

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
PC72-01	Whole Plan Change	1	General Support / Opposition	2	1	NZ Transport Agency	Support with Amendment	Support as a regional business park that will provide for the longer term industrial land requirements as identified in SmartGrowth and the WBOP District Plan.	Retain plan change subject to amendments listed.
				FS 22 [2]	1 [1]	Tauranga City Council [NZ Transport Agency]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. Risks of the changes are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 28 [2]	[1]	Rotorua District Council [NZ Transport Agency]	Oppose	Changes are inconsistent with SG and the WBOP District Plan.	Reject Submission
				3	1	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support	Support as agreed through the SmartGrowth partnership.	Retain as notified
				FS 22 [3]	2 [1]	Tauranga City Council [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. Risks of the changes are low.	Approve Plan Change.
				FS 28 [3]	2 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Bay Of Plenty Regional Council]	Oppose	Changes are inconsistent with SG Strategy.	Reject the submission.
				5	1	Hickson, Paul James	Support	Should speed up development of RBP, allow head offices related to industries based at the RBP, childcare facilities are needed, need for food outlets/cafes and services for workers. RBP is ideally located for BOP export industries.	Approve PC72
				FS 25 [5]	4 [1]	Carrus Corporation Ltd [Hickson, Paul James]	Support	Agree in respect to RBP being an export based business park.	Support the development of RBP
				FS 28 [5]	4 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Hickson, Paul James]	Oppose	Expediting the Park development is not a sensible approach when there is insufficient data available to determine what effect the proposed changes PC72 seeks to impose will have on transport networks and existing industrial and commercial land resources. Affording greater flexibility to establish non-industrial land uses in the Park is inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission
				6	6	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Ideal location for those industries in the primary sector and not suited to urban environments. Assists with "live, work, play" for Te Puke and future Te Tumu and Wairakei communities, and help reduce the commuter flow into Tauranga.	Approve PC72
7	1	Stafford Rise Trust Ltd	Oppose	Will adversely affect the sustainability, vitality and viability of industrial and commercial land in the Rotorua District. Contradicts the RPS as there will be an imbalance of land supply. No economic impact analysis in S32. No development has taken place so why extend the zone. A spot zone will be created within the Industrial Zone. PC72 gives rise to a de-facto centre not envisaged by SmartGrowth.	Decline the PC				

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				FS 22 [7]	16 [1]	Tauranga City Council [Stafford Rise Trust Ltd]	Oppose	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 23 [7]	5 [1]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Stafford Rise Trust Ltd]	Support	Will adversely affect the sustainability, vitality and viability of industrial and commercial land in the Rotorua District. Contradicts the RPS.	Reject PC72
				FS 28 [7]	6 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Stafford Rise Trust Ltd]	Support	<p>Will adversely affect the sustainability, vitality and viability of industrial and commercial land in the Rotorua District. PC72 is inconsistent with higher order planning instruments.</p> <p>Non-industrial uses are inappropriate in an industrial zone and such flexibility is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the WBDP.</p> <p>The s32 analysis is inadequate as it fails to fully evaluate the costs, benefits and adverse effects arising from PC72.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the staging rules will create an imbalance of land supply, demand and uptake.</p>	Accept the submission
				11	1	Rotorua District Council	Oppose	<p>PC 72 is opposed in its entirety on the basis that the amendments proposed to the operative District Plan:</p> <p>a) Will have an adverse effect on the sustainability, vitality and viability of the industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and the wider region;</p> <p>b) Will lead to transport inefficiencies and consequential adverse effects on the local and regional transportation network;</p> <p>c) Are inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments, notably the SmartGrowth Strategy, and the RPS, and inconsistency with the Operative District Plan; and</p> <p>d) Are inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA in that they fail to achieve the sustainable management of the region's natural and physical resources.</p> <p>While opposed in its entirety, in particular, RLC's opposition is focussed on the following parts of PC 72:</p> <p>a) Chapter 21: The inclusion of additional non-industrial land use activities (permitted and discretionary) in the</p>	Reject PC72 in its entirety

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								<p>Industrial chapter applying to the Rangiuru Business Park ("Rangiuru") and specifically larger takeaway outlets, childcare / day-care / pre-school facilities, increased flexibility of office activity;</p> <p>b) Chapter 12: The changes to the provision of roading infrastructure, in particular changing the TEL intersection from four to three legs; and</p> <p>c) Chapter 12: Amendment to expand Stage 1 of development from occupying 25ha (gross) to 45ha (gross) and related rule 12.4.13.8 which sets a development threshold of 50% within Stage 1 before further development beyond that stage can occur.</p>	
				FS 22 [11]	15 [1]	Tauranga City Council [Rotorua District Council]	Oppose	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 23 [11]	6 [1]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Rotorua District Council]	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	Reject PC72
				FS 26 [11]	1 [1]	Smartgrowth Implementation Committee [Rotorua District Council]	Oppose	RBP is an important component of the SG settlement pattern. The changes sought are minor with no substantial changes to the provision of non-industrial uses. SG is concerned at the selective use of quotes from the SG Strategy. The submission would be more appropriately dealt with during a review of the RPS or District Plan. With a recently reviewed SG Strategy, an operative RPS and WBOPDC District Plan, there is limited opportunity for policy debates through this plan change.	Approve PC72
				FS 29 [11]	1 [1]	Hebland Holdings Ltd [Rotorua District Council]	Oppose	The plan change seeks to revise an operative zoning.	Retain PC72 subject to submission points made by Hebland.
				FS 30 [11]	1 [1]	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate) [Rotorua District Council]	Oppose	The Plan Change seeks to revise an operative zoning.	Retain PC72 subject to submission points made by Hebland.
				12	1	Whakatane District Council	Support with Amendment	The Whakatane District Council continues to support the development of the Rangiuru Business park primarily for industrial activities to reap potential benefits across the region; not just in the Western Bay.	<p>Make amendments or additions to the industrial zone objectives, policies and rules that encourage non-industrial activities to establish in the Business Park.</p> <p>Ensure the funding mechanism to pay for infrastructure costs remains relevant, given the Resource</p>

