

**From:** [info@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:info@waipadc.govt.nz)  
**To:** [Policy Shared](#)  
**Subject:** External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Maria Barrie  
**Date:** Tuesday, 8 November 2022 12:25:36 pm

**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 of submitter** Maria Barrie  
**Contact name (if different from above)** Gavin McCullagh, 4Sight Consulting  
**Email address** [REDACTED]  
**Address for service** [REDACTED]  
**Contact phone number** [REDACTED]

**This is a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Waipā District Plan**

Plan Change 17 Hautapu Industrial Zones

**Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?** I could not  
**Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that - (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition?** I am  
**Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission?** I do  
**If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?** Yes  
**Do you support the proposed change(s)?** I oppose

**The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are (give details):**

Overall purpose, Appendix S1 Future Growth Cells, Section 7 Policy: Industrial Zone 7.3.4.9, Rules 7.4.1.1, 7.4.1.5, 7.4.2.1, 7.4.2.2, 7.4.2.20; Appendix S5 - S5.1.3 and all structure plan diagrams and a number of consequential issues identified in the attached detailed submission.

**My submission is**

As detailed in the attached document:

My submission is that the rural environment and surrounds are an essential elements that I value in living at 345 Peake Road , Cambridge (where I have lived since 2009) and that this value will be diminished by the proposed inclusion of Area 6 in the expanded industrial zone.

The overall purpose of Proposed PC17 to rationalise and activate industrial activities in Hautapu is opposed in part.

Changes to the Cambridge / Hautapu Industrial Growth Cells to add 'Area 6' to the C9 growth cell are opposed.

A number of proposed changes to the existing rules in the Industrial Zone are opposed in part.

**I seek the following decision/s from Council**

As detailed in the attached submission document, I seek that Area 6 is excluded from the proposed plan change.

**Attachments**

[MBarrie Submission to proposed Waipa Plan Change 17 20221108 \(1\).pdf](#) (328 kb)

**SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17 TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN PURSUANT  
TO CLAUSE 6 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

**To:** Gary Dyet Chief Executive  
Waipa District Council  
Private Bag 2402  
Te Awamutu 3840

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

**Submitter:** Maria Barrie

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

*Hereafter referred to as the Submitter*

**Address for service:** 4Sight Consulting Limited

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Attention: Gavin McCullagh

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Submitter lives at [REDACTED] 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.

## THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED PLAN THAT THE SUBMISSION RELATES TO ARE SUMMARISED AS FOLLOWS

3. The specific provisions submitted on, the rationale for the submission on each of these matters, and the relief sought is contained in the schedules below. Changes sought to the provisions are shown by deletion in ~~striketrough~~ and addition in underline. The Submitter support alternative relief that achieves the same outcomes.
4. In addition to the specific outcomes and relief sought, the following general relief is sought:
  - a) Achieve the following:
    - i. The purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and consistency with the relevant provisions in Sections 6 - 8 RMA;
    - ii. Give effect to Waikato Regional Council's RSP;
    - iii. Assist the Council to carry out its functions under Section 31 RMA;
    - iv. Meet the requirements of the statutory tests in section 32 RMA; and
    - v. Avoid, remedy or mitigate any relevant and identified environmental effects;
  - b) Make any alternative or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission, including any consequential relief required in any other sections of the proposed plan change that are not specifically subject of this submission but where consequential changes are required to ensure a consistent approach is taken throughout the document; and
  - c) Any other relief required to give effect to the issues raised in this submission.

## THE SUBMITTER WISHES TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF THIS SUBMISSION.

## IF OTHERS MAKE SIMILAR SUBMISSIONS THE SUBMITTER MAY BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER PRESENTING A JOINT CASE WITH THEM AT ANY HEARING.

