

From: [Cate Southworth](#)
To: [Policy Shared](#)
Cc: [suzanne.orourke](#); [Mark Chrisp](#)
Subject: External Sender: Further Submissions on Plan Change 26 to the Waipa District Plan on behalf of Fonterra Limited
Date: Thursday, 8 December 2022 10:08:49 am
Attachments: [image00001.png](#)
[Fonterra Further Submissions on Waipa District Plan Change 26 Final dated 7.12.22.pdf](#)

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

Cate Southworth has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

 [Fonterra Further Submissions on Waipa District Plan Change 26 Final dated 7.12.22.pdf](#)

<!--[endif]-->

Good Morning,

Please find attached the **further submissions on Plan Change 26** (Residential Zone Intensification) to the Waipa District Plan lodged on behalf of **Fonterra Limited**.

The Contact details are as set out in the attached further submission (c/- Suzanne O'Rourke at Fonterra Limited, and **Mark Chrisp at Mitchell Daysh Limited** – as Authorised Agent for Fonterra Limited).

Please direct all future correspondence to Mark Chrisp in the first instance.

I have copied both Suzanne and Mark in to this email.

Can you please confirm receipt of the attached further submission.

Thank you very much

Kind Regards,
Cate

 **Cate Southworth**
Senior Consultant

+  | PO Box 1307, Hamilton 3240
www.mitchelldaysh.co.nz

The information contained in this email message received from Mitchell Daysh Limited (and accompanying attachments) may be confidential. The information is intended solely for the recipient named in this email. If the reader is not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, disclosure, forwarding or printing of this email or accompanying attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return email.

Dated: 7 December 2022

Fonterra Limited

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Chrisp', is written over a light grey dotted rectangular background.

Mark Chrisp (Duly Authorised Agent for Fonterra Limited)

ATTACHMENT A: FONTERRA LIMITED’S FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Plan Change that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Submission Point	Name of Submitter	Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought from Council
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities (Submitter No. 79)				
79.202	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79). Specifically, Fonterra are opposed to the following amendments sought by Kainga Ora:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To amend Policy 2A.3.7.1(h) to delete the reference to reverse sensitivity. • To amend Policy 2A.3.7.1 so that it remains applicable to compact housing generally, not just four or more dwellings. <p>Kāinga Ora submit that ‘the MDRS setbacks and District Plan noise standards are sufficient to address effects on adjoining non-residential activities’.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is broader than just being about setbacks and noise. Concerns can relate to a wide range of effects. Such complaints can place significant constraints on the operation of established activities, as well as their potential for future growth and development. In extreme cases, reverse sensitivity effects can force established activities to relocate elsewhere or close.</p> <p>Compliance with the applicable setback requirements and noise standards as proposed by the Submitter does not mitigate other effects, including reverse sensitivity effects on existing industrial activities.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is a well-established planning principle, and is an adverse effect for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991. It refers to the susceptibility of established, effects-generating activities (which often cannot internalise all of their effects) to complaints or objections arising from the location of new sensitive activities nearby. Reverse sensitivity effects occur in urban environments (e.g., when residential and industrial activities are located in close proximity to one another). Reverse sensitivity is relevant to compact housing generally, not just developments of four or more dwellings.</p>	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.202 and retains Policy 2A.3.7.1(h) as notified.

79.140	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communiti es	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to delete Resource Management Issue 2A.2.7. Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, whether for infrastructure or otherwise. They submit that effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.140 and retains Issue 2A.2.7 as notified.
79.268	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communiti es	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to delete all references to reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.268 and retains all references to reverse sensitivity as a matter of discretion as notified.
79.271	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communiti es	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to amend Rule 15.4.1.1(e), including the proposal to delete reverse sensitivity as a matter of discretion.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.271, retains Rule 15.4.1.1(e) as notified, and retains the potential for reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.
79.189	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communiti es	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to amend Policy 2A.3.4.10 to delete the reference to 'bedroom additions'. Bedroom additions create new habitable areas, and should be designed and sited in consideration of reverse sensitivity effects on the Te Awamutu Dairy Manufacturing site. They should also be required to be acoustically treated.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.189.
79.204	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communiti es	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kāinga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to delete the references to 'address reverse sensitivity effects' in Policy 2A.3.7.1. Reverse sensitivity is a well-established planning principle, and is an adverse effect for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991. It refers to the susceptibility of established, effects-generating activities (which often cannot internalise all of their effects) to complaints or objections arising from the location of new sensitive activities nearby. Reverse sensitivity effects occur in urban environments (e.g., when residential and industrial activities are located in close proximity to one another). Reverse sensitivity is therefore a valid and appropriate consideration in the design of residential activities.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in Submission 79.204 and retains Policy 2A.3.7.1 as notified.
79.205	Kainga Ora – Homes and	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking to delete any references to reverse sensitivity in the residential zones. Reverse sensitivity is a well-established planning principle, and is an adverse effect for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991. It	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.204 and retain the references to reverse sensitivity in residential zones, as notified.

	Communities		refers to the susceptibility of established, effects-generating activities (which often cannot internalise all of their effects) to complaints or objections arising from the location of new sensitive activities nearby. Reverse sensitivity effects occur in urban environments (e.g., when residential and industrial activities are located in close proximity to one another). Reverse sensitivity is therefore a valid and appropriate consideration in the residential zone, particularly in relation to residential activities occurring in close proximity to industrial activities, including the Te Awamutu Dairy Manufacturing Site.	
79.19	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking the deletion of the Stormwater Infrastructure qualifying matter overlays including the spatial application and associated provisions in PC26.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.19 and retains Stormwater Infrastructure as a qualifying matter.
79.36	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking the deletion of the Stormwater Infrastructure qualifying matter overlays including the spatial application and associated provisions in PC26.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.36 and retains Stormwater Infrastructure as a qualifying matter.
79.242	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking the deletion of the Stormwater Infrastructure qualifying matter overlays including the spatial application and associated provisions from the planning maps.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.242 and retains Stormwater Infrastructure as a qualifying matter overlay identified on the planning maps.
79.18	Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	Fonterra oppose the submission by Kainga Ora (Submitter 79) seeking amendments to Section 2A as set out in Submission 79.18 to allow three dwellings per site as a permitted activity and four dwellings per site as a restricted discretionary activity in the medium density residential zone.	That Council rejects the relief sought by Kainga Ora in Submission 79.18.