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
									Legislation Amendment Act includes the following statement: The Bill simplifies charging regimes for new developments by removing financial contributions from the RMA (Page 5 of the proposed Bill). This is critical to ensuring the appropriate cost recovery mechanisms are in place.
				FS 22 [12]	17 [1]	Tauranga City Council [Whakatane District Council]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 26 [12]	2 [1]	Smartgrowth Implementation Committee [Whakatane District Council]	Oppose	The changes sought are minor with no substantial changes to the provision of non-industrial uses. With a recently reviewed SG Strategy, an operative RPS and WBOPDC District Plan, there is limited opportunity for policy debates through this plan change.	Approve PC72
				FS 28 [12]	12 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Whakatane District Council]	Oppose	The changes will undermine the vitality and viability of the existing industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and wider region. Opposes the decision sought to change the industrial zone's objectives and policies.	Reject the submission
				FS 30 [12]	2 [1]	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate) [Whakatane District Council]	Oppose	The submissions are unclear but appear to oppose limited commercial activities that PC72 supports.	Retain limited commercial activities and offices that support the RBP.
				12	3	Whakatane District Council	Support with Amendment	The Plan Change shows a desire for flexibility in the range of ancillary activities that may be needed to support an industrial activity. This may be contrary to the intent of higher level policy documents including SmartGrowth. SmartGrowth recognises it is part of a wider Bay of Plenty framework. To that end the implementation of planning provisions that have the ability to undermine other sub-regional centres, such as the Eastern Bay, should be avoided. The Council generally supports the development of the Rangiuru Business Park, and sees the benefits and opportunities it can bring to the Eastern Bay. SmartGrowth (Section 108, page 73) recognises that a strong sub-regional economy is part of a wider regional, Upper North Island and national economy and in developing a growing economy in the western bay, that it is important that the factors contributing to that growth are viewed from the perspective of strengthening links in the Eastern Bay of Plenty and Rotorua".	Ensure the Plan Change provisions reinforce the industrial opportunities it is intended to provide for (to benefit the wider Bay of Plenty), and not undermine exiting commercial centres throughout the region through the inadvertent draw of non-industrial activities into the Business Park.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				FS 28 [12]	14 [3]	Rotorua District Council [Whakatane District Council]	Support with Amendment	Greater flexibility to establish non-industrial activities is contrary to higher order planning instruments. RLC does not support the decision sought to amend PC72 to reinforce the industrial activities the Park is intended for.	Accept the decision but decline the decision sought
				FS 29 [12]	2 [3]	Hebland Holdings Ltd [Whakatane District Council]	Oppose	The submissions are unclear but appear to oppose limited commercial activities that PC72 supports.	Retain limited commercial activities and offices that support the RBP.
				FS 30 [12]	3 [3]	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate) [Whakatane District Council]	Oppose	The submissions are unclear but appear to oppose limited commercial activities that PC72 supports.	Retain limited commercial activities and offices that support the RBP.
				13	1	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Support with Amendment	Generally support Plan Change 72 subject to the submission points below.	Approve Plan Change 72 subject to other submission points below including consultation with affected land owners regarding servicing options. This should be completed before any decision is made on Plan Change 72.
				FS 28 [13]	15 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Hebland Holdings Ltd]	Oppose	The changes will undermine the vitality and viability of the existing industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and wider region. Will lead to transport inefficiencies and adverse effects on the local and regional transportation network. PC72 is inconsistent with higher order planning instruments. It is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA as it fails to achieve the sustainable management of the region's natural and physical resources.	Reject the submission
				15	1	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)	Support with Amendment	Generally support Plan Change 72 subject to the submission points below.	Approve Plan Change 72 subject to other submission points below including consultation with affected land owners regarding servicing options. This should be completed before any decision is made on Plan Change 72.
				FS 28 [15]	17 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)]	Oppose	The changes will undermine the vitality and viability of the existing industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and wider region. Will lead to transport inefficiencies and adverse effects on the local and regional transportation network. PC72 is inconsistent with higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangioru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								It is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA as it fails to achieve the sustainable management of the region's natural and physical resources.	
				16	2	Paterson, Rob	Unknown	Decisions must reflect that the proposed changes are meaningful and not simply stop gap measures until development of the business park is finalised sometime in the future.	Decisions must reflect that the proposed changes are meaningful and not simply stop gap measures until development of the business park is finalised sometime in the future.
				18	1	Te Puke Economic Development Group	Support	<p>Over the last three years, Te Puke EDG has lobbied for priority to the development of Rangioru Business Park. This will create industry and jobs which will benefit the entire Bay Of Plenty The proposal from Quayside for staging of the development, alternative cost effective infrastructure and direct access to the Tauranga Eastern Link has our full support.</p> <p>We understand consultation with stakeholders has resulted in some minor changes to permitted activities. This plan change will therefore hasten the development and the resulting economic development.</p>	Approve the plan change.
				FS 27 [18]	18 [1]	Seeka Kiwifruit Industries Ltd [Te Puke Economic Development Group]	Support	It is essential to the economic development of our region that companies like ours and our industry have access to modern infrastructure and services as will result with RBP. It will ensure full benefit maximisation of the TEL.	Approve PC72 as notified.
				FS 28 [18]	21 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Te Puke Economic Development Group]	Oppose	<p>The changes will undermine the vitality and viability of the existing industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and wider region.</p> <p>Will lead to transport inefficiencies and adverse effects on the local and regional transportation network.</p> <p>It is inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments.</p> <p>It is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA as it fails to achieve the sustainable management of the region's natural and physical resources.</p>	Reject the submission.
				20	1	Te Puke Community Board	Support	<p>The Te Puke Community Board supports "Plan Change 72" for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposed industrial park will provide employment opportunities for those living in the Te Puke District and will broaden the provision of goods</p>	Adopt PC72

