

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 17 to the Waipā District Plan –
Hautapu Industrial Zones

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MALCOLM BOYD & ASHLEY
BOYD**

Dated 2 June 2023

LACHLAN MULDOWNY
BARRISTER

P +64 7 834 4336 **M** +64 21 471 490

Office Panama Square, 14 Garden Place, Hamilton

Postal PO Box 9169, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240

www.lachlanmuldowney.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Malcolm Boyd, and I have previously provided a statement of evidence dated 17 March 2023, on behalf of myself and my brother, Ashley. That statement was provided at a time when the Hautapu Landowners Group (**HLG**) submission seeking a deferred zoning was deemed out of scope. Since then, the deferred zoning relief has been declared within scope.
2. Accordingly, this statement updates the Hearing Panel on the Kama Trust position.

KAMA TRUST POSITION

3. The key driver behind the Kama Trust's support for Plan Change 17 (**PC17**) is the shared vision we have with Council which is to help address the urgent need for industrial land supply in Cambridge, and to take the pressure off the Carters Flat area, which cannot accommodate that demand.
4. We have had several local businesses approach us over the past year looking to expand their businesses and move from where they are currently situated, both from the Carters Flat area and other Cambridge based firms.
5. We have signed a heads of agreement and non-disclosure agreement with a large business in Carters Flat that wishes to grow their business but is unable to commence their project until they have more certainty.
6. Both they and we have been unable to progress any of these opportunities due to the delays in PC17 becoming operative. Both they and we are unable

to commit to further steps in our process until there is more certainty of direction for PC17.

7. Our concern is that these businesses may move elsewhere, which will be inefficient for the Cambridge based workforce, and will impact Cambridge's attraction as a place where people can work and live.
8. We believe it is critical that PC17 be approved as soon as possible, so that we can immediately commence our development. Our biggest concern now is that what was intended to be a fairly straightforward plan change process, with infrastructure provision agreed with Council, and all easily deliverable, has now become unnecessarily complicated by the HLG submission.
9. HLG has consistently asserted that they have a simple solution to all infrastructure issues, and that their stormwater proposal represents an overall improvement. However, it appears to us that the evidence that HLG has provided is largely desktop based and there have been multiple assumptions made with little technical evidence to back it up.
10. We have looked closely at these issues, had our experts attend conferencing, and do not agree that the addition of the HLG land is a better outcome. To us, if we are required to develop in combination with HLG it will add delays, risk and uncertainty to our development within PC17.
11. To be clear, we are not opposed to HLG's development aspirations, but we are opposed to our development being linked, or contingent upon HLG. We need to be able to develop our land independently of HLG, and not be reliant on infrastructure solutions that they control. As stated in the Joint Witness Statements for Three Waters and Transport, integration only need be explored later, when HLG have completed the necessary technical work and once the PC17 development hurdles have been triggered.

12. We accept that our development will need to be capable of integrating with the HLG land in the future if the deferred industrial zoning is approved and ultimately live zoned. Our traffic and stormwater experts confirm that we can design our infrastructure to ensure this future integration is possible.
13. But we do not want to be put in a position where we are reliant on HLG for any aspect of our development. If that occurs, the associated risks and uncertainties could place our development in jeopardy and will inevitably lead to delays. This is something we, Council and our potential industrial land users should not accept. Delay and uncertainty must be avoided.
14. HLG seem to be trying to shift the goal posts once again by saying that their land should be 'lived' zoned. We believe that this is not a viable option and could further delay the plan change process.
15. Finally, I note that if there is a trigger for development of Area 6 by having traffic signals at the Alwill Drive intersection, this will further delay businesses the opportunity to relocate. Road 1 on C8/C9 which will potentially create additional traffic volume is located on the 'Hannon' land and relies on this being made available which currently has no time frame.
16. I want to conclude by saying that Kama Trust is ready to go and wants to commence development as soon as we are able. If PC17 progressed in the manner sought by Kama Trust, we envisage that businesses could be able to move out to Area 6 within the next 12-18 months. We certainly hope the decision on PC17 facilitates this outcome.

Malcolm and Ashley Boyd

2 June 2023