



**Western
Bay of Plenty**
District Council



Mā tō tātou takiwā
For our District

Plan Change 95
Pencarrow Estate
Pongakawa

**Summary of
Submissions and
Further Submissions**

| Submitter Ref no. | Sub No. | Name | Section/ Appendix | Sub-section | Issue | Oppose/ Support | Submission Point Summary | Relief/ Decision Sought Summary |
|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 7 | 7.11 | Julian Clayton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Oppose | My understanding is that the local medical centres are at capacity and are not resourced to cover the additional population. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 9 | 9.2 | Graeme Gillespie | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Oppose | On a positive side it will provide easy access to a convenience store and other community based activity and recreational space. This assumes a critical population to sustain such activity, which is not a given. There is a threat that the commercial facilities will remain vacant and subject to vandalism and graffiti. The commercial activity must also support community health and well-being - no bottle stores, vape shops or gambling facilities. | Decline the plan change. |
| 11 | 11.2 | Neville and Jill Marsh | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Support | Some commercial sites will attract businesses with the community in mind. | Council needs to support and approve Plan Change 95 for Pencarrow Estate to proceed. There is nothing we want changed. |
| 12 | 12.17 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Oppose | There is no social infrastructure at the rural settlement of Arawa Rd. Pongakawa School is almost 2km away across SH2 and up Pongakawa School Rd with no footpath or cycle way making it out of safe reach other than by car. I see no current demand for a 'country store'. BP Pongakawa gas station is a short drive but mostly the community source their provisions from the supermarkets in Te Puke and Papamoa, I doubt a "country store" will change residents shopping habits. Medical staff are stretched as it is and it is hard to imagine medical and dental staff extending their services to Pongakawa. I doubt the development will bring a scale large enough to support a 'health hub/doctors surgery/dental service'. Currently residents travel out of Pongakawa some distances for social infrastructure such as shopping, recreation, health needs etc and I envisage the residents of a development such as this PPC in this location would do likewise. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.17 [12.17] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 13 | 13.5 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Support | The proposed commercial zone for professional services and retail will add considerable value for existing Pongakawa residents. | Approve the Plan Change. |
| FS39 [13] | FS39.4 [13.5] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group)] | | | | Oppose | PPC95 is not supported by the SmartGrowth Strategy, which is a strategic plan to manage growth in the western Bay of Plenty. SmartGrowth considers more than just the economic benefits of growth: housing, land, infrastructure, transport, community development, tangata whenua aspirations, and the natural environment need to be looked at together to achieve effective long-term growth. There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 reports an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. Intensification of Te Puke and development of other areas identified in SmartGrowth are more practicable options to address the housing shortfall in this district. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 14 | 14.3 | Rachael Sexton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Oppose | We don't have any shops, which is actually a good thing. This also saves any non residents and potential undesirable elements coming into our neighbourhood the likes of vaping etc and fast cars. Its is much safer for those families that have chosen to live further away from Te Puke and Paengaroa for these reasons and also knowing that our children can't leave this area without us is a safer way to live in our current climate for our young people. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---------|---|---|
| 17 | 17.6 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Oppose | Having a commercial block will also encourage more traffic from non-residents resulting in further congestion and risks to the already dangerous intersection. | We strongly urge council to consider how the existing residents feel towards this development and oppose any further progress in favour of the developer. |
| 21 | 21.3 | Paengaroa Community Association | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Commercial Zoning | Support | This community needs more commercial land for professional services and retail for the existing Pongakawa, Pukehina and Otamarakau residents. | Allow Pencarrow Estate to build houses, grow and develop more residential and commercial land. |
| 20 | 20.1 | Hamish Henderson | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Ecological Effects | Oppose | The Waihi estuary, the destination of all discharges from this development is highly polluted. The tract of land across which these discharges flow to the estuary was called Kawa Swamp. It is now highly modified with little ecological value. The ecological report recognises that little of the original flora remains. The mitigating measures required in the report being wastewater and run-off treatment and cessation of dairying minimise the adverse ecological effects. Surely we need to make significant improvements. This is an opportunity, but there is nothing in the report advocating this. Simply minimising the adverse effects is a totally inadequate aim. | The proposal should be declined. The Ecological report acknowledges that the area of this proposed development, fringing the old Kawa Swamp is now highly modified with little ecological value and polluted waterways. The nationwide movement to correct this situation by removing stock from the land and planting appropriate vegetation, if adopted here on an adequate scale could encourage me to reverse this opposition. This would require planting an area at least as large as that in this proposal. I am unimpressed with the extent and form of the "mitigating effects" listed in the ecological report which are minor. |
| 11 | 11.1 | Neville and Jill Marsh | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | General | Support | Pencarrow Estate has shown in their plan that all utilities have been covered, a park area for all families of Arawa Road, Penelope Place and Pencarrow Estate have an area to enjoy. The subdivision is not on swamp land it is not taking a huge area out of the farm platform. | Council needs to support and approve Plan Change 95 for Pencarrow Estate to proceed. There is nothing we want changed. |
| 17 | 17.4 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | General | Oppose | Are local schools, medical centres and emergency services resourced to handle the additional population? | We strongly urge council to consider how the existing residents feel towards this development and oppose any further progress in favour of the developer. |
| 32 | 32.3 | Scott Adams | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | General | Support | The plan change creates reserves and a small commercial area that will help Pongakawa to be more self-sufficient and provide passive recreational opportunities without driving to other destinations. | Support the plan change. |
| 12 | 12.18 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | General | Recreation Infrastructure | Oppose | The applicants emphasize enhancing recreational infrastructure in the Arawa Rd/Penelope PI community with walkways, parks, and a village green. While additional facilities are welcomed, there is an existing recreational plan approved by the Council, centered around the Paper Rd areas owned by the Council. In the plan there is a proposal to create walking and cycling access across drains at the end of the Paper Rd for public access along the stop bank of the Wharere Stream and cycling access to Wharere Rd, potentially connecting to the planned Pukehina cycleway. The application mentions safety concerns about the Paper Rd corridor, labeling it as narrow with open drains on both sides, which is contested as false and scaremongering. The Paper Rd areas are a real gem for this community and widely used and treasured by the community, local residents have been in conflict with the applicants over the area. The applicants oppose the Council's Recreation Plan, especially public walking access along the Wharere Stream stop bank. The submission urges a change in the applicant's position to fully support the Council's plans and residents' hopes for the Paper Rd areas. I urge anyone making a judgement on this to get both sides of the story before making that judgement. If the applicants are sincere in their dedication to providing recreational facilities for the community then they need to show they support the Council's and the residents hopes. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---|---|---|---------------------------|---------|--|---|
| FS38 [12] | FS38.18 [12.18] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 9 | 9.4 | Graeme Gillespie | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Recreation Infrastructure | Oppose | The increased population will create greater demand on the Arawa Road walkway, reducing the ability for unrestrained exercise for our dog. We acknowledge that this is somewhat selfish but does represent a loss of current privilege. | The plan change be declined. |
| 13 | 13.6 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Recreation Infrastructure | Support | The addition of recreational facilities will support social wellbeing. | Approve the Plan Change. |
| 14 | 14.6 | Rachael Sexton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Recreation Infrastructure | Oppose | We have no community facilities here. The Pongakawa school, community Hall and sports centre is too far away to be of any use for our young people to use. Its on the other side of the highway down a long road that is also unsafe to walk or bike down, with many large trucks that use it. | Decline the plan change. |
| 7 | 7.4 | Julian Clayton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | The horticultural businesses in the area are already established meaning those that work there already have housing and the seasonal workers are usually either RSE scheme labour, backpackers or transient workers who aren't looking to purchase housing. This coupled with the fact current housing market listings are taking a long time to sell shows there isn't the demand for housing in this area and therefore, there isn't the need for this development. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 7 | 7.1 | Julian Clayton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | The reason we and many of the other residents choose to live here is because it is a small rural community and not a larger residential one, which suits our choice of lifestyle. If the Pencarrow Estate is allowed to go ahead it will more than triple the residency of the area and remove that rural aspect of the existing community and the enjoyment of living here. It is classed as a rural district, RD6 and should remain so. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 7 | 7.2 | Julian Clayton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | We are a rural community and do not wish to be part of a residential high density community. Allowing this development would urbanise the area ruining its rural aspect and negatively impact the community. Part of the development is for high density housing which does not fit in with any rural environment and would be a blight on the landscape. What proportion of the development will be allotted to state/public housing? Given the reports of antisocial behavior that seem to constantly flow from this type of housing I feel the existing community has the right to know the developer's intentions with regard to this. Are the local emergency services adequately resourced to cover the additional housing and population? This should have been considered in the development risk assessment and I feel the existing community has the right to know how this development might affect the availability of emergency help. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 8 | 8.4 | Craig Green, Lisa McArthur | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | Paengaroa is a much better serviced area for such a development: there are multiple entrance/egress points for vehicles, a school within walking distance, better public transport service options and better utility services in general. Paengaroa connects well to the Pongakawa kiwifruit industry via Old Coach Road as an alternative to SH2, and is within walking/cycling distance of the new Rangiuuru Business Park. | Decline the plan change. |
| 8 | 8.5 | Craig Green, Lisa McArthur | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | This plan change relies heavily on the applicants view that provision of accommodation is in demand for non-seasonal workers who service the kiwifruit industry in the wider Te Puke/Paengaroa/Pongakawa area and projected staffing required at the under-development Rangiuuru Business Park. While that may or may not be true to a greater or lesser extent than the applicant perceives, we do not believe that rural Pongakawa is the place for a subdivision to service that need. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--|--|
| 8 | 8.1 | Craig Green, Lisa McArthur | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | While the aspiration to provide affordable housing is admirable, 350m2 sites are completely out of keeping with the surrounding residential properties on Arawa Road and Penelope Place, which are all in the region of 800-1000m2. This level of housing density also compounds other concerns around vehicle movement increases. | Decline this application to rezone to Residential based on this & other sections of our submission. |
| 9 | 9.6 | Graeme Gillespie | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | To permit the establishment of small isolated housing developments within dairy farms to raise capital for farm infrastructure improvements, or whatever other reason, creates an unacceptable precedent. This creates a real risk that these pockets of housing without community support will evolve into ghettos, with associated social issues. | Decline the plan change. |
| 11 | 11.4 | Neville and Jill Marsh | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | Housing is in crisis so a private developer trying to give families a home is commendable. | Council needs to support and approve Plan Change 95 for Pencarrow Estate to proceed. There is nothing we want changed. |
| 12 | 12.7 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | The applicants claim the Pongakawa horticulture industry is growing rapidly. Currently I know of no one residing in the current Arawa Rd settlement who works on local orchards. There are a few who work in packhouses in and around the Te Puke township. When houses in this settlement come on the market, if there was the stated demand, they would be snapped up by local kiwifruit workers. That is absolutely not the case. The residents of this settlement mostly travel some considerable kilometres to access employment, recreation, health, shopping and other requirements. The orchard management structure has changed a lot in recent years. Growers are passing the management of that orchard to the packhouse which packs his fruit. Increasingly that has become the preferred approach for orchard management in the industry. The large developments that have happened in recent years around Pongakawa are also managed in this way. Offices of these packhouses and management companies are in and around Te Puke town and it is here that these companies orchard managers are based. Much of the on orchard work is seasonal and seasonal workers and RSE worker schemes are sourced from overseas. While it is possible some houses in any new development in this location may go to local orchard staff the vast majority would go to buyers outside the local horticulture industry. I don't see any evidence of that changing at all in the future. It would appear that the applicants claims of their development plans meeting local industry housing demand are unfounded and their justification for the various Policy statements not to apply to their PPC not substantiated. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.7 [12.7] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---|--|
| 13 | 13.3 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | We identified Pongakawa as a strategically located community ideal for increased housing. A good example of HUB and SPOKE - The Te Puke township as a Hub service centre and Pongakawa as a critical Spoke. Ultimately, a vision has developed for rural residential growth, connected to the Te Puke township and service centre and part of the wider Bay of Plenty region. We have never received any push back in finding sensible new housing solutions for the already well established communities in the Te Puke region. The emergence of a long term vision to create a new township in the vicinity of Paengaroa/ Maketu, with a population of 15000 people, should not be interpreted as an immediate solution to our housing shortage. We also need to accelerate rural residential housing and deliver sensible short term solutions. With continuing land conversion to kiwifruit in particular, we need new housing to allow people to live close to work. Allowing smaller rural residential developments is not at the expense of productive land. Rather, it is in support of meeting medium term housing demand over the next 10 years. Continuing Kiwifruit growth and the nearby upcoming Rangiuuru Business Park with potential for 4000 new jobs are real. The proposed development at Pencarrow Estate fits naturally with the existing settlement of 100 homes. Pencarrow Estate will add considerably to the important community aspiration of being Safe, Serviced, Sustainable and Satisfied. Pencarrow Estate will offer high quality, healthy housing. New kiwifruit plantings east of Te Puke at approx. 250ha per annum are sustainable and profitable. Housing in close proximity to these jobs is critical. | Approve the Plan Change. |
| FS39 [13] | FS39.3 [13.3] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group)] | | | | Oppose | PPC95 is not supported by the SmartGrowth Strategy, which is a strategic plan to manage growth in the western Bay of Plenty. SmartGrowth considers more than just the economic benefits of growth: housing, land, infrastructure, transport, community development, tangata whenua aspirations, and the natural environment need to be looked at together to achieve effective long-term growth. There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 reports an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. Intensification of Te Puke and development of other areas identified in SmartGrowth are more practicable options to address the housing shortfall in this district. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 14 | 14.5 | Rachael Sexton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | I am all for progress and I do understand people need somewhere to live, but this should be done in the best place that will be able to cater to the needs of a growing community. | Decline the plan change. |
| 15 | 15.5 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | There is no demand for houses out here as the ones that have been or are currently listed for sale are not selling quickly if at all. There was a suggestion that houses were needed for kiwifruit workers. As we know most of our kiwifruit workers are RSEs or others on their OE. As they are only seasonal workers, they are not eligible to buy in NZ and their employer often supplies their accommodation or they stay in backpackers. | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 17 | 17.7 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | We bought in this area as we wanted a rural setting for our family. After discussing with other residents on this street we believe this to be the case for most home owners here. A high density subdivision does not fit the characteristics of this area and is an unnecessary development with negative impacts on the local community. | We strongly urge council to consider how the existing residents feel towards this development and oppose any further progress in favour of the developer. |
