

Summary Report for District Plan Change 93 - Te Puna Springs

Topic	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
PC93-01: Whole of Plan Change	01: Whole of Plan Change	1	1	Morris, Douglas Kaye	Support	This rezoning is a means to develop commercial amenities for Te Puna in a planned and orderly manner	Supports the expansion of the commercial zone as put.
PC93-02: 3 - Definitions	01: NEW - Sensitive activity(ies)	4	3	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited		The reason for this change is that there are other references to sensitive activities in the District Plan, so the definition should be specific to Te Puna Springs. The activities now referenced also relate to activities as listed in the District Plan.	Reword the definition of sensitive activities as follows: "Sensitive Activity(ies) - Te Puna Springs" is specific to Area A Te Puna Springs Structure Plan and means activities which are sensitive to noise, spray, and odour and which have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects. This is limited to residential dwellings, minor dwellings, accommodation facilities, place of assembly, education facilities and medical/scientific facilities.
		6	4	Forest And Bird	Support with Amendment	The proposed definition for "Sensitive Activities" is somewhat different to how that term is defined in the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). The RPS term should be used, it is inclusive and would be applicable to the situation described in the proposal.	Change definition to be in line with the RPS definition
		14	1	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Support in part. Definition should incorporate reference to other activities which are likely to be sensitive to spray, such as commercial activities.
		14	2	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Support in part. Given the immediate proximity of kiwifruit orchard operations and high risk posed by spray activities, the definition should incorporate reference to other activities which are likely to be sensitive to spray, such as commercial activities.
		16	14	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Change definition to be in line with the RPS definition
PC93-03: 4C.5.3.2 - Activity Performance Standards	01: 4C.5.3.2 (h)(ii) - NEW - Screening in Industrial and Commercial Zones - Te Puna Springs Structure Plan	4	4	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited		The reason for this change is that these provisions should be separate requirements to better align with Plan formatting.	Separate the provisions in section 4C as follows 4C.5.3.2 Screening in Industrial and Commercial Zones a. Te Puna Springs Structure Plan (i) Any subdivision or development of land within the zone shall be designed, approved and developed in general accordance with the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan and Landscape cross-section in Appendix 7. (ii) Landscape plans shall be prepared by a qualified landscape designer and approved by Council. (iii) The plan for the stormwater pond shall be prepared in consultation with Pirirakau.
		8	4	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment	Heartlands draws attention to the existence of the 2020 Catchment Management Plan MOU between the two local councils, Pirirakau and itself, and asks that it also be represented in landscape plan development, at the very least for the stormwater pond and the "naturalised" spring.	More extensive involvement would be welcomed between the parties in the MOU
		14	3	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		More extensive involvement would be welcomed between the parties in the MOU
PC93-04: 19.3.1 - Permitted Activity Lists	01: 19.3.1 - Permitted Activities - NEW - Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only)	4	1	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited	Support with Amendment	The reason for this change is that the above activities are no longer needing to be provided for, given that Supermac/Modcom will relocate from the site if the land is rezoned.	Delete the following permitted activities under new Additional Activities list Activity List 19.3.1 Permitted Activities Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only) Rural Contractors Depot Offices (ancillary to activities occurring on site that are not provided for) Places of Assembly within Area B Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Warehousing and Storage

5	1	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	Support the removal of industrial type activities from the list of activities permitted on the site	Remove the additional permitted activities list
8	1	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose	Heartlands has come to the view that the present proposal also does not conform to the description of "commercial" purposes in the Operative District Plan. Instead, it puts forward a series of Plan Changes that inappropriately adjust the definition of reverse sensitivity rules so as to incorporate its intended level and type of operation alongside those activities that under the District Plan characterise commercial use. Seek to introduce, what are essentially industrial activities under the guise of a series of special rules for a commercial zone designation specifically limited to Te Puna Springs. The proposal also relies heavily on an argument, best expressed at its Appendix D, Economics Overview Report, that the redesignation of that part of the site zoned as rural land does not represent an actual 'loss' of rural land. In our submission, the fact that non-permitted land use - "a more industrial yard type use" has been operating on rural zoned land "for a number of years" is no argument that the proposed rezoning does not represent a loss of rural land.	Heartlands asks the applicant to address their real reasons for seeking a plan change and not to wrench the rules relating to commercial zoning into a shape that might permit them to carry out their intentions while paying very little attention to the extremely clear Objectives and Policies for commercial-zoned land in the Operative District Plan.
9	1	Bp Oil New Zealand Ltd	Support with Amendment	BP seeks clarification regarding the proposed addition of new permitted activities (Te Puna Springs only) under Rule 19.3.1, namely: (c) Places of Assembly within Area B However, the Section 32 Report attached as Appendix J in the PC 93 document recommends adding a new permitted activity rule (Te Puna Springs only), which is written as follows: (d) Places of Assembly within Area C. Within the Structure Plan, attached as Appendix C in the PC 93 document, (Te Puna Springs, Proposed Private Plan Change, 23 Te Puna Road, Tauranga prepared by Aurecon, for Te Puna Springs Estate Limited, dated 13 October 2021) there is no reference to an "Area C", nor is there anywhere throughout the entire document. BP seeks clarification of this inconsistency and further questions the need to include Places of Assembly as a permitted activity in the Te Puna Springs area when the Te Puna Hall, is a consented development, is the only planned "Place of Assembly" within the Structure Plan. BP seeks certainty that this Plan Change will not enable the expansion or intensification of use the hall without appropriate consideration of potential effects on traffic, access (especially for fuel tankers and heavy vehicles) and parking or establishment of similar facilities elsewhere in the plan change area.	We request an assessment of effects of the proposed changes to the existing zone rules and transport chapter as they relate to the Places of Assembly; or alternatively remove the Permitted Activity pathway for Places of Assembly and rely on the approved resource consent and related conditions.
11	1	Muggeridge, Lorraine Glenys	Support with Amendment	We have been consulted by the applicant and understand that there are a number of minor changes which the applicant seeks to make to the plan change which will remove industrial type activities from the list of activities permitted on the site. We support these amendments as they will result in better commercial zone outcomes and remove "industrial type activities"	Remove "industrial" type activities from permitted activities list
12	4	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	Can it please be clarified what type of manufacturing and the maximum number of employees per business. Please confirm in the updated documents for the application what will be permitted in this commercial zone that is being proposed to primarily serve the local rural community.	Confirm permitted activities

