

FONTERRA LIMITED

FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14 TO THE WAIPĀ DISTRICT PLAN: REZONING OF PART OF C10 GROWTH CELL

To: Plan Change 14 (Mangaone Precinct) to the Waipā
District Plan
Waipā District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840
Attention: Plan Change 14 Further Submission

Via email: [districtplan@ Waipādc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@Waipādc.govt.nz)

Submitter: Fonterra Limited
Submitter No: 5

Contact: Rhezza Jangaard

**Address for
Service:** **Fonterra Limited**

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act Fonterra Limited has an interest in Plan Change 14 greater than the interest the general public has.

Fonterra Limited wishes to be heard in support of this further submission.

If others make a similar submission, Fonterra would not consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Dated: 29 August 2024

Fonterra Limited



Rhezza Jangaard

Consent Manager – Fonterra Limited

ATTACHMENT A: FONTERRA LIMITED'S FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter No.1)				
1/1 1/2 1/3 1/4	Terence Maxfield West	Neutral	<p>Fonterra notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Change 14 preparation has been solely funded by Fonterra Limited. • Fonterra Limited is also paying for costs associated with the processing of Plan Change 14 by Waipā District Council. • A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) • Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.</p> 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter 1) and accepts the decision sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
Wood, Hannah & O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter No.2)				
2/1	Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd	Oppose	<p>Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p><i>conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p>These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.</p>	
2/2 2/3	Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd submission points 2/2 and 2/3. A detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report.</p> <p>The ITA sufficiently assesses traffic safety and includes details of the physically restricted design of road access onto Swayne Road as shown on "Figure 10:4 : Indicative Internal Minor Accessway Link with Swayne Road" page 61.</p> <p>Fonterra also notes that the following rule is proposed to limit vehicle access on Swayne Road:</p> <p><i>Rule 15.4.2.91A</i></p> <p><i>Any subdivision or development (as relevant) in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan</i></p> <p><i>Area shall ensure that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) There is no new direct access from Lots or Activities to:</i></p> <p><i>(i) Swayne Road; or</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Zig Zag Road.</i></p> <p><i>Advice Note: Rule 15.4.2.8 shall apply to these roads.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Only light vehicles are able to use the proposed road connection to Swayne Road.</i></p> <p><i>(c) Roads shall be constructed in accordance with the roading cross-sections in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
2/4	Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd	Oppose	Fonterra opposes Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd submission point 2/4. A detailed Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) was submitted with Plan Change 14. This report provides a comprehensive assessment on the visual impact of proposed Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and the Council retains the setbacks as notified.
Transpower (Submitter No.3)				
3/1 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/5 3/6 3/7 3/8 3/9 3/10	Transpower	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.
Kama Trust (Submitter No.6)				
6/1	Kama Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes the submission point 6/1 by Kama Trust. Fonterra notes that the Kama Trust property is some distance from the site subject to Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6), noting that it is not specific in any event, and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	
6/2	Kama Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 6/2 by the Kama Trust seeking to add staging provisions to Plan Change 14 due to “oversupply of industrial zoned land”. The effect of rezoning Mangaone Precinct from rural to industrial is sufficiently assessed in the Economic Assessment (Appendix I). Specifically, Section 4.1, outlines the existing Cambridge industrial land provisions and the likely timings these areas will come to market. This report states that:</p> <p><i>“The owners of Area 7 are in the final stages of preparing a Private Plan Change to ‘live zone’ Area 7, spanning approximately 16.3ha, whereby it could become available sometime between 2026 and 2028. Considering that the proposed Mangaone Precinct will not be accessible until at least 2027/2028, it can be expected that the influence of PC14’s net additional industrial land provision (47.6ha) would not start affecting the existing live-zoned industrial market until 2028”.</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>Fonterra also notes that the entire land holding is 79ha, however, this is inclusive of the proposed reserve area (approximately 16ha) along Mangaone Stream and roads. The net area for industrial activities is approximately 47.6ha.</p>	
6/3	Kama Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 6/3 by the Kama Trust seeking to add staging provision to Plan Change 14.</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>The findings of these technical reports do not require staging considerations of other to manage environment effects including traffic and infrastructure demand . These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>
6/4	Kama Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 6/4 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address stormwater concerns is vague.</p> <p>Fonterra also notes that stormwater is assessed in detail in the following technical reports that support Plan Change 14:</p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of stormwater from the proposed Plan Change 14 area. Furthermore, any stormwater discharge will need to comply with existing Waikato Regional Council regulations.</p>	
6/5	Kama Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 6/5 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address transport concerns is vague.</p> <p>Fonterra also notes that traffic impacts are assessed in detail in the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H). <p>This technical report sufficiently assesses the traffic effects from the proposed Plan Change 14 area.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
6/6	Kama Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 6/6 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address amenity concerns is vague</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment including amenity effects and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	
Bardowie Investments Limited (Submitter No. 7)				