| 18 | 18.1 | Jurgen Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | I bought a lifestyle block in the country to be in the country not look out over 135 packed in houses reported to be built. This rezoning was not in any regional or council long term plan. My original LIM report indicated that a possible 6 houses could possibly be built on this land but final subdivision for this was never completed. Property sections should not be under 800m ² and a 30m building enforcement from the rural property boundaries. | The proposal should be declined by council on the basis the infrastructure in the area to develop this land does not exist and is not in the long term regional growth plan. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--|--|
| 19 | 19.5 | Alan & Pasrieia Birley | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | No number of houses to be built are in the plan. It looks like as many as there is now. | We don't agree with the proposal. The removal of option 3. |
| 21 | 21.2 | Paengaroa Community Association | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | Paengaroa Community Association supports the development to provide our rural communities with housing to meet the needs of development within the kiwifruit industry and Rangiuru Industrial park and existing agricultural and horticultural development. We need housing to support these crucial developments to our region. The proposed development is immediately adjacent to the existing settlement in Arawa Road, Penelope Place and houses on SH 2 in Pongakawa. This development mirrors the existing settlement of around 100 homes and this helps mitigate the transfer of rural productive land to provide valuable housing stock in this community. | Allow Pencarrow Estate to build houses, grow and develop more residential and commercial land. |
| 22 | 22.2 | Peter Cooney | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | Plan Change 95 will help provide additional housing capacity in the eastern area of Western Bay of Plenty that has seen very little greenfield residential development over last three decades (Papamoa excluded). Pongakawa is located close to areas of significant horticultural development which generates significant employment. We understand the Rangiuru Business Park will also create jobs for approximately 4000 people once fully developed. RBP Stage 1 is near completion and the flyover enabling earthworks is already underway with the assistance of a significant government grant. | Support the plan change as notified. |
| FS39 [22] | FS39.6 [22.2] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Peter Cooney] | | | | Oppose | <p>There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 reports that there is an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically.</p> <p>PPC95 is not supported by the SmartGrowth Strategy, which is a strategic plan to manage growth in the western Bay of Plenty. SmartGrowth considers how housing, land, infrastructure, transport, community development, tangata whenua aspirations, and the natural environment need to be looked at together to achieve effective long-term growth. Bay of Plenty Regional Council does not support PPC95 because it is not anticipated in the SmartGrowth Strategy and represents ad hoc development and inefficient development and use of infrastructure.</p> <p>Regional Council acknowledges the critical need for housing in the western Bay of Plenty. However, while development of this type appears attractive in the short term (providing housing), it leads to a sporadic, nonstrategic growth pattern and decentralised infrastructure that is costly to maintain in the long term. A more practicable option for addressing the housing shortfall in this district is intensification of Te Puke, as enabled by Plan Change 92 (PC92) and supported by SmartGrowth. PC92 will provide more capacity in Te Puke than originally anticipated, and so less greenfield land is required than previously calculated. Te Puke has existing social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling, public transport, and a centralised wastewater treatment plant.</p> | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 23 | 23.2 | Karen Summerhays, Nicola Cooke | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | This proposal is yet another pressure on resources to move the focus for social infrastructure development away from Te Puke and Paengaroa, where it has been acknowledged by Council that there is substantial investment required. The Spatial Plan of Te Puke is yet to be developed and the impacts of growth on our water supplies, transportation links and community services is yet to be determined. The requirements of the Rangiuru Business Park will have a major impact on our natural resources and impacts on the receiving environments. This proposal will set a precedence for other parcels of productive land to also develop small housing areas. We do not want to return to the days of Councils having to respond to random plan change requests and so diverting their work away from areas with more substantial outcomes. There will be added pressure and costs on our already stretched emergency and other social services (health, home care etc) to deliver to this rural area. The ongoing affordability of the proposed housing is a myth and any of these proposals to provide affordable housing only ever exists for the first purchaser and then subsequently the market corrects the price for any future sales. The affordability of the future residents also needs to be considered such as: high insurance costs due to flooding risk, the likelihood of very high rates contribution to the ongoing infrastructure costs. The housing typologies likely to be built in this subdivision will not necessarily deliver the housing we need e.g. 1 & 2 bedroom and multigenerational houses with Universal Design and accommodation for workers to support our kiwifruit industry. | That the proposed Plan Change be declined. |
| 24 | 24.1 | David Hamilton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | We support the plan change to create more houses in Pongakawa. These houses will go a small way towards helping shortage of housing supply in the area and help the local horticultural and agricultural businesses in the area with their staff shortages. As a local property developer of 6 houses in Pongakawa we see this proposed plan change as highly beneficial to Pongakawa and the economic growth. | We support the plan change. |
| 25 | 25.1 | Kirsten Jefferson | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support in part | I would like to see amendments to the plan taking in the following concerns: Security of the area with a lot of low density housing and lack of police services to support it. The amount of proposed housing. The current services/facilities cannot support the volume of proposed homes/people. | Less houses, larger sections. |
| 28 | 28.1 | Pukehina Ratepayers' & Residents' Association Inc. | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | There is much more housing needed in the Western Bay area and this can certainly help covering a range of things for our area. We understand NZTA may need to make some adjustments at the main road and we think this is just part of the growth and it will just have to be done. While we have not been privy to a complete understanding of the project as a whole we do know enough to say we think it should proceed. To back a new development such as this is in keeping with growth for the area as a whole. Everyone agrees that a farm land that isn't terribly productive is better to be used for something else that is constructive. This is a very well thought out independently resourced proposal. | Support the plan change. |
| 30 | 30.1 | Paul Hickson | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | Support the plan change. Our family has farmed at Pongakawa since 1892 and own the farm, directly opposite the proposed estate (Pongakawa School Road). In my lifetime I have seen considerable growth in the area and with the change of many farms to include kiwifruit growing the need for housing is urgent. Council has recently allowed Bay Gold to establish a village for the workers on Maniatutu Road but surly in the long term it is better to provide permanent year round housing for families who may work locally, enjoy the many facilities Pongakawa has to offer - school, action centre, swimming pool, squash courts, sports fields, playgrounds and service sectors, BP, kiwirail, vehicle repair garages and Weallens. Families would also become part of the community. The growth of Penelope Place has been a success and even the original Arawa Road offered housing to people such as retired sharemilker from our farm and parents who have closely involved in school activities. | Support the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 31 | 31.1 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | Pongakawa has an entirely rural character with no existing urban environments, the proposal will compromise the visual quality and greenspace of the rural area. Urban expansion and land fragmentation reduce the availability of agricultural land and food production for local populations. Loss of agricultural land results in increased pressure to convert natural to agricultural use. While the plan change report considers the loss of 12ha productive land as minor, it will contribute to the overall loss of production land in the district and increase the demand for conversion or more marginal land. We consider urban development of the rural zone inappropriate and seek that the rural character and amenity be retained. The plan change relies on the proximity to the business park as a supporting reason for the development. We consider this irrelevant as the existing towns of Paengaroa and Te Puke are closer. These towns provide a sufficient level of services and a well functioning urban environment. The Te Puke structure plan identifies two areas for future urban development and PC 92 has introduced the medium density residential standards. The areas identified in the structure plan provide practicable capacity for development that will enhance the existing township. The medium density provisions in Te Puke will increase the dwelling yield and will meet the housing demand. The plan change considers the development appropriate because it will provide accommodation for horticulture workers. We disagree and consider no guaranteed increase in accommodation for kiwifruit workers. The need for kiwifruit accommodation should be addressed in a more structured manner, with developments specifically catering to RSE, temporary and seasonal workers. Orchard workers, especially seasonal workers are unlikely to purchase these new lots. Furthermore, seasonal workers need to be located within a township where there is access to sufficient services. The proposed commercial lots will not be adequate to cater to all needs and will cause fragmentation of the rural zone. | Decline the plan change. |
| 32 | 32.1 | Scott Adams | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Support | There is a significant employment being generated in the eastern portion of WBOP district as a result of new horticultural development, investment and development of greenfield industrial land (Rangiuru Business Park). The plan change will build residential housing capacity in Pongakawa that will service this area. Residential development in Pongakawa in recent times as been subdivided and developed within a very short period, showing there is a real demand for housing in this area (ZB Homes development is an example in Penelope Place). | Support the plan change. |
| FS39 [32] | FS39.8 [32.1] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Scott Adams] | | | | Oppose | There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 (HBA) reports that there is an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. A more practicable option for addressing the housing shortfall in this district is intensification of Te Puke, as enabled by Plan Change 92 (PC92) and supported by SmartGrowth. PC92 will provide more capacity in Te Puke than originally anticipated, and so less greenfield land is required than previously calculated. Te Puke has existing social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling, public transport, and a centralised wastewater treatment plant. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 37 | 37.5 | Jo Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Residential Zoning | Oppose | Security - especially due to high density housing which directly or indirectly can mean rentals - generally speaking people do not respect or care for property/their environment that they do not own. | Strongly oppose Pencarrow Estate. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 12 | 12.11 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Stormwater Effects | Oppose | Proper stormwater management is required to prevent waterway contamination in any new development. The applicant has refused to allow stormwater from Arawa Road to flow onto their land in spite of flow paths marked. In early 2023, Council widened, curb and channelled and installed a footpath on the first section of Arawa Rd from SH2 to Penelope Place. A culvert and flow path had to be constructed on Arawa Rd 100m from SH2. The landowners refusal has lead to extra costs and adjustments through others properties. Allowance for stormwater to flow where it would naturally flow and there needs to be an accommodation for Arawa Rd stormwater at all locations and in all the developers plans. There will be more vehicle movements on the lower section of Arawa Road which would need to be widened, curb and channelled and footpath installed which means stormwater. There is already a culvert installed by Council under Arawa Rd and through the property of 53 Arawa Rd and onto the PPC land. The Penelope Place subdivision road where it joins Arawa Rd is a flow path that runs through the PPC land to the Puanene stream. This flow path should be secured. When that subdivision was being constructed the developers and Council wanted to install a release culvert for a 1-in-100 year stormwater event under Arawa Rd to link onto the flood flow path. The PC95 applicant refused to allow this and a sump had to be constructed to take this water instead of releasing to the flood flow path. This has put the property at 20 Arawa Rd at unacceptable risk. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.11 [12.11] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 37 | 37.2 | Jo Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Stormwater Effects | Oppose | Management of water quality to all residents and having on site wastewater treatment close to Puanene Stream, flood plains, etc having direct flow to estuary that locals have worked incredibly hard to restore and improve quality. Impact on water quality. | Strongly oppose Pencarrow Estate. |
| 27 | 27.7 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Stormwater Management | Support in part | Regional Council supports onsite soakage to discharge stormwater from individual lot areas (roofs, paved areas, driveways) where possible. However, based on the Geotechnical Investigation Report (CMW Geosciences, 11/02/2022, TGA2021-0096AC Rev 0), a high groundwater table may preclude the use of soakage in the lower lying areas. | The conceptual stormwater design should check there is sufficient capacity in the stormwater pond/wetland to provide treatment and attenuation of stormwater from those areas (if needed). |
| 12 | 12.13 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Traffic Effects | Oppose | Arawa Rd intersection is regarded by local residents as dangerous. SH2 is very busy especially between 6.30am - 9.00am and 3pm - 6pm. Around 60 households access Arawa Rd at this intersection and some would say this is manageable. There have been no serious crashes here although the risk is still very high. With a 200% increase in vehicles accessing the intersection the safety margin is unacceptably high. The planner is only proposing 'Minor upgrades to the intersection'. Nothing short of a major upgrade would be acceptable. This would include widening both sides of the Puanene bridge, 150m long deceleration lane appropriate barriers and realigning SH2 to match the bridge widening. Any chance of a reduction in speed limit on SH2 is looking more remote. Arawa Rd from SH2 to the Penelope Place intersection was upgraded in 2023 by Council. The road was widened, curb and channelled down one side and footpaths installed all to a high standard. The lower section of Arawa Rd from Penelope Place to the end of the seal is currently quite narrow with no footpath. The PPC documents show a large area of land in the PPC boundary at the end of Arawa Rd marked for development with a right of way off Arawa Rd. This result in more vehicle movements. This increase in traffic volumes will change the road status from adequate to inadequate and necessitate the upgrade of this lower section of Arawa Rd to the same standard as the new first section of Arawa Rd. Curb and channelling of this section brings with it the need to dispose of stormwater. | Decline the plan change. Nothing short of a major upgrade to the Arawa Rd / SH2 intersection would be acceptable. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--|---|
| FS38 [12] | FS38.13 [12.13] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 7 | 7.7 | Julian Clayton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Oppose | Concerns over the siting and management of the waste water treatment plant. The low lying ground in the proposed development is prone to flooding when it rains. What safeguards are in place to prevent wastewater escaping from the plant in adverse weather conditions, or times of flooding, or getting into and contaminating water ways or bore water supplies? Also, how will any odors emitted from the plant be controlled? The area frequently has S/W winds which would carry any smell straight over the existing community. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 8 | 8.3 | Craig Green, Lisa McArthur | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Oppose | Concerns for the unintended consequences of an "island" of rural properties on Arawa Road surrounded by a new, residential development. These properties all have septic tanks with an absorption/infiltration field likely to be at the rear of their properties, bounding the proposed subdivision. There is some uncertainty about what decisions WBOPDC might impose on these properties as the new development's waste water system is designed and implemented, with associated unforecast expenses imposed on the land owners. | Decline the plan change. |
| 12 | 12.12 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Oppose | There is no detail as to how the wastewater treatment facility will operate what is the viability of such a scheme at this location. There is no detail as to how that can be achieved given the applicants remaining land is mostly flood plain. There is a high risk of treated effluent entering the adjacent waterways to the estuary. Maori sensitivity to any human effluent, treated or otherwise, entering waterways that run through traditional food gathering sites relevant Iwi and Hapu would also share these concerns. The risk to waterways/drains in the vicinity and downstream to the estuary of environmental contamination from treated effluent untreated sewage are high and it is hard to see how, in this location, that risk can be kept to an acceptable level. The treatment scheme and effluent disposal field are located very close to the flood plain farm drains and the Puanene Stream. It has been under water several times. How will a disposal field work efficiently on land with this hydrology. The farm drains flow into the Wharere Stream and down to the Waihi estuary. This estuary is severely degraded from silt, nutrient loads and faecal coliforms that flow into the estuary from mostly farming and some forestry sources. Consultation with local Iwi by the applicants shows all Iwi express concerns that wastewater/treated effluent disposal would have to be carefully managed. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.12 [12.12] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 27 | 27.29 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Support in part | The discharge of treated wastewater can have adverse effects on groundwater quality. | Provide an assessment of the effects of the nutrient loads on the underlying soils and groundwater from the discharge, and how these align with baseline activities such as farming. |