## THE SUBMITTER COULD NOT GAIN AN ADVANTAGE IN TRADE COMPETITION THROUGH THIS SUBMISSION.

## 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  
08 November 2022

## SCHEDULE ONE - GENERAL

### A. THE SPECIFIC PARTS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17 (PC17) THAT THIS SUBMISSION RELATES TO ARE:

- The overall purpose of Proposed PC17 is to rationalise and activate industrial activities in Hautapu, which is opposed in part.
- Changes to the Cambridge / Hautapu Industrial Growth Cells to bring forward C9 from post 2035 to pre-2035, which are supported in part.
- Changes to the Cambridge / Hautapu Industrial Growth Cells to add 'Area 6' to the C9 growth cell, which are opposed.
- A number of proposed changes to the existing rules in the Industrial Zone, which are opposed in part.

### B. THE REASONS FOR THE SUBMISSION ARE:

#### 1. Overall purpose of Proposed Plan Change 17

The s32 Report indicates that *“the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 17 is to rationalise and activate industrial zoning in the Hautapu area, through updating the structure plan to include the new master plan and making improvements to the provisions in Part B – Definitions, Section 7 – Industrial Zone, Appendix S1 Future Growth Cells and Appendix S5 Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan, and Planning Maps in order that they are more effective and efficient.”*

The overall purpose to rationalise and activate industrial zoning in the Hautapu area is opposed in part, regarding the proposed rezoning of Area 6 (see item 3 below).

#### 2. Changes to the Cambridge/Hautapu industrial Growth Cells to bring forward C9

PC17 proposes to amend Appendix S1 Future Growth Cells to bring forward the area described as C9 in Cambridge Growth Map and table labelled “Cambridge / Hautapu Industrial Growth Cells – anticipated beyond 2035”.

The proposal to amend Appendix S1 Future Growth Cells is supported in part subject to item 3 below.

#### 3. Changes to the Cambridge/Hautapu industrial Growth Cells to add 'Area 6' to the C9 growth cell.

PC17 includes the proposal to add Area 6 (comprising LOT 2 DP 500427, LOT 2 DPS 67103 LOT 1 DP 420007, LOT 1 DP 500427, LOT 1 DP 310233, LOT 2 DP 546845, LOT 1 DP 546845 and a portion of LOT 1 DP 532855) to the C9 Growth Cell and to rezone this area from Rural to Industrial. (See Figure 1 in the s32 Report)

The proposal is opposed.

#### 4. Changes to the existing rules in the Industrial Zone

PC17 proposes to change policies and rules in Section 7, maps and tables in Appendix S1 and provisions, plans and diagrams in Appendix S5 Hautapu Structure Plan and Design Guidelines as a result of the proposed inclusion of Area 6 in the C9 Growth Cell and consequential rezoning.

The proposal is opposed in part, specifically amendments relating to Area 6.

#### 5. Consequential issues arising from the proposed inclusion of Area 6

There are elements of the proposed inclusion of Area 6 that are not satisfactory if the industrial rezoning proceeds. These additional changes must be addressed.

#### C. THE RELIEF SOUGHT IS:

Where specific changes are proposed, these are shown in ~~strike through~~ (deletions) and underline (additions).

##### 1. Overall purpose of Proposed Plan Change 17

- a. The overall purpose of proposed Plan Change 17 excludes rezoning of the land north of Hautapu road, identified as Area 6, from Rural Zone to Industrial Zone.

##### 2. Changes to the Cambridge/Hautapu industrial Growth Cells to bring forward C9

- a. Retain the intent to bring forward the C9 Growth Cell for development before 2035, on the basis that it does not include or require 'Area 6'.

##### 3. Changes to the Cambridge/Hautapu industrial Growth Cells to add 'Area 6' to the C9 growth cell.

Appendix S1 – Future Growth Cells

- b. Cambridge Growth Map – show the original C9 Growth Cell outlined in blue and labelled 55ha, (exclusive of Area 6).
- c. Table labelled "Cambridge/Hautapu Industrial Growth Cells – anticipated now to 2035", Land Area delete ~~75ha~~ and replace with 55ha (current C9 area). The industrial provision of ~~111~~ 91 hectares of industrial land will be sufficient to meet the Future prof anticipated demand until 2041.