7/1	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Neutral	<p>Fonterra notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment including amenity effects and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.</p> • Any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f) to read: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>“Any activities, in the areas listed below, that requires an air discharge permit from the Waikato Regional Council:</i></p> 	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Bardowie Investments Ltd (Submitter 7), which is not specific in any event, and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>(i) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area; (ii) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area; and (iii) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area. Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air. • These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21 of the Waipā District Plan.” 	
Dredge, Lesley (Submitter No. 8)				
8/1	Lesley Dredge	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 8/1 by Lesley Dredge.</p> <p>A comprehensive and detailed Economic Assessment (Appendix I) was submitted to support Plan Change 14. Section 4 of the Economic Assessment specifically addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Local Existing Industrial Land Provisions and the likely timings these will come to market; • Future Proof Business Development Capacity Assessment (BDCA) 2023 Modelling Outcomes and issues Property Economics has identified with this model include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A substantial 492ha loss in short term industrial land capacity and around 684ha loss in industrial land capacity in the medium term within a 2-year assessment period. This raises concerns regarding how the definition of capacity is being applied across the two assessments (BDCA 2021 and BDCA 2023 Forecasts). ○ Issues with employment projections ○ Issues with demand modelling approach ○ Issues with capacity modelling which specifically assesses Waipā District. Of note, the Economic Assessment highlights the following: <i>The same issue of overstated capacity is reflected in the estimates for the Waipā District due to</i> 	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Lesley Dredge (Submitter 8) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p><i>the inclusion of Lake Karapiro Events Zone and Mystery Creek Events Zone in the capacity modelling. As stated on Page 38 of the BDCA 2023, “the two zones provide locally significant areas of land, with the Mystery Creek Events Zone totalling nearly 47ha. These have been included because of their ability to provide land capacity for commercial and industrial employment”. However, according to the provisions outlined in the WDP11, these zones are special purpose zones designated to facilitate events and recreational activities. Notably, industrial activities are not designated as “permitted” within these areas. Therefore, while these zones remain largely undeveloped, the likelihood of accommodating meaningful industrial development is considered highly unlikely and should be discounted from industrial capacity.</i></p> <p>Fonterra also notes that the entire land holding is 79ha, however, this is inclusive of the proposed reserve area (approximately 16ha) along Mangaone Stream and roads. The net area for industrial activities is approximately 47.6ha.</p>	
8/2	Lesley Dredge	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 8/2 by Lesley Dredge. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” executive summary states:</p> <p><i>The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Lesley Dredge (Submitter 8) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	
Henmar Trust (Submitter No.9)				
9/1	Henmar Trust	Support in part Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra supports the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial.</p> <p>Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected to. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct.</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) 	That the Council rezone Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial and that the Council does not adopt additional requirements proposed by Henmar Trust.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	
9/2 9/3	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/2 and 9/3 by Henmar Trust. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” section 4.11 discusses the future integration of remaining land in the C10 Growth Cell, of particular relevance is highlighted below:</p> <p><i>“ . . . it is important to ensure that the development of the Mangaone Precinct is undertaken in a manner that does not compromise the development of the C10 Northern Block in an integrated manner. The achievement of that outcome will be achieved by virtue of the following</i></p> <p><i>It is not expected that there will be an internal roading connection from the northern part of the C10 Northern Block into the Mangaone Precinct (whereby an alternative point of access to Zig Zag Road could be via the proposed roundabout on the northern edge of the Mangaone Precinct), and no such access has been proposed as part of Plan Change 14. This would result in vehicles from the northern part of the C10 Northern Block having to inefficiently travel some distance to the east to join Zig Zag Road and then travel a similar distance to the west towards Victoria Road (where the vast majority the traffic is expected to head). . .</i></p> <p><i>. . . It is expected that the C10 Northern Block would be serviced by the water and wastewater networks developed by WDC (this forms part of the C10 Masterplan).”</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
9/4	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/4 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>
9/5	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/5 by Henmar Trust. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” executive summary states:</p> <p><i>The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).</i></p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	
<p>9/6 9/7 9/8 9/9</p>	<p>Henmar Trust</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/6, 9/7, 9/8 and 9/9 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies,</p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p> <p>Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p>These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.</p> <p>Lastly, Fonterra notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f) to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Any activities, in the areas listed below, that requires an air discharge permit from the Waikato Regional Council:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(i) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area;</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(ii) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area;</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>and</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(iii) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.”</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air.</i></p> <p>These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21 of the Waipā District Plan.</p>	