| 27 | 27.30 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Support in part | UV disinfection is expected to address public health concerns from pathogens in the wastewater discharge but does not remove public health effects from the nitrogen discharge. | Provide a public health assessment. |
| 37 | 37.3 | Jo Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Effects | Oppose | Most wind direction means that most existing residents will smell the waste treatment. | Strongly oppose Pencarrow Estate. |
| 10 | 10.2 | Robin Simmons | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support | Wastewater/ sewage - would like to see this put in before new housing goes in as a cost saving and no septic tanks to be used. | Wastewater/ sewage - would like to see this put in before new housing goes in as a cost saving and no septic tanks to be used. |
| 15 | 15.3 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Oppose | We would consider that this (the proposed wastewater treatment) would not be a very viable option/addition due to the fact that the area designated for this treatment plant is low lying and prone to flooding. Where does it go when the water table rises? The fact that the area is surrounded by waterways that feed into the Pukehina estuary baffles me as to why this would even be considered. And the smell? A lot of our winds often come from that direction. We all know these schemes come at a huge cost not only initially in the initial infrastructure but with the ongoing maintenance as well. We do not wish to have to contribute in any way for a utility that we do not want, or need nor do we want to have to face the prospect of being made to hook into and use the scheme later down the track. | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 17 | 17.2 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Oppose | The wastewater treatment plan is largely concerning and what that will mean in times of flooding. | We strongly urge council to consider how the existing residents feel towards this development and oppose any further progress in favour of the developer. |
| 19 | 19.4 | Alan & Pasrieia Birley | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Oppose | What infrastructure or services will be planned for? How can we be guaranteed that no sewer contamination of our water supply will occur as a result of this subdivision. | We don't agree with the proposal. The removal of option 3. |
| 20 | 20.2 | Hamish Henderson | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Oppose | The discharges from Pencarrow Estate are from 2 sources: wastewater from the household effluent system and run off from rooves and impervious surfaces. Both receive a level of treatment, but still carry pollutants. Excess rainfall events overwhelm these treatment systems elevating pollutants in the discharge water. | The proposal should be declined. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 27 | 27.20 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The Engineering Services Report uses the Auckland Design Manual Wastewater code of practice to estimate commercial design flow. This is the incorrect standard. The BOP On-Site Effluent Treatment Regional Plan (OSET Plan) requires the Australian/New Zealand Standard 1547:2012 On-site domestic wastewater management to be used for on-site wastewater discharges in the BOP. The Report (Lysaght, 12/12/2022, Revision 5) has calculated the residential flow incorrectly and should be revised to ensure the discharge area is sized correctly. This must be corrected at structure plan stage as it is likely to affect the layout of the development. The Report uses municipal methods to calculate the flows to the wastewater treatment system, which appears to have led to a significant underestimate of the discharge area required to service the proposed development. Decentralised on-site wastewater design is not subject to the same occupancy and per capita flow assessment methods as developments served by municipal wastewater systems. Infiltration and peak wet weather flows are not applicable to the proposed STEP system because the network will comprise small diameter plastic pipework, which is not susceptible to infiltration. The Report does not provide references for the residential flow calculation. The report concludes a total design flow of 95.4m ³ /day, comprising a residential design flow of 85.8m ³ /day and a commercial flow allowance of 9.6m ³ /day, along with allowances for peak wet weather flows (caused by the infiltration of surface and groundwater into the reticulation network during high rainfall). This methodology is only relevant to development in areas served by a municipal reticulation network and large-scale sewage treatment plant. | Revise the wastewater flow calculation using the Australian/New Zealand Standard 1547:2012 (AS/NZ1547:2012) On-site domestic wastewater management. Revise the residential flow calculation based on AS/NZ1547:2012 methodology for on-site wastewater treatment systems (rather than centralised municipal systems). Provide references for the residential flow calculation. Based on the revised/corrected wastewater flow calculation, revise and redesign the wastewater discharge area. |
| 27 | 27.21 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The Engineering Services Report incorrectly calculates the occupancy allowance of the proposed development. In the Bay of Plenty, Schedule 6 of the OSET Plan sets out the correct way to calculate the occupancy allowances. Average occupancy cannot be used for on-site systems because they must be designed for peak flows. | Revise the occupancy allowance – it should be calculated correctly using Schedule 6 of the Bay of Plenty Regional OSET Plan. The maximum occupancy, not the average, is relevant for onsite wastewater treatment systems. |
| 27 | 27.22 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | A 130 lot residential subdivision comprising 4 bedroom dwellings, occupied by 6 people each would equate to a population of 780 people. Using a per capita flow allowance of 200 litres/person/day (in accordance with AS/NZ1547:2012) equates to a residential design flow of 156,000 l/day (or 156 m ³ /day) for the full development (rather than the estimated residential flow of 85.8m ³ /day). | Revise the size of the discharge area using the correct wastewater flow calculations. |
| 27 | 27.23 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | Commercial wastewater production is very specific to the business involved and is difficult to estimate, but the applicant should at least estimate the total daily flow allowances. It appears that the preferred wastewater treatment system suppliers were not aware of the commercial component of the proposal and so have not included this in the high level design and the discharge area is likely to be undersized. | Revise the size of the discharge area using the correct wastewater flow calculations. |
| 27 | 27.24 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | Innoflow Technologies Ltd determined the size of a proposed secondary treatment system based on a 105 lot subdivision with no commercial area. The design provided must be revised to include the additional lots and the commercial area. | Revise the size of the secondary treatment system using the correct number of lots and including the commercial component of the development. Confirm the expected treated effluent quality. |
| 27 | 27.25 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The tanks may be subject to hydrostatic uplift and foundation concerns, given the highly compactable soils. The large concrete tanks represent significant weight (9 tonnes per tank plus 25 tonnes of wastewater) which will need to be appropriately supported. Hydrostatic uplift occurs when an empty or partially empty tank is lifted out of the ground due to the pore pressure of water in the surrounding soil under high groundwater table conditions. This can significantly damage a wastewater treatment system but can be addressed by appropriate geotechnical design. The large tanks may need to be installed above ground, depending on winter groundwater conditions. | Provide an assessment of potential geotechnical issues with installing the wastewater treatment system into peat soils with a high groundwater table, using the highest groundwater. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 27 | 27.26 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The proposed discharge of significant volumes of treated wastewater into peat is not common practice (as areas underlain by peat are generally rural) but is acceptable if there is sufficient clearance with winter groundwater levels because peat is highly permeable. Soakage rates in peat are high and this means that final treatment of wastewater may not occur before wastewater enters groundwater, so there must be sufficient depth of unsaturated soil below the disposal system. The application notes groundwater was intercepted at a depth of 1.2m, however this was assessed in January 2022. The soil type is known for fluctuating water tables, and an accurate winter groundwater table level is very important information to enable an accurate effects assessment. If winter groundwater levels encroach to within 600mm of the ground surface, the disposal area location may not be appropriate. | Include consideration of the highest groundwater before finalising the wastewater treatment system to ensure there is sufficient separation of wastewater and groundwater. |
| 27 | 27.27 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | Policy 12 of the OSET Plan requires all systems to set aside an appropriately sized reserve area to provide for unanticipated operational problems and/or system failure. The area set aside must be consistent with the requirements of AS/NZ1547:2012 and be determined by a risk assessment. The reserve area must be shown on the structure plan and must not be used for permanent structures, including buildings and impervious surfaces. In this case, provision of a 50% reserve area is appropriate (i.e. 50% of the size of the discharge area). Regional Council has concerns that adding a reserve area as required by the OSET Plan may take up a larger portion of highly productive land. | Revise the structure plan to show a 50% wastewater discharge reserve area. This should be designed into the proposal because it may alter the layout of the proposed development. |
| 27 | 27.28 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The application does not identify the appropriate separation distance of the wastewater discharge from the Puanene Stream. This should be calculated based on Table R2 of AS/NZ1547:2012. | Provide a risk assessment of the potential effects of contaminants (including biological oxygen demand, total suspended solids, nutrients and pathogens) entering the stream. |
| 27 | 27.31 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | The applicant has not provided a description of how the wastewater system will be managed into the future. The plan change application should specify which legal body will be the consent holder (for the wastewater discharge), and how the responsibility for installation of the future stages of the system and ongoing maintenance will be managed. If the wastewater system is intended to be vested to council, the applicant should include a discussion of the ongoing cost burden of the proposal. Likewise, confirmation that Western Bay of Plenty District Council will take over the management and maintenance of the system and the discharge consent, is crucial. | The application should specify: 1. Which legal body will be the consent holder for the wastewater discharge. 2. How responsibility for the installation of future stages of the wastewater system and ongoing maintenance will be managed. 3. If the wastewater system is intended to be vested to council. 4. The ongoing cost burden of the wastewater system. 5. Confirmation that council will take over the management and maintenance of the system and the discharge consent. |
| 14 | 14.7 | Rachael Sexton | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Water Supply | Oppose | There is poor water pressure here, this is a concern with having more residents needing to tap into it. It is also my understanding that we don't have a fire water hydrant here either. | Decline the plan change. |
| 15 | 15.6 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Water Supply | Oppose | There is no fire hydrant on our road due to not enough water pressure, so how is adding 100+ more houses going to affect our water pressure? | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 18 | 18.3 | Jurgen Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Water Supply | Oppose | Water supply to the current houses on Arawa Road was paid for by the residence who all paid over 12K over 10 years for this privilege. The pipe capacity was only big enough to deliver water to Arawa Road and some how the recent Penelope Place development was given access to this at no cost by the council. This was also contested by the Pencarrow applicant at the time to council. The water supply will not have the capacity to deliver water to another residential development without a major infrastructure upgrade. | The proposal should be declined. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 25 | 25.3 | Kirsten Jefferson | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Water Supply | Support in part | The current water supply is too small to handle another residential development. Penelope development struggle. | Improved infrastructure - road, water, amenities first to support a development. |
| 37 | 37.4 | Jo Delaere | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Water Supply | Oppose | Impact on water pressure. | Strongly oppose Pencarrow Estate. |
| 12 | 12.2 | Mike Maassen | Appendix 7 - Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa | Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Zoning | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | Arawa Rd/Penelope Place is a collection of residential sections in a rural location. A Dairy Factory was planned for this location circa 1960 and the land was zoned residential at that time to provide homes for the factory staff. The Dairy Factory never eventuated but the residential zoning remained. Penelope Place was developed more recently because NZTA would not allow those sections access from SH2 and there was no access from Arawa Rd. The landowner purchased a property on Arawa Rd and subdivided off an access road for the Penelope Place land. The current owners subdivided off eight 2000m ² sections of their farmland adjoining Arawa Rd in the 1990's and remain zoned rural. The settlement is classified by the Regional Council, the District Council and NZTA as a rural settlement and is not in any way an urban area. The attraction for the residents who reside here is its rural nature and outlook. The road is relatively quiet with no through traffic. The section sizes are quite large in today's terms ranging from 800m ² to 2000m ² which is another attraction for those residing here. | Decline the plan change. Develop new housing stock closer to existing social infrastructure. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.2 [12.2] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many people's concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 7 | 7.10 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | Construction Effects | Oppose | The groundworks phase of the development is likely to create dust and vibration. Both of which have potential to cause damage to the existing properties. The usual process is for the developer to conduct a full dilapidation survey with the property owner to establish the current property condition so there can be no doubt over any damage caused by the construction work and the developer's liability for it. I understand the developer currently does not see this as their responsibility. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 15 | 15.4 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Other - Not Specified | General | Construction Effects | Oppose | Concern over the dust, noise and vibration from earthworks to be carried out. I do shift work and the likelihood of getting any decent quality sleep with machinery working close to the back of our house will be nil. This would in turn affect my ability to do my job affectively. The dust that the earthworks will create is also an issue as once again a lot of our wind blows from that direction. | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 17 | 17.5 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Other - Not Specified | General | Construction Effects | Oppose | Construction damage to properties through ground vibrations, wear and tear on an already under maintained road and a drawn out disturbance to the peaceful rural neighbourhood. | We strongly urge council to consider how the existing residents feel towards this development and oppose any further progress in favour of the developer. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|-----------------------|---------|--------------|---------|---|---|
| 12 | 12.8 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Consultation | Oppose | Eight 2000m ² sections on Arawa Rd, zoned rural, boundary directly onto the plan change land. In November 2022 the PPC applicants did consult with seven of these eight properties. I was one of the seven. The applicants did invite us to include our properties in their Plan Change at no cost to us. It was suggested to us that our properties would immediately jump in value by \$500,000 dollars if rezoned residential because of the subdivision potential of our properties. We were shown a rather basic map of their plans and asked for any feedback or concerns. There were two meetings and they were cordial. However all seven of us declined their invitation to join the PPC. For myself (and I think the others as well) I prefer the rural nature of my property, have no desire to subdivide and believe my property has a price premium because of its size. There was no consultation, that I am aware of, with the wider Arawa Rd/Penelope Place community or indeed others who also boundary on to the PPC land. This has concerned me as a planned development such this will have some impact to some degree on all residents of this rural settlement not just those directly adjoining the PPC land. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.8 [12.8] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 13 | 13.2 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Other - Not Specified | General | Consultation | Support | In 2018 we made submissions to the Smart Growth Future Development Strategy to encourage and endorse new housing developments across the Te Puke region. This housing is needed to support our economic growth. Over the last 6 years we have led tours across the Te Puke region for various leaders to acquaint them with the breadth of our communities and our economic growth. This has included Smart Growth leaders and managers, Regional Councillors, District Councillors, Tauranga City Commissioners and Senior officials from Housing and Urban Development, Waka Kotahi, Internal Affairs and Kainga Ora. We have hosted Cabinet Ministers and MP's regularly and have highlighted the need for new housing to support economic growth. | Approve the Plan Change. |
