

PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN (STAGE 1)

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

In the matter of hearing submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1) – Hearing 7 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones

---

**Summary of evidence (planning) by Chanel Hargrave on behalf of Hynds Pipe Systems Limited and the Hynds Foundation**

Dated: January 2020

---

This summary of evidence addresses the key points from the Joint Statement of Evidence prepared by myself and Ms McLellan in support of the submissions of Hynds Pipe Systems Limited and the Hynds Foundation (**the submitters**). This summary also addresses the matters on which the submitters were invited to respond to in the s42A Rebuttal Evidence, prepared by the Reporting Officer.

Hynds Pipes Systems Limited (**Hynds**) is a significant heavy industrial activity within the Pokeno area, utilising approximately 22ha of land and operating 24 hours a day to manufacture and supply concrete construction materials. Locational advantages, land availability, compatible zoning, access to key transport routes and a supportive planning framework have resulted in Hynds, and other large industrial companies, investing substantial capital to establish within the Operative Industrial 2 Zone. These industrial activities generate important economic and employment opportunities for the District.

It is our opinion that the policy framework needs to distinguish between the purpose and expected outcomes of the two Industrial Zones to provide for the establishment and operation of heavy industrial activities. Without adequate distinction between zones there is potential that the integrity of the Heavy Industrial zone could be compromised, impacting on investment in existing and future activities. Appropriately zoned land is required to enable efficient operation and to ensure these activities are not compromised by reverse sensitivity. The relief sought provides suggested amendments which address the aforementioned issues. We have reviewed our suggested amendments in light of the recommendations included in the Reporting Officer's s42A Rebuttal Evidence, as explained below and set out in Attachment A to this summary.

#### **Objective 4.6.1 – Economic Growth of Industry**

In review of the s42A rebuttal evidence we accept that the objective is sufficiently generic in consideration of the National Planning Standard definition of industry. In addition our concern will become redundant when Waikato District Council apply the zone naming required by the National Planning Standards, noting that there is no ‘industrial zone’, rather light, general and heavy industrial zones.

Our evidence sought the inclusion of additional wording recognising the positive effects of industrial activities. In review of the Reporting Officer’s rebuttal evidence we have refined the amendment sought to objective 4.6.1 as follows:

- (a) ~~The economic g~~ Growth of the district’s industry is supported and strengthened in industrial zones, recognising the positive employment and economic benefits of industrial activities.

This addition is proposed to recognise the positive effects of industry. It is our opinion that employment benefits should also be recognised by the objective. The amendment sought will give better effect to the strategic objective, 1.12.6, which seeks to maximise employment and economic growth.

#### **Policy 4.6.2 – Provide for Industrial Zones with Different Functions**

Upon consideration of the s42A rebuttal evidence we accept the Reporting Officer’s recommended amendments to policy 4.6.2(i). We disagree with the Reporting Officer’s recommendations for policy 4.6.2(ii) that relate to the Heavy Industrial zone for the reasons set out below.

Additional wording is sought to 4.6.2(ii)A identifying that heavy industrial activities are required to locate there because of the nature of their operation. It is our opinion that this links the operation and nature of heavy industrial activities to the anticipated level of effect and more clearly distinguishes the purpose of the zone.

We support wording that recognises heavy industrial activities generate potentially significant adverse effects on sensitive receivers. We do not agree with the recommendation in the Reporting Officer’s s42A Rebuttal Evidence to delete that wording from 4.6.2(ii)A. This is consistent with the description in the National Planning Standards which states that Heavy Industrial Zones are:

*Areas used predominantly for industrial activities that generate potentially significant adverse effects. The zone may also be used for associated activities that are compatible with the potentially significant adverse effects generated from industrial activities.*

The removal of “subject to appropriate setback distances” is sought and additional wording is proposed as follows: encroachment from sensitive activities is avoided through compatible zoning interfaces and

physical buffers. This addition seeks to protect heavy industrial land from sensitive activities which would compromise the operational efficiency of existing and future activities. This is consistent with Urban Development Policy 4.7.11 which seeks to “*avoid potential reverse sensitivity effects of locating new dwellings in the vicinity of intensive farming, extraction industry or industrial activity*”.

