

BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER of the Resource management Act 1991 (the Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER of proposed Plan Change 33 to the Waipā District Plan

**STATEMENT OF LAY EVIDENCE OF JOHN GUNDESEN (HAUTAPU
LANDOWNERS' GROUP**

DATED: 13 OCTOBER 2025

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is John Gundesen. I own a property that is directly adjacent to the Kama Trust land (Area 6). I gave evidence at the PC17 hearing. In my evidence that follows, where I refer to “we” I am referring to myself and/or my family.
2. Mr Chrisp and Mr Hawthorne have covered the PC17 process in their evidence. However, I believe that there is one particular outcome of that process that is important for the Hearing Commissioner to be aware of. After the hearing finished, a joint memorandum was filed on behalf of the HLG and Kama Trust which reflected our understanding of how quickly the Kama Trust intended to develop their Area 6 so that the HLG could pursue a live industrial zone. This is where the concept of the 80% development started, which was based on Kama Trust’s assurances that they would be at that point within 18 months of the PC17 hearing that took place in 2023.
3. Site works are now well underway right next door to our home, and we are still trying to get some clarity and resolution to this process. We didn’t want industrial development next to us – this situation is not of our making. However, we realised through the PC17 process that we couldn’t defeat the proposed zoning and so changed our approach to try to achieve an outcome that would enable us to move on. It’s been over three years now and we have incurred significant costs trying to get to a point where we can move on. I am hoping that this PC33 process will be the solution.

BACKGROUND

4. I would like to provide some background to the Hearing Commissioner about who we are and why we are here. As outlined in my March 2023 evidence to the PC17 Hearing Panel, we did everything in our power to research our lifestyle property at 346 Peake Rd. We requested Council Property and LIM reports, we researched the then proposed Fonterra wastewater treatment plant plans, Kiwifruit spray risk from the Boyd’s orchard next door, Nitrate levels in the local water bores, and the local zoning – including industrial and large lot residential in surrounding areas.

There was no indication that industrial zoning was intended over Hautapu Road and right up to our driveway.

5. As we later found out, that lack of information was because Kama Trust had entered into a “non-disclosure agreement” with the Council not to divulge plans to change the zoning to industrial in return for establishing stormwater treatment on their property.¹ In hindsight, there’s little wonder there was no mention of this imminent zone change in Council documents or amongst local property agents. The submission in opposition to PC33 from the Kama Trust and the infrastructure layout now consented by its subdivision consent, reinforces my concerns and fears that they have focussed on fulfilling their own short-term infrastructure and financial needs and are not interested in their effects on their or neighbours.
6. Our efforts to resolve this situation have been extremely costly, both financially and personally. We have had to divert funds reserved for family and personal future plans to paying for the planning process to be able to restart our lives somewhere else. The whole experience has been draining and trying to decide on the best options to take as a group has added further strain.
7. We have endured a complete loss of lifestyle. We no longer enjoy the place we purchased as a peaceful equestrian focused retreat, we have sold all our sport horses, the horse float and gear. Riding was my only daughters big dream, a dream that took us from central Auckland to rural Cambridge to pursue this sport she loved. This property was a lifestyle dream turned nightmare for us. It cannot continue without resolution. That is why it is critical for us that there is certainty that Area 7 will be live zoned and certainty timing for when development can progress. It cannot drag on for years to come.

EFFECTS OF AREA 6 RESOURCE CONSENT IMPLEMENTATION

8. Currently we endure from dawn til dusk six days a week, the incessant sound of diggers beeping, earth movers rumbling and trucks revving their way along our boundary. When big diggers pass the artwork on the wall

¹ Refer to the Statement of evidence of Mark Chrisp, 13 October 2025, paragraph 3.3.

all move skewwhiff, the fireplace chimney rattles and the house shakes as the earth moves, it is like an earthquake is going on.

9. Our intention when buying 346 Peake Road was to fully renovate the home as it was a thirty-year-old place which needed bathrooms and kitchen replaced and a lot of modernisation and heating. But when the letter arrived from Beca, the Council and Kama Trusts engagement arm telling us about the imminent rezoning right on our boundary, we opted not to put money into the house until this rezoning was resolved as it did not seem like a logic or good use of funds.
10. Consequently, no renovation has since occurred, we are not able to move on and we have been stuck living in a do up for years now, this means living with leaky bathrooms, with buckling tiles, sagging kitchen cabinets and rapidly rotting decks.
11. While the Kama Trust subdivision is not the subject of this PC33 hearing, I believe there is some relevance because it illustrates the approach they have taken to their development, to the detriment of the HLG. We were not consulted on regarding the risk of contaminated land, no site validation report has been shared with us, there is no dust mitigation. With the shelter belt being removed, I'm expecting a dust bowl over the summer. See the photos below that illustrates why I am so concerned. I took these photos myself with a standard setting (i.e., not zoomed in or enlarged).



Figure 1: Photo from boundary of Gundesen property looking towards Hautapu Welders in the background (to the south).



Figure 2: View down Gundesen driveway towards Peake Rd, showing the stormwater pond being formed on Area 6.



Figure 3: View from Gundesen entry door.

PC33 – DEVELOPMENT TRIGGERS

12. In my view, this background reiterates the need to have a certain development trigger in PC33 that cannot be manipulated through changes to resource consents. If Kama Trust is genuine that its current subdivision will be completed and 80% of the area subject to section 224 within the next 12 months, there should be no issue with including a “fall back” year date of 2027. I agree with Mr Chrisp that the vesting of Road 4 as an additional trigger makes sense, given everything that has happened since PC17 was made operative and we lodged PC33.
13. In summary, my family and I ask you to understand our situation, to put right what has occurred in the past. We have no options but to seek a fair outcome and a better planning solution. We have operated in good faith, we have done all we reasonably could to ensure we bought in a safe and friendly location, relying on Council documents and reports. We did not seek to be part of an industrial precinct. We invested in what should have been a quiet safe rural location to live. We have tried our best to seek a fair outcome for all parties and we ask that you make a decision that will enable us to have some certainty about the future.

John Gundersen
13 October 2025