| FS39 [13] | FS39.2 [13.2] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group)] | | | | Oppose | PPC95 is not supported by the SmartGrowth Strategy, which is a strategic plan to manage growth in the western Bay of Plenty. SmartGrowth considers more than just the economic benefits of growth: housing, land, infrastructure, transport, community development, tangata whenua aspirations, and the natural environment need to be looked at together to achieve effective long-term growth. There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 reports an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. Intensification of Te Puke and development of other areas identified in SmartGrowth are more practicable options to address the housing shortfall in this district. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 18 | 18.4 | Jurgen Delaere | Other - Not Specified | General | Consultation | Oppose | Consultation process was only with direct boundary properties not the region and more an informal discussion to try include our 8 properties as part of this purposed rezoning. Not a discussion of how the neighbouring property owners felt about this application. Discussion have not been minuted and original decision discussed were retracted at a 2nd meeting where the applicants land development consultant attended and could not answer any questions satisfactory addressed to him. He also did not get back to me as he indicated. | The proposal should be declined by Council. |
| FS38 [18] | FS38.20 [18.4] | Hayden Dugmore [Jurgen Delaere] | | | | Support | Jurgen makes a point about initial public consultation being a closed, informal affair. Combined with Mikes revelation that neighbours were told that this Development would raise their property values, There is an argument to be made that those neighbouring landowners will gain advantage via increased property values and this may influence their submissions. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---|---|
| 19 | 19.1 | Alan & Pasrieia Birley | Other - Not Specified | General | Consultation | Oppose | No consultation prior to this application. | We don't agree with the proposal. The removal of option 3. |
| 12 | 12.9 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Ecological Effects | Oppose | The location of this PPC is centered in an area of rather sensitive and important aquatic environments all draining into the Waihi/Pukehina estuary. The stream runs along the western boundary of the PPC. The PPC documents describe the waterway as a 'drain'. The total catchment of the Puanene Stream from the Waihi estuary to the source is about 16kms. Farmers along some of this waterway have undertaken extensive native plantings along the streambanks to enhance the stream and improve water quality. The Puanene Stream runs into the Wharere Stream down to the estuary. The estuary is severely degraded and the subject of extensive rehabilitation work. Any efforts to improve the water quality of the Puanene Stream are beneficial to the health of the estuary. The Puanene Stream's course through the applicants farm has been significantly altered through the course of the farms development. The streams original meandering course is now a more straight canal like course. While it's course has been significantly altered it is still the Puanene Stream and should not be mistaken for or classified as a farm 'drain'. It is likely the stream is home to, and an important migratory path for numerous fish and invertebrate species such as long and short finned eel, kokopu, inanga and koura. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.9 [12.9] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 27 | 27.5 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Ecological Effects | Oppose | The Assessment of Ecological Effects (Wildlands Consultants Ltd, May 2022) identifies the watercourse flowing along the PPC95 western margin (Figure 1 in the submitter's full submission) as a drain. No supporting evidence for this classification was provided. Note: evidence from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist that this is the Puanene Stream is provided in the full BOPC submission. Overall, when considering the evidence, the Puanene Stream is a natural watercourse and should be considered a "modified watercourse" as described in the RNRP and is not a farm drain. The Puanene Stream will therefore be subject to the policies for river/stream management in the RNRP and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management(NPS-FM). Freshwater management within the site should be reconsidered and an appropriate setback from the stream should be applied allowing the stream riparian zone to be restored and to limit encroachment of future residential or commercial developments into this zone. These are dynamic systems that need space to meander and interact naturally with the floodplain. Streams provide important habitat for indigenous flora and fauna and are dynamic systems that need room to move. Providing a setback provides protection for both the natural and built environment. The values of these waterbodies and freshwater ecosystems are to be protected under the NPS-FM. A vegetated riparian margin provides an even greater benefit and improves aquatic ecological values and water quality through increased shading, reducing sediment and contaminants reaching the waterbodies and improving water quality. Vegetation with appropriate species has been found to assist with slope and bank stability. | Reclassify the watercourse flowing along the western margin of the proposed plan change area as the Puanene Stream. Provide an assessment of the effects on the stream from the proposed plan change, in accordance with the RNRP and the NPS-FM. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| 29 | 29.1 | Ngati Whakahemo | Other - Not Specified | General | Ecological Effects | Support | We support PC95 and emphasise the importance of comprehensive environmental protection measures. Ngati Whakahemo advocate for the preservation and safeguarding of the water intake area, stormwater disposal, wastewater management, and monitoring. Ngatio Whakahemo support is contingent upon the implementation of robust measures, strict adherence to regulations and the use of sustainable practives. Ngati Whakahemo believe that these measures are critical for the long-term sustainability and integrity of our waterways and ecosystems. | 1. Incorporate comprehensive environmental protection measures around the water intake area to ensure the preservation and safeguarding of this vital resource. 2. Implement robust environmental protection measures for stormwater disposal, prioritizing the preservation and safeguarding of our waterways and ecosystems. 3. Implement stringent environmental protection measures for wastewater management, with a focus on preserving and safeguarding our waterways and ecosystems. 4. Implement comprehensive environmental protection measures in the monitoring of wastewater development and disposal, ensuring strict adherence to regulations and safeguarding the integrity of our waterways and ecosystem. |
| 26 | 26.1 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | Emissions Reduction | Support in part | Waka Kotahi has a role in the delivery of the Emission Reduction Plan/Te hau mārohi ki anamata (ERP) and the National Adaptation Plan (Urutau, ka taurikura: Kia tū pakari a Aotearoa i ngā huringa āhuarangi). Within these plans are several key policies and targets for adapting to and mitigating the effects of Climate Change. The integration of land use and transport will be key in reducing emissions and ensuring the transport system is resilient. | On balance Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to Plan Change 95. From a strategic policy perspective, the proposal is considered to be inconsistent with some key provisions of the NPS-UD due to car-centric transport outcomes, with limited provision for public transport and transport choice. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |
| 26 | 26.2 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | Government Policy Statement on Land Transport | Support in part | Waka Kotahi also has a role in giving effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). The GPS is required under the LTMA and outlines the Government's strategy to guide land transport investment over the next 10 years. The four strategic priorities of the GPS 2021 are safety, better travel options, climate change and improving freight connections. A key theme of the GPS is integrating land use, transport planning and delivery. Land use planning has a significant impact on transport policy, infrastructure and services provision, and vice versa. Changes in land use can affect the demand for travel, creating both pressures and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure and services, or for demand management. | On balance Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to Plan Change 95. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |
| 12 | 12.10 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Oppose | The PPC also has a boundary of flood plain with farm drains running into the Wharere Stream. Flood plain that is subject to periodic flooding and surface run off to water ways. Within the PPC boundary and marked on natural hazard maps are 3 flood flow paths. You would expect these to be flow paths for stormwater from within the PPC land. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.10 [12.10] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 12 | 12.14 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Oppose | The PPC faces a flood risk, evident from a witnessed event in 1988/1989, where water was lapping at the road. I would have to question the applicants statement in the PPC document (Pg 32) that in 50 years they have not seen flooding to this extent on their land. The devastation that Cyclone Gabriel wrought earlier this year shows just how vitally important it is not to underestimate the risk of flooding when planning development. Three flood flow paths shown on Council hazard maps within the PPC land are essential for existing residents' flood protection and providing pathways for floodwater during major weather events. These flood flow paths cannot be compromised in any way in the developers plans. Two of the flood flow paths are not addressed at all in the PPC plans and the one that flows from Penelope Place to the Puanene Stream appears to be altered substantially in the plan. The culvert that runs under Arawa Rd from Penelope Place needs to connect directly to the flood flow path and not into a sump as it currently does. The lack of reference to these paths in earlier plans raises concerns about disregarding natural hazards. These natural, free and open flood flow paths are essential to the future viability and security of this settlement by mitigating flood risk. | Decline the plan change. Any development in this area will need to carefully manage these flood flow pathways to avoid potential future flood damage and costly remediation work. Costs that would undoubtedly fall on Council and Ratepayers. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.14 [12.14] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 16 | 16.1 | Jordan O'Malley, Ian O'Malley | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Oppose | We have observed flooding that occurs in the paddocks behind 19 Arawa Road with heavy and prolonged rainfall (see attached photos as evidence of flooding in the areas that are proposed to have low-density and high-density housing). We have lived in this area for nearly 8 years and this flooding occurs usually between 1 and 4 times a year when there is heavy and prolonged rainfall in this area. The photos are from June 2023 & December 2022. The notification document details infilling these flood zones to build on and also to have grassed channels. Lysaght recommended in their report that infilling on site may need to be undertaken to raise road and building pad levels above adjacent flood levels to ensure sufficient freeboard is achieved. These approaches could help minimise the flooding on the Pencarrow Estate properties, but we are concerned that infilling the Pencarrow Estate properties will increase the flooding risk to the upstream properties and that the grassed channels will not be able to channel enough excess water to keep the upstream properties from flooding. | Oppose the planning map changes. |
| 27 | 27.19 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Support in part | The application is supported by a natural hazard risk assessment undertaken in general accordance with the RPS natural hazard provisions (NH 9B and NH 4B) for liquefaction, active faults and coastal hazards. However, the risk assessment does not clearly state there will be no increase in risk offsite from flooding when the development is completed, including to lifeline infrastructure. This is a requirement of RPS Policy NH 4B and should be addressed. The following further information is required to assess flood risk: Appropriate stormwater sizing and groundwater interaction to confirm low risk onsite is achieved; Appropriate stormwater volume mitigation to confirm no increase in risk offsite is achieved; Appropriate overland flow path sizing to confirm low risk is achieved on site and risk is not increased offsite; and Assess cumulative effects of floodplain infilling and land use change to confirm risk is not increased offsite. | As required by RPS Policy NH 4B: Amend the natural hazards flooding risk assessment for the 100 year ARI flood to clearly identify how low risk can be achieved on site; and Amend the natural hazards flooding risk assessment for the 500 year ARI flood to confirm that the flood risk offsite is not increased when the development is completed. |
| 27 | 27.16 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Support in part | The proposal identifies three overland flow paths and proposes to maintain their capacity. Calculations were based on a 1% AEP 2040 climate change. To avoid an increase in upstream flood risk, the capacity must be based on 1% AEP RCP8.5 to 2130. The structure plan dated October 2023 does not show one of the overland flow paths (OLFP3). This is inconsistent with the Engineering Services Report. | Revise the calculations of the overland flow paths based on 1% AEP RCP8.5 to 2130. Revise the structure plan to show all overland flowpaths. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 27 | 27.18 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Flooding | Support in part | The proposal estimates some flood displacement for the 1% AEP through infilling, although this is not based on flood modelling. The applicant identifies this effect as negligible. However, the proposal fails to identify this effect as part of a cumulative effects assessment including increased stormwater volumes due to land use change. Flood modelling is recommended to identify cumulative effects for a variety of events (flood risk and system performance). | Assess cumulative effects of floodplain filling and land-use change, identify appropriate mitigation measures and revise the proposal accordingly. |
| 12 | 12.15 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Natural Hazards - Liquefaction | Oppose | Natural hazard maps appear to indicate that much of the PPC land falls within a liquefaction risk zone in the event of a major earthquake. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.15 [12.15] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 7 | 7.12 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | Allowing the development of this area of the farm to residential use goes against the National Policy Statement for highly productive land. As the area planned for development currently houses most of the farm's operational infrastructure and removes this area from being productive. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 12 | 12.6 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | The BOPRC advise that the PPC is 'Contrary' to the National Policy Statement for highly productive land. The land of this PPC is classified as highly productive land. This PPC land is the 'guts' of this farm, the PPC takes out all of the most productive land and all of the high ground with all of the farm infrastructure. This land has been farmed as a highly productive dairy unit for years. Much of this farm is low lying flood plain so this high ground is vital to the future viability of this farming unit. The loss of this high ground will spell the end for this highly productive farming unit and will result in the fragmentation of a large and geographically cohesive area. Dairy farm units of this size that sustain a family are becoming increasingly rare as more and more farms are amalgamated into large enterprises managed by more corporate type farmers. It is important to retain farming units of this size for future generations of farmers. If this PPC goes ahead it could set allow other such rural developments and the districts highly productive land could soon be interspersed with small settlements of people who all need to drive to their jobs, schools, entertainment and supermarkets in the main centres. Highly productive land is a precious and finite resource - once it's gone it's gone. Local Authorities need to tread carefully and ensure that the solutions of today aren't fuelling the problems of tomorrow. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.6 [12.6] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 14 | 14.8 | Rachael Sexton | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | It is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement Policies and the National Policy Statement for Highly productive land and this is outside the designated urban growth area seems to be being ignored. | Decline the plan change. |
| 20 | 20.3 | Hamish Henderson | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | A town plan is a document with the aim of shielding rural land and especially land with a high use classification from urban expansion, maintaining an area's rural character. This proposal erodes this district and the country of 12 hectares of not just rural land but of land with a Use Classification of 2, which is very fertile and productive land. | The proposal should be declined. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|--------|---|---|
| 27 | 27.4 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | <p>Regional Council considers PPC95 to be contrary to the NPS-HPL. This directs urban development and urban rezoning away from highly productive land by preventing inappropriate rezoning, subdivision, and use of highly productive land, with few exceptions. The entire PPC95 area is highly productive land under the NPS-HPL. The PPC95 site is rural and not identified for future urban development.</p> <p>There is no evidence of demand for housing in the Pongakawa area and capacity has already been enabled in more efficient locations. The applicant refers to the workforce increase needed to support horticultural land, however the HBA does not assess or identify Pongakawa as having a demand for additional development capacity. The HBA has identified demand in Te Puke, but PPC95 is 15km from Te Puke. The nearest urban environment, as defined in the NPS-UD, is Te Puke. Te Puke has an existing urban population of over 8,000 and a broad range of social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling and public transport services. Significant capacity for further brownfield and greenfield growth of residential and business activity in and around Te Puke is already planned.</p> <p>If there is no evidence of housing demand in Pongakawa, consideration of the same locality and market is unnecessary.</p> | Decline the plan change. |