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
9/10	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/10 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 as proposed is consistent with the Master Plan which has been prepared by Waipā District Council and accommodates the Henmar Trust Property.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/11	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/11 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/12	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/12 by Henmar Trust. Appendix S27 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These reports detail why future infrastructure such as the roundabout is in a specific location, mitigation measures for the rural/industrial interface including restricting Swayne Road access to light vehicles and urban design controls that will be imposed on future development.</p> <p>The changes proposed by Henmar Trust to Appendix S27 are opposed.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
9/13	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/13 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of stormwater from the proposed Plan Change 14 area. The Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) proposes constructed wetlands to manage of the site runoff up to 100-year average return interval storm event. The outlets of the constructed wetlands have been designed to attenuate the flow down to approximately 50% of the pre-development peak flows.</p> <p>Furthermore, any stormwater discharge will need to comply with existing Waikato Regional Council regulations.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/14 9/15	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/14 and 9/15 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 results in three consequential changes to the Structure Plan relating to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct (Appendix 20) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Kiwifruit Block is proposed to form part of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area (identified as part of Node 1A) and be subject to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan and Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines contained in Appendix S20 of the Waipā District Plan; 2. A change is required to reflect the updated position proposed in relation to the alignment of the roading connection (a proposed Collector Road) between Victoria Road and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area; and 3. A pedestrian and cycle link is proposed along the eastern edge of Node 1B. <p>The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” executive summary states:</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p><i>The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).</i></p> <p>Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	
9/16	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/16 by Henmar Trust. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” executive summary states:</p> <p><i>The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p><i>technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).</i></p> <p>Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	
9/17	Henmar Trust	Support in part Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra supports the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial.</p> <p>Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected to. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct.</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) 	That the Council rezone Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial and that the Council does not adopt additional requirements proposed by Henmar Trust.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) o Economic Assessment (Appendix I) o Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) o Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) o Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) o Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	
9/18	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/18 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that the term “Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities” is currently only referred to in the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and Plan Change 14 is seeking to include the definition for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/19	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/19 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that the specific definition for Gymnasium is proposed to restrict the permitted activity within the Central Focal Area of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/20	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/20 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of this Plan Change 14 process as it is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/21	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/21 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p>	
9/22	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/22 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/23	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/23 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/24	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/24 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/25	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/25 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/26	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/26 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
9/27	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/27 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/28	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/28 by Henmar Trust as the need to assess the potential and actual effects on people and the environment is required under the Resource Management Act section 104.</p> <p>Fonterra also notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f) to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Any activities, in the areas listed below, that requires an air discharge permit from the Waikato Regional Council:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(i) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area;</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(ii) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area;</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>and</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(iii) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21 of the Waipā District Plan.”</i></p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/29	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/29 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/30	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/30 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9)

