

**From:** [info@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:info@waipadc.govt.nz)  
**To:** [Policy Shared](#)  
**Subject:** External Sender: Plan Change Further Submission Form 6 - Gareth Moran  
**Date:** Thursday, 15 December 2022 10:36:17 am

**CYBER SECURITY WARNING:** This email is from an external source - be careful of attachments and links. Please follow the Cybersecurity Policy and report suspicious emails to Servicedesk

**Full name** Gareth Moran  
**Email address** [REDACTED]  
**Telephone** [REDACTED]  
**Postal address** [REDACTED]  
**Contact person** Gareth Moran  
**This is a further submission...** In support of a submission on the following proposed change proposed to the Waipā District Plan

**Insert name of proposed plan change**

17

**I am...**

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest

**Specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category**

refer to attachment

**Name of original submitter** Kama Trust

**Address of original submitter** [REDACTED]

**Submission number of original submission (if available)** 8.1

**I...** Support the above submission

**The particular parts of the submission I support/oppose are**

refer to attachment

**The reasons for my support/opposition are**

refer to attachment

**I seek that..**

Part of the submission be allowed

**Describe the part(s) you seek to allow/disallow**

refer to attachment

**Give precise details on why you seek the above**

refer to attachment

I...

Wish to be heard in support of my further submission

**If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?**

Yes

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17 TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN  
PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 8 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: Garry Dyet Chief Executive  
Waipa District Council  
Private Bag 2402  
Te Awamutu  
Via email only: [districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz)

Submitter: Kama Trust

[REDACTED]

Address for service: Barker & Associates

[REDACTED]

Cambridge 3434

Via email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## 1.0 Submission Information

---

- 1.1 The specific Plan Change 17 submissions that Kama Trust which to comment further on are attached.
- 1.2 Kama Trust supports and/or is in opposition to the specific submissions submitted on as listed in the attached document. The reasons are also provided in the attached document.
- 1.3 The decisions Kama Trust wishes Council to make ensure that the issues raised by Kama Trust are dealt with are contained in the attached document.
- 1.4 Kama Trust wishes to be heard in support of this further submission.
- 1.5 If others make a similar submission, Kama Trust will consider presenting a joint case with them at a Hearing.

## 2.0 Introduction

---

- 2.1 Kama Trust welcome the opportunity to provide further submissions on the original submissions lodged in relation to the Hautapu Industrial Zones Plan Change (PC 17).

## 3.0 General Feedback

---

- 3.1 Kama Trust further submissions relate to the following submissions, which are documented in alphabetical order as per Councils summary of decisions document:
  - Submission #01 – Turner, Lee and Kristin
  - Submission #02 – Boyds Asparagus Industries
  - Submission #03 – McGowan, Bruce and Susan Jean
  - Submission #04 – Webb, Edward James and Betty Gordon
  - Submission #05 – Middlemiss, Kevin Charles
  - Submission #06 - Hogath, Nicky (AML Limited trading as Allied Concret)
  - Submission #07 – Barrie, Maria (4Sight Consulting Limited)
  - Submission #09 – Smith, Matthew Craig
  - Submission #10 – Hannon, Richie and Carol
  - Submission #11 - Burke, Hayden James
  - Submission #12 – Waka Kotahi
  - Submission #13 – Stamp, Jason
  - Submission #14 – Briggs, Michael and Jennie
  - Submission #15 – Matheson, Ian
  - Submission #16 - Matheson, Natalie
  - Submission #17 - Danswan, Rebecca
  - Submission #18 - Walker, Casey
  - Submission #19 - West, Jane Victoria
  - Submission #20 – Fonterra Limited

- Submission #21 – Hautapu Landowners Group
- Submission #22 – Transland Group Limited
- Submission #23 - Hayes, Owen David John
- Submission #24 – Evans, Jaine
- Submission #25 – Henmar Trust
- Submission #26 - Antram, Janine
- Submission #27 - Roberts, Ethne Penelope
- Submission #28 - Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Kama Trust remains in support of PC 17 as notified; aside from the introduction of the stormwater detention pond dissecting the property at 84 Hautapu Road, which appears to have been included in error.