| 31 | 31.5 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-HPL | Oppose | <p>We do not consider that appropriate weight is given to the intent and policies of the NPS-HPL, RPS, or District Plan where they concern highly productive land and use of rural zones. It is imperative that highly productive land be retained for agricultural purposes. Section 3.6 of the NPS-HPL states tier 1 authorities may allow rezoning of highly productive land if there are no other reasonably practicable options for providing development capacity. We disagree that the proposal meets the tests of section 3.6. The Te Puke Structure Plan identifies a substantial area for residential development, and also identifies the town centre along Jellicoe Street for future urban development. These areas are considered to practicably provide development capacity in the same locality while providing a well-functioning urban environment. The plan change report justifies the loss of 12ha of productive land by suggesting it will provide for the changing needs of the horticulture industry. We consider this an incredibly flawed justification and are concerned that the proposed plan change will set a precedent for development and loss of highly productive land. While the horticultural industry has been growing in recent years influencing the needs of the district, it cannot be used to justify inappropriate development when sufficient pathways are available. Development should be focused around established urban areas to avoid the loss of productive land and enhance existing communities.</p> | Decline the plan change. |
| 7 | 7.5 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Oppose | <p>Other areas of land that have been marked for development in areas that better fit in with the smart growth strategy in that they are closer to the industrial and retail centres that have the infrastructure in place, or that can more easily be put in place. Which when developed will provide for the housing needs of those who choose to move to the area.</p> | Priority should be given to these as they are already in place and would be far more cost effective, reduce travel and possibly congestion. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|---|-----------------------|---------|--------|---------|---|---|
| 12 | 12.4 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Oppose | The proposal is beyond the scope of the NPS-UD and misinterprets the purpose of the RPS Change 6. The PPC is also not provided for in any other relevant local authority urban growth plan or strategy. NZTA Waka Kotahi appear to hold a similar position as the BOPRC on the NPS-UD. Despite the applicants receiving this advice from these authorities they are justifying their plans and seeking to get around the relevant Policy Statements by stating their development meets the perceived demand for housing for the Pongakawa Horticulture Industry. The NPS-UD removes overly restrictive barriers to allow growth to go up and out in urban locations that have good access to existing services, public transport networks and infrastructure. The Arawa Rd/Penelope Place settlement is not an urban area and has limited existing services and no infrastructure. As this location is rural and not an urban area it probably falls outside the scope of the NPS-UD. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.4 [12.4] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 13 | 13.7 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Support | Delivery of up to 130 new houses is aligned to the National Policy Statement. It contributes to the national vision that everyone in NZ lives in a home and a community that meets their needs and aspirations. It is an accessible place connected to employment, education, social and cultural opportunities. Pencarrow Estate will deliver homes that are warm, dry, safe, stable and affordable. This land use change with addition of infrastructure and housing is responsive to demand, is well planned and will add considerable value. | Approve the Plan Change. |
| 14 | 14.9 | Rachael Sexton | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Oppose | It is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement Policies and the National Policy Statement for Highly productive land and this is outside the designated urban growth area seems to be being ignored. | Decline the plan change. |
| 22 | 22.1 | Peter Cooney | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Support | There is a significant housing shortage in the Bay of Plenty and, in particular, the western BOP subregion. This is reflected in the latest HBA report for the subregion. This housing shortage results in increased urban land costs which in turn contributes to higher housing costs and reduces affordability. The implementation of greenfield residential areas is also significantly constrained due to transport corridor constraints and the provision of infrastructure. | Support the plan change as notified. |
| FS39 [22] | FS39.5 [22.1] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Peter Cooney] | | | | Oppose | There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 reports that there is an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. PPC95 is not supported by the SmartGrowth Strategy, which is a strategic plan to manage growth in the western Bay of Plenty. SmartGrowth considers how housing, land, infrastructure, transport, community development, tangata whenua aspirations, and the natural environment need to be looked at together to achieve effective long-term growth. Bay of Plenty Regional Council does not support PPC95 because it is not anticipated in the SmartGrowth Strategy and represents ad hoc development and inefficient development and use of infrastructure. Regional Council acknowledges the critical need for housing in the western Bay of Plenty. However, while development of this type appears attractive in the short term (providing housing), it leads to a sporadic, nonstrategic growth pattern and decentralised infrastructure that is costly to maintain in the long term. A more practicable option for addressing the housing shortfall in this district is intensification of Te Puke, as enabled by Plan Change 92 (PC92) and supported by SmartGrowth. PC92 will provide more capacity in Te Puke than originally anticipated, and so less greenfield land is required than previously calculated. Te Puke has existing social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling, public transport, and a centralised wastewater treatment plant. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|-----------------------|---------|--------|-----------------|--|---|
| 26 | 26.4 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Support in part | <p>The proposal is consistent with elements of the NPS-UD, Waka Kotahi considers that the proposal is inconsistent in some key respects: The settlement would be heavily reliant on private motor vehicles, with limited public transport and active transport options available. The settlement would not have a population base sufficiently high to support the range of local services and amenities required to avoid substantial private vehicle travel. Residents will still need to travel to reach a wider range of services and employment not provided by the development or neighbouring local community. PC95 indicates that residents may work in the Rangiuru business park, approximately 9km west, likely be dependent on private vehicles. The scale of development is unlikely to generate public transport opportunities, and the distances and nature of the route to services and employment are unlikely to encourage walking and cycling. The development is out of sequence as it is not identified as a growth location in any relevant planning documents, or the UFTI. While the development will have good vehicular access to (SH2, transport choice options will be very limited. Meeting housing needs through improvised plan changes and developments could undermine opportunities for development at scale with the critical mass to support the connected centres approach set out in UFTI and well-functioning urban environments.</p> | <p>On balance Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to Plan Change 95. From a strategic policy perspective, the proposal is considered to be inconsistent with some key provisions of the NPS-UD due to car-centric transport outcomes, with limited provision for public transport and transport choice. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought.</p> |
| FS39 [26] | FS39.7 [26.4] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Waka Kotahi] | | | | Support | <p>Bay of Plenty Regional Council's position aligns with the Waka Kotahi assessment that PPC95 is inconsistent with Policy 1(c) of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The settlement would be heavily reliant on private motor vehicles, with limited public transport and active transport options available. • The settlement's population base would not be large enough to support the range of local services and amenities needed to avoid substantial private vehicle travel beyond the immediate locality. • The proposed commercial zoning may reduce the need for residents to travel further afield for some trips, but residents would still need to travel to reach a wider range of services and employment not provided by the development. This is an existing scenario, which would be exacerbated by further development. <p>Bay of Plenty Regional Council's position also aligns with the Waka Kotahi assessment that PPC95 is inconsistent with clause 3.8 of the NPS-UD because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would not contribute to a well-functioning urban environment because Pongakawa social infrastructure, including the school, is nearly 2 kilometres from the settlement, across State Highway 2, with no safe way to walk or cycle across the highway and no footpath or cycle lane to safely access the Pongakawa amenities other than by private car, and • The only transport option to/from the development would be by private vehicle, rather than public or active transport, and so it is not considered to be well-connected along transport corridors. <p>Regional Council acknowledges the critical need for housing in the western Bay of Plenty. However, while development of this type appears attractive in the short term (providing housing), it leads to a sporadic, nonstrategic growth pattern and decentralised infrastructure that is costly to maintain in the long term. Te Puke and the other areas identified for development by SmartGrowth are more practicable options to address the housing shortfall in this district.</p> | <p>Decline Proposed Plan Change 95</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|-----------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|---|--|
| 27 | 27.2 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Oppose | Regional Council does not agree with the applicant's assertion that PPC95 is clearly consistent with the relevant direction of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that PPC95 is provided for in Proposed Change 6 to the Regional Policy Statement. The objective of the NPS-UD and RPS PC6 is to soften the edges of existing urban environments, not to enable satellite expansion or an ad-hoc growth pattern such as proposed by PPC95. The applicant's planning framework assessment misinterprets the purpose of RPS PC6. The assessment concludes that RPS PC6 will remove the urban limits and therefore enable PPC95. However, the NPS-UD and RPS PC6 enable out of sequence development only in urban environments. Pongakawa is not defined as an urban environment under the NPS-UD. As such, the NPS-UD and RPS PC6 do not enable PPC 95. | Decline proposed plan change 95. |
| FS40 [27] | FS40.2 [27.2] | Waka Kotahi [Bay of Plenty Regional Council] | | | | Support | NZTA supports submission points 27.1 and 27.2 as addressed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, stating that Private Plan Change 95 (PPC95) is inconsistent with NPS-UD as it is not identified as a growth location in any relevant planning documents, or Smart Growth and the Urban Form and Transport Initiative. It is noted this aligns with points raised by NZTA within their submission. | |
| 32 | 32.2 | Scott Adams | Other - Not Specified | General | NPS-UD | Support | The latest Western Bay of Plenty Subregion - Housing and Business Capacity Assessment Report (HBA) indicates a shortfall of residential housing capacity, despite Te Puke urban growth area. | The private plan change is supported as this forward-thinking initiative is consistent with the NPS-Urban Development as will assist economic development in the subregion and the significant investment that has been made in horticultural development in the Pongakawa area. |
| FS39 [32] | FS39.9 [32.2] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Scott Adams] | | | | Oppose | There is no evidence for housing demand in Pongakawa specifically. While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 (HBA) reports that there is an urgent need to investigate future growth areas in the Eastern Corridor, this refers to Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa specifically. A more practicable option for addressing the housing shortfall in this district is intensification of Te Puke, as enabled by Plan Change 92 (PC92) and supported by SmartGrowth. PC92 will provide more capacity in Te Puke than originally anticipated, and so less greenfield land is required than previously calculated. Te Puke has existing social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling, public transport, and a centralised wastewater treatment plant. | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 7 | 7.9 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | Rates | Oppose | The upgrading or increase in services/utilities and infrastructure required to service this development will come at a cost. Unless those costs are going to be ringfenced to the development it will mean an increase in rates and service/utility charges would be inflicted on all residents in the area. Which means we would be forced to contribute towards a development we didn't want. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 17 | 17.3 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Other - Not Specified | General | Rates | Oppose | Will the cost of this development increase rates? | Decline the plan change. |
| 18 | 18.5 | Jurgen Delaere | Other - Not Specified | General | Rates | Oppose | If this rezoning does get approved I do not want to be forced to be rezoned residential or pay rate increases for any future infrastructure required to develop this land. | The proposal should be declined by Council. |
| 23 | 23.5 | Karen Summerhays, Nicola Cooke | Other - Not Specified | General | Rates | Oppose | The residents of the development will utilise the social infrastructure of the surrounding towns so will they be required to contribute to the targeted rates that maintains them? E.g. sports fields/ halls/ libraries. The economies of scale to provide social infrastructure, and maintain it, is not sustainable for a settlement of this size. The residents of the Te Puke / Maketu Ward should not have to bear the brunt of the future costs of this private development. | That the proposed Plan Change be declined. |
| 12 | 12.3 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | The Regional Council appears to hold a position that this proposal is not provided for in the BOP Regional Council Policy Statement for Urban and Rural Growth (RPS URG) and is not supported by the BOPRC RPS Policy UGSA. The proposal is also beyond the scope of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) and misinterprets the purpose of the RPS Change 6. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|--|---|
| FS38 [12] | FS38.3 [12.3] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 14 | 14.10 | Rachael Sexton | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | The fact that it is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement Policies and the National Policy Statement for Highly productive land and this is outside the designated urban growth area seems to be being ignored. | Decline the plan change. |
| 27 | 27.3 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | <p>PPC 95 is contrary to RPS Objective 25 and Policies UG 5A, UG 6A, 7A, UG 10B and UG 14B for these reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PPC 95 area is not within or near an existing defined urban management or growth area nor any urban environment. • While the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2022 (HBA) identifies need for future growth for Te Puke and the future eastern town of Te Kainga, not the broader Eastern Corridor or Pongakawa. The MDRS plan changes mean less greenfield land is required. • The PPC95 area does not achieve strategic integration of infrastructure services because the area has no existing reticulated wastewater services. <p>Regional Council believes the application to be contrary to RPS Objective 26 and policies UG 18B, IR 1B and IR 5B for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPC95 will result in versatile land being used for non-productive purposes outside existing and planned urban-zoned areas, and is not for regionally significant infrastructure. <p>Regional Council considers PPC95 to be contrary to RPS Objectives 10, 11 and 29 and their policies for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPC95 will result in cumulative effects from inefficient use of space associated with sporadic new subdivision. • PPC95 does not integrate with local authority long term planning and funding mechanisms or respond to strategic growth plans. • PPC95 does not sustainably manage growth because it is not coordinated, sequenced, or serviced in an efficient and integrated manner. | Decline the proposed plan change. |
| 31 | 31.2 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | We do not agree with the assessment that the proposal is consistent with objective 3. Objective 3 states that more people should be enabled to live in areas of an urban environment that are near a centre zone, serviced by public transport and where there is a demand for housing relative to other areas of the urban environment. The site and surrounding area are zoned rural, the small pocket of dwellings existing of Arawa Road are not considered an urban environment. The nearest centre is located in Te Puke and we considered that development is best suited to occur within the existing township. While the horticultural and agricultural industries present employment opportunities, there is sufficient opportunity for housing and development around existing townships. While it is important to meet the demand for housing in the Western Bay District it should not be used to justify inappropriate development or the loss of highly productive land. The site is not serviced by public transport and the proposed increase in residential area will not be sufficient to require the operation of more regular services. | Decline the plan change. |
| 31 | 31.3 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | We do not agree with the assessment that the proposal is consistent with objective 23. The plan change report considers the 'critical 'mass population' delivered will be sufficient to sustain local services. We disagree with this statement and expect the viability of businesses to be limited and that people will still have to travel further afield for services. Te Puke is considered sufficiently close to access services and development should be focused here and in Paengaroa to utilise and enhance existing centres and facilitate more appropriate growth. The proposal will not introduce sustainable urban form, instead creating fragmentation of rural communities. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------------|--------|---|--|
| 31 | 31.4 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | Regional Policy Statement | Oppose | We note that the proposal is inconsistent with policies UG5A, UG6A, UG7B, and UG14B. We do not agree with the assessment that the proposal is in accordance with objective 26. The application considers the residential development necessary to provide for the primary production use of surrounding farmland. This is unjustified, many farm workers are offered accommodation on the property, orchard workers are predominantly seasonal finding temporary accommodation in town or at RSE facilities, and other agricultural/horticultural staff have sufficient opportunity to access housing in Te Puke, Paengaroa, Pukehina or Maketu. Development on highly productive farmland is considered inappropriate and should be undertaken within existing townships. | Decline the plan change. |