14	4	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Heartlands asks the applicant to address their real reasons for seeking a plan change and not to wrench the rules relating to commercial zoning into a shape that might permit them to carry out their intentions while paying very little attention to the extremely clear Objectives and Policies for commercial-zoned land in the Operative District Plan.
14	5	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Remove "industrial" type activities from permitted activities list
15	15	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Oppose		We request an assessment of effects of the proposed changes to the existing zone rules and transport chapter as they relate to the Places of Assembly; or alternatively remove the Permitted Activity pathway for Places of Assembly and rely on the approved resource consent and related conditions.
15	2	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Delete the following permitted activities under new Additional Activities list Activity List 19.3.1 Permitted Activities Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only) Rural Contractors Deport Offices (ancillary to activities occurring on site that are not provided for) Places of Assembly within Area B Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Warehousing and Storage
15	8	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Remove "industrial" type activities from permitted activities list
16	8	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose		Delete the following permitted activities under new Additional Activities list Activity List 19.3.1 Permitted Activities Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only) Rural Contractors Deport Offices (ancillary to activities occurring on site that are not provided for) Places of Assembly within Area B Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Warehousing and Storage
17	1	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support		Delete the following permitted activities under new Additional Activities list Activity List 19.3.1 Permitted Activities Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only) Rural Contractors Deport Offices (ancillary to activities occurring on site that are not provided for) Places of Assembly within Area B Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Warehousing and Storage

		18	1	Bp Oil New Zealand Ltd	Unknown		Delete the following permitted activities under new Additional Activities list Activity List 19.3.1 Permitted Activities Additional Permitted Activities (Te Puna Springs only) Rural Contractors Depot Offices (ancillary to activities occurring on site that are not provided for) Places of Assembly within Area B Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Warehousing and Storage
PC93-05: 19.2.5 - Non-complying Activity List	01: 19.3.5 - NEW - Non-complying Activities (Te Puna Springs only)	4	5	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited	Support with Amendment	Amend 19.2.5 as follows: 19.2.5 Non-complying Activities (Te Puna Springs only) (a) Sensitive Activities Te Puna Springs located within Area A Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area	The reason for this change is that the formatting and reference to the definition and structure plan area is improved.
		11	2	Muggeridge, Lorraine Glenys	Support	We strongly support the non-complying activity status of sensitive activities and the 30m buffer proposed. Such activities include those as set out in the plan change including places of assembly (such as cafes), accommodation and education facilities.	Support the non-complying activity status of sensitive activities and the 30m buffer proposed.
		14	6	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Support the non-complying activity status of sensitive activities and the 30m buffer proposed.
		15	9	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Support the non-complying activity status of sensitive activities and the 30m buffer proposed.
		17	2	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support		Support the non-complying activity status of sensitive activities and the 30m buffer proposed.
PC93-06: 19.4.1 - Activity Performance Standards	01: 19.4.1(a)(iv) - NEW - Height - Additional activity performance standard (Te Puna Springs Only)	4	6	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited	Support with Amendment	The reason for this change is that the wording better aligns with plan formatting	Amend Activity performance standards 19.4.1(General) to refer to: (iv) Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area The maximum height of buildings/structures shall be 12m
		8	5	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose	In Heartlands' view this scale of building, even if confined to Area A (the margins of the site) is inappropriate for the usual scale of commercial buildings and risks the introduction of more 'industrial' activities on site. We draw attention to the application's own acknowledgement that there is a history of non-compliance with zoning rules there.	Retain the lower height limit.
		12	5	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	We do not support the permitted height being increased to 12m. rather than 9 m. and wish the expected general understanding of a commercial zone to be retained and not be modified for purposes best suited to an industrial zone	Retain 9m height limit
		14	7	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Retain the lower height limit.
		14	8	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Retain 9m height limit
		15	3	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Oppose		Amend Activity performance standards 19.4.1(General) to refer to: (iv) Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area The maximum height of buildings/structures shall be 12m
		15	7	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Retain the lower height limit.

02: 19.4.1(viii) - Continuous Retail Frontage - exclude Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area	4	7	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited	Support with Amendment	The reason for this change is that the replacement wording better aligns with plan formatting.	Delete Activity performance standards 19.4.1 (general) relating to parking up to the road boundary and continuous retail frontage as notified by replacing the provisions with the following: (viii) Continuous retail frontage - Development in the Commercial Zone shall be constructed up to the road boundary except for vehicle access up to 6m wide per site. Note: For the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area, - this requirement shall not apply. - Each building shall have clear windows on