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								<p>and services for all ratepayers.</p> <p>2. It is a recommendation of SmartGrowth to establish an industrial park in the eastern region of the Western Bay of Plenty District.</p> <p>3. The park is ideally situated in close proximity to already established rail and roading networks leading to the Port of Tauranga. It is also ideally situated in the centre of the thriving Bay of Plenty region.</p> <p>4. The industrial park will allow for industrial activity to be situated in an area where adverse effects such as odour, noise, vibration, dust and traffic movement will be mitigated.</p> <p>5. The park will now be developed in stages which will ensure that the land is developed in the most efficient and effective way.</p> <p>6. With residential zoned areas expanding along the coastline east of Mount Maunganui an industrial park in the eastern hinterland will mean that employees working in the park will not need to travel across the Tauranga urban area to get to their place of employment.</p> <p>7. There is already significant industrial activity in the area in the form of post-harvest activity and a well-established freezing works.</p>	
				FS 28 [20]	22 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Te Puke Community Board]	Oppose	<p>The changes will undermine the vitality and viability of the existing industrial and commercial land resources in the Rotorua District and wider region.</p> <p>Will lead to transport inefficiencies and adverse effects on the local and regional transportation network.</p> <p>Is inconsistent with higher order planning instruments.</p> <p>Oppose flexibility to the stages of development on the basis that the provision of land for the initial stage of development is too large and is an inefficient approach to the development of land at the Park.</p> <p>The development threshold introduced (50%) is too low and contrary to higher order planning instruments.</p>	Reject the submission.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				21	1	Archbold, Mark and Brenda	Oppose	<p>Reasons for opposing are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of amenity values with the conversion of rural land to light and heavy industrial. Increased noise, traffic, dust, odour, vibration, lighting effects, visual impacts, hazardous substances and other nuisance activities particularly during site establishments but also with the long term change in land use. 	<p>Decline PC72,</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Amend to include more extensive provisions and considerations to mitigate or remedy the adverse effects especially the traffic noise, vibration, traffic volumes and health and safety issues for the residents' and landowners on Young and Pah Roads.</p>
PC72-02	Roading	1	TEL	6	1	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Proposed change to the interchange and internal roading are logical	Approve PC72
				8	1	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Support with Amendment	<p>The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange to the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) is shown on some of the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'. This eastern connection is supported, however in order to ensure it is reserved / protected it requires identification and recognition both in the District Plan provisions and on the Structure Plans for PC72 that it will be a local road connection. The first bullet point of 12.4.13.5 and the proposed roading layout, land use and staging plan is inadequate identification of what is required</p>	<p>Add to 12.4.13.5 the following bullet point after the third bullet point :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Notwithstanding which option of the Rangiuru Interchange to the TEL is chosen, the eastern leg of the Rangiuru Interchange shall be designed to accommodate future local road access from the business park boundary in the east to the interchange and shall be vested as road reserve as part of the issue of any s224 certificate for any subdivision, or building consent or any use of land in the Business Park as required through bullet point one of this rule.'
				FS 28 [8]	7 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Oppose	<p>RLC is concerned that a three legged interchange with the TEL will result in poorer access outcomes for RDC and reduce the potential economic benefits of connections between Rotorua and Rangiuru.</p>	Reject the submission.
				8	7	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Oppose	<p>The operative provisions of the Rangiuru Business Park show in the appendices a diagram of a diamond interchange indicating the need to set aside during the development of the business park an easterly connection for the interchange.</p> <p>The proposed Appendix 7 structure plans in the plan change show no interchange diagram and on several of the plans in PC72 such as the contour diagram, a set of lines that could be considered a road reserve or at least a services corridor are shown. One plan states "reserved lands". The structure plans are not consistent and clear on the intention to require the local road connection to the east in the longer term. The structure plans for PC72 need to make it clear that there is</p>	<p>Show on all Rangiuru Business Park structure plans the proposed local road from the east to connecting to the interchange. This road is currently referred to on the structure plan referenced as 11.6 Roading Layout and Land Use in PC72 as 'Reserved Land'.</p> <p>Amend this label on all plans as Reserved Land for "local road providing eastern connection".</p> <p>These structure plans include the following structure plans notified in PC72 and any other plans or diagrams introduced through the PC72 process:</p>