Heavy industry is anticipated to generate high vehicle traffic, noise, glare, odour and air emissions. These types of effects are incompatible with sensitive activities, such as residential development. Heavy industry is therefore most at risk of being affected by reverse sensitivity. To operate efficiently these activities not only rely on appropriately zoned heavy industrial land, but also compatible adjoining zones or physical buffers. The Heavy Industrial Zone is spatially constrained and represents a small proportion of the Waikato District’s urban area. Given the potential significance of adverse effects it is my opinion that the use of the word avoid is appropriate, not only to ensure a suitable level of amenity for sensitive activities, but also to protect industrial zones from the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity. Notwithstanding this we have proposed an alternative option for consideration:

B. Protect heavy industrial activities from reverse sensitivity effects through compatible zoning interfaces and physical buffers.

Reverse sensitivity is a key issue for the Heavy Industrial Zone. It is my opinion that this issue should be addressed in the policy framework for this zone as well as other chapters that provide for sensitive activities. This will ensure vertical integration across the Plan.

#### **Policy 4.6.3 – Maintain a Sufficient Supply of Industrial Land**

The amendments proposed by the Reporting Officer in the s42A Rebuttal Evidence address the submitters concerns and the recommendation is accepted.

We support the amended wording that recognises the different requirements of general and heavy industries. We also support the removal of the wording “to avoid the need for industrial activities to locate in non-industrial zones” as this contradicts the proposed Rural Zone provisions which provide for Rural Industries.

#### **Policy 4.6.7 – Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes**

We confirm no new objectives and policies are sought to 4.6.7.

#### **Rule 21.2.5.1 - General Earthworks Provisions**

The amendments proposed by the Reporting Officer in the s42A rebuttal evidence address the submitters concerns and the recommendation is accepted.

**Rules 21.3.1 – Building Height and 21.3.3 Daylight Admission**

Upon reflection on the Reporting Officer’s rebuttal evidence and further consideration of these issues, we accept the recommendations that relate to building height and daylight.

We support the recommendations made by the Reporting Officer in the s42A report that relate to Permitted Activities (21.1PA), Landscaping (21.2.1), Construction Noise (21.2.3) and Signage (21.2.7.1 and 21.2.7.2). In regard to Noise (21.2.3.1) we accept the recommendations in the s42A report and support the 75dB LAeq noise limit for the Heavy Industrial zone (21.2.3.1 P2 a (i)).

Chanel Hargrave

16/1/2020

## Attachment A

Summary of amendments sought to objectives and policies – Post s42A Rebuttal Evidence

### 4.6.1 Objective – Economic growth of industry

- (a) ~~The economic g~~Growth of the district's industry is supported and strengthened in industrial zones, recognising the positive employment and economic benefits of industrial activities.

### 4.6.2 Policy – Provide for different functions

- (a) Recognise and provide for a variety of industrial activities within two industrial zones that have different functions depending on their purpose and effects as follows:

(i) Industrial Zone

- A. Accept as proposed in the s42A rebuttal evidence.

(ii) Heavy Industrial Zone

- A. Recognise and provide for a range of industrial and other compatible activities that are required to locate there because of the nature of their operation. These activities generate potentially significant effects on more sensitive zones, including relatively high levels of visual impact from buildings and associated parking and loading spaces, outdoor storage, lighting, noise, odour and heavy traffic, ~~subject to appropriate separation distances.~~

- B. Encroachment from sensitive activities is avoided through compatible zoning interfaces and physical buffers.

Or alternatively:

- B. Protect Heavy Industrial activities from reverse sensitivity effects through compatible zoning interfaces and physical buffers.

### 4.6.3 Policy – Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land

Accept as proposed in the s42A rebuttal evidence.