##### 4. Changes to the existing rules in the Industrial Zone

That the changes policies and rules that are based on the addition of 'Area 6' to the C9 Growth Cell in the Section 7 of the WDP and Appendix S5 be deleted as follows:

Section 7 – Industrial Zone

- a. ~~Policy: Industrial Zone – 'Area 6' (Hautapu) 7.3.4.9 To enable lawfully established industrial activities within the Carter's Flat Commercial Zone to relocate Hautapu 'Area 6'.~~

Proposed Rules:

- b. 7.4.1.1 Permitted activities (~~w~~) ~~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.~~
  - c. 7.4.1.5 Non-Complying activities (~~p~~) ~~and Hautapu Industrial 'Area 6'~~
  - d. 7.4.2.1 (b) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan ~~and Hautapu 'Area 6' – The...~~
  - e. 7.4.2.2 (b) ~~Hautapu 'Area 6' –~~ The minimum setbacks from
  - f. 7.4.2.20 Within the Bardowie industrial Precinct Structure plan Area ~~and Hautapu 'Area 6'~~
- ...

Appendix S5 – Hautapu Structure Plan and Landscape Guidelines

- g. S5.1.3 ...The structure plan area is approximately 100 ~~120~~ hectares in size....
- h. Structure plan diagrams – all inclusion of area 6 to be removed from the industrial zone, including the Indicative Planting Layout.

Planning maps

- i. Do not include Area 6 within the industrial zone on maps as proposed.

**5. Consequential issues arising from the proposed inclusion of Area 6**

- a. Rural Character – Issue 4.2.17 identifies “Rural character has the potential to be eroded by development, subdivision, signs and other activities which can conflict with that character.” The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning will have these erosive effects on the current character of her property and surrounds. It is an objective of the District Plan 4.3.7 *Rural character is maintained*.
- b. Amenity – The Submitter lives in the Rural Zone, currently surrounded on all sides by Rural Zone and rural activities. The proposed rezoning of Area 6 will diminish the existing amenity primarily through the introduction of artificial lighting and glare on the industrial estate. Any proposed change must meet the policies; 20.3.2.1 *To ensure that artificial lighting is installed and utilised so as to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on adjoining and adjacent properties and roads* and 20.3.2.2 *To minimise reflective glare from buildings*.
- c. Noise - The Submitter lives within 50 metres of Area 6. There is potential for a significant increase in noise at times when noise is not normally present in the rural zone. There is a need to ensure that if Area 6 is rezoned, that the noise standards (7.4.2.18) for the industrial areas adjoining rural zones are consistent with and create no more impact than the existing noise standards (4.4.2.15) for rural zones. That the rules ensure no loss of noise amenity.
- d. Traffic – It is anticipated that the proposed industrial developments will generate additional traffic on Peake Road. This has been identified in the submission (referred to in the s32 Report) made by the Kama Trust (2020) to the Future proof Strategy. This is not a desirable consequence for the Submitter. Additionally, the Submitter is concerned that Area 6 might be accessed from Peake Road either during construction or as a consequence of future development of the site. Any proposal for inclusion of Area 6 and its future development must preclude access to Peake Road for either construction or operations.
- e. Perimeter Boundary Treatment – Currently the submitter has a relatively open frontage to Peake Road and a view of a large evergreen hedge around the existing rural activities. The new attachment A requires amenity street tree planting as part of landscape amenity strip planted at “minimum 30 m spacing” whereas the deleted attachment A required 30m spacing. Confusingly the requirement in *Street Tree Planting* S5.7.1.2 (d) *Amenity street tree planting at 30m maximum spacings should be provided along Peake Road, Hautapu Road and along parts of Hannon Road and Victoria Road (refer to Attachment A)* differs from both of these. It would be preferable that this rule is reflected accurately in Attachment A.
- f. Additionally, the species of trees proposed in Attachment B for Public Road and Streetscape planting are all deciduous, which means during winter they provide a more stark view than the existing evergreen hedge. (as an example figure above from Figure 20 Appendix S) The intent of the Structure Plan s5.2.2 is to “*minimise any potential adverse visual and landscape effects as a result of future development*”.
- g. So there could fewer street trees required by the structure plan under the proposed amendment than previously. This will clearly be far less vegetation on the Peake Road frontage the existing situation. Relief is sought either through a general increase in planting density, choice in trees or some specific treatment opposite 345 Peake Road.