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								intended to be a road connection from the business park to the eastern community including in the long term the eastern end of the Te Tumu urban area by way of the Kaituna Link. Such a connection maybe provided by Council in the future by way of a Designation or as part of a subdivision of adjoining rural lands. Rule 21.4.2 (a) of the operative Plan requires development to be generally in accordance with the Structure Plan and therefore the connecting point can at least be protected through the rules of this plan change.	a) 11.1 Proposed Stormwater Catchments and Amenity Reserves; b) 11.2 Proposed Contours; c) 11.3a Sewer Reticulation Layout - On site Option; d) 11.3b Sewer Reticulation Layout - Off site Option; e) 11.4a Water Supply - On Site Option; f) 11.4b Water Supply- Off Site Option; g) 11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use.
				9	1	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Support with Amendment	The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange to the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) is shown on some of the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'. This eastern connection is supported, however in order to ensure it is reserved / protected it requires identification and recognition both in the District Plan provisions and on the Structure Plans for PC72 that it will be a local road connection. The first bullet point of 12.4.13.5 and the proposed roading layout, land use and staging plan is inadequate identification of what is required	Add to 12.4.13.5 the following bullet point after the third bullet point : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Notwithstanding which option of the Rangiuru Interchange to the TEL is chosen, the eastern leg of the Rangiuru Interchange shall be designed to accommodate future local road access from the business park boundary in the east to the interchange and shall be vested as road reserve as part of the issue of any s224 certificate for any subdivision, or building consent or any use of land in the Business Park as required through bullet point one of this rule.'
				9	7	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Oppose	The operative provisions of the Rangiuru Business Park show in the appendices a diagram of a diamond interchange indicating the need to set aside during the development of the business park an easterly connection for the interchange. The proposed Appendix 7 structure plans in the plan change show no interchange diagram and on several of the plans in PC72 such as the contour diagram, a set of lines that could be considered a road reserve or at least a services corridor are shown. One plan states "reserved lands". The structure plans are not consistent and clear on the intention to require the local road connection to the east in the longer term. The structure plans for PC72 need to make it clear that there is intended to be a road connection from	Show on all Rangiuru Business Park structure plans the proposed local road from the east to connecting to the interchange. This road is currently referred to on the structure plan referenced as 11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use in PC72 as 'Reserved Land'. Amend this label on all plans as Reserved Land for "local road providing eastern connection". These structure plans include the following structure plans notified in PC72 and any other plans or diagrams introduced through the PC72 process: a) 11.1 Proposed Stormwater

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								<p>the business park to the eastern community including in the long term the eastern end of the Te Tumu urban area by way of the Kaituna Link. Such a connection maybe provided by Council in the future by way of a Designation or as part of a subdivision of adjoining rural lands. Rule 21.4.2 (a) of the operative Plan requires development to be generally in accordance with the Structure Plan and therefore the connecting point can at least be protected through the rules of this plan change.</p>	<p>Catchments and Amenity Reserves;</p> <p>b) 11.2 Proposed Contours;</p> <p>c) 11.3a Sewer Reticulation Layout - On site Option;</p> <p>d) 11.3b Sewer Reticulation Layout - Off site Option;</p> <p>e) 11.4a Water Supply - On Site Option;</p> <p>f) 11.4b Water Supply- Off Site Option;</p> <p>g) 11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use.</p>
				10	1	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Support with Amendment	<p>The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange to the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) is shown on some of the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'. This eastern connection is supported, however in order to ensure it is reserved / protected it requires identification and recognition both in the District Plan provisions and on the Structure Plans for PC72 that it will be a local road connection. The first bullet point of 12.4.13.5 and the proposed roading layout, land use and staging plan is inadequate identification of what is required</p>	<p>Add to 12.4.13.5 the following bullet point after the third bullet point :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Notwithstanding which option of the Rangiuru Interchange to the TEL is chosen, the eastern leg of the Rangiuru Interchange shall be designed to accommodate future local road access from the business park boundary in the east to the interchange and shall be vested as road reserve as part of the issue of any s224 certificate for any subdivision, or building consent or any use of land in the Business Park as required through bullet point one of this rule.'
				10	7	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Oppose	<p>The operative provisions of the Rangiuru Business Park show in the appendices a diagram of a diamond interchange indicating the need to set aside during the development of the business park an easterly connection for the interchange.</p> <p>The proposed Appendix 7 structure plans in the plan change show no interchange diagram and on several of the plans in PC72 such as the contour diagram, a set of lines that could be considered a road reserve or at least a services corridor are shown. One plan states "reserved lands". The structure plans are not consistent and clear on the intention to require the local road connection to the east in the longer term. The structure plans for PC72 need to make it clear that there is intended to be a road connection from the business park to the eastern</p>	<p>Show on all Rangiuru Business Park structure plans the proposed local road from the east to connecting to the interchange. This road is currently referred to on the structure plan referenced as 11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use in PC72 as 'Reserved Land'.</p> <p>Amend this label on all plans as Reserved Land for "local road providing eastern connection".</p> <p>These structure plans include the following structure plans notified in PC72 and any other plans or diagrams introduced through the PC72 process:</p> <p>a) 11.1 Proposed Stormwater Catchments and Amenity</p>

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								community including in the long term the eastern end of the Te Tumu urban area by way of the Kaituna Link. Such a connection maybe provided by Council in the future by way of a Designation or as part of a subdivision of adjoining rural lands. Rule 21.4.2 (a) of the operative Plan requires development to be generally in accordance with the Structure Plan and therefore the connecting point can at least be protected through the rules of this plan change.	Reserves; b) 11.2 Proposed Contours; c) 11.3a Sewer Reticulation Layout - On site Option; d) 11.3b Sewer Reticulation Layout - Off site Option; e) 11.4a Water Supply - On Site Option; f) 11.4b Water Supply- Off Site Option; g) 11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use.
				17	2	Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce	Oppose	Oppose the suggested changes to the interchange. We would expect that such a Business Park would be servicing the greater BOP Region therefore having south bound traffic use the Te Puke Highway would create congestion. We would assume that such an industrial area will mean an increase in the number of trucks coming in and out of Rotorua. The Tauranga Eastern link was developed to relieve such congestion. We would therefore suggest further investigation be given to ways to include south bound traffic in the Business Park interchange	Further investigations into options that would see south bound traffic included in the interchange.
				FS 23 [17]	4 [2]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce]	Support	Oppose suggested changes to the interchange. RBP should be servicing the greater BOP Region.	Southbound traffic must be retained/included in the interchange.
				FS 28 [17]	20 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce]	Support	RLC is concerned that the suggested changes to the interchange with the TEL will result in poorer access outcomes for RDC and reduce the potential economic benefits of connections between Rotorua and Rangiuru which is contrary to higher planning instruments.	Accept the submission.
				21	2	Archbold, Mark and Brenda	Oppose	Oppose the three legged interchange. This will put strain and increased traffic volumes and issues on to Young and Pah Roads, affecting residents and also creating safety issues at nearby Maketu Road and Pah Road intersections.	Decline the three legged interchange option and retain the four legged interchange as already approved.
				FS 28 [21]	23 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Archbold, Mark and Brenda]	Support	RLC is concerned that a three legged interchange with the TEL will result in poorer access outcomes for RDC and reduce the potential economic benefits of connections between Rotorua and Rangiuru which is contrary to higher planning instruments.	Accept the submission