| 9 | 9.7 | Graeme Gillespie | Other - Not Specified | General | Reverse Sensitivity | Oppose | The proposal creates a risk of reverse sensitivity in respect to the current dairying and horticulture activity. There are existing odour and noise issues with the dairying and kiwifruit farming. The residents of Arawa Road and Penelope Place generally tolerate these 'nuisances' as part of moving into the environment. Further residential intensification will create a likelihood that people less tolerant of the environment will complain, creating cost to Council to investigate and resolve complaints. The impact on neighbouring kiwi fruit farms of noise abatement must also be recognised. | Decline the plan change. |
| 19 | 19.2 | Alan & Pasrieia Birley | Other - Not Specified | General | Reverse Sensitivity | Oppose | We have a horticulture property nearby with requirements to notify house owners of any spray. We need to know how many more houses we have to notify. | We don't agree with the proposal. The removal of option 3. |
| 31 | 31.6 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | Reverse Sensitivity | Oppose | The location is a rural area which is not typically associated with residential or commercial activities. There may therefore be a limited tolerance by the proposed sensitive activity and its users for the day to day operation of the rural area thereby creating a potential conflict with rural property owners carrying out their lawful practices. A no complaints covenant is not considered to adequately address this potential reverse sensitivity effect on existing and future activities. The council has a role to ensure conflicts between members of the community are avoided. Arawa Road is surrounded by farmland and orchards, the operation of which involves extended hours of work, use of machinery and chemicals. The proposal will introduce significant reverse sensitivity effects for adjacent farmers and is likely to cause future restraints on their operation. While the application states that milking in the adjacent shed will cease, this cannot be relied upon in future and may constrain future use of the farm infrastructure. | Decline the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 27 | 27.1 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Smart Growth and UFTI | Oppose | Bay of Plenty Regional Council does not support PPC95 because it is not assessed or anticipated in the SmartGrowth Strategy and represents ad hoc development and inefficient development and use of infrastructure. While development of this type appears attractive in the short term (providing housing), it leads to a sporadic, nonstrategic growth pattern and decentralised infrastructure that is costly to maintain in the long term. Significant planning has been undertaken by the SmartGrowth partners to support the preferred urban form, through previous iterations of the SmartGrowth Strategy and the UFTI. UFTI was approved by all SmartGrowth partners. We do not agree with the applicant's assertion that PPC95 is suitably consistent with the direction of UFTI and SmartGrowth. UFTI and The Strategy does not identify any short, medium, or long term greenfield residential development in the Pongakawa/PPC95 vicinity. SmartGrowth Strategy 2023 identifies the following growth areas consistent with the UFTI connected centres settlement pattern: existing growth areas where land is already zoned, planned growth areas where investigations have been completed, and potential long-term growth areas. These allocations cover the period 2024-2054 and were informed by the latest housing and business capacity assessment and draft long-term plans of the local authorities in the region. The 2023 connected centres settlement pattern does not allocate residential or commercial growth to Pongakawa, the PPC95 area. | Decline proposed plan change 95. |
| FS40 [27] | FS40.1 [27.1] | Waka Kotahi [Bay of Plenty Regional Council] | | | | Support | NZTA supports submission points 27.1 and 27.2 as addressed by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, stating that Private Plan Change 95 (PPC95) is inconsistent with NPS-UD as it is not identified as a growth location in any relevant planning documents, or Smart Growth and the Urban Form and Transport Initiative. It is noted this aligns with points raised by NZTA within their submission. | |
| 7 | 7.8 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Effects | Oppose | The majority of the properties on Arawa Road are on porous ground which removes the potential for flooding and water/sediment run off. How will water/sediment run off and pollution of the surrounding land and waterways will be prevented either during the construction phase or after? Any type of pollution from the development is likely to have a damaging effect on the biodiversity of the area. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 27 | 27.6 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | Regional Council recommends a stormwater management plan is provided for this plan change area to ensure the issues identified in the following submission points about stormwater are addressed in an integrated manner, as required by section 30(1)(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991, RPS Objective 11 and RPS Policy IR 3B. Land use and development decisions are closely connected to the health and wellbeing of water and the risks of water-related natural hazards to communities, and so catchment planning is needed at the land use decision stage. It is not appropriate to consider stormwater matters after the structure plan has been drafted – integrating land use and water planning is essential to protecting and enhancing the life supporting capacity of the region's waters and te mana o te wai. The stormwater discharge consent process under the regional plan is not the appropriate mechanism to manage stormwater effects of large developments for two main reasons: If the permanent stormwater discharge consent is applied for after the development is completed, there is little or no ability to consider alternative stormwater management options or ability to improve stormwater quality; and It is difficult or impossible to consider catchment-wide cumulative effects from stormwater discharges under a resource consent process. Stormwater effects need to be considered collectively on a catchment or sub-catchment basis to enable cumulative effects to be assessed at the structure planning stage and implemented via provisions in the district/city plan. | Provide a stormwater management plan (SMP), which sets out the stormwater management for the proposed structure plan area. The SMP should: 1. Set out the objectives for stormwater management and the receiving environment for the proposed structure plan area; 2. Demonstrate how the proposed stormwater management is the best practicable option (BPO), taking into account the existing site features; 3. Set out how stormwater quality and quantity will be managed in an integrated way; and 4. Outline draft planning provisions to manage stormwater in the structure plan area, to be incorporated into the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 27 | 27.8 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The Engineering Servicing Report (Lysaght, 12/12/2022, Revision 5) states that stormwater from roads will be collected in catchpits and piped to the stormwater detention pond. The structure plan states that roadside swales will drain the roads. | Clarify at structure plan stage if swales or pipes will be used to drain the roads. Regional Council supports grassed swales to provide water quality treatment before discharging to the receiving environment. If swales are proposed, they must be appropriately sized and designed. |
| 27 | 27.9 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The Assessment of Ecological Effects (Wildlands, May 2022, Contract Report No. 6334) recommends the stormwater detention area is planted with wetland plants. The Engineering Servicing Report (Lysaght, 12/12/2022, Revision 5) and proposed planning map (Private Plan Change 95 Pencarrow Estate – Pongakawa, proposed Planning Map) refer mainly to a stormwater pond. | Clarify if a stormwater wetland or stormwater pond will be used. Regional Council's Stormwater Management Guidelines (page 161) favour constructed wetlands over ponds because they provide better filtration of contaminants, including dissolved contaminants, due to densities of wetland plants, incorporation of contaminants in soils, adsorption, plant uptake, and biological microbial decomposition. In addition, wetlands, being shallow water bodies, do not have the safety issues associated with deeper ponds. Constructed wetlands must have a spillway to carry the 1% AEP flood with a minimum of 0.5 metre embankment freeboard. |
| 27 | 27.10 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The design and sizing of the stormwater pond is based on using a 10mm/hr rainfall intensity. This approach is taken from GD01 in Auckland, which is not the appropriate guideline to use in the Bay of Plenty. The 10mm/hr was based on continuous simulation of Auckland rainfall to determine appropriate rainfall intensity criteria for sizing flow based on proprietary treatment devices such as stormfilters or upflo filters. Using the 10mm/hr rainfall intensity depth is likely to lead to the device being undersized. | Use the Stormwater Management Guidelines for the Bay of Plenty region (Bay of Plenty Regional Council Guidelines 2012/01) to determine water quality and detention volumes based on the 90th percentile rainfall event, and the volumes needed to attenuate the relevant larger storms, such as the 2, 10 and 100 year ARI event). Feasibility for spacing requirements for the stormwater detention area should be redone based on BOPRC guidelines, not Auckland guidelines. |
| 27 | 27.11 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The stormwater treatment pond does not appear to achieve the correct length to width ratio to meet the treatment requirements in the Stormwater Management Guidelines for the Bay of Plenty Region (Bay of Plenty Regional Council Guideline 2012/01). | Provide size calculations that meet the Stormwater Management Guidelines for the Bay of Plenty Region (Bay of Plenty Regional Council Guideline 2012/01). |
| 27 | 27.12 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The Puanene Stream on the northwest boundary of the site is a stream, not a drain. As such, extended detention is required for all impervious areas (except those discharging via soakage) that drain to the stream. Holding water back (detention) and releasing it slowly helps to reduce erosion. Ensuring that impervious surfaces do not flow directly into streams can clean dirty stormwater and better manage instream erosion. Water sensitive design (WSD) should be used for all developments five hectares or larger. WSD is consistent with the Stormwater Management Guidelines for the Bay of Plenty region and the NPS-FM. The most effective WSD method is a treatment train approach, which is a series of sequential stormwater treatments to maximise pollutant removal. This ensures that all stormwater runoff is treated at source or as close to the source as possible to maintain or improve stormwater quality post- development. This includes runoff from all roads, car parks, houses, and commercial areas. | Revise the stormwater plans to include extended detention, including a treatment train approach, for all impervious areas draining to the treatment wetland/pond. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 27 | 27.13 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The proposal states that stormwater attenuation will be provided. However, the Engineering Services Report notes that the watercourse will need to be upgraded where the pond discharges to prevent erosion of the watercourse banks in large storm events. More stormwater flowing into streams as a result of residential development can cause erosion and destabilise stream channels and the ground. Holding water back and releasing it slowly helps to reduce erosion. | Clarify if post-development Puanene Stream flows will be erosive, or if this refers to localised erosion at the outlet which requires erosion protection. Avoiding the requirement for new erosion protection structures in rivers and streams as a result of increased flows from the development is consistent with Objective 1 and Policies 1, 3, and 7 of the NPS-FM. Stormwater discharges and any associated structures must be designed to avoid accelerated stream channel erosion and scour of any river/stream. Erosion protection of outlets, streams, channels and overland flowpaths must be consistent with the Stormwater Management Guidelines for the Bay of Plenty region. |
| 27 | 27.14 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The plan change area drains into an area currently managed by a privately owned drainage system (Little Waihi Drainage Scheme), which relies on conveyance through modified water courses (including drains, channels and pump stations). An increase in impervious areas will result in: more stormwater discharging to the drainage scheme, more stormwater volume pumped during storm events, and associated increase in operational cost. The proposal fails to address the effect of increase in stormwater volume in relation to the drainage scheme design scenarios. | Clarify the appropriate stormwater volume mitigation and effects on the Little Waihi Drainage Scheme. |
| 27 | 27.15 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | The proposal indicates that 50% of the site's stormwater runoff will be discharged via ground soakage for the 10 year 10 minute storm and as such assumes that peak flow rates will not increase. The geotechnical investigation was undertaken during summer after a year of low flow conditions. The report identified groundwater at depths ranging from 1.0m to 4.3m below ground level and concludes that shallow groundwater below the more low-lying areas and swales may preclude the use of ground soakage in these areas. In addition, it is expected that during prolonged phases of rain and following rain events beyond the design levels of the drainage scheme, these groundwater levels will be elevated, and soakage will become less effective. For the secondary events up to 1% AEP 2130, a stormwater pond is proposed to manage peak flows. The report provides for a pond volume but fails to indicate the required area; the likely shallow groundwater in this area will limit the available pond depth. Visually the area seems to be around 2000m ² , which would require the pond to be around 2m deep. | Clarify the required size of the stormwater pond/wetland. This information should be worked out at structure plan stage as the stormwater wetland/pond size may affect the structure plan layout. |
| 27 | 27.17 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Stormwater Management | Support in part | Regional Council does not have a flood model for this catchment (the Wharere Canal catchment). However, flood modelling results from WBOPDC's rural settlement model indicate that the Puanene Stream capacity is limited. In addition, the bridges underneath State Highway 2 and the Kiwirail embankment appear to be undersized, resulting in ponding and overtopping in the 1% AEP RCP8.5 2130 climate change adjusted event. To avoid failures of this nationally important infrastructure, these assets may need to be upgraded in the future, which could result in increased flood flows downstream through the plan change area. | No relief sought. |
| FS40 [27] | FS40.3 [27.17] | Waka Kotahi [Bay of Plenty Regional Council] | | | | Support | As addressed in point 27.17 by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, NZTA agrees that adequate flood modelling and assessment needs to be undertaken to understand potential risk to the state highway network and any proposed mitigation required. | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 7 | 7.6 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | The junction at Highway 2 and Arawa Road is not equipped to handle increased traffic and would require significant modifications. The highway's curvature reduces visibility, posing a higher risk of collisions, particularly during low winter sun. Tainui Road and its junction with the highway would need substantial upgrades for safe access/egress. Overall, the existing road conditions, junction positions, limited visibility, and winter sun make it unsuitable for higher traffic volume. Arawa Road itself would need upgrades for heavy vehicles, buses and for children to cross the highway as it is proposed for school buses to enter the estate to pick up and drop off students, and the additional traffic would likely worsen road damage caused by current farm vehicles. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 8 | 8.2 | Craig Green, Lisa McArthur | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | There has been a marked increase in traffic flows on SH2 during peak traffic times. Long, continuous streams of traffic in both directions on SH2 make it challenging for current Arawa Road and Penelope Place residents to join the SH2 traffic flow safely, especially in the direction of Te Puke, the TEL road and Tauranga. We have observed repeated dangerous driving behaviours (most often overtaking) caused by impatient drivers stuck in these traffic flows. We believe that the extra vehicles in a ~130 home residential subdivision are likely to be close to 2 x vehicles per household, and without current viable/realistic public transport options for your average worker that an extra couple of hundred vehicles exiting and entering Arawa Road each day is an unacceptable increase in risk. We applaud the inclusion of an off-SH2 school bus stop and turning bay to service children safely getting to and from local schools, however the aspiration that the provision of such a bus stop will, by its existence, improve public transport options to mitigate resident vehicular movements is wishful thinking at best. | Decline this application to rezone to Residential based on this & other sections of our submission. |
| 9 | 9.3 | Graeme Gillespie | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | The negative aspects are the compromised access to SH2 off Arawa Road through congestion at peak periods. The Arawa Road/ SH2 intersection is challenging turning right onto SH2 due to the proximity of the bend to the east and volume and speed of traffic on SH2. The proposal is not supported by Waka Kotahi as other locations offer better integration between land use and transport. | Decline the plan change. |
| 10 | 10.1 | Robin Simmons | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support in part | In regard to a bus stop, there is no consideration of kids having to cross main road to catch or exit bus on rail road side of main road. High school students to Te Puke High and younger students coming home from Pongakawa school by bus. | Have consideration of kids having to cross main road to catch or exit bus on rail road side of main road. |
| 10 | 10.3 | Robin Simmons | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support | Road width/off street parking - as this is a rural residential area you need free unimpeded access for emergency vehicles at all times. | Road width/off street parking - as this is a rural residential area you need free unimpeded access for emergency vehicles at all times. |
| 11 | 11.3 | Neville and Jill Marsh | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support | The pull off areas to turn into Arawa Road or onto SH2 will still allow the SH2 road traffic to flow smoothly. | Council needs to support and approve Plan Change 95 for Pencarrow Estate to proceed. There is nothing we want changed. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|---|--|
