14 provided an appropriate vehicle to recognise this. No traffic assessment was needed because this had already been completed as part of the land use consents granted for the site.</p> |