

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSIONS ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR PLAN CHANGE 57 TO THE MATAMATA-PIAKO DISTRICT PLAN

under Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

To: Matamata-Piako District Council
35 Kenrick Street
TE AROHA
(by email: submissions@mpdc.govt.nz)

Name of submitter: Warwick and Marion Steffert

1. Warwick and Marion Steffert (**the further submitter**) make this further submission in support of or opposition to submissions on Plan Change 57 (**PC57**) to the Operative Matamata-Piako District Plan (**ODP**).
2. Warwick and Marion Steffert have an interest in PC57 that is greater than the interest the general public has on the grounds that they own land in Morrinsville which is subject to a private plan change (**PC58**) that seeks rezoning from Rural to General Industrial Zone (**GIZ**). The use and development of the further submitter's land is likely to be directly affected by relief sought in submissions on PC57.

Submissions supported or opposed

3. The submissions that Warwick and Marion Steffert support or oppose are set out in the table attached as **Appendix A** to this further submission.

Reasons for further submission

4. For the submissions in **Appendix A** that Warwick and Marion Steffert support or oppose (either in full or in part) those submissions should be allowed or disallowed (either in full or in part) as sought by Warwick and Marion Steffert, so as to:
 - a. promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA and to give effect to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;
 - b. enable the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources by ensuring the provisions are suitable for managing the effects of industrial development and subdivision;
 - c. give effect to the objectives and policies of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development; and
 - d. ensure that the provisions of PC57 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC57 and the ODP, which are in turn the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
5. Without limiting the generality of the above, the additional reasons why Warwick and Marion Steffert support or oppose each submission are set out in **Appendix A**.

Decisions sought:

6. Warwick and Marion Steffert seek the following relief:
 - a. That the submissions supported in **Appendix A** be allowed (either in full or in part).

- b. That the submissions opposed in **Appendix A** be disallowed (either in full or in part).
 - c. Such further, alternative or other consequential amendments as may be necessary to fully address Warwick and Marion Steffert's further submission.
7. Warwick and Marion Steffert wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Signed for and on behalf of Warwick and Marion Steffert by:



