

**HEARING 21 NOVEMBER 2023  
POINTS OF DISCUSSION BY  
SUSAN CATHERINE JOLL**

1. Greetings
2. Thanks for opportunity to speak at this hearing.
3. We are Gordon and Susan Joll who live at 22 Tawa Avenue, Kaiwaka.
4. We would like to address our submission with many areas found to be short on detail or incorrect and therefore we have major credibility issues with the facts and figures presented in the following reports compiled by so-called experts.

It began with an email received from the council in response to receiving my initial submission dated 31 July 2023 where I was addressed as "Dear Name". Then I see my name as a submitter on the KDC website is S J Joll – they cannot even get basic information correct, compounding credibility issues.

5. The areas we would like further clarification are;  
Please refer to the Acoustics Report by Lindsay Mary Leitch

Starting with Paragraph 1.5:

*Side explanation: There is one theme of statements running throughout this report as well as significant anomalies. I do not wish to repeat our impression and response so many times, so from here it will be referred to as an "Objectionable Statement".*

#### Overview of "Objectionable Statement"

1. A statement that appears to be made based on one person's individual opinion. E.g.Paragraph 1.5 - Define reasonable, is there a scale? We find this comment ignorant, with little or no detail. Furthermore, to define "relatively low", stating any increase in noise or traffic FOR US has minimal impact. Zero empathy for us. **They're not the ones who live there.** Also, we are having difficulty accepting the approach taken when we have, and will, identify multiple areas of concern, and again thank you for giving us the opportunity to discuss them. Examples of The Objectionable Statement occur in paragraphs: 1.5, 7.2, 8.2, 8.4, 8.5, 8.7, 10.3,10.5

#### ACOUSTICS REPORT

Para 4.6 – Metrics for describing sound. Noise levels, over a 12 hour period must not exceed 50dB by a further 5dB for longer than 15 min. Page 3, 4.2. Who will be responsible for ensuring these readings are adhered to? What is the plan for monitoring and ensuring these regulations are met? Loose statement.

Monitoring: Paragraphs 4.6, 6.1, 7.4

- 7am to 7pm 55dB LAeq(15min),
- 50dB is described on Page 3
- 7.2 INHERENT NOISE GENERATED BY CHILDREN PLAYING
- what about the reasons that we are not talking only school hours, **we are talking after school activities, a marae so obviously the whole thing includes weekends! I find that comment particularly shallow and ill-researched.**
- My horse business, Willow Bend Horse Hotel, has looking after horses for people since 2005. I cannot accept having a noisy school with traffic 24/7 as being anything good for my horse business. This makes me especially sad. I won't be able to ride up and down the road anymore. Many of my clients ride their horses to my arena so that is another aspect of my business disrupted.
- Boundary breaches: we terrified any person or object will come across our boundary that would harm or frighten mine or other people's animals at any time, ever? Please note I look after other people's animals – some are friendlier than others – I do not want any encounters over the fence between my animals and school children.
- 8.2 – Objectionable Statement.
- Noise Propagation: please explain, para 8.7

CONCLUSION:

**Any increase in noise levels coming from #9 Tawa Avenue is unfavourable to us.** We are completely happy with our life and address as it has been for over 18 years and do not want to live across the road from a school with any level of Inherent Noise generated by children playing and associated activities, including a huge increase in traffic.

**TRANSPORT** by Colin Robert Shields

Para 1.5 and Chester Report 6. Para 3, – vulnerable road users – what about horses? I have ridden up and down that road for 18 years, back to when it was just a farm track, before Tawa Avenue was created after the subdivision. Lots of my customers and riders from around our district ride up the road to my arena and beyond. How do I see the consent for the school benefitting me or my business in any way by making zero allowance for this? Was it even considered?

**Para 1.8 – See “Objectionable Statement”- (*becoming offensive to us*)**

Para 4.3 – When I moved here in 2005 it was before they started to fence off the newly formed subdivision. There are at least eight blocks up Kiwi Lane since the inception of the subdivision. The idea of three as in the report, is off-putting and incorrect and the point finishes with Tawa Avenue referred to as Tawa Road. Credibility of these reports is in doubt from here.

Para 5.6 – Northern Bass happens for three days from 365. To state in the report that traffic would be busier in Summer and during the NB festival, than what the school would generate, is disturbing. Does this mean that the increase in noise level for us would become only be slightly less than these levels you deem acceptable, for

the whole year? Lastly, I am sure the well-respected Worsfold family of Kaiwaka would appreciate it if you had spelt their name correctly. More insignificant details I suppose.

Para 5.11 - **See “Objectionable Statement”**

Para 5.16 – Realistically, the children who don’t travel by bus, or people attending the proposed gymnasium or Marae will potentially be driving up and down our road for up to 12 hours a day. How does the writer of this report arrive at the conclusion that “there will not be a huge impact on neighbouring properties”, in terms of traffic?

Para 7.1 - **See “Objectionable Statement”**

## **STORM AND WASTE WATER**

Page 7, Figure 3, Illustrates vicinity of waterways to site

Page 8 – Re the Northland Regional Council Biodiversity Wetlands Map – Please could we have a linear description of “nearby”? Again, Northern areas of the site are deemed most suitable for the disposal field, alarmingly close to the waterways.

Page 8 – Constraints Summary – has already discovered this land is not the most suitable regarding soil type, for natural drainage. The proposed site for laying any wastewater fields is actually closest to both creeks; <200m> from both Northern boundaries of #9 Tawa Ave. How can this be allowed?

In periods of rain both creeks easily rise up to almost paddock level. What plans do you have for when your system fails and the creeks become contaminated – inevitable.

Page 9: Has an assessment been done in order to compare any onsite option with the other option of connection to Kaiwaka Wastewater Scheme? Outcomes?

Page 10, Paragraph 8 – Permitted daily volume of 2m<sup>3</sup>, exceeding this would require Discretionary Consent. What is Discretionary Consent? Is it written permission that allows you to exceed normal maximum levels, by more than six times (page 11)? Has Discretionary Consent to exceed this level by more than six times, been granted already?

Lastly, has the slope angle of the proposed disposal area been confirmed from detailed contour data or survey? Evidence please.

How can anyone feel comfortable going ahead without this basic information sorted out and details that don’t require any expert get overlooked?

### **9.2 Land Application System**

If Discretionary Consent is issued and taking into account the poorly draining, clay type soil of this region from an area can only handle 2mm/day without constraints.

The Northern slope of #9, if a sliding scale was applied, this proposed disposal field will get loaded to 24mm. How is that acceptable? Page 12 – Findings?

Two Options:

In the event of the kura connecting to the Kaiwaka Waste Water scheme, what obligation, short, mid or long term do we have as residents, to connect to that system? We have just spent \$40k installing a septic system at our beautiful new house so not interested in anything of the sort and is just another reason to oppose.

Page 13 – Proposed drainage field sites. These options seem flimsy and subject to lots going wrong. No credibility in the facts and figures when basics get missed. Need contingency plans in the event of failure of fragile run off system less than 200m from two waterways. What are the plans to carefully manage stormwater and groundwater?

HAS AN OPTION BEEN CHOSEN?

Chester Report 9. Conclusion: “the requiring authority has demonstrated that the site can be suitably serviced in terms of wastewater and water supply and there are options to sufficiently manage stormwater. Evidence please?”

FINAL CONCLUSION:

We have nothing against the project we just don't want it built next door. No credibility in the details to date by people hired by the MOE to push this consent through the council.

-

-