

**BEFORE A HEARINGS PANEL OF THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL
COUNCIL AND MASTERTON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Resource Consents: WAR 070077 (27160-27172)
Notice of Requirement**

IN THE MATTER of resource consent applications to
Greater Wellington Regional
Council pursuant to section 88 of
the Resource Management Act
1991

**AND
IN THE MATTER** of a Notice of Requirement to
Masterton District Council pursuant
to section 168, 168A and 181 of the
Resource Management Act 1991

BY Masterton District Council

FOR the proposed upgrade of the
Masterton Wastewater Treatment
Plant

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ROBERT SCHOFIELD
ON BEHALF OF MASTERTON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Subject: Planning & Resource Management Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of this supplementary evidence is to respond to an issue raised directly with the applicant during the preliminary stage of the hearing, in relation to an area of land owned by Homebush Water Resources Limit, adjoining the southern end of the MWTP site.

1.2 For completeness I also note that, while my evidence-in-chief dated 13 February identified that I would comment further on the recommended conditions of the Designation and on the Resource Consents, the concerns of the District Council with the recommended conditions have been appropriately addressed in the other expert evidence presented on behalf of the District Council. I am happy to answer questions from the Panel about the draft conditions as required.

2. EFFECTS ON LAND OWNED BY HOMEBUSH WATER RESOURCES LTD

2.1 I understand that the Plan attached as Appendix 4 to Ms Southey's s42A report on behalf of Masterton District Council omitted to include land owned by one of the submitters, Mr Forbes. The area of land in question is held by Homebush Water Resources Limited, and includes land to the immediate south of the existing ponds, on either side of a paper road between Te Whiti Road and the Ruamahanga River.

2.2 I confirm that the potential effects of the proposed upgrade on this area of land were fully considered during the preparation of the AEE for the MWTP upgrade: the absence of that land from Ms Southey's map does not affect any of my assessment or recommendations. While neither the AEE nor my evidence-in-chief specifically addressed this area of land, I can make the following specific comments in relation to that land:

- (a) The proposed upgrade works would not directly affect any land owned by Homebush Water Resources Ltd or its ability to continue to be used for dairying – in this regard, the Makoura Stream provides a good physical separator.
- (b) The use of the access road to the MWTP is also unlikely to affect the ability for this subject land to be farmed. Any issues with construction traffic (such as dust) can be addressed through a Construction

Management Plan (as per the AEE and the recommended conditions of the designation); once constructed, there would only be occasional use of the track by vehicles accessing the Plant.

- (c) The existing extent of vegetation along the Makoura Stream provides a good screening of the existing and new ponds, of which only the grassy embankments are or would be visible. Views of those grassy embankments would not, in my opinion, represent a significant deleterious effect on the amenity values of the existing environment experienced from the Homebush Water Resources Ltd property.
- (d) The Homebush Water Resources Ltd land is located some distance from the land disposal area, from which it is partly separated by the Stream and proposed new ponds. The closest part of the designated area would continue to be used for farming purposes for the foreseeable future – even if it were developed for land disposal, such operation is unlikely to have any effect on the Homebush Water Resources Ltd land and its use for farming purposes. I also note the proposed 50m buffer would extend around the edge of the designated area between the new pond and Te Whiti Road.
- (e) Because of its proximity to the MWTP, under the Combined Wairarapa District Plan, consent would be needed to site a new dwelling on that land (Rule 4.5.2(d)(viii)). However, such consent is also required under the existing designation simply because of the proximity of the subject land to the existing ponds.

Robert Schofield
Environmental Planner – Director
Boffa Miskell Limited
26 February 2009