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
PC72-02	Roading	2	Te Puke Highway	2	2	NZ Transport Agency	Support with Amendment	The Transport Agency wants to ensure that appropriate monitoring of the Pah Road/Te Puke Highway and Maketu Road/Te Puke Highway intersections is undertaken and that the biennial monitoring provides a minimum standard.	12.4.13.7(a) (second paragraph) is changed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum two year monitoring period (by Western Bay of Plenty District Council) of the safety and capacity performance shall be undertaken.
				13	6	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Support with Amendment		Provide sufficient flexibility to enable the interim Roading solutions to be extended if traffic safety is shown to be acceptable and have surplus capacity for additional heavy vehicles. Consequential amendments to the rules as necessary.
				15	5	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)	Support with Amendment	Rule 12.4.13.7 Interim development - Roading. Support interim road options. Consider raising the 70ha cap if traffic safety maintained.	Provide sufficient flexibility to enable the interim Roading solutions to be extended if traffic safety is shown to be acceptable and have surplus capacity for additional heavy vehicles. Consequential amendments to the rules as necessary.
PC72-02	Roading	3	Internal Network	2	3	NZ Transport Agency	Support with Amendment	Support internal roading layout, but concerned that the widening of Pah Road is likely to encourage a higher speed environment for the existing Pah Rd/Te Puke Highway intersection	Support internal roading layout, but that a safe and appropriate travel speed is achieved on Pah Road (after the 10m wide upgrade to rural standard) and speed management features approaching the Te Puke Highway intersection are incorporated into the design.
				21	3	Archbold, Mark and Brenda	Oppose	The Young Road entrance threshold feature and bylaw is opposed. Details are lacking. Concerned that the threshold will restrict school buses and rubbish collection services. it will also redirect traffic volumes to Pah Road.	Decline and delete Young Road threshold and bylaw restriction. Amend and seek to include the midway link road.
				21	4	Archbold, Mark and Brenda	Oppose	Oppose the use of Young and Pah Roads as access roads into the park. Increasing traffic volumes and heavy transport e.g. logging trucks will impact unfairly on the amenity values of Pah Road and the Young Road residents.	The four legged TEL interchange must be built and completed before RBP Stage 1 earthworks and development can commence. Amend to include as first and safest option the midblock link road. Amend on commencement of RBP Stage 1, Young and Pah Roads have a reduction of speed limit to 50 km/h. Ban use of exhaust brakes on Young and Pah Road.
PC72-03	Community Service Area	2	Location and Size	4	1	Bluehaven Management Ltd	Oppose	The proposed Community Service Area rules will enable ad hoc commercial office and retail development that is not appropriate at this location.	Reject the proposed amendments Or

