

BEFORE THE RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an proposed change to the Rangitikei District
Plan at 1091, 1151 and 1165 State Highway 1
Marton.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PAUL NORMAN THOMAS
Dated 9 June 2020

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Paul Norman Thomas.
2. I prepared a statement of evidence in relation to this matter dated 20 March 2020. That evidence included my relevant qualifications and experience that I will not repeat.
3. That evidence concluded that the Plan Change should be declined or that the Plan Change should be limited to a much smaller area of 40 ha with a structure plan and appropriate policies.
4. The timetable for this hearing was then put on hold for the Level 3 and 4 lockdown periods.
5. Minute 4 then provided the opportunity for further supplementary reporting for the Council in response to evidence received. This has resulted in a further statement of evidence of Greg Carlyon dated 2 June 2020.
6. This evidence responds specifically to that supplementary planning evidence.

CODE OF CONDUCT

7. Reiterating my evidence in chief I confirm that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise. Indeed, a large part of this evidence expresses concerns about the lack of technical expertise that has been applied to this matter and needs to be remedied.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS

8. The supplementary evidence of Greg Carlyon seeks to further develop Option 4 from his s42A report. It does not, however, seek to remedy many of the other glaring omissions that I identified in my evidence in chief including failure to evaluate alternative sites and locations as required by Section 32 and the failure to justify the extent of land supply sought. Indeed, you don't have any evidence before you on market land supply, only the reports that form part of the plan change which I previously commented on.
9. The supplementary evidence seeks to flesh out Option 4 adding objectives and a range of policies based on an Industrial (Deferral) Overlay and something called "The Industrial Development Capacity Area."
10. The key features of the proposed provisions include
 - Zoning the land industrial
 - Adding a "deferral overlay"
 - 2 objectives
 - A Stage 1 policy that includes its deletion once a plan change to include a structure plan has been notified and financial provision has been made for three water services and roading upgrades.
 - A Stage 2 set of policies

OBSERVATIONS ON THE REVISED PROVISIONS

11. It is perhaps first appropriate to say that I have re-read my evidence in light of the Council supplementary evidence and apart from correcting a few typos I do not wish to change any of the opinions and criticisms expressed in relation to the proposed plan

change. However I do comment further later in this evidence on the inadequate technical basis to advance even the more limited Option 5.

12. In my evidence at para 77 I characterised Option 4 as a “Claytons” plan change “ie the plan change you get when your not doing a plan change.” In case any parties involved in the hearing were not familiar with this expression, it derives from a 1970s and 1980’s marketing campaign for a non alcoholic distilled spirit which famously used the byline “The drink you have when you are not having a drink”.
13. I made this observation because Option 4 as set out in the s42A report required a further plan change to fix up two of the most glaring matters before it could come into effect.
14. At para 147 of the s42A report the deferral policy is stated at B(ii) as *“directing the avoidance of industrial development within the “deferral overlay” until such time that the “deferral policy” is removed.”*
15. Clearly there has been some further consideration of this because the provisions now proposed are totally inconsistent with B(ii) above. The Stage 1 policy and rules do not avoid development until the deferral policy is removed. It actually does quite the opposite, it enables industrial development from the outset through a Restricted Discretionary consent which can only be limited notified to four specific parties.
16. Policy A1-5.4 (b) states *“Adverse effects generated by Industrial Activities within the Industrial (Deferral) Overlay must be avoided beyond the boundary of the overlay.”* A deferral policy that doesn’t actually give effect to deferral is yet another angle on the ongoing “Claytons” theme of this plan change.
17. Part (c) states that the whole policy is removed on notification of a plan change which addresses a structure plan for the site and provides evidence of financial provision for three waters and roading improvements.
18. Firstly, notification of a Plan Change alone is in my opinion not sufficient status, it should be operative, so that the final form of the structure plan applies, rather than simply that proposed by the Council. Secondly, the intent is presumably that at this point the Plan is left with the “Stage 2 policies”. However, the Stage 2 policies appear to apply from the outset so the whole concept of a Stage 1 and Stage 2 appears very confused.