| 14 | 14.4 | Rachael Sexton | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | The road access onto the main highway is very treacherous. There is very little turning left area coming off the highway from Te Puke direction, and if the school bus in dropping off or picking up children, then the bus stops in the turn off area. When coming from the Whakatane direction and turning right into the road, there is a turning bay, however again if someone else is turning left into Arawa Rd or the bus is there, you can't see past them. It is difficult getting in and out of the road anytime of the day. This is unsafe enough with the number of residents here at the moment, let alone adding up to 130 more residents, potentially 260 or more new vehicles trying to turn in and out. We have had our bus stop updated for our children to use when waiting for the bus, but this is on the other side of Arawa Road to where the bus stops, if it is raining and the children are in it, as the bus comes down the road, they all run across the road (very close to the highway intersection) to get to the bus. There is no public transport here, and no where safe for it to stop if there was. And the cost that it would take to improve the road intersection, when there are other communities with the correct infrastructure needed to accommodate such a development. | Decline the plan change. |
| 15 | 15.2 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | With this proposed development comes the increase of vehicles. The public transport out here is very limited and in turn means people do have to use their own transport to go anywhere. Our Arawa Rd/ SH2 intersection is dangerous with the existing volume of traffic from Arawa/Penelope Place. We have limited visibility onto SH2 from the Whakatane direction when exiting Arawa Rd. We have very little room to pull over to the left of SH2 when turning into Arawa Rd and when turning right into Arawa Rd we have to sit in the middle of the road facing oncoming traffic doing 100km. Unless there are alterations done to widen SH2 and create safe turning bays into Arawa Rd this will undoubtedly increase the risk of major accidents happening. The development may potentially bring a large amount of kids to the area and what the mode of transport required to get them to school etc. Pongakawa school is not within walking distance from here due to the fact that there are no foot paths. The school buses stop on the edge of SH2 to drop pick up and drop off kids. This is not ideal as it exists but there is no other option as they have nowhere to turn around if they turn into Arawa Rd. The highschool kids have to cross SH2 to catch their bus into town. I believe there is consideration to adding a turning bay for the buses at the entry of Pencarrow estate but I do not see any provisions for this noted on the plan. There is no existing infrastructure out here apart from a fuel station, a school and a hall, all of which one needs a vehicle to get to. We have to use SH2 to go anywhere. It makes no sense to me to want to put a subdivision in an area like this. | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 16 | 16.2 | Jordan O'Malley, Ian O'Malley | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | We oppose because of the risk of adding more private motor vehicles to the number of vehicles using intersection of SH2 and Arawa Road. It is such a dangerous intersection and we have had many near-miss accidents even though we are using this intersection as safely as we can. There is a median strip to use when turning right into Arawa Road; however, one end of the median strip is used for vehicles turning into Arawa Road and the other end is used for vehicles turning into Pongakawa School Road. Vehicles should be pulling into these median strips in close proximity to the road that they wish to turn into, but this is not what happens in reality. We have witnessed many drivers using the median strip from the start to the end. This risk could be minimised by creating a turning bay that vehicles can actually fit in rather than have half of the width of their vehicle still in the 100km road while turning into Arawa Road when travelling from the West. The length of this turning bay would need to be longer than it currently is because people need more time to slow down and turn safely. Even with ample indicating to turn and slowing while still on the bridge, cars behind still decide that they need to go around the turning vehicles, therefore putting them on the wrong side of the road and into the median strip. More private vehicles will use this intersection if this subdivision and development goes ahead. That is a very scary thought for us and the risks involved seem to be very understated in the assessment conducted by Harrison Transportation. | Oppose the planning map changes of Pencarrow Estate. If it is not opposed then we would want to see that adequate roading changes are put in place to minimise the risk of collisions at the intersection of Arawa Road and SH2. A reduction in the speed limit would help and also creating a turning bay that is longer than the length of road between Arawa Road and the current bridge. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| 17 | 17.1 | Joseph & Victoria Phillips | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | The intersection into Arawa from the highway is not fit to handle a higher volume of traffic. It is already a dangerous intersection to get in and out of and would almost definitely result in an increased amount of crashes. We have concern this will increase further congestion in the area due to insufficient public transport options available. This will result in the need for a high percentage of residents to be reliant on their own personal transport. | We urge council to listen to the existing residents in the area and stop any further progress in favour of the developer. |
| 18 | 18.2 | Jurgen Delaere | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | Accesses to Arawa Road from North to South off SH2 is extremely dangerous, my family and I have had several close encounters over the years and more so recently with the remapping of the paintwork on the road by the transport agency. Access onto SH2 from Arawa Road can take up to 5 minutes waiting for traffic to pass and get safe access. Arawa Road does not have the capabilities to endure another 100 plus vehicles daily and there is no public transport in this area. The Arawa Road to SH2 intersection will need major development to ensure it is safe to exit and entre and the speed limit on SH2 dropped in the area. | The proposal should be declined. The Arawa Road to SH2 intersection will need major development to ensure it is safe to exit and entre and the speed limit on SH2 dropped in the area. |
| 19 | 19.3 | Alan & Pasrieia Birley | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | We are concerned about the vehicle pressure on to the main highway 2 having only one access out. | We don't agree with the proposal. The removal of option 3. |
| 20 | 20.4 | Hamish Henderson | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | Low traffic volumes is part of the appeal of rural land. State Highway 2 is already a busy road with a high proportion of log trucks. This development will add more cars to this already busy road. Primary School access is along Pongakawa School Road. Travelling this involves crossing the busy SH 2 and the parallel railway. This is a significant risk even for a dedicated bus service. Hazards associated with the railway alone are of concern. The loss of valuable rural land and with the building of 130 new houses increasing the traffic volume on what is already a very busy highway, is justification enough to not approve this proposal. | The proposal should be declined. |
| 23 | 23.3 | Karen Summerhays, Nicola Cooke | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | Access to the TEL may cater for transportation concerns to Tauranga but in all likelihood the people living there will come to Te Puke for their local shopping. The traffic entering Te Puke from the east is already identified as a large issue so we don't want to add to that until viable solutions can be found. There will be pressure to provide public transport to this small rural community when we are already struggling to maintain a low level of service in the Te Puke and surrounds and there will be serious safety issues of buses accessing the highway and safe stops. | That the proposed Plan Change be declined. |
| 25 | 25.2 | Kirsten Jefferson | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support in part | Road access into and out of Arawa Road - I feel it is unsafe currently let alone having an extra 135 households using it as an entrance/exit road. | Alternative access to subdivision, not Arawa Road. |
| 26 | 26.6 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support in part | Waka Kotahi acknowledges the applicant's efforts in engaging with us prior to public notification of PC 95. In undertaking preliminary conversations with the applicant, Waka Kotahi has provided initial comments to the proposed intersection treatment upgrade of the Arawa Road/SH 2 Intersection. | On balance Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to Proposed Plan Change 95. Safe and efficient vehicular access to SH2 can be achieved with network upgrades broadly in line with those proposed. However, further information and some amendments are sought in this regard. In terms of next steps, Waka Kotahi requests that the applicant engage further with us on the proposed design solution. We consider the proposed upgrades to be appropriate to achieve a safe and efficient outcome, subject to some amendments. Waka Kotahi also requests a completed Safe System Audit for review and approval and a 10-year intersection capacity assessment. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| 27 | 27.33 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support in part | RPS Policy UG 3A promotes travel demand management across the region, including increasing public transport use, reducing use of private cars and ensuring adequate provision for and increased use of future public transport, walking, cycling networks and corridors, while providing for connectivity. | PPC95 should be amended to provide for the following: 1. The traffic impact assessment should provide information on multi-modal transport, notably public transport, walking and cycling. 2. The development's internal road network should provide more detail about how it will support people to access dwellings by providing a low speed environment supported with internal walking connections. 3. Provide bicycle parking in the vicinity of the development to encourage multi-modal travel. 4. Provide an accessibility map (or appropriate further analysis) that clarifies how walking and cycling is supported through the development, and how it integrates with the wider network. 5. Given the scale of the development, footpaths should also be provided along the frontage of the development to integrate to the wider network. 6. Consider undertaking a safety assessment to understand whether pedestrian crossing facilities are needed to support safe movement. 7. Recognise how the site could provide people with access to public transport, and services in the wider area. |
| FS40 [27] | FS40.4 [27.33] | Waka Kotahi [Bay of Plenty Regional Council] | | | | Support | NZTA supports point 27.33 by Bay of Plenty Regional Council, as it aligns with points raised in NZTA's initial submission over the need for more information/provisions regarding multi-modal transport, notably public transport, walking and cycling. As noted, further consideration is needed regarding the access to public transport, and services in the wider area. | |
| 30 | 30.2 | Paul Hickson | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Support in part | Waka Kotahi should reduce the speed limit to 70km per hour from the Puanene to east of the BP. This should be done now. If safety for pupils walking to Pongakawa School is a concern we would offer a safe walking trail via our wetland and our farm to the southern end of the Pongakawa School Road (our wetland is one of 6 NIWA sites in NZ). | Waka Kotahi should reduce the speed limit to 70km per hour from the Puanene to east of the BP. This should be done now. If safety for pupils walking to Pongakawa School is a concern we would offer a safe walking trail via our wetland and our farm to the southern end of the Pongakawa School Road (our wetland is one of 6 NIWA sites in NZ). |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|---|---|
| 31 | 31.7 | Rebecca and Cameron Black | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | We consider traffic safety a significant concern associated with the proposed development having access from State Highway 2. There is poor visibility in this location and an increase in traffic generation would compromise the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network. Section 5 of the road safety audit prepared by Abley recommends a reduction in speed limit on SH2 in the area of Arawa Road and an offset left turning lane for visibility. A reduction in the speed limit will disrupt traffic flows along this main arterial route. Section 5 also states that vehicle movements to and from the development would predominantly occur in the morning and evening with people going to work. This is assessed as reducing the potential risk of vehicle accidents. However, the variability of rural work is not sufficiently considered. It is reasonably assumed that a substantial proportion of residents will work on farms, an occupation requiring varied hours that will result in frequent vehicle movements throughout the day. The mitigation proposed is not considered sufficient to mitigate the potential adverse effects from development. The applicant and agents have referred to the site as being adequately serviced by public transport. We consider this entirely inaccurate, with bus transport limited to 1 trip per day and the development will not introduce sufficient demand for increased operation of this route. The applicant has also referred to the proximity of the railway and anticipated future development of public trains. This will provide no solution in the short or medium term due to New Zealand's single track line which can in no way accommodate a passenger service. | Decline the plan change. |
| 33 | 33.1 | Gaye Allan | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | I am opposed to the proposed Pencarrow Estate. I feel that developers haven't thought through the impact of traffic on Arawa Road coming into and out of Arawa Road with the 100km speed limit there will be no room for error coming into Arawa from Te Puke, with the bridge practically on the intersection, if two or more are entering Arawa, cars following will be stopped on that narrow bridge. At the moment the amount of cars from Arawa and Penelope is ok, add another 200 odd cars, not practical. I believe planned road upgrade into Arawa is minor, it needs to be major or no development. | A change to proposed roading would be another exit onto SH2 or Tainui Road, thus alleviating traffic congestion on Arawa Road. |
| 34 | 34.1 | Jodi Ahfook | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | I am opposed to the new subdivision that is going to be built. My main concern is the amount of cars that will be entering and exiting onto Arawa Road. Arawa Road is 800m approximately and if there is 130 houses we are looking at approximately 260 cars at any given time on Arawa Road, plus Penelope residents. The volume of traffic is going to be extreme at peak hour. State highway 2 to one of the most dangerous stretches of road with many accidents yearly. | There needs to be at least two ways of exiting the subdivision (not onto Arawa Road). Tainui Road would be ideal as it's a long stretch of road that could also be used by Arawa and Penelope residents. Possibly making the paper road a proper road going out to Wharere Road would also be a good plan. Arawa Road is just too short and small to cater to all that traffic. |
| 35 | 35.1 | Tai Ahfook | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | I am completely opposed to the new subdivision being implemented near Arawa Road. As a resident of Penelope Place, the exit onto the main highway is already fairly busy as it is. Having an extra 130 houses added and only having one entry and exit will make matters worse, possibly making chaos during mornings due to a school down Pongakawa School Road across the train track. State Highway 2 being a dangerous road as it is, having multiple crashes a year, adding over 130 cars will make traffic at peak hour utter chaos. Possibly endangering the safety of current residents and future residents. | Having one entry and exit onto Arawa Road isn't ideal, I would personally propose having a road stretch out to another existing road such as Wharere Road or Tainui Road as well as Arawa Road. This way it will minimise traffic and create an easier way out for those needing to go in a rush. |
| 36 | 36.1 | Gina and David Brookes | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | We oppose this plan. There is one small road that will service (an extra potential) 260 cars/people. Getting onto the main road is hard enough now without extra cars being involved. Can you imagine all those cars heading to work between 7-9am and again coming home at night. We have only been on Penelope Place for 5 years and already the road is getting excessive wear, when we are only going 20km max and needs repairing. Not safe. There is enough crashes out this way as it is - more cars under pressure will make it worse. | Do not build more houses or a major upgrade of the road would be necessary - more lanes, a turning bay off the main road - not in favour of this. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| 37 | 37.1 | Jo Delaere | Other - Not Specified | General | Traffic Effects | Oppose | Roading/ transport - Arawa Road & intersection to SH2 is incredibly unsafe at the moment neither let alone adding an extra 120 minimum cars to this scenario. There are no facilities here without having to get in vehicle to drive for anything including recreational (Pongakawa School is across SH2 and up a very busy country road - not safe for kids to walk to local pool, squash etc), health shops or employment - most horticultural work is seasonal and done by RSE schemes. Every local who lives on both Arawa Road and Penelope Place strongly oppose this as it will have a direct impact on our lives, including transport, transport/ roading safety including drop off/pick up of kids on buses. | Strongly oppose Pencarrow Estate. |
| 7 | 7.3 | Julian Clayton | Other - Not Specified | General | UFTI | Oppose | The proposal falls outside the District Council's urban growth plan and does not fit the smart growth strategy, it is not a connected centre and will not fit into the plan of emissions reduction through connected centres. Due to its geographic location, limited public transport, and distance from industrial and retail centers, residents are likely to heavily depend on personal transport, leading to increased pollution and congestion. The absence of convenient options for walking, cycling, or public transport further reinforces this reliance. The development would ultimately transform Pongakawa from a rural to an urban area. | Reject the proposed development in full. |