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								<p>The Industrial Zone has no objectives and policies that support the proposed amendments. The Section 32 Report contains insufficient assessment and evaluation of this issue.</p> <p>The proposal is inconsistent with the sub regional commercial strategy which promotes a hierarchy of identifiable centres with clearly defined functions, as set out in the WBOP District Plan Commercial chapter issues, objectives and policies.</p> <p>The existing plan provisions have poor alignment with District Plan objectives and policies which needs to be rectified. Any plan changes should await the outcome of the SmartGrowth Eastern Corridor study to ensure an integrated approach is taken. This study is likely to lead to changes being made to the plan provisions for commercial activities for both Tauranga and Western Bay.</p>	<p>Include appropriate objectives and policies that identify the purpose and nature of local commercial centres at Rangiuru Business Estate</p> <p>And</p> <p>Provide for two identified local centres at Rangiuru Business Estate that are of a location, scale and type that will provide required convenience services to the local workforce. Maximum GFA for convenience retail and office activities should not exceed 500mz for each local centre.</p>
				FS 22 [4]	3 [1]	Tauranga City Council [Bluehaven Management Ltd]	Oppose	The changes proposed are minor and any risks are considered to be low.	Approve PC72
				FS 23 [4]	1 [1]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Bluehaven Management Ltd]	Support	The proposal is inconsistent with SmartGrowth and its BOP region-wide focus.	Reject PC72
				FS 26 [4]	3 [1]	Smartgrowth Implementation Committee [Bluehaven Management Ltd]	Oppose	The changes sought are minor with no substantial changes to the provision of non-industrial uses. With a recently reviewed SG Strategy, an operative RPS and WBOPDC District Plan, there is limited opportunity for policy debates through this plan change. SG cannot curtail existing property rights conferred through operative planning documents. Therefore it is not feasible to meet the submitters request to wait until the Eastern Corridor component of the Settlement Pattern has been completed.	Approve PC72
				FS 28 [4]	3 [1]	Rotorua District Council [Bluehaven Management Ltd]	Support with Amendment	<p>Non-industrial uses are inappropriate in an industrial zone and such flexibility is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the WBDP.</p> <p>The more permissive regime will undermine the centres-based approach sought by higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The s32 analysis is inadequate as it fails to fully evaluate the costs, benefits and adverse effects arising from PC72.</p>	Accept the submission, but in relation to the decision sought, RLC only supports the rejection of the proposed amendments. RLC does not support the alternative decisions sought.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				15	3	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)	Support with Amendment	Support community services area but delete the locational limitation being within 250m of marked intersections in favour of performance standards including access, site visibility, servicing and reverse sensitivity.	Amend qualifying locational criteria in favour of performance standards including access, site visibility, servicing and reverse sensitivity.
				FS 28 [15]	19 [3]	Rotorua District Council [Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)]	Oppose	Concern at greater flexibility within CSAs to provide for non-industrial uses. This is inappropriate in the industrial zone and is contrary to higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission.
PC72-03	Community Service Area	3	Activities	6	3	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Sensible to allow food outlets and childcare facilities to support employees.	Approve PC72
				8	2	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Support	The TTLG submission on Rule 21.3.2 is subject to: 1. The locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" not moving from the locations shown on the notified Structure Plans for PC72; 2. The maximum "net land area" for the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing; and 3. The individual development "net land area(s)" within the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing.	1. Retain Rule 21.3.2 as notified in PC72. 2. Retain the locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" as shown on the notified Structure Plan for PC72, referenced as "11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use".
				FS 22 [8]	4 [2]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 25 [8]	1 [2]	Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	It is important that the Community Services areas do not increase in size nor the locations are changed.	Retain the locations of the Community Service areas and Rule 21.3.2 as notified.
				FS 28 [8]	8 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Oppose	Oppose the increase in number and location of the Community Service Areas (CSAs). Concern at greater flexibility within CSAs to provide for non-industrial uses. Non-industrial uses are inappropriate in an industrial zone and should be concentrated in existing commercial centres.	Reject the submission.
				8	5	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Support with Amendment	The proposed "Community Service Area(s)" in PC72 highlight the need for a Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for Tertiary Education Facilities in Rule 21.6.5; similar to existing sub-clause (h) in Rule 21.6.5. This is required to ensure that the "Community Services Area(s)" uses are compatible with and are accessory to activities in the Business Park.	Add a new sub-clause to Rule 21.6.5 as follows: (?) 'For the Rangiuru Business Park, in respect of tertiary education facilities, the means by which the viability of other retail areas / town centres within the Westerns Bay of Plenty sub-region is maintained and enhanced.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				FS 28 [8]	11 [5]	Rotorua District Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Oppose	Affording greater flexibility to establish non-industrial land uses in the Park is inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission.
				9	2	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Support	The TTLG submission on Rule 21.3.2 is subject to: 1. The locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" not moving from the locations shown on the notified Structure Plans for PC72; 2. The maximum "net land area" for the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing; and 3. The individual development "net land area(s)" within the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing.	1. Retain Rule 21.3.2 as notified in PC72. 2. Retain the locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" as shown on the notified Structure Plan for PC72, referenced as "11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use".
				FS 22 [9]	7 [2]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				9	5	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Support with Amendment	The proposed "Community Service Area(s)" in PC72 highlight the need for a Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for Tertiary Education Facilities in Rule 21.6.5; similar to existing sub-clause (h) in Rule 21.6.5. This is required to ensure that the "Community Services Area(s)" uses are compatible with and are accessory to activities in the Business Park.	Add a new sub-clause to Rule 21.6.5 as follows: (?) 'For the Rangiuru Business Park, in respect of tertiary education facilities, the means by which the viability of other retail areas / town centres within the Westerns Bay of Plenty sub-region is maintained and enhanced.
				FS 22 [9]	10 [5]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				10	2	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Support	The TTLG submission on Rule 21.3.2 is subject to: 1. The locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" not moving from the locations shown on the notified Structure Plans for PC72; 2. The maximum "net land area" for the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing; and 3. The individual development "net land area(s)" within the "Community Service Area(s)" not increasing.	1. Retain Rule 21.3.2 as notified in PC72. 2. Retain the locations of the "Community Service Area(s)" as shown on the notified Structure Plan for PC72, referenced as "11.6 Rooding Layout and Land Use".
				FS 22 [10]	11 [2]	Tauranga City Council [Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				10	5	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Support with Amendment	The proposed "Community Service Area(s)" in PC72 highlight the need for a	Add a new sub-clause to Rule 21.6.5 as follows:

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for Tertiary Education Facilities in Rule 21.6.5; similar to existing sub-clause (h) in Rule 21.6.5. This is required to ensure that the "Community Services Area(s)" uses are compatible with and are accessory to activities in the Business Park.	(?) 'For the Rangiuru Business Park, in respect of tertiary education facilities, the means by which the viability of other retail areas / town centres within the Westerns Bay of Plenty sub-region is maintained and enhanced.
				FS 22 [10]	14 [5]	Tauranga City Council [Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				15	2	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)	Support	Support 21.3.2 additional permitted activities.	Retain 21.3.2
				FS 28 [15]	18 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)]	Oppose	Oppose the greater flexibility afforded to establish non-industrial activities. This is inappropriate in the industrial zone and contrary to higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission
PC72-04	Industrial Zone	1	Offices	6	4	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Offices should be allowed that are associated with businesses in RBP.	Approve PC72
				8	3	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Support	Rule 21.3.11 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.3.11 (a) as notified
				FS 22 [8]	5 [3]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 25 [8]	2 [3]	Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	Rule is appropriate	Retain as notified
				FS 28 [8]	9 [3]	Rotorua District Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Oppose	Affording greater flexibility to establish non-industrial land uses in the Park is inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission.
				8	4	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Support	Rule 21.6.5 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.6.5 (i) as notified
				FS 22 [8]	6 [4]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				FS 25 [8]	3 [4]	Carrus Corporation Ltd [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Support	Rule is appropriate	Retain as notified
				FS 28 [8]	10 [4]	Rotorua District Council [Te Tumu Landowners Group]	Oppose	Affording greater flexibility to establish non-industrial land uses in the Park is inconsistent with the higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission.
				9	3	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Support	Rule 21.3.11 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.3.11 (a) as notified
				FS 22 [9]	8 [3]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				9	4	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Support	Rule 21.6.5 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.6.5 (i) as notified