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
				and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/31 9/32 9/33 9/34 9/35 9/36	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/37	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/37 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that there are existing noise regulations contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i> These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/38	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/38 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/39 9/40	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/39 and 9/40 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra’s primary submission. Additionally, the only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to completely review the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	
9/41	Henmar Trust	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/41 by Henmar Trust.</p> <p>Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected too. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct.</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment, justifies the location of specific infrastructure and outlines mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/42 9/43	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/42, 9/43 and 9/44 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9)

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
9/44			Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
9/45	Henmar Trust	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/45 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
Waikato Regional Council (Submitter No.10)				
10/1	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes the submission point 10/1 by Waikato Regional Council.</p> <p>Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) ○ Archaeological Assessment (Appendix E) ○ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ○ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ○ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ○ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) ○ Detailed Site Investigation (Appendix J) ○ Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix K) ○ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) ○ Cultural Impact Assessment (Appendix M) ○ Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/2 10/3 10/4	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2, 10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
10/5 10/6 10/7			as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	
10/11	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 10/11 by Waikato Regional Council for the reasons set out in their primary submission.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) in relation to 10/11.
10/12	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/12 by Waikato Regional Council. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/16	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/16 by Waikato Regional Council. Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) specifically includes “for industrial purposes” to avoid an unrelated subdivision such as a boundary adjustment triggering the need for the reserve management plan in advance of industrial development. The industrial development and use of the Managone Precinct is what triggers the creation of a reserve management plan.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/17 10/18	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/17 and 10/18 by Waikato Regional Council. Fonterra considers it is unnecessary to include an additional rule as this requirement will be imposed as a condition of a land use or subdivision consent in the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
10/19	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/19 by Waikato Regional Council. Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) should only be triggered if the consent being sought is to enable the industrial development and use of the Mangaone Precinct. Fonterra does not consider a blanket trigger appropriate.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/21	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/21 by Waikato Regional Council. There are two comprehensive ecological assessments that include bats supporting Plan Change 14 being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) Particularly, the advice provided by Gerry Kessels of Bluewattle Ecology includes learnings from other plan changes within the Waikato region which identified bats habitats.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and acceptst the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/22	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/22 by Waikato Regional Council. The proposed changes to Rule 15.4.2.69 already requires that any subdivision or development (as relevant) is in general accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27. Fonterra considers that it is not practical to require any subdivision or development (as relevant) be “in accordance” as being 1mm out would technically mean that the proposed activity does not meet the requirement resulting in unnecessary future consenting issues.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/23	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/23 by Waikato Regional Council. Fonterra considers that the proposed stormwater system is appropriate for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan as it is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats (Appendix D1) • Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) • Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
