

Before the Hearings Panel

Waipa District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And

In the matter of Waipa Plan Change 17 – Hautapu Industrial
Zones

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MARIA
BARRIE Dated: 16 March 2023**

1. My name is Maria Barrie, my partner Jason Hanham and I own the property 345 Peake Rd, which is located directly across Peake Rd from the Boyds Asparagus block, Area 6. We purchased our property in August 2009 and have lived there ever since. Our daughter Emma was born in 2011 and as a family we very much enjoy all aspects of living in a rural zone.
2. Unfortunately, we were not initially notified by Waipa District Council along with the other neighbours of the proposed rezoning of Area 6. Rather ironically, it is because we live in a rural zone, with great neighbours who alerted us to what was being proposed, that has enabled us to be part of the process.
3. We did our due diligence prior to purchasing our property, we understood the future expressway plans and we understood the proposed future industrial development nearby, we also understand not everything remains the same. We trusted that Waipa DC had carried out its due diligence and had planned to cater for growth well into the future.
4. When we heard about the proposed re-zoning of Area 6, we investigated it to see if we had missed anything. We found the information on the 2019 Plan Change 5 - Waipa 2050 Growth Strategy. This work claims to have taken into account revised population projections and updated zoning accordingly. In relation to the Hautapu area it claims that the inclusion of 36ha (C8) will be sufficient to meet anticipated industrial demand until 2041. What we don't understand how in 2023, only 4 years later, we now being told that the rezoning of even more rural land is required.
5. The prospect of our family home being so close to industrial activity is obviously not exciting to us. We were aware of the planned rezoning of area C9 and have no objection to this. Finding out that Future Proof has encouraged and agreed to the proposed addition of Area 6, without direct notification to adjoining neighbours and that the section 32 report is relying on this as the justification for change is a real concern. It seems utterly unfair that we had no opportunity to participate or even hear the discussions, but the Karma Trust were welcome to participate.
6. One of the other areas of concern is the suggestion in documents that consents have been issued already for parts of Area 6 for industrial activities, therefore it makes sense for the whole area to be re-zoned. This would seem to be a bit of a slippery slope, and potentially something all Waipa residents should be more aware of. These consents were granted without reference to us, had we known that the intent was to grant a couple, then move right on through to our boundary we would have objected at that point.
7. The proposed re-zoning of Area 6 will affect my family in many ways. We are genuinely concerned about living across from industrial activity when we expected to continue to enjoy life in a rural zone. Our main key concerns are as follows:
8. Currently, our view towards the proposed Area 6 includes a high, well-maintained hedge, consistent with the rural environment we live in. The prospect of this changing to anything that does not provide a solid screen from any industrial buildings is unacceptable to us.

Unfortunately, from what I have seen of the development in the Hautapu area, the Structure Plan intent to achieve of a “high value amenity” look far from being achieved. The new developments have minimal, small grade plantings within the property and nothing on the verges (see Appendix A for some examples of this). It is hard to have any confidence that the current rules will suffice in protecting our visual amenity. We don’t believe the proposed landscape treatments will come close to mitigate the negative visual effects nor will they aid in buffering the expected increase in noise. If more specific rules were applied and adhered to there may be a greater chance of providing adequate mitigation.

9. The change to industrial zoning in Area 6 will not only bring more traffic noise from Peake Rd, it will also bring unwanted vehicle noise from within the area. Currently traffic noise from Peake Rd is largely restricted to a couple of busy times of the day, we expect the proposed industrial zoning will bring more and heavier vehicles contributing to more road noise in general.
10. We currently hear the odd farm bike, or tractor from the Boyds operation in Area 6, but this is not often constant and is a sound that we wholly anticipated and accept as part of the rural living. The proposed change to industrial means that we are likely to hear the constant beeping of forklifts, the beeping of reversing trucks, loud bangs as things are loaded and unloaded from trucks and people noise, possibly 7 days per week. As a family, part of the attraction of a rural property is having the space to be outside for our daughter to play with her family and friends. I expect the constant beeping of industrial vehicles will be extremely frustrating and disturbing to family life.
11. In closing, I would like to re-iterate my objection to the rezoning of Area 6. I don’t think there is sufficient rationale to support the need nor has there been adequate consideration of the effects on my family and others in the area. I would urge you to reconsider the proposed addition of Area 6 or at the very least look very carefully at what conditions may offer more acceptable outcomes.

Appendix A – Examples of ‘Landscape Planting’ Hautapu Structure Plan Area



Appendix A – Examples of ‘Landscape Planting’ Hautapu Structure Plan Area