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				FS 22 [9]	9 [4]	Tauranga City Council [Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				10	3	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Support	Rule 21.3.11 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.3.11 (a) as notified
				FS 22 [10]	12 [3]	Tauranga City Council [Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				10	4	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Support	Rule 21.6.5 is pragmatic and appropriate and should not be altered	Retain Rule 21.6.5 (i) as notified
				FS 22 [10]	13 [4]	Tauranga City Council [Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd]	Support	Supports the delivery of SmartGrowth. The changes are minor and the risks are low.	Approve PC72
				12	2	Whakatane District Council	Oppose	<p>The Council opposes specific provisions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appear to provide for the introduction of non-industrial activities into the "Community Service Areas" at a scale that could produce an inadvertent planning outcome, and that is contrary to the purpose of wider sub-regional objectives as outlined in the Regional Policy Statement, SmartGrowth Strategy and the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan; • Allow further office provisions throughout the zone as a discretionary activity, despite the objectives and policies aiming to restrict these activities in scale and location. 	<p>Ensure the rules allowing non-industrial activities to establish in the "Community Service Areas" (such as offices or educational activities) achieve the aim of a service centre, primarily supporting industrial uses located in the Business Park. The rules do not appear to limit the ability for a single dominant non-industrial use, such as an office complex, to establish and operate separately from the industrial activities in the remainder of the zone. They could also be developed ahead of and/or separately from the remainder of the zone, subject to infrastructure provision and bundling to occur. Additional provisions that provide for the appropriate timing of development of Commercial Service Areas (relative to industrial development) and a mix of service oriented land uses in these areas, could support the "bundling" provision included in the Plan Change, to maintain the integrity of these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Rule 21.3.11(a), that provides for additional offices accessory to industrial activities but not on the same lot, is supported by robust discretionary activity criteria. The proposed criteria recognise that a "demonstrated need to be located in the Business Park, including a locational requirement to be near an associated Permitted Activity within the Park is useful. However, it could be more explicit that it needs to be shown why additional office space

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
									<p>cannot be provided on the site of the industrial activity or in the defined Commercial Service Areas; it could be construed to only question why it needs to be near a permitted activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure there is a tighter connection between the Objectives and Policies of the Industrial Zone and the non-industrial activities provided for in the Rangiuru Business Park. The current Objectives and Policies (Objectives 1, 3, 4 and Policy 5) suggest that offices need to be very carefully managed within industrial zones to maintain the integrity of the zone, and to not undermine other commercial centres throughout the District (and Region) where offices preferably locate.
				FS 23 [12]	2 [2]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Whakatane District Council]	Support	The proposal is inconsistent with SmartGrowth and its BOP region-wide focus.	Reject PC72
				FS 28 [12]	13 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Whakatane District Council]	Support with Amendment	<p>Concern at greater flexibility within CSAs to provide for non-industrial uses.</p> <p>RLC does not support the decision sought to amend the WBDP.</p>	Accept the submission, but decline the decision sought.
PC72-05	Staging	1	General	6	2	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Support to make more viable.	Approve PC72
				FS 28 [6]	5 [2]	Rotorua District Council [Walker, Graeme Francis]	Oppose	<p>RLC is concerned that a three legged interchange with the TEL will result in poorer access outcomes for RDC and reduce the potential economic benefits of connections between Rotorua and Rangiuru which is contrary to higher planning instruments.</p> <p>Will adversely affect the sustainability, vitality and viability of industrial and commercial land in the Rotorua District and the wider region.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the staging rules will create an imbalance of land supply, demand and uptake.</p> <p>Non-industrial uses are inappropriate in an industrial zone and such flexibility is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the WBDP.</p>	Reject the submission.

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
				13	7	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Support	Rule 12.4.13.8 Subsequent Stages - Support flexibility.	Retain this rule.
				FS 28 [13]	16 [7]	Rotorua District Council [Hebland Holdings Ltd]	Oppose	Oppose changes to make the stages of development on the basis that the provision of land for the initial stage of development is too large and is an inefficient approach to the development of land at the Park. The development threshold introduced (50%) is too low and contrary to higher order planning instruments.	Reject the submission
PC72-06	Infrastructure	1	General	6	5	Walker, Graeme Francis	Support	Support options for water and wastewater subject to meeting environmental standards.	Approve PC72
				13	3	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Rules 12.4.13, 12.4.13.2, 12.4.13.4, 12.4.13.5 require confirmation of the service delivery options for water, wastewater and roading. The choice of serving options is controlled by the Stage One developer. The costs associated with the different options have significant variations in cost. These options should be discussed and confirmed through consultation with all affected land owners rather than giving the Stage 1 developer the decision making authority.	Undertake consultation with affected land owners to ensure the preferred servicing options are selected through a transparent consultative process.
				16	1	Paterson, Rob	Unknown	Need certainty and assurance that what is proposed is definite, and not revised in future with other alternatives.	Decision needs certainty and assurance that what is proposed is definite, and not revised in future with other alternatives.
				17	1	Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce	Oppose	Oppose the use of public funds to meet infrastructure costs of the Rangiuru Development. We see this development as direct competition to similar blocks of land in Rotorua and the greater BOP region owned by the private sector. To use public funds to complete the infrastructure on this block creates an uneven playing field. The Regional Council should be using its funds to promote growth throughout the BOP and not create satellite economies.	BOP Regional Council/ Quayside Holdings to revise its strategy on the Rangiuru Business Park. BOP Regional council/ Quayside not to provide funds to meet infrastructure costs.
				FS 23 [17]	3 [1]	Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust [Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce]	Support	Oppose the use of public funds to meet the infrastructure costs of RBP.	Reject PC72
				FS 30 [17]	4 [1]	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate) [Rotorua Chamber Of Commerce]	Oppose	Strictly commercial competition is not an RMA issue. The location of Rangiuru to Rotorua is unlikely to detract from the commercial viability of Rotorua industrial or commercial land.	Retain PC72 with limited Commercial activities as proposed.
PC72-06	Infrastructure	2	Water	14	1	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Support with Amendment	It is unclear from the water supply option plans proposed for inclusion in Appendix 7 of the District Plan whether fire hydrants are proposed and where these	Add to the end of Rule 12.4.13.3: Any option for water supply servicing the Rangiuru Business Park shall be designed and