19. This is further confused by the Site Plans attached which seem to have no legal status in the plan change provisions. However, these also include Stage 1 and Stage 2 areas for development.
20. The site plans appear to be an attempt to illustrate the Stage 2 policies and be a starting point for a Structure Plan but without being a Structure Plan (yet more Claytons). The Stage 2 policies are, in short, an attempt to address the issues raised in submissions but without any technical justification or basis.
21. Before considering the Stage 2 policies in detail I note that the rule provisions seek to declare the following persons to be affected for the purposes of notification: Kiwirail Holdings Ltd, NZ Transport Agency, Ngati Apa, Whanganui District Health Board. This notably excludes Fraser Auret Racing and residential owners/ occupiers to the north of the site. This is frankly outrageous given the lack of detail and technical assessment associated with this plan change. In the event that the Commissioner did see fit to approve some form of Plan Change, then it should include a Clause that states "*Rule B1.1-6 does not apply to the Industrial Development Capacity Area and all applications shall be publicly notified*".
22. Turning to the so called Stage 2 policies. Policy A1-5.1A is a typical motherhood and apple pie policy that has no technical backing that it is capable of being achieved. Where is the noise report that this relies on, where is the emissions modelling for forestry processing industries that this relies on etc.
23. The policy seeks to embrace all possible adverse effects but it fails to do so because it focusses on amenity. As you are aware "Amenity values" are defined in the Act, it is about peoples appreciation of an area's pleasantness, aesthetic coherence and cultural and recreational values. It does not cover the principal concern of Fraser Auret Racing which is the environmental conditions for training performance racehorses which are considerably more sensitive than people to noise, air quality and glare effects.
24. This point is also relevant to the Restricted Discretionary Rule which doesn't even reserve discretion to consider the effects on Fraser Auret Racing. It includes "protection of rural amenity from inappropriate use and development." It does not include protection of the operational conditions of nearby rural and commercial businesses that would include Fraser Auret Racing.
25. Alongside Policy A1-5.1A is Policy A1-5.5A which refers to a "boundary buffer" along the eastern and northern road boundaries of no less than 400 m. One might anticipate

that this would be a physical separation from the industrial activities but no again in true Claytons fashion it seeks to enable light industrial use of this buffer. The buffer when your not having a buffer.

26. Even if it were to be a real buffer and not a Claytons buffer what is the technical basis for a setback of “400 m or more”. This requires expert assessment particularly in relation to noise and air quality effects. There is none. The expert evidence at a recent quarry case that I was a Commissioner on in Canterbury (which involved 3 air quality experts) was that particulates (PM₁₀) can be wind born and invisible to the eye for a distance of kilometres rather than hundreds of metres.
27. Policy A1-5.5B limits Stage 1 to 40 hectares. However, this is shown to extend to 400 metres from Wings Line. As stated above there is no technical basis for establishing this proximity to sensitive activities being both residential activities and elite racehorses.
28. In my evidence in chief I indicated the possibility of enabling development of 40 hectares with at least an 800 m buffer. On reflection I have no technical justification for an 800 m setback, just as there is no technical justification for a 400 m setback. Any plan change simply cannot proceed without the technical effects assessments. Such assessments need to consider ongoing construction activity as well as the performance of types of industrial plants.
29. Policy A1-5.5C refers to a Stage 2 area of 80 hectares. This is shown on the site plan as the rest of the plan change area less the 400m light industrial areas. However, there are no policies or rules that require Stage 1 to be complete before advancing to Stage 2. Consents could be issued for development of Stage 2 as soon as the Plan Change is treated as operative.
30. Policy A1-5.5.6 deals with noise and vibration. It says “effects” shall be avoided beyond the zone boundary. It then seeks to enable non compliance with standards through part mitigation. This policy effectively enables adverse noise effects on adjacent activities some of which, such as Fraser Aurret Racing, are particularly sensitive to noise. This is likely because there is no technical basis to conclude that industrial activities of the types envisaged can comply with the noise standards at the zone boundary. This is simply not acceptable. Timber processing industries have a track record of serious noise effects. Night time noise is particularly disruptive to both people and equine health.