.....
Chris Steffert

Development Manager

Date: 21 March 2023

Address for service: Monocle
Panama Square
14 Garden Place
HAMILTON 3204

Telephone: 027 836 6507

Email: ben@monocle.net.nz

Contact person: Ben Inger

Appendix A – Submissions supported and opposed, reasons and relief

	Name, address and original submission number	Submission point and summary of submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
1.	Matamata-Piako District Council lpratt@mpdc.govt.nz Submission 20	Minor amendment to GIZ Issues statement.	Support	The changes are appropriate.	Allow the submission.
2.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Proposed minor rewording of Policy GIZ-P1, Policy GIZ-P5 and Policy GIZ-P6.	Support in Part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an error in the submitter's requested amendments to GIZ-P1 (should refer to "they" rather than "that"). 2. The requested changes to GIZ-P6 are similar to the changes requested in Warwick and Marion Steffert's submission. The requested addition of "shall enhance" in MPDC's submission is unclear. 	<p>Allow the submission, except:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GIZ-P1 should refer to "they" rather than "that". 2. For GIZ-P6 the wording in Warwick and Marion Steffert's submission should be adopted, which does not include "shall enhance".
3.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	GIZ-R1 – Deletion of separate activity status for 'light industry'.	Support	Light industry is a type of activity that should be provided for. However, to the extent it is covered by the definition for 'industrial activity' then it is agreed that a separate activity status for 'light industry' is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
4.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	GIZ R1(3) and (4) require a noncomplying activity status for both 'wet industry' and 'activities that require a discharge consent'.	Oppose	Discretionary Activity status is appropriate in the GIZ for industrial activities that require an air discharge consent. There is no relationship between wet industry and activities requiring an air discharge consent so there is no need for the activity status for those activities to be consistent.	Disallow the submission.
5.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Delete exclusion reference to 'utility reserves' in GIZ-R2(b) and GIZ-R2(5)(a).	Oppose in Part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submission raises concern that reserves containing swales which are dual purpose would be in the category of utility reserves. There is no definition for 'utility reserves' in either the District Plan or the National Planning Standards. In the further submitter's experience, reserves which contain swales and other similar drainage infrastructure are typically vested as Local Purpose (Drainage) Reserves or Local Purpose (Stormwater) Reserves while reserves containing wastewater pump stations and the like are typically vested as Local Purpose (Utility) Reserves. 2. It is appropriate that no minimum building setback and no minimum height in relation to boundary standards apply to utility reserves. 3. If necessary, a definition for 'utility reserves' could be added. 	Disallow the submission.
6.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	The fencing rule GIZ-R2(10)(c) conflicts with fencing rule GIZ-R2(5). Add an exclusion in the fencing rule GIZ-R2(10)(c) for fencing of service and outdoor storage areas.	Support in Part	The specific relief is unclear but it is agreed that any inconsistency between the fencing requirements in GIZ-R2(10)(c) and GIZ-R2(5) needs to be addressed by way of changes.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording for changes to GIZ-R2(10) and/or GIZ-R2(5) and subject to other changes sought in Warwick and Marion Steffert's submission.
7.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Amend GIZ-R2(11) to limit exclusion of plant and machinery to front yards and yards facing a key transport corridor.	Support	The changes are appropriate and will enable more efficient and effective use of industrial land.	Allow the submission.
8.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Amendments and clarification to GIZ-R2(13) to delete reference to 'excluding utility reserves' and implementation of rule for pedestrian entrance in relation to the state highway boundary.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no definition for 'utility reserves' in either the District Plan or the National Planning Standards. The submission raises concern that reserves containing swales which are dual purpose would be in the category of utility reserves. In the further submitter's experience, reserves which contain swales and other similar drainage infrastructure are typically vested as Local Purpose (Drainage) Reserves or Local Purpose (Stormwater) Reserves while reserves containing wastewater pump stations, electricity transformers and the like are typically vested as Local Purpose (Utility) Reserves. 2. It is appropriate that the additional building design standards in GIZ-R2(13) are not required to be met for utility reserves where there will be limited (or no) public access. 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Submission point and summary of submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
				3. If necessary, a definition for 'utility reserves' could be added.	
9.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Amendment to GIZ-R2(14) for rain water tanks and water re-use.	Support in Part	It is agreed that linking water storage requirements to site area is a suitable approach. The right balance needs to be achieved to ensure that water storage requirements are appropriate and not unduly excessive.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
10.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Minor rewording of GIZ-R3(d) to clarify Discretionary criteria.	Oppose	It is understood that the matter of discretion in GIZ-R3(1)(d) is intended to address circumstances where non-industrial (for example retail) activities seek to establish in the Industrial Zone which could potentially impact on the function of Business Zones. It is appropriate for the specific reference to Business Zones to be retained. It is unclear what other zones could be affected in those circumstances.	Disallow the submission.
11.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Include specific rule for water metres in Rule 6.3.15(i).	Oppose	The introduction of rules requiring water meters should be considered on a district-wide basis so that a consistent approach is taken, rather than for an individual zone. It is understood that there are no rules requiring water meters in other Industrial Zones within the district.	Disallow the submission.
12.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Provide exclusion for reserve lots from minimum lot size criteria (6.3.15).	Support	It is appropriate to exempt reserves from the minimum lot size requirements.	Allow the submission.
13.	Matamata-Piako District Council Submission 20	Amendment to definition of 'wet industry' to reduce 10,000l criteria to 5,000l.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10,000 litres is an appropriate threshold for wet industry. A 5,000 litre threshold would be too low, particularly given that resource consents for 'wet industry' may not be granted due to their Non-Complying Activity status. The threshold would apply per site, meaning that larger sites would still be constrained by the 5,000 litre threshold. This could capture activities that are not high-water users by nature. 	Disallow the submission.
14.	Fonterra Farm Source sarah.davidson@btw.nz Submission 24	<p>18.1 General Industrial Zone Issues</p> <p>Supports GIZ provisions including 'Issues', 'Objectives' and 'Principle Reasons' sections, with amendments to ensure that 'wholesale and retail trade suppliers are provided for within the GIZ.</p>	Support	Wholesale retail and trade suppliers are a Permitted Activity so the change sought by the submitter is appropriate.	Allow the submission.
15.	Fonterra Farm Source Submission 24	<p>GIZ-O1</p> <p>Supports GIZ provisions including 'Issues', 'Objectives' and 'Principle Reasons' sections, with amendments to ensure that 'wholesale and retail trade suppliers are provided for within the GIZ.</p>	Oppose	The changes sought by the submitter to GIZ-O1 refer to "ancillary activities that support and/or are compatible with industrial activities" which is more restrictive than GIZ-P1. GIZ-P1 refers to non-industrial activities which are anticipated in the GIZ as being activities that are "ancillary to industrial activities, support industrial activities or are compatible with industrial activities".	Disallow the submission.
16.	Fonterra Farm Source Submission 24	<p>GIZ-PR1</p> <p>Supports GIZ provisions including 'Issues', 'Objectives' and 'Principle Reasons' sections, with amendments to ensure that 'wholesale and retail trade suppliers are provided for within the GIZ.</p>	Support	Wholesale retail and trade suppliers are a Permitted Activity so the change sought by the submitter is appropriate.	Allow the submission.