| 12 | 12.5 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | UFTI | Oppose | NZTA and BOPRC have similar concerns on the NPS-UD and the UFTI and that any development here will be reliant on high vehicle kilometres travelled by any future residents. NZTA do not support meeting housing demand through 'ad hoc' plan changes and developments or building houses 'for the sake of building houses' and NZTA prefer the connected centres approach with development in well functioning urban environments rather than in areas such as this PPC area without the range of services and amenities required to avoid substantial travel beyond the immediate locality. The BOPRC also advise that the Urban Form and Transport Initiative [UFTI] for the WBOP District does not identify Pongakawa as a potential urban growth location. The UFTI identified areas for and ways to increase housing supply with a Connected Centers programme and to avoid ad hoc plan changes and developments that are 'haphazard unguided and reactive'. The consequences of uncoordinated growth are additional costs to ratepayers for infrastructure and services, congestion and environmental degradation. By planning and delivering for the longer term, the SmartGrowth partners will avoid many of the negative consequences associated with growth. The site of this PPC is not recognised in the UFTI as a growth location and NZTA consider it to be unanticipated and out of sequence. This PPC is 'ad hoc' development that the UFTI project was set up for to avoid. The hard work, planning and cooperation by the various partners that went into developing the UFTI would have been in vain if a PPC such as this was successful. The applicants are trying to justify why their plans should ignore the principles and guidelines of the UFTI project but I believe their claims are unfounded and misleading. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.5 [12.5] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 23 | 23.4 | Karen Summerhays, Nicola Cooke | Other - Not Specified | General | UFTI | Oppose | If development is to occur in that general area, we believe Paengaroa is better placed to accommodate growth as identified in the UFTI plans. | That the proposed Plan Change be declined. |
| 26 | 26.5 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | UFTI | Support in part | Meeting housing needs through improvised plan changes and developments could undermine opportunities for development at scale with the critical mass to support the connected centres approach set out in UFTI and well-functioning urban environments. | Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to plan change 95. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---|---|
| 12 | 12.1 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | There has been talk of a development at this location for many years. Initially for large lifestyle type sections with wide tree lined streets and covenants on the sections for everything from building type to fence heights. Now it has morphed into a high density urban type development. Intensive development in existing urban areas is a necessary evil to increase housing supply however I do have concerns if this is an appropriate location for an intensive urban type development. This PPC appears to be inconsistent and contrary to the various policy statements on the urban form and transport initiative and housing supply, designed to guide local authorities to ensure housing growth happens in a planned, appropriate manner and avoid plan changes that are ad hoc, haphazard, unguided and reactive. How has the PPC been allowed to progress this far. The PPC Request appears to ignore natural, environmental and road safety hazards and all the Policy Statements that the Council has to operate under. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.1 [12.1] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 12 | 12.16 | Mike Maassen | Other - Not Specified | General | Water Supply | Oppose | There is a reticulated Council owned and maintained water supply from the Maniatutu Rd water supply that runs along State Highway 2 and services Pongakawa. This supply is at capacity and any future development will require an upgrade of the existing water supply from Maniatutu Rd. The current line was installed in 2002 and paid for with a targeted rate by the residents of Arawa Rd. The Penelope Place subdivision got around this by installing reservoirs to service the development. That was feasible with only 22 sections. With 130 sections planned a new water line from Maniatutu Rd would be acceptable. Supply capable of providing water for firefighting purposes is also required. At present there is no firefighting supply close to this PPC. This upgrade of the water supply to meet the needs of any future development here absolutely needs to be funded by the developers just as the existing line was funded on a user pays basis by the residents back then. It would be totally unfair on ratepayers if the needs of this Development were funded in any way by ratepayers. | Decline the plan change. |
| FS38 [12] | FS38.16 [12.16] | Hayden Dugmore [Mike Maassen] | | | | Support | Mike's Submission summarizes many peoples concerns and provides evidence for those concerns. I believe Mike is correct when he points out the flaws and issues with this development. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 1 | 1.1 | Craig Haggio | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | School Infrastructure is able to cope with the additional students the subdivision will create. There are huge grounds and a surrounding parcel of land which can also be developed for recreational and other purposes. The school receives regular inquiries from people wanting to move to the area asking of housing or land availability. Many of the older large dairy farms have now been converted to more intensive horticulture - kiwifruit, avocado etc. The required labour units increase as a result. it is important that housing is available close by. This makes sense as it not only makes living more affordable for workers but also will lower emissions and congestion on roads etc. | The adjustment to the plan by Council is supported. Further, the developers of Pencarrow Estate should be granted permission to begin as soon as they feel able to. |
| FS41 [1] | FS41.1 [1.1] | Robyne Cooper [Craig Haggio] | | | | Support | As a longstanding resident of Arawa Road... in excess of 35 years, I am aware of the benefits of living in this area and having had four sons and a grandson all attend Pongakawa School, have reaped the benefits of being part of this fabulous School and Community. We are aware of the severity of the current housing shortage with two of my children having to relocate and buy in Papamoa as there were no alternat options in this community. I feel this would benefit both out school and community. | 100% support the sub-division to give others the chance to grab their own "wee slice of paradise". |
| 2 | 2.1 | Maketu Volunteer Coastguard Maketu Volunteer Coastguard | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | This development is huge and most needed for the district. Good affordable residential building land near by is impossible to find. This is a great central location to live, work and play. Close to main amenities including our beaches and sea an opportunity for more people to belong to our organisation. We fully support this proposal. | Support the proposal. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|-----------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|--|---|
| 3 | 3.1 | Shane Beech | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | It just makes logical sense that this land is converted into usable sections to own/ build on. There is a huge lack of available sections in this part of the western bay area. With the ability to buy/ build on and live here is a bonus for everyone. As a business owner the ability for staff to live nearby means more opportunity for employment. Family's too will support local business. | Fully support this development. |
| 4 | 4.1 | Maketu Volunteer Fire Brigade Maketu Volunteer Fire Brigade | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | In this day and age, its extremely difficult to get and retain volunteers. The thought of having more people move into this area means there's more chance of recruiting volunteers to help protect and look after our people and their property. | Fully support the plan change. |
| 5 | 5.1 | Dianne Boothby | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | We are in total support of the plan change for rezoning. | Support the plan change. |
| 6 | 6.1 | Robert Allcard | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | Support the plan. | Support the Plan. |
| 9 | 9.1 | Graeme Gillespie | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | There are advantages and disadvantages from the proposed subdivision. Most significant concerns are due to the disregard of sound planning principles, common sense and the potential consequential costs to council. The proposal is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). In order to maintain integrity of the RPS the Regional Council would need to appeal any approval to the Environment Court creating unnecessary costs to both Councils. | The Private Plan Change application is declined as it is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement and sound planning principles. |
| FS38 [9] | FS38.19 [9.1] | Hayden Dugmore [Graeme Gillespie] | | | | Support | Graeme points out as Mike did that this proposal is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement. I wonder how this proposal wasn't rejected outright because of this. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 13 | 13.1 | Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group) | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | Te Puke has significant economic drivers and has developed extraordinary capability to grow and prosper. Te Puke has 6000ha of orchards and sophisticated post harvest facilities. Growth projections are positive. The Te Puke region has well established and connected communities, all with their own identity, social infrastructure and a history of economic and social progress. Centrally located, it has proximity and easy connection to the Bay of Plenty's 3 cities. With a population of 20000 approx. and GDP in excess of \$2b, our contribution to the national economic effort is both important and impressive. Pongakawa, with a population of 3000, is a well established and highly regarded community within the Te Puke region. It makes a significant contribution to our economic output and social wellbeing. This output will continue to grow. More housing is needed to support economic growth. Pongakawa includes and is surrounded by excellent social infrastructure (years 1-8 school, community hall, automotive service centre, rural farm service businesses, heritage society, safe and efficient road network, ambulance and fire services, beaches, Paengaroa, Te Puke, and Tauranga, Whakatane, Rotorua and the lakes within a 50 minute drive). The new Government is very clear on the importance of new housing. We prefer to see a much greater focus on greenfields developments, which means converting farmland into suburbs". The case for approval of the plan change is compelling. Superb location, well planned, high quality, strong economic drivers, excellent social infrastructure, satisfies housing demand, good placemaking, value addition to a successful community, is aligned with the National Policy Statement and is in sync with the vision of the new Government. | Approve the plan change. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|-----------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---|---|
| FS39 [13] | FS39.1 [13.1] | Bay of Plenty Regional Council [Mark Boyle (Te Puke Economic Development Group)] | | | | Oppose | <p>The proposal is not aligned with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), which aims to soften the edges of existing urban environments to allow growth to go up and out in urban locations with good access to existing services, public transport networks and infrastructure, not to enable satellite expansion or an ad-hoc growth pattern as proposed by Proposed Plan Change 95 (PPC95).</p> <p>Pongakawa social infrastructure, including the school, is nearly 2 kilometres from the existing settlement, across State Highway 2, with no safe way to walk or cycle across the highway and no footpath or cycle lane to safely access the Pongakawa amenities other than by private car. In addition, the only transport option to/from the development would be by private vehicle, rather than public or active transport. This means that the proposed development would not contribute to a well-functioning urban environment that is well-connected along transport corridors (clause 3.8(2) of the NPS-UD).</p> <p>Regional Council acknowledges the critical need for housing in the western Bay of Plenty. However, while development of this type appears attractive in the short term (providing housing), it leads to a sporadic, nonstrategic growth pattern and decentralised infrastructure that is costly to maintain in the long term. A more practicable option for addressing the housing shortfall in this district is greater intensification of Te Puke, as enabled by Plan Change 92 (PC92). PC92 will provide more capacity in Te Puke than originally anticipated, and so less greenfield land is required than previously calculated. Te Puke has existing social and community infrastructure including all levels of schooling, public transport, and a centralised wastewater treatment plant.</p> | Decline Proposed Plan Change 95 |
| 14 | 14.2 | Rachael Sexton | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | <p>This is a small rural community that supports a number of families with children. Currently the children and young people are able to roam and play in our community in safety from cars and non residents coming in. We as a community are all fully aware that our children are out and about and are careful as we come and go. This can be maintained with the small number of residents that we have here. I think you will find that most of the residents here are happy with the way things are currently, and we do not wish for change. Just maintaining what we have.</p> | Decline the plan change. |
| 15 | 15.1 | Cyndi and Troy O'Reilly | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | <p>We chose to buy our property in Arawa Rd because it offered the lifestyle we wanted - Rural, views, spacious, generously sized sections and out of town. If this development is to proceed it will take away the nice small safe rural community vibe we have and turn it into more of a town (suburb) environment which is not the reason we all live out in the country. This proposed development obviously means more people and with that no doubt brings an increased risk of crime, which this community has never had a problem with in the 18 years we have resided here. It is unnecessary and unwanted by a majority of the immediate community.</p> | I would like to see the council reject the Pencarrow Estate plan change for rezoning and development of land. |
| 21 | 21.1 | Paengaroa Community Association | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | <p>The Paengaroa Community Association have read the document for the proposed Pencarrow Estate development and we fully endorsed the proposed District Plan change 95. We strongly believe for our local rural communities to remain vibrant we need to future proof more housing stock. The John Dohnt development in Paengaroa has had a huge positive impact within our community. The voluntary and business sectors in our Paengaroa community were strengthened along with an increased attendance at the local schools and we believe the Pencarrow Estate development should be given the same opportunity to make a positive contribution to the Pongakawa community.</p> | Allow Pencarrow Estate to build houses, grow and develop more residential and commercial land. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|---|----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| FS38 [21] | FS38.21 [21.1] | Hayden Dugmore [Paengaroa Community Association] | | | | Oppose | Paengaroa community members would benefit from development in the immediate Paengaroa Area. Considering that Paengaroa has infrastructure, Sufficient roading, Shops, a School and a Park. I am surprised and disappointed that the PCA is advocating for development outside of their township. | Reject the Pencarrow plan change for Rezoning and development |
| 22 | 22.3 | Peter Cooney | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support | We have met with the Plan Change applicants and believe that their vision to enhance Pongakawa is one that will have positive social and economic effects for the community and surrounding rural area, while enhancing the supply of housing. The applicants long term association with the land, since the early 1970's I believe, has meant that they have tried to create a Plan Change that will provide housing capacity while resulting in long lasting positive effects for the community. Classics support the efforts the applicants have made in develop a robust structure plan that will create varied housing price points while respectful the existing Pongakawa urban area and surrounding environment. | Support the plan change as notified. |
| 23 | 23.1 | Karen Summerhays, Nicola Cooke | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Oppose | Overall, we support the objections raised by both the Bay of Plenty Regional Council and Waka Kotahi, in particular their concerns about the following. Stormwater management and onsite effluent treatment on low lying land and the pressures on the receiving environment. The high flood risk in a global warming environment/extreme weather events situation which are likely to result in future retreat or protection demands in the future. Access to the SH2 on a corner in a 100km speed zone (the road is already struggling with traffic and safety issues especially in the kiwifruit season). Protection of our productive land. | That the proposed Plan Change be declined. |
| 25 | 25.4 | Kirsten Jefferson | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support in part | I support development and growth but feel that a development of this size is unsustainable with the current infrastructure, amenities and facilities currently available. | |
| 26 | 26.3 | Waka Kotahi | Other - Not Specified | General | Whole of Plan Change | Support in part | Waka Kotahi is a Crown Entity established by Section 93 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA). The objective of Waka Kotahi is to undertake its functions in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest. Waka Kotahi's interest in this proposal stems from its role as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A transport investor to maximise effective, efficient and strategic returns for New Zealand; - A planner of the land transport network to integrate one effective and resilient network for customers; - Provider of access to and use of the land transport system to shape smart efficient, safe and responsible transport choices; and - The manager of the State Highway system and its responsibility to deliver efficient, safe and responsible highway solutions for customers. | On balance Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to Proposed Plan Change 95. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |
| 26 | 26.7 | Waka Kotahi | Section 12 - Subdivision and Development | 12.4.24 Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Traffic Effects | Support in part | Waka Kotahi notes that the applicant proposes to undertake upgrades to SH2 as a prerequisite to Stage 1. The upgrades would be required prior to the issuance of a certificate pursuant to Section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 or, prior to any land use or building consent activity being established on the site. | Waka Kotahi is neutral with regard to plan change 95. Safe and efficient vehicular access to SH2 can be achieved with network upgrades broadly in line with those proposed. However, further information and some amendments are sought in this regard. For the avoidance of doubt, Waka Kotahi seeks that the improvements (to SH2 as a pre-requisite to Stage 1) be made a prerequisite to <u>any</u> stage of the proposal (whichever stage occurs first), whether it be Stage 1, 2, 3 etc. Waka Kotahi seeks all consequential changes necessary to give effect to its relief sought. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 27 | 27.32 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council | Section 12 - Subdivision and Development | 12.4.24 Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa Structure Plan | Wastewater Infrastructure | Support in part | Reference to the Engineering Service Report (Lysaght, reference 225216 Rev 2 dated 1/9/2022) in the proposed addition to the District Plan would lock in the wastewater treatment system design inaccuracies noted in earlier submission points. | A revised report should be referenced in the District Plan once the inaccuracies noted in our submission points are satisfactorily corrected. |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------|--|---|