31. Examples include Lumbarcube Ltd in Rotorua, 3400 complaints despite being judged to comply with the District Plan standards. Also Niagara Sawmill Company Ltd in Invercargill abatement notice issued.¹
32. With the scale of activities proposed construction noise is also a major issue. The existing District Plan standards do not apply to construction. Instead B1.7-6 applies NZS 6803: Acoustics – Construction Noise. While commonly used it does enable much higher levels of daytime noise and therefore a much higher risk of significant effects on racehorses and the community.
33. Policy A5-1.11 concerns necessary upgrades to road and rail networks. Para 25 of the supplementary evidence lists the scope of roading related improvements considered necessary. While again this is not based on any technical assessment, the intent of the policy is supported because it is directive in terms of “avoid” and requires the upgrades to be functional prior to increased demand being realised. However, the policy needs to be expanded to include the specific measures required and these need to be confirmed through technical evidence. The policy also needs to be implemented through rules that make industrial development a non complying activity until such time as these improvements are in place. It also needs to be demonstrated now, rather than at some future date, that these measures are capable of being funded through established funding mechanisms or a developer agreement.
34. In the event that some form of Plan Change is determined, which on the basis of the evidence available I do not support, then Policy A5-1.12 which limits access to Makirikiri Road is supported.
35. Policy A5-1.13 relates to stormwater management. This requires a stormwater collection and treatment wetland within the site of at least 6.5 hectares. The Site Plan locates this on a minor tributary to the Tutaenui Stream that flows north to south close to Makirikiri Road. However, this is not the main tributary stream that flows through the site, so is it feasible for a wetland in this location to work for the whole site. Again there is no technical evidence that supports this policy, it may or may not be appropriate.
36. Policy A5-1.14 relates to trade waste discharges. Para 23 of the evidence states that this refers also to wastewater, but this is not the case. The policy infers that trade waste (and possibly wastewater) may not be able to be accommodated at the nearby Marton municipal sewerage system. It is yet another policy that covers the bases without any

¹ Refer to attachments

technical understanding of what is and is not possible and feasible. A full engineering three waters assessment is necessary to understand the issues and the suitability of the site for development in terms of this particular set of issues.

37. This is also the case in relation to the final policy relating to potable and industrial water demand. There is no modelling of demand, assessment of potential sources and consequences of take. The policy seeks to protect from over allocation and effects on municipal supplies without providing any technical assessment of the issues.
38. This review of the provisions proposed has reinforced my opinion that irrespective of section 32 obligations and unproven demand, the basic technical issues around effects on sensitive activities, noise, air discharges, stormwater, wastewater, water supply and road improvements simply have not been undertaken and you are therefore not in a position to make a finding that the site is suitable for the land uses proposed irrespective of the other issues I address in my evidence in chief.
39. While I raised the possibility of a maximum 40 hectare zone adjacent to Mikirikiri Road and the railway my opinion is now firmly that this requires extensive further investigation and expert assessment before it could be seriously contemplated.

Paul Thomas
9 JUNE 2020



your local businesses need you



13:01:17 Tuesday 9 June 2020



[CORONAVIRUS](#)

[NEWS](#)

[TRAFFIC & CRASHES](#)

[VIDEO](#)

[LIFESTYLE](#)

[COUNCIL DIRECT](#)

[BLOGS](#)

[CONTACT](#)



North City Scaffolding

Competitively Priced Scaffold

OPEN

Posted: 7:49am Thursday 31 Jan, 2019 | By Phil Capmbell

[Become a supporter](#)



Timber site reminder of noisy area



The buildings are coming down.