10/24 10/25 10/26	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 by Waikato Regional Council. Any discharge to the Mangaone Stream will be the subject of a discharge permit as such this is a consenting matter. The points raised in 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 will be matters of assessment that the Waikato Regional Council can consider.</p> <p>Fonterra notes the following regarding the Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed constructed wetlands will have a permanent water level designed to store the required volume for water quality treatment and retention as required by the Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline 2020. • Extended detention is also provided by the primary outlet from the constructed wetland for protection of the receiving environment from erosion caused by concentrated flow (per requirements of the Waikato SMG 2020) as specified in Table 4. • Further retention via soakage is deemed not possible for the PC14 area due to on-site shallow groundwater and insufficient soil soakage rates. • The proposed constructed wetlands are within the development area and will be located outside of the pre-development floodplain. • Site runoff shall be provided with water quality treatment and attenuation within the constructed wetland before being discharged into Mangaone Stream. • Results of the 2D stormwater model indicate improvement of flood levels downstream of the Victoria Road culvert for the 2yr and 10yr storm events simulated. • A very minimal increase in flood levels of about 2cm at the existing floodplain immediately upstream of Victoria Road for 100yr storm event but tends to even out right after the road culvert and starts to decrease from pre-development flood levels. • Local increase in flood levels along the stream within the PC14 area are a result of model assumption where basin 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>outlets are concentrated to the eastern end of the stream. More desirable results can be achieved by spacing out the numerous basin outlets throughout the length of the stream, the details of which can be represented via further modelling activities in resource consent stage of the development when more comprehensive earthworks and pond locations have been defined.</p>	
10/28	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral	<p>Fonterra considers that details being requested under submission point 10/28 are matters of consent where more detailed stormwater modelling can occur with the post-development ground levels and other impervious surfaces are defined.</p> <p>Fonterra notes the following regarding the Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catchment-based hydrology for the development site was undertaken due to the earthworks not yet defined when the 2D stormwater model was built. This is deemed appropriate at this stage of the development planning process. A rain-on-grid can be applied to the site similar to the rest of the catchment at resource consenting stage when the earthworks, channel and pipe design, and constructed wetlands have been better defined. The rain-on-grid approach will illustrate the flood depths within the site. • Initial abstraction – HG has noted a typographical error that should have stated 1.4mm la for post-development and 7.55mm for pre-development instead of the other way around as reported on Table 6. The post-development la applied to the model is in line with the Waikato Stormwater Runoff Modelling Guideline 2020. The 7.55mm la for pre-development is a little higher than the recommended value. We believe this has led to a lower pre-development discharge in the model which we aimed to achieve by attenuation via constructed wetland. Hence, the modelled attenuation is more conservative. Necessary update to the 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<p>pre-development and post-development models can be applied during the consenting stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface roughness coefficient for pre-development refers to the areas within and outside the site. For post-development, the roughness coefficient is only applied to areas outside the site, since the site itself is modelled as lumped catchments which do not consider surface roughness as one of its parameters. • Existing culverts along Mangaone Stream have been modelled as 1D structures within the 2D mesh based on survey and available online data for existing structures. • Surveyed stream bed topography was burned into the LiDAR data before the LiDAR was imported into the software as terrain. We believe this is a good representation as it uses the topographic survey data. • The 2D stormwater model for this plan change is a development of the previous pre-development scenario models for the neighbouring Bardowie Industrial Land development and the C8-C9 development which utilised the 2008 LiDAR data. HG has utilised the same LiDAR data for consistency with stormwater assessment from previous developments, and to preserve the pre-development scenario results across the wider catchment. • Local increase in flood levels along the stream within the PC14 area are a result of model assumption where basin outlets are concentrated to the eastern end of the stream. More desirable results can be achieved by spacing out the numerous basin outlets throughout the length of the stream. Flow energy can be dissipated by providing additional stormwater infrastructure to diffuse to concentrated flows from outlets for erosion protection. The details and effects of these additions can be represented via further modelling activities in resource consent stage of the development when more comprehensive earthworks and pond locations have been defined. 	

