

FURTHER SUBMISSION [REDACTED] CHANGE 17 HAUTAPU INDUSTRIAL ZONES TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN [REDACTED] USE 8 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

To: Gary Dyet Chief Executive [REDACTED]

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

Submitter: [REDACTED]

Hereafter referred to as the Submitter

Address for service: 4Sight Consulting Limited [REDACTED] mail: [REDACTED]

Attention: Gavin McCullagh

Phone: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The Submitter lives at 345 Peake Road and has been resident at this property since August 2009.
2. The rural environment and surrounds are an essential factor in the value to the Submitter of living at this location.
3. The submitter lodged a primary submission to Plan Change 17 (PC17). The primary submission to PC17 (Council Submitter Number 7) related to the Submitter's interests in the rezoning of Area 6 in PC17.
4. The Submitter opposes the inclusion of Area 6 in PC17 and questions the basis on which it is proposed. Additionally, the Submitter seeks that in the event of Area 6 being incorporated in PC17 that the relief sought mitigates the impact of that inclusion.
5. These further submissions and the reasons for the same are set out within the following table, entitled 'Further Submissions to Proposed Plan Change 17 Hautapu Industrial Zones to the Waipa District Plan'. Changes sought to the provisions are shown by deletion in ~~striketrough~~ and addition in underline. The Submitter supports alternative relief that achieves the same outcomes.
  - a) **THE SUBMITTER WISHES TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF THESE FURTHER SUBMISSIONS.**
  - b) **IF OTHERS MAKE SIMILAR SUBMISSIONS THE SUBMITTER MAY BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER PRESENTING A JOINT CASE WITH THEM AT ANY HEARING.**
  - c) **THE SUBMITTER COULD NOT GAIN AN ADVANTAGE IN TRADE COMPETITION THROUGH THIS SUBMISSION.**
  - d) **THE SUBMITTER IS DIRECTLY AFFECTED BY AN EFFECT OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE SUBMISSION THAT –**
    - I. **ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE ENVIRONMENT; AND**
    - II. **DOES NOT RELATE TO TRADE COMPETITION OR THE EFFECTS OF TRADE COMPETITION.**

Signed on behalf of Maria Barrie





Gavin McCullagh  
Principal Planner  
12 December 2022

6. FURTHER SUBMISSIONS TO PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17 HAUTAPU INDUSTRIAL ZONE TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Antrim, Janine	26.1	General - Transportation	I want it left as it is please	Support	M Barrie has also identified the potential for increased traffic on Peake Road and, in particular, is concerned that an access will be made to Area 6 from Peake Road either for construction or operations	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17
Briggs, Michael and Jenni	14.2 & 14.5	Industry Zone Policy 7.3.4.9	Delete <del>7.3.4.9 To enable lawfully established industrial activities within the Carter's Flat Commercial Zone to relocate to Hautapu 'Area 6'.</del>	Support	The s32 report (section 3.2, p85) reasoning that inclusion of Area 6 helps solve a different planning problem; i.e. that existing businesses are being "zoned" out of Carters Flat is not a valid argument, because the plan change without Area 6 will still create new industrial areas to which Carters Flat industries could relocate.	Amend as indicated and also amend proposed rule 7.4.1.1 (w) <i>Within 'Area 6' of the Hautapu Industrial Plan Area, any lawfully established, dry industry activity that is located within the Cambridge Commercial Zone of Carters Flat established prior to 2022.</i>
Briggs, Michael and Jenni	14.4	Industry Zone Rule 7.4.1.1 (a)	<i>7.4.1.1 Permitted Activities</i> <i>The following activities shall comply with the performance standards of this zone</i>	Support in part	The Submitter supports this argument that the current operative plan might allow any form of industrial activity within Area 6 without the proposed amendment. This is because the proposed rule 7.4.1.1 (w) <i>Within 'Area</i>	Amend as indicated

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<i>(a) industrial activities (excluding 'Area 6' of the Hautapu Industrial Area).</i>		<i>6' of the Hautapu Industrial Plan Area, any lawfully established, dry industry activity that is located within the Cambridge Commercial Zone of Carters Flat established prior to 2022. does not constrain any other industry activity (i.e. not dry) from locating in Area 6.</i>	
Danswan, Rebecca	17.1	General	Do not approve	Support	The Submitter does not support the inclusion of 'Area 6' in PC17	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17
FENZ	28.1	New Policy 7.3.4.11	A new policy in Section 7 Industrial Zone <u><i>Policy 7.3.4.11 To ensure that all subdivision and development within the Hautapu Structure Plan area is provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008</i></u>	Support in part	The Submitter shares the concern expressed in the FENZ submission that the limits on water supply to the proposed industrial areas create an unacceptable risk and that proposed PC17 is amended to include measures to reduce this risk.  The Submitter also relies on a groundwater supply and is concerned that additional demand for the expanded industrial zone may impact that supply.	Amend as indicated  Provide clarification that industrial development of Area 6 (if included in PC 17) will not adversely impact the groundwater supply for 345 Peake Road.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Fonterra Ltd	20.1	Planning maps 4, 22, 23 and 24	Retain the industrial zoning within 'Area 6' as notified, with the addition of the 'specialised dairy industrial area' overlay.  Figure 1: 'Area 6' with Industrial Zoning and a 'specialised dairy industrial area' overlay.	Oppose	Fonterra gives protection from 'Reverse Sensitivity' as the key reason for their submission. This is opposed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Area 6 is included, it is Intended to be an Industrial Zone for dry industry and therefore sensitive activities would be non-complying e.g.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Rule 7.4.1.5 Non-complying</i></li> <li><i>(a) Residential activities.</i></li> <li><i>(b) Education facilities, except as provided for by Rule 7.4.1.1(v).</i></li> <li><i>(c) Medical centres, except as provided for by Rule 7.4.1.1(v).</i></li> <li><i>(d) Tourism facilities</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Applying the dairy industrial area across 'Area 6' would in fact raise the future possibility of dairy industry activities taking place there in close proximity to existing residences and creating the</li> </ul>	Reject the proposed amendment