#### 4.0 Further Submission on the Hautapu Industrial Zones Plan Change (PC 17)

Submission#	Support/Oppose/Seek Amendment	Comments/Reasons	Relief Sought
Submission #26.1 and 26.2 - Antram, Jamie	Oppose	The submitted requests that the PC is rejected in its entirety, predominantly due to traffic and rural amenity related effects.	Kama Trust are in opposition to the rejection of the PC on the basis that the proposed District Plan provisions accompanied with the conclusions made within the Integrated Transportation Assessment (ITA) will adequately avoid and/or mitigate any potential traffic and amenity related effects. On this basis, Kama Trust seeks that the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #7.1 to 7.6 – Barrie, Maria	Oppose	In summary the submitter requests that 'Area 6' is rejected from the plan change as notified.	Kama Trust are in opposition to the rejection of 'Area 6' as per the submitters request on the basis that any potential environmental effects can be either avoided or mitigated, and seek that PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.

Submission #14.1 to 14.09 – Briggs, Michael and Jenni	Neutral	The submitters seek more clarification in terms of the District Plan provisions regarding wet and dry industry; and incentivising the relocation of existing businesses from Carters Flat.	Kama Trust take a neutral position in relation to submission points #14.1 to 14.08.
Submission #14.9	Oppose	Submission #14.9 seeks the indicative road layout accessing ‘Area 6’ is moved as far east as possible.	Kama Trust are in opposition to Submission #14.9 on the basis that the proposed vehicle entrance points represent the most efficient access to the site, as demonstrated within the ITA.
Submission #14.10	Neutral	Submission #14.10 seeks the amenity street tree planting and landscape amenity strip, and building setbacks should be extended to included Area 6.	Kama Trust are not in opposition to the addition of the landscaping planting plan as identified in Council’s 32 analysis.
Submission #11.1 – Burke, Hayden James	Support	The submitter is in full support with the PC as notified.	Kama Trust concur with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.

Submission #17.1 – Danswan, Rebecca	Oppose	The submitter is in opposition to the PC due to potential effects associated with traffic, noise, smell and livestock disruptions.	Kama Trust seek that this submission is rejected and that the PC is approved as notified; on the basis that the proposed District Plan provisions, layout and design of the structure plan and the findings of the key specialist reports, including the ITA, will ensure any potential adverse environmental effects are avoided or mitigated.
Submission #24.1 – Evans, Jane	Support	The submitter is in full support with the PC as notified.	Kama Trust concur with the key points raised by the submitter and request the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #28.1 – Fire and Emergency New Zealand.	Oppose	The submitter requests the PC is rejected on the basis that adequate water supply for firefighting purposes cannot be provided.	<p>As part of the development of the Industrial Zoning, sufficient water supply for Fire Fighting will be provided. Kama Trust oppose the submitters stance to have the PC objected on this basis.</p> <p>Kama Trust take a neutral position in relation to the addition of Policy 7.3.4.11 as requested by the submitter; on the basis that the intent of this policy is already captured within Chapter 15 (15.3.3.1 and 15.3.19.1) of the District Plan.</p>

<p>Submission #20.1 – Fonterra Ltd</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>Oppose</p>	<p>There are two distinct components associated with the submitter’s requests.</p> <p>1) The submitter supports the rezoning of the wider C9 growth cell, including the addition of Area 6.</p> <p>2) The submitter requests that Area 6 is re-zoned ‘Specialised Dairy Industrial’.</p>	<p>Kama Trust is in full support of the submitters request associated with the rezoning of the wider C9 growth cell, and Area 6.</p> <p>Kama Trust is in opposition to the inclusion of the ‘Specialised Dairy Industrial’ zoning as part of Area 6.</p> <p>The ‘Specialised Dairy Industrial’ provisions only enable activities associated with the processing of milk and the production of milk related products to be established as a Permitted Activity. This means that any non-milk related activities would require resource consent and likely written approval from Fonterra Ltd.</p> <p>It is Kama Trusts opinion that the inclusion of the ‘Specialised Dairy Industrial’ clause, will frustrate and add additional timeframes and consenting costs to the future development of Area 6 and add further restrictions regarding the potential relocation of businesses located at Carters Flat.</p>
--	------------------------------	--	---