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								will be located. In order for the NZFS to be able to access firefighting water supply in the event of a fire emergency, the onsite reticulated network needs to be designed appropriately and in accordance with the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509: 2008.	developed in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509: 2008.
				14	2	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Support with Amendment	The intention of proposed Section 21.3.11(b) to provide for the assessment of additional mitigation measures to manage water usage effects of very heavy users is supported. However, in order to provide for the operational requirements of the NZFS and be consistent with Section 14(3)(e) of the RMA, it is considered that water for firefighting purposes should be excluded from this provision.	Amend Section 21.3.11(b) as follows: 21.3.11 Additional Discretionary Activities - Rangiuru Business Park (c) Any individual activity or land use which exceeds the Maximum Daily Demand for water (54mVha/day) (excluding water used for firefighting purposes).
PC72-07	Financial Contributions	1	General	8	6	Te Tumu Landowners Group	Oppose	The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) as shown on the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'; should have the land purchase costs and construction costs for this connection included as a separate line item in the Financial Contributions Schedule Tables for both/either of the three and four legged interchange options to ensure that this connection is reserved / protected. This connection is a strategically significant roading connection that warrants funding through the contribution system.	Add to Table(s) 1: Financial Contributions Schedule - Rooding (both the 3&4 Legged Interchange versions) separate line items in each schedule for land purchase and construction costs for the eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL).
				9	6	Te Tumu Kaituna 14 Trust	Oppose	The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) as shown on the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'; should have the land purchase costs and construction costs for this connection included as a separate line item in the Financial Contributions Schedule Tables for both/either of the three and four legged interchange options to ensure that this connection is reserved / protected. This connection is a strategically significant roading connection that warrants funding through the contribution system.	Add to Table(s) 1: Financial Contributions Schedule - Rooding (both the 3&4 Legged Interchange versions) separate line items in each schedule for land purchase and construction costs for the eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL).
				10	6	Ford Land Holdings Pty Ltd	Oppose	The eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL) as shown on the Structure Plans attached to PC72 as 'Reserved Land'; should have the land purchase costs and construction costs for this connection included as a separate line item in the Financial Contributions Schedule Tables for	Add to Table(s) 1: Financial Contributions Schedule - Rooding (both the 3&4 Legged Interchange versions) separate line items in each schedule for land purchase and construction costs for the eastern connection (roading leg) to the proposed Rangiuru Interchange of the Tauranga Eastern Link (TEL).

Summary Report for the 2015 Plan Change 72 - Rangiuru Business Park

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
								both/either of the three and four legged interchange options to ensure that this connection is reserved / protected. This connection is a strategically significant roading connection that warrants funding through the contribution system.	
				13	4	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Appendix 7: The costs for the development of the stormwater pond on the Hebland Holdings land and PGG Wrightson land has increased from \$361,000 to \$1.174 million (Item 6.3).	Clarification as to the costing of stormwater pond development and identification of any changes to catchments.
				13	5	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Appendix 7 Stormwater Pond 1 - land purchase and legal (Item 6.4)	Adjust land value to reflect current market value. Note the purchase price of the land was higher than current per ha land value in Item 6.4.
				15	4	Attwood, Wesley Blythe (Estate)	Oppose	Rules 12.4.13, 12.4.13.2, 12.4.13.4, 12.4.13.5 require confirmation of the service delivery options for water, wastewater and roading. The choice of serving options is controlled by the Stage One developer. The costs associated with the different options have significant variations in cost. These options should be discussed and confirmed through consultation with all affected land owners rather than giving the Stage 1 developer the decision making authority.	Undertake consultation with affected land owners to ensure the preferred servicing options are selected through a transparent consultative process.
PC72-08	Miscellaneous	1	Rail Access	13	2	Hebland Holdings Ltd	Oppose	The plan shows a local purpose reserve amenity between Hebland Holdings Land and the railway land (green corridor). This effectively closes the opportunity to use the rail corridor for access and transportation of goods.	Amend Section 11.6 – Road Layout and Land Use plan by changing the plan so the Rangiuru Business Zone land adjoins the Railway land without any proposed amenity reserve.
PC72-08	Miscellaneous	2	Drainage Effects	19	1	Pamment, DR and PA	Oppose	Concerned at effect the park will have on our farmland downstream from the extra water runoff caused which will make our land wetter due to water table and extra drainage requirements so we can continue farming as we do now and in the future.	Guarantees that over time the continual sinkage of our land that we can continue farming without our water table lifting any higher than it is now because of the wetlands from the park alongside.