

Submission ID: 68947

Submission Date: 2023-08-30 21:10:56

Name (individual/organisation):

Peter Hexter

Contact person (if different from above):

Peter Hexter

Address for correspondence:

2559 State Highway 26

Email:

peter@cooperaitken.co.nz

Phone Number:

0274669035

I am:

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest that the general public has

Please explain how you fall within this category:

The property boundaries on my property.

Original Submission Number:

67761

Position:

Oppose

Reason for position:

I do not believe there has been adequate consideration reflected in the current submission. Therefore I have attached areas that need to be addressed.

Decision sought from Council:

Disallowed in part

Which part?

1. Swale and Tree Plantings/Overall Mitigation of the impact on rural neighbours
2. Height of building structures and the use of zoning
3. Application of current local regulations
4. Location of Sewerage pumping station and ponds
5. Water runoff assessment
6. Traffic analysis
7. Assessment of economic impact
8. Cycle and walking pathways
9. Environmental
10. Lack of future planning

I wish to be present at the council planning hearing:

Yes

I would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with others making a similar submission:

Yes

Upload additional info (if necessary):

[64ef07a0b4aa2-Submission for Private Plan Change 58.docx](#)

Without prejudice.

Additional information on the Submission to Private Plan Change 58 – Avenue Business Park, Proposed General Industrial Zone, Morrinsville by Peter Hexter and associated parties.

I am writing this submission on the above plan change 58.

Please note as per previous submission, I oppose the plan change until the below amendments are addressed and those of the other parties that have highlighted their concerns, specifically: Matamata Piako Council, Fire and Emergency, Waka Kotahi and the rural neighbours to this associated property.

If we can mitigate the below issues as best as possible then I will review my opposition to this proposal. We need a collaborative approach, to date there has been no consultation other than via the Council seeking feedback.

The key submissions are as follows:

1. Swale and Tree Plantings – Oppose what has been highlighted in the amended plan.

The swale and tree planting are not significant enough to deal with the runoff, noise, light and dust pollution. As other submitters have mentioned there needs to be a solid break from native trees and bushes to break this pollution that will affect the rural neighbours. The current plan does not provide this solution. It is also important that the rural neighbours have aesthetic views due to the type of infrastructure being built here. The swale should be a minimum of 10 metres and the tree planting should be at a least a minimum of 12 metres from the boundary. If it was residential land that was being zoned, then it would have a 10-metre boundary adjustment, need to review the rules associated with this.

It is important that the completion of the Swale and the planting is completed before any significant works is carried out on the land.

Please note there was no direct assessment of noise on my property – 2559 State Highway 26 therefore I believe that the testing to date has been insufficient.

2. Height of building structures – Oppose the current building height of the potential buildings.

Initially any section that backs on to rural land should be no higher than 8 metres at its peak. The height of buildings should only be allowed to go to say a 12-metre height as they get

closer to the current industrial area, I would be encouraging a gradual gradient towards the height of the current Bowers Block building plant.

In the same vein is the type of zoning should vary, that is light commercial on the boundary of rural land moving towards light industrial as it gets closer to the land that is already zoned for it.

3. The current proposal does not align with Matamata Piako Council Guidelines as noted in their submission – therefore oppose the plan change until they align with the current council guidelines where practical.

It is my understanding from review the planned proposal that there are elements that missing and do not align that are significant, therefore there needs to be some alignment here.

4. The location of the ponds and sewerage pumping station – Oppose the current plan placement.

As a rural neighbour, I do not believe there should be the risk of this sort of plant or ponds near a rural boundary. It should be located closer to the Bower site where the noises will offset each other, and risk of contamination can be minimised.

5. Water Runoff Assessment – Oppose the assessment applied in the plan change 58

Water ponds heavily on the property currently, so much so that they have had to create a lake feature in the middle of the current proposed land. Morrinsville has seen severe rainfall and flooding issues, therefore it is important that a higher level of assessment is completed of the runoff. There is also an opportunity to deal with the poor runoff on neighbouring properties due to insufficient drainage allowed for by the MPDC, Environment Waikato and Wai Kotahi.

6. State Highway 26 – Oppose the current analysis of traffic.

It is important that access is made available to State Highway 26. Avenue road will become congested, and it is always important to allow for two entrances and exits therefore there needs to be a more robust plan around accessing State Highway 26. As submitted by other parties there should be a reduction in speed limit heading West towards Hamilton and then a further extension of the zone to around the corner heading towards Hamilton – perhaps pass the first bridge. Traffic will get heavier with the expansion of Morrinsville and Ruakura therefore better speed limits and a wider road with hard verges/pull off lane would be required leading into Morrinsville from the West.

I reject Wai Kotahi's submission about forcing more use of Avenue Road which is already heavily used. Wai Kotahi needs to review their strategy around the roading on State Highway 26. There is already concerns around the safety of traffic pulling out of the child care centre and the new commercial property that has been built opposite WD Davenport.

7. Assessment of economic impact – Oppose the assessment

There is no assessment of the impact on the rural and neighbouring land. It is important that this assessment is clear in the report.

8. Assessment of cycle pathways and walking paths – Oppose the current terms

We need to encourage safe cycling, cycling access and good pedestrian access.

9. Environmental – Oppose the lack of thought put into this submission

In the submission I did not see adequate conditions around sustainable building practices, renewable energy or conserving of energy. This is the opportunity where we could reduce light pollution by having street lights and signage turning off after 9pm in day light savings and after 7 pm for the rest of the year. Buildings utilising solar, better use of runoff water etc.

10. Lack of future growth options – Observation

In the proposed plan change it does not allow for any future development of surrounding land. It would have been good to consider potential options for future growth and what that would look like. Again consultation with neighbours could create opportunities for the local town.