Submission #10.1 – Hannon, Ritchie and Carol	Support/neutral	The submitter supports the plan change but seeks the flexibility in relation to the location of the detention ponds and road layout.	Kama Trust concur with the submitters request for the PC to be supported; but take a neutral position in relation to a revised location of the stormwater detention ponds positioned outside of the Industrial Zone boundaries.
Submission #21.1 to 21.3 – Hautapu Landowners Group.  Submission #21.1          Submission# 21.2          Submission #21.3	Oppose          Oppose          Support	The submitter seeks that land to the north of Area 6, bounded by Peake Road, Fonterra and Managone Stream is rezoned as Deferred Industrial. Should this not be accepted then the submitter seeks the rejection of Area 6.          The submitter has raised concerns regarding the stormwater detention ponds and potential contamination.          The submitter identifies that the proposed stormwater detention pond located on the northern side of Area 6,	This submission is not within the scope of Plan Change 17 and should be rejected on that basis. In substantive terms, Kama Trust opposes the relief sought by the Hautapu Landowners Group, in particular the position that if the identified land north of Area 6 is not rezoned as Deferred Industrial then the Industrial zoning of Area 6 be rejected.          Kama Trust are in opposition to the key points raised by the submitter regarding stormwater contamination, based on the conclusions made within the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Te Miro Water.          Kama Trust are in support of submitters request, as the stormwater detention pond was not designed to dissect the property at 84 Hautapu Road. This appears to have been

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Auckland | Hamilton | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

	Oppose	<p>dissects that property at 84 Hautapu Road.</p> <p>The submitter is in opposition to the split zoning between of 84 Hautapu Road.</p>	<p>added into Councils PC notification package in error.</p> <p>As per our above comments, more information is required before Kama Trust would be in the position to support this request.</p>
<p>Submission #23.1 to 23.3 – Hayes, Owen David John</p> <p>Submission#23.1</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitter is in opposition to the PC on the basis that the three waters infrastructure is unable to support the inclusion of Area 6.</p>	<p>Kama Trust is in opposition to the relief sought by the submitter; based on the key conclusions made within the Three Waters reports which formed the basis of Council’s Section 32 Analysis.</p>
<p>Submission #23.2 and 23.3</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitter has raised concerns regarding the loss of amenity values and elite soils.</p>	<p>On the basis that Area 6 is developed in accordance with the design criteria identified in the Structure Plan, accompanied with the additional layer of protection offered by the proposed District Plan provisions, any potential amenity related effects are able to be avoided or mitigated. In terms of the protection of elite soils, given Area 6 has been</p>

			identified in the Future Proof Growth Strategy, the site is exempt from the directives of the National Policy Statement, Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL).
Submission# 25.1 and 25.2 – Henmar Trust	Oppose	The submitter requests that Area 6 is not re-zoned as notified due to it not being located within an identified Future Growth area.	Kama Trust is in opposition to this submission on the basis that Area 6 has been identified in the Future Proof Strategy for future industrial growth.
Submission #6.1 – 6.3 - Hogarth, Nicky	Neutral	The submitter requests that variation to the definition of ‘Dry Industry’ to allow for a wider range of industrial activities.	Kama Trust take a neutral position in relation to the submitters request to broaden the definition of wet industry.
Submission# 6.1 to 6.2			
Submission# 6.3	Neutral	The submitter seeks the deletion of Rule 7.4.1.5 (p)(iii) which categorises concrete batching plans as non-complying activities.	Kama Trust take a neutral position in relation to the exclusion of concrete batching plans as non-complying activities.
Submission #6.4	Support	The submitter supports the uplifting of the C9 Industrial Zone	Kama Trust is supportive of the submitters request and seeks that the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.

Submission #2.1 – Keaney, Andrew John	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified.	Kama Trust is supportive of the submitters request and seeks that the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #15.1 to 15.3 – Matheson, Ian.  Submission #15.1  Submission #15.2  Submission #15.3	Oppose    Neutral   Oppose	The submitters seek the PC is rejected given they live in close proximity to the PC area.  The submitter suggests that a footpath is required along Peak Road  The submitter requests the PC is rejected on the basis of additional noise.	Kama Trust seek the PC is approved as notified, (aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road) on the basis that the design characteristics of the structure plan and the proposed District Plan provisions will avoid and/or mitigate any potential adverse environmental effects.  Kama Trust are not in opposition to the submitters request to add a footpath along Peake Road, subject to specialist evidence being provided by a Traffic Engineer.  Kama Trust are in opposition to the relief sought by the submitter on the basis that any potential noise related effects will be adequately avoided or mitigated by virtue of the proposed District Plan provisions and the design characteristics of the Structure Plan.