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC14 area is adjacent to the BIL (DP 529042) development and the DP 20745 greenfield to the west of the site's boundary. Further west across Victoria Road are the C8-C9 industrial areas and the Fonterra dairy factory. A greenfield area is located across Zig Zag Road serving as north boundary of the site, while other developments are located across Swayne Road along the east boundary. Lastly, a small parcel of land which is currently utilised by the BIL for stormwater management shares the south boundary. The results of HG stormwater modelling undertaken for the PC14 area indicates that the proposed development in PC14 will not exacerbate the pre-development flooding situation within the neighbouring properties as illustrated by the white polygons in Figures 13, 14, and 15 of the SMP. Further consideration of the post-development ground levels of BIL & C8-C9 can be undertaken in more detail within the stormwater model during the consenting stage when the post-development ground levels for PC14 and the constructed wetland locations and layouts have been clearly defined. 	
10/30	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/30 by Waikato Regional Council. While an emissions reduction plan has not been specifically included, a range of measures have been included to address the outcomes sought. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
10/31 10/32	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
10/33 10/34 10/35 10/36 10/37			included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	
Dredge, Kenneth (Submitter No. 11)				
11/1	Kenneth Dredge	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 11/1 by Kenneth Dredge. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) • Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes also notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing building setbacks could result in the land being utilised for yard space thus generating additional lighting glare, noise closer to boundaries etc. • A 2m high bund was considered during the review and assessed as having a negative effect on the adjacent rural landscape character values due to its difference in character to the surrounding environment. The proposed buffer treatment was carefully designed to soften the interface with the rural landscape character values and to provide a cohesive outcome that compliments the existing boundary treatments from the residents on Swayne Road. 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
11/2	Kenneth Dredge	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 11/2 by Kenneth Dredge. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell-Hautapu” executive summary states:</p> <p><i>“The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).”</i></p> <p>The Kiwifruit Block through this Plan Change 14 process will be incorporated into the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
11/3	Kenneth Dredge	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 11/3 by Kenneth Dredge. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read:</p> <p><i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Hautapu ‘Area 6’ all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p>These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
Director-General of Conservation (Submitter No.12)				
12/2	Director-General of Conservation	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/2 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/2.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
12/3 12/4 12/5	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 12/3, 12/4 and 12/5 by Director-General of Conservation. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
12/7	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/2 by Director-General of Conservation. Fonterra considers that this matter is for Waipā District Council to consider under various processes such as the Reserves Act and it is inappropriate for Plan Change 14 to predetermine the outcome.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
12/9	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/9 by Director-General of Conservation. Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) specifically includes “for industrial purposes” to avoid an unrelated subdivision such as a boundary adjustment triggering the need for the reserve management plan in advance of industrial development. The industrial development and use of the Managone Precinct is what triggers the creation of a reserve management plan.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
12/10	Director-General of Conservation	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/10 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/10.
12/13	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/13 by Director-General of Conservation. The proposed changes to Rule 15.4.2.69 already requires that any subdivision or development (as relevant) is in general accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27. If the subdivision or development does not comply with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27 it becomes a non-complying activity.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
12/14	Director-General of Conservation	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 12/14 by Director-General of Conservation as it is unnecessary to compromise infrastructure outcomes. It is noted that there are two comprehensive ecological assessments which support the proposed stormwater design being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) ○ Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
12/15	Director-General of Conservation	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/15 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/15.
Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent (Submitter No. 13)				
13/1 13/2	Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 13/1 and 13/2 by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent. As a detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report. Fonterra considers that there is no need for further traffic effects assessment or restriction of development.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent (Submitter 13) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter No. 14)				
14/1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 14/1 by Fire and Emergency New Zealand as Plan Change 14 is the rezoning of land from rural to industrial which pushes out the urban boundary limit.	That the Council adopts relief point 1 sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) being: <i>"Council accepts the extension of the 'urban limit' within the planning maps to include the PPC14 area."</i>
14/2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 14/2 by Fire and Emergency New Zealand. The Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) contains Appendix 1 Indicative Cross Section Forms, which show the proposed road widths for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
			The ITA sufficiently assesses traffic safety and includes details of the physically restricted design of road access onto Swayne Road as shown on "Figure 10:4 : Indicative Internal Minor Accessway Link with Swayne Road" page 61.	
14/3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral	Fonterra is supportive in principle of low flammability planting, however, is at a level of detail which is beyond the requirements of a plan change. Fonterra also notes that other priorities, such as planting that enhances bats habitat and amenity screening may prevail when selecting plant species.	That the Council considers the relief sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) in the balance of the other purposes planting needs to serve in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.
Taylor, Reon (Submitter No.15)				
15/1	Reon Taylor	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 15/1 by Reon Taylor. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read:</p> <p><i>"Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i></p> <p>These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
15/2	Reon Taylor	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 15/2 by Reon Taylor. The proposed provisions for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area already provides for sufficient landscaping and fencing on the boundaries.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
15/3 15/4	Reon Taylor	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 15/3 and 15/4 by Reon Taylor. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes also notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing building setbacks could result in the land being utilised for yard space thus generating additional lighting glare, noise closer to boundaries etc. 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.
15/5	Reon Taylor	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 15/5 by Reon Taylor. The proposed restrictions on heavy vehicle traffic movements will apply during construction and operation.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.