

Submission No: 13

Submission ID: 62524

Submission Date:

2022-11-08

21:33:35

Name (individual/organisation):

Scott Brogden

Contact person (if different from above):

Address for correspondence:

195 Tauranga Road, RD 3, Matamata

Email:

sbrogden@xtra.co.nz

Phone Number:

(027) 254-1166

This is a submission on Private Plan Change 57: Calcutta Farms Limited - Industrial Zone, Matamata

The specific provisions of the plan change that my submission relates to are:

Steps taken to reduce the impact of the pollution on our property, primarily the noise and light pollution.

If your submission won't fit in the below text box, please upload a document containing your submission. Please select which method you'd like to use:

I will upload a document

My submission is:

Upload the document containing your submission here:

[636a145fa5b94-Submission to MPDC for Private Plan Change 57.pdf](#)

I seek the following decision from Council:

If the plan change is not declined, make the following amendments

Suggested amendments:

As documented in my submission. File attached.

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:

No

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

No

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of this submission that—

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

Upload additional info (if necessary):

Notes:

- The submission and decision you wish Council to make should only relate to the contents of the proposed plan change
- Submissions close at **4:30pm, Wednesday, 9 November 2022.**
- Please complete and submit this form before the closing date. Physical copies are also available and should be posted to: Matamata-Piako District Council, PO Box 266, Te Aroha or emailed to submissions@mpdc.govt.nz; or you can drop it off at any Council office.
- I accept that by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public. After the closing date, all submissions received will be available for public viewing.

Submission:

My name is Scott Brogden. I live with my wife and three children (14, 12, 7) at 195 Tauranga Road across the road from the proposed Industrial area. We purchased our home 8 years ago in 2014 and have lived here since then.

I would like to talk about a few items that this proposal will impact upon our lives.

- Noise Pollution
- Light Pollution
- Visual Pollution or Adverse visual outlook
- Construction effects of both the Industrial area as well as any developments upon it in the future

Noise Pollution

Situation:

State Highway 24 is a busy road. There is considerable traffic at times, but often there is very little traffic and the issue of road noise is minimal with just the odd vehicle going past. Thankfully we are far enough out of town that we very rarely get engine braking from trucks disturbing us.

Issue:

I am concerned about the effects of noise from the development.

The Acoustic Assessment by Hegley Acoustics in the Plan Change Applications appendix G discusses the Matamata Piako District Plan allowable noise limits as being of a lower level than that of the existing State Highway. However, I feel the statement "*Thus, any industrial noise will be controlled to well within a reasonable level and below the level currently experienced from traffic noise.*" to be slightly misleading. While this may be true for the daytime levels of traffic, once the evening comes and the traffic levels drop, if there were to be a 24hr operation directly across the road I feel we may be impacted by any constant noise.

Also, I would not like the fact that there is already road noise to be an "excuse" to emit a higher level of noise at the source.

I am also concerned about the potential frequency of the noise generated. While higher-frequency noise may be attenuated quickly so will not travel far, any low-frequency noise can travel considerable distances. This can also often not so much be heard, but felt.

This can be experienced by there being a noisy party in the distance, the higher frequencies with the singing, etc may die away quickly over the distance. However, the low-frequency bass can travel a long way and is in some ways more disruptive if exposed to it for a long period of time.

This issue can present during construction (from vibrating rollers or plate compactors) or from operating machinery (crushers or chippers etc). I admit that I am still unsure as to the activities that will be allowed in this industrial area so the operating machinery mentioned above may not be an issue due to not being permitted.

This potential issue of frequency is not mentioned in the acoustic assessment at all.

Suggested Mitigation:

That the Matamata Piako District Plan levels be monitored and enforced where required.

That any activities have set times for operation via the resource consent process.

Light Pollution

Situation:

One of the reasons we bought this property, was because as we are out of town we have minimal light impinging on our property. Two of our three bedrooms face the road.

Issue:

I am concerned that any externally mounted lights on constructed buildings will shine across the road and onto our bedroom windows. We do have a hedge along a portion of our boundary, but there is a significant part that only has a post and rail fence, thus providing no protection.

Suggested Mitigation:

The Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects by Boffa Miskell, in the Plan Change Applications Appendix F, touches on this issue. The assessment offers this recommendation under the heading "Building Design Controls":

"Avoidance of flood lighting signage and buildings including facades along SH24. Sensor yard lighting is suitable for security purposes."

I support this recommendation, and for it to be managed via the resource consent process. I also would like to suggest that any security lighting be aimed within the boundary of the yard it is for.

Visual Pollution or Adverse Visual Outlook

Situation:

Currently, along our State Highway 24 boundary, we have a hedge running for a large portion of the length, and a post and rail fence for the remaining length. This allows us to have the best of both worlds with privacy without being "blocked in". Currently, this view is across State Highway 24, of rural land, and off to Maungakawa hill in the distance.

Issue:

When discussing the Visual Sensitivity for nearby properties in the Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects by Boffa Miskell, in the Plan Change Applications Appendix F, there is the following statement:

"...Similarly views toward the site from 195 Tauranga Road are screened by its' own onsite Cryptomeria hedgerow. Should this be removed views would be direct toward the site, immediately across the road corridor. As such the sensitivity is considered to be currently moderate-low from the property but has potential to have a high degree of visual sensitivity."

I partially disagree with this assessment, as the mentioned hedgerow does not run the complete length of the State Highway 24 boundary. This means we have a not insignificant length of boundary that currently has an outlook of rural and natural beauty. Once built out we will have an outlook of industrial buildings, and reduced enjoyment. I believe the moderate-low sensitivity level does not tell the whole picture.

Suggested Mitigation:

The Recommendation section of the Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects by Boffa Miskell, in the Plan Change Applications Appendix F, recommends two Landscape Buffer Treatments to screen the visual effects of the buildings from the road and adjacent properties.

I support either of these recommendations. The ability to soften the view of the buildings will need time to grow in and will also need maintenance but will be a significant improvement on having the view of a 12m tall industrial building looming above the road and properties.

Construction effects of both the Industrial area as well as any developments upon it in the future

Situation:

Currently, we do have road noise from State Highway 24, as mentioned earlier in this submission, which is variable during the day, and much less at night time. Also, we have minimal dust issues affecting us.

Issue:

During the construction of both the industrial development infrastructure and subsequently the development of the land with buildings, there is a potential for noise, dust, and traffic to be an issue.

Suggested Mitigation:

The Plan Change Application discusses this issue and suggests:

“.... It is well-established that noise, dust and traffic effects can be addressed by future resource consents where best practice construction management will be implemented.”

I support this suggestion with the proviso that the allowed times for construction are also reasonable for all parties.