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					potential for reverse sensitivity	
Hautapu Landowners Group	21.1	General	<p>Rezone land immediately to the north of 'Area 6' as deferred industrial, to be live zoned on specified levels of development in Area 6 or 31 March 2030, whichever is sooner.</p> 	Oppose	This proposal does not mitigate the effects of the proposed rezoning of Area 6 on the Submitter and likely worsens some.	Reject the proposed amendment
Hautapu Landowners Group	21.2	Appendix S5 - Stormwater	This is particularly the case in relation to stormwater whereby the expanded area would facilitate the development of swales or detention ponds / wetlands with a controlled outlet to the Mangaone Stream (which would also avoid the issues noted above in relation to land being dissected and becoming unusable). Having a point of direct access to the	Support in part	The Submitter relies on groundwater and is in close proximity to the proposed Area 6 stormwater detention basin. The Submitter shares the concerns of the Hautapu Landowners Group in paragraph 4.3 of their submission <i>"This includes concerns about the potential for groundwater</i>	Demonstrate that stormwater can be managed without negative impacts on the water supply at 345 Peake Road.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			Mangaone Stream was a key element in relation to the effective management of stormwater within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct. T		<i>mounding, contamination of groundwater and bores used for domestic and stock drinking purposes,</i> The Submitters desired outcome is that Area 6 is excluded from PC 17. However, unless it can be shown that there is no risk to the groundwater supply at 345 Peake Road, an alternative stormwater solution is supported.	
Hayes, Owen David John	23.3	General – protection of highly productive land	I'd like to see the original council plan adhered to - with the industry remaining on the South Side of Hautapu Road.	Support	The s32 Report gives very little consideration to the loss of this highly productive land and makes no reference to the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land that was released on 19 September 2022 shortly before the s.32 Report was published and came into effect 17 October 2022.	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17
Henmar Trust	25.1	Land supply – existing growth cells have sufficient land to accommodate relocation of industry from Carters Flat.	That Council does not rezone land outside the existing Identified Industrial Growth Cells until the existing Industrial Growth Cells have been rezoned and serviced.	Support	The s32 Report relies heavily (p21) on the Kama Trust submission on the Update Future proof Strategy 2021 and associated technical reports particularly with regard to the need for additional industrial land supply. The	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					Kama Trust submissions assert that there is an identified shortfall in industrial zoned land, but does not provide supporting evidence.	
Hogarth, Nicky (AML trading as Allied Concrete)	6.3	Rule 7.4.1.5 Non-complying activities	Seeks the removal of concrete batching plants from the list of non-complying activities  <i>7.4.1.5 Non-complying industries</i>  <i>The following activities shall comply with the performance standards of this zone</i> <i>(p) Notwithstanding Rule 7.4.1.3(f), the following activities are non-complying activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precent Structure Plan Area and Hautapu Industrial Area 'Area 6'.</i> <i>(i) Bitumen plants;</i> <i>(ii) Incineration activities;</i> <del><i>(iii) Concrete batching plants;</i></del> <i>(iv) Relocated buildings.</i>	Oppose	Based on the other non-complying activities; concrete batching plants are likely to have been listed for reasons other than just water use. However, this has not been clearly explained in s6.1.3 of the s32 Report.  Page 40 of the s32 Report includes the following statement "The philosophy behind the structure plan is to enable light to medium industry, including dairy and equine industries, avoiding the impacts associated with heavy industry"	Reject the proposed amendment
Matheson, Ian	15.2	Transportation - General	Not rezoning the area into industrial - keep the status as is	Support	Refer to Waka Kotahi submission 12.1 identifying the need for additional transport studies. This rezoning should not progress without that information.	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Roberts, Ethne Penelope	27.1	General NPS- Highly Productive Soils	I seek that the council does not implement plan change 17, the rezoning from rural to industrial land.	Support	The reasoning in the s32 report p42 that the loss of the productive horticultural activities on high class soils is outweighed by the industrial gains is not quantified. No reference is made to the NPS-Highly productive Land, despite it coming into effect before the s32 Report was published.	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17
Stamp, Jason	13.2	General - Transport	Do not rezone any land in the area. Improve consultation and engagement.	Support	Refer to Waka Kotahi submission 12.1 identifying the need for additional transport studies. This rezoning should not progress without that information.	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17
Waka Kotahi	12.1	General - Transportation	Waka Kotahi seeks that Waipa District Council undertake an assessment of traffic flows and intersection capacity to determine whether the State Highway 1B/Hautapu Road intersection can cater for the additional traffic volume from Plan Change 17, prior to construction of the roundabout.	Support	While the Waka Kotahi submission is focused on the Hautapu Road – SH1, Peake Road is an alternative route to SH-1 and may be impacted by traffic increases, particularly if there is any delay to proposed works.  It should be noted that the Transportation report prepared for the Kama Trust’s submission on the Future Proof Strategy - on which the proposal to include Area 6 is largely based - states “Most trips from the site and Structure Plan area would be expected	Do not include Area 6 in PC 17  Undertake the requested studies before progressing to an expansion of the industrial area

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Relevant PC17 Provision / Topic	Relief sought by submitter	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					<p><i>to originate from Victoria Road as this is the most direct route to Cambridge and SH1. However, Peake Road may be used as an alternative route given it avoids the SH1 interchange and some vehicles may head north on SH1B” (CKL Report 12 February 2021)</i></p>	