

Before an Independent Hearings Panel

The Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1)

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

IN THE MATTER OF hearing submissions and further submissions on the Proposed
Waikato District Plan (Stage 1):

Topic 25 – Zone Extents

**HIGHLIGHTS PACKAGE
ANDREW CURTIS ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED
(Air Quality)**

12 May 2021

BUDDLE FINDLAY

Barristers and Solicitors
Auckland

Solicitor Acting: **Vanessa Evitt / Mathew Gribben**

Email: vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com / mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com

Tel 64-9-358 2555 PO Box 1433 DX CP24024 Auckland 1140

1. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 1.1 My full name is Andrew Ferguson Curtis. I am Technical Director Air Quality at Pattle Delamore Partners, with over 30 years' experience and have specialised for over 24 years in air quality.
- 1.2 I have provided both statements of primary (EIC) and rebuttal (Rebuttal) evidence in relation to potential air quality related reverse sensitivity effects in relation to proposed rezoning sought by Havelock Village Ltd ("**HVL**") of land at 5 Yashili Drive, 88 Bluff Road, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road, Pokeno ("**the Site**").
- 1.3 The PWDP does not contain a definition of reverse sensitivity and I have considered those in the Operative District Plan and Waikato Regional Policy statement when considering the potential issue of reverse sensitivity.
- 1.4 In general, these definitions are acceptable, but it is important to note that where a discharge that gives rise to some form of effect is not lawfully established, or is greater than that consented, then any effects associated with it cannot be considered reverse sensitivity ones.
- 1.5 In addition, any complaints that might occur in relation to discharges where activities are lawfully established and operating within their consents, while they may be annoying do not of themselves constitute a reverse sensitivity effect.
- 1.6 HVL is proposing to incorporate a Pokeno Industrial Buffer on the Site, to provide separation between industrial activities and sensitive land uses.
- 1.7 While the width of the buffer is less than that proposed by some submitters, it is my opinion that the proposed buffer is appropriate to ensure that any residual air discharges from lawfully established activities within both the Industrial and Heavy Industrial zoned land do not result in potential reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities located within Site that forms part of the rezoning proposed by HVL.
- 1.8 I consider this level of separation is better than that proposed in the PWDP, where residential land to the northeast of the Site immediately abuts the Industrial zone, and the Business zoned land to the east abuts the Heavy Industry zone.
- 1.9 I have reviewed evidence submitted on behalf of Hynds and do not consider from an air quality perspective that there is potential for visible dust or steam emissions from its activities that fit within the WRC Permitted Activity standards to result in reverse sensitivity effects.

- 1.10 I am comfortable that the proposed HVL light industrial buffer adjacent to the Yashili site is appropriate for activities that are being undertaken within the existing Industrial zone.
- 1.11 I consider that the HVL light industrial buffer provides a separation distance which is suitable to avoid the potential for conflict between what could be considered incompatible activities and therefore meets one of the key objectives set out in the S42A Framework report.

Andrew Curtis

12 May 2021