

Before the Independent Hearing Commissioners

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a hearing on submissions on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

Topic: Rural Zone

CMP Kokiri Limited

Submitter number: 611

Supplementary Evidence of Amy Louise Callaghan

1 July 2024

Submitter's solicitors:

Sarah Eveleigh | Sarah Schulte
Anderson Lloyd
Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013
PO Box 13831, Armagh, Christchurch 8141
DX Box WX10009
p + 64 3 379 0037 | f + 64 3 379 0039
sarah.eveleigh@al.nz | sarah.schulte@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 My name is Amy Callaghan.
- 2 I hold a Bachelor in Resource and Environmental Planning with Honours from Massey University. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 3 I am currently employed as a Technical Director – Planning at GHD Limited and have held that position since 2022.
- 4 My previous work experience includes both planning in a local authority environment and in the private sector. This has involved experience preparation of environmental scoping reports, resource consent applications and Assessments of Effects on the Environment for regional and district council requirements and preparing evidence and submissions to resource consent hearings, private plan changes and the Environment Court. I have specific experience with meat processing facilities and am currently involved in projects for facilities throughout New Zealand.
- 5 I have prepared a planning assessment supporting the submission of CMP Kokiri Limited, trading as ANZCO Foods Kokiri Limited (**ANZCO**), on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (**TTPP**).
- 6 ANZCO owns and operates a meat processing plant located at RD1 Dobson-Arnold Valley Road, Arnold Valley 7872, legally described as Lots 1 and 2 DP 2134 (**Site**).
- 7 ANZCO's original submission sought to rezone the Site from Rural to General Industrial, or similar zoning that provides for continued meat processing activities on the Site. In my original evidence dated 18 March 2024 I proposed an alternative approach in the form of an activity-specific precinct: Kokiri Rural Industry Precinct.
- 8 In preparing this evidence I have considered the following documents:
 - (a) ANZCO's original submission on the TTPP
 - (b) The TTPP, in particular:
 - (i) The General Rural Zone objectives, policies and rules
 - (ii) The General Industrial Zone objectives, policies and rules
 - (c) The section 32 reports for the General Rural and General Industrial Zones.
 - (d) The primary evidence provided on behalf of ANZCO by both myself and Katharine Jones (traffic).

- (e) The Section 42A Officer's Report for Rural Zones (excluding Settlement Zone).
- (f) The Section 42A Officer's Report for Commercial and Industrial Zones.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

- 9 While this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Scope of evidence

- 10 I have prepared supplementary planning evidence in response to the recommendations made in the S42A Officer's Report. Specifically, the recommendation that ANZCO's meat processing plant at Kokiri be re-zoned from General Rural Zone (**GRUZ**) to Light Industrial Zone (**LIZ**). This includes:
- (a) The planning implications and appropriateness of the recommended LIZ for ANZCO's ongoing operations; and
 - (b) Proposed solutions that recognise the existing operations and the need to provide for them on an ongoing basis through the use of a precinct or more appropriate Rural Zone, while managing adverse effects.
- 11 This supplementary evidence should be read in conjunction with my primary evidence.

S42A Report

- 12 The Officer's Report supports CMP Kokiri Limited's submission and recommends rezoning the site to LIZ. No commentary is provided in the report as to why this zone is preferred or why the precinct approach is not considered appropriate.

Commentary

- 13 In my opinion a precinct approach, as proposed in my primary evidence, remains the most effective means of recognising and providing for the existing activity on site, while providing long term protection from the effects associated with the establishment of another industrial activity should the meat processing plant cease to operate on the Site. A benefit of the Kokiri Rural Industry Precinct as proposed in my primary evidence is that it provides greater long-term protection of the amenity values associated with the surrounding rural environment, than either the

GIZ or LIZ. Specifically, the precinct would limit site coverage to 30%, significantly less than the 65% permitted under the LIZ or 80% under the GIZ. The rules I have recommended for the Rural Industry Precinct are also specific to meat processing facilities (as currently exist on the Site), so would not enable the establishment of other industrial activities such as saw mills, construction companies and manufacturers on the Site, to an extent greater than is currently provided for in the General Rural Zone.

- 14 If the Councils wish to maintain the existing suite of zones in the TTPP as notified, and do not wish to include a new precinct, consideration needs to be given to what is the most appropriate industrial zone for the site. While the TTPP includes two discrete industrial zones, there is in my opinion, no distinction between the types of activity that can establish in each zone. The TTPP includes a combined suite of Objectives and Policies that do not distinguish between the two zones and there are no definitions for light industrial or general industrial activities to support the two zones. The TTPP only distinguishes between the two zones in the 'Overview' statements at the start of each zone sub chapter which have limited statutory weight.
- 15 In my opinion, in the absence of any guidance from the TTPP, 'Light Industrial' infers that the activities will generate fewer adverse effects and will be more consumer focused than general or heavy industry. The types of activity that I consider might be anticipated in Light Industrial Zones include mechanical servicing, car sales yards, building depots or warehousing. That is consistent with the Overview section for the Light Industrial Zone, which states that "Activities within this zone may include light manufacturing, contractors' depots and automotive repair and service industries and some compatible commercial activities. Aquaculture activities such as fish or seaweed farming and processing are also appropriate in this zone". These activities all have notably different effects than a meat processing facility. Although the Overview have limited statutory weight, I consider that they do create a community expectation of the type of activities and effects that will occur in the zone.
- 16 On this basis I consider that, if the Hearings Panel disagrees with the precinct approach, then the GIZ best aligns with the operation of the meat processing facility. I consider that this is consistent with the reporting officer's other recommendations, namely the rezoning of Lots 2 and 2 DP 462928 (Harihari sawmill) from Settlement Zone to GIZ, reflecting the industrial use of the site for more than 20 years.¹

¹ Officer's Report: Rural Zones at [522]

Conclusion

- 17 Overall, as stated in my primary evidence, I consider that the proposed GRUZ zoning is inappropriate for the ongoing use and development of the Site as a meat processing plant. The GRUZ fails to recognise this established use on the Site and the plan provisions will create a high regulatory burden for ANZCO.
- 18 While I support the general intent of the TTPP to provide for rural industry to the extent that it meets performance standards, the Site is a unique situation where a rural industrial activity established in the rural environment several decades ago. I consider a more appropriate approach would be to provide for ANZCO's activities via an activity-specific precinct within the GRUZ.
- 19 This approach will provide an appropriate balance between providing for an established use while managing the adverse effects on the surrounding rural environment.
- 20 If this approach is not accepted, I consider the GIZ to be more suitable than the LIZ.

Dated 1 July 2024

Amy Louise Callaghan