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Auckland | Hamilton | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

Submission #16.1 to #16.3 – Matheson, Natalie	Oppose	As with submission #15.1 – 15.3 the submitter requests the PC is rejected on the basis of the proximity of their personal residents, effects on livestock, noise effects and additional traffic.	Kama Trust are in opposition to the relief sought by the submitter as outlined in Submission #15.1 to 15.3.
Submission #3.1 – McGowan, Bruce and Susan Jean	Support	The submitter seeks that the PC is approved as notified, as it will enhance the local economy and accelerate growth.	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #5.1 – Middlemiss, Kevin Charles	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified.	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #27.1 to 27.3 – Roberts, Ethne Penelope	Oppose	The submitter seeks the PC is rejected on the basis of the recent government direction on elite soils.	Kama Trust is in opposition to this submission on the basis that Area 6 has been identified in the Future Proof Growth Strategy and is therefore exempt for the NPS HPL.
Submission #27.1		The submitter seeks the PC is rejected due to increased traffic movements and adverse effects on amenity values, water and livestock.	Kama Trust in opposition to points raised by the submitter on the basis that any adverse amenity, traffic and water effects can be adequately avoided or mitigated.
Submission #27.2	Oppose		

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Auckland | Hamilton | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

Submission #27.3	Oppose	The submitter requests the PC is rejected based on cultural effects.	Kama Trust are in opposition to this submission on the basis that consultation with local iwi was undertaken as part of Councils Section 32 analysis and no cultural related concerns were identified.
Submission #9.1 – Smith, Matthew Craig (Bardowie Investments)	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified.	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #13.1 and 13.2 – Stamp, Jason	Oppose	The submitter requests the PC is rejected based on potential transportation and amenity related effects. The submitter also states that improved consultation and engagement is required.	<p>Kama Trust are in opposition to the points raised by the submitter based on the key conclusions made within the TIA which demonstrate that an acceptable traffic solution is will be attainable; in addition to the proposed District Plan provisions and design of the Structure plan which will ensure any adverse environmental effects are avoided/mitigated.</p> <p>The submitters comments relation to the consultation process is out of the scoop with what can and cannot be taken into account during an RMA PC process.</p>

Submission #22.1 – Transland Group Limited.	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified.	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #1.1 – Turner, Lee and Kristin	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.
Submission #12.1 – Waka Kotahi	Neutral	The submitter has expressed concerns regarding the effects on State Highway 1B and Hautapu Road intersection.	Kama Trust satisfied that proposed council upgrades to the intersection will mitigate any potential effects on the State Highway 1B and Hautapu Road intersection; and that a staged approach to the development of the areas identified as part of PC 17 is not necessary.
Submission #18.1 – 18.2 - Walker, Casey	Oppose	The submitter is in opposition to the PC on the based on decreasing property values and potential traffic effects.	Kama Trust is opposition to the points raised by the submitter based on the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Property values is not an effect that warrants consideration under the RMA.</li> <li>2) An ITA in support of the PC has been provided which concludes that viable traffic solution is achievable.</li> </ul>

Submission #4.1 – Webb, Edward James and Betty Gordon	Support	The submitter is in full support of the PC 17 as notified	Kama Trust agree with the key points raised by the submitter and seek the PC is approved as notified.
<p>Submission #19.1 – 19.5 – West, Jane Victoria.</p> <p>Submission# 19.1</p> <p>Submission #19.2</p> <p>Submission# 19.3</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Oppose</p> <p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitter raised concerns regarding the lack of notice and the suitability of the location of ‘Area 6’.</p> <p>The submitter is in opposition to the PC on the basis of traffic effects.</p> <p>Submitter is in opposition to the PC on the basis of potential noise, light and odour.</p>	<p>Kama Trust in opposition to this submission based on the key matters outlined in their original submission and within Council’s 32 analysis.</p> <p>Kama Trust are in opposition to this submission on the basis that the proposed mitigation measures within the ITA will ensure the safety and functionality of the roading network is not compromised.</p> <p>Kama Trust is in opposition to this submission on the basis that the proposed provisions of the District Plan and design characteristics of the Structure Plan will adequately avoid/mitigate any potential noise, lighting or odour effects.</p>

Submission #19.4	Oppose	Submitter is in opposition to the PC based on Cultural Heritage.	Kama Trust are in opposition to this submission on the basis that no cultural related effects were identified during the consultation phase required as part of Council's S32 analysis.
Submission #19.4	Oppose	The submitter is in opposition to the PC based on the loss of elite soils and effects on the Mangaone Stream.	<p>Kama Trust are in opposition to this submission on the basis that Area 6 was identified in the Future Proof Growth Strategy and this thus exempt for the NPS HPL.</p> <p>In addition, subject to the implementation of the requirements of the Three Waters analysis prepared as part of the PC process, any potential effects on the Mangaone Stream will be avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>Kama trust seek that the PC is approved as notified, aside from the inclusion of the stormwater detention pond onto the property located at 84 Hautapu Road.</p>