Lumbercube, the timber company which suddenly closed its doors three years, has begun dismantling its machinery and buildings in Rotorua.

This week the company, which caused grief in the well-to-do area of Lynmore with its noisy night operations, began pulling down its buildings.

The company, which owns Rotorua Trucking Haulage based across the road from the mill, closed its doors in Rotorua in 2016.

GLINT

Connect with employees in times of distress — a leader's toolkit.

[Read now](#)

At least 80 employees lost their jobs.

Rather than blame the public outcry, let alone a breach of a local noise control bylaw, local district councillors Mark Gould and deputy mayor Dave Donaldson said at the time the decision to shut the business was based on economics.

Public pressure manifested into 3400 complaints, many by prominent and influential Rotorua citizens. They formed the Eastside Community Association, specifically to deal with the noise.

From the time the ex-Tachikawa Mill opened with its new owners in 2015, complaints of stress and lack of sleep were received by the council.

Mark Gould was one councillor to attend every meeting organised by the citizens, with the rider he was unable to comment as a resident to avoid a conflict of interest. position.

"I felt I had to attend meetings for I was concerned for the people who lived in the area," says Mark.

"I recall that Lumbercube closed its doors suddenly – it was a surprise."

Many residents felt their eardrums throb with the low booms emitting from the mill each night. Modified, if inventive, a sort muffling was tried, without success as the noise at whatever levels continued to rent the night air.



In April last year, the council voted to "prevent another Lumbercube" with a plan change related to noise control, despite appropriate resource consents approved for the mill.

Reduced evening noise levels were introduced at the behest of the new association.

Some 130 complaints were lodged by residents in the first nine weeks of the mill opening in 2015. Apparatus used to monitor noise levels did not apparently show major distractions.

While noise at lower levels of Lynmore were hardly noticed, the levels rose during the night in areas well above the homes on the flatter reaches of Lake Rotorua east.

The issue led to a review of the district plan, but it took some doing.

Councillors were obliged to accept reports that the pulsating din from the mill were at acceptable levels.

It is also thought the issue led indirectly to at least one council casualty.

TrySafePersonalAlarm.com

Police Say To Carry This

[OPEN](#)

You may also like...

How To Fix Car Scratches

Ad NanoMagicStore.com

BOP man killed in Auckland shooting

sunlive.co.nz

Unedited History Photos

Ad History Daily

One injured in Welcome Bay crash

sunlive.co.nz

Call Us Today

Ad The Tank Guy

Pro System Design

Ad Profile Boats

Z robbery trio jailed

sunlive.co.nz

Four Lot players \$ million

sunlive.co.nz

ADVERTISEMENT
Advertise with
Stuff

Sawmilling firm ordered to reduce noise at night

Louise Berwick • 11:04, Jul 25 2014



A major Southland company has been served an abatement notice following complaints to the Invercargill City Council.

The longstanding family-owned firm Niagara Sawmilling Company Ltd has been given until August 27 to adhere to the notice.

The notice says the company must reduce all noise from 10pm to 7am and comply with the Invercargill City District Plan.

The notice imposes the conditions on log handling activities, processing plant machinery, on-site vehicle movement, drum debarking plant and movement of containers and equipment at the Kennington site.

The firm has been the subject of several complaints but city council environmental and planning services director Pamela Gare said she had no reason to believe it would not comply with the instructions.

Niagara Sawmilling director Ross Richardson declined to comment.

ADVERTISEMENT
Advertise with
Stuff

The document warns the company that failure to comply with the notice could bring prosecution under the Resource Management Act unless there is an appeal.

If Niagara Sawmilling did appeal, their case would then be taken to the Environment Court.

"It's entirely in Niagara's court now," Gare said.

"Our expectation is that they will comply. We have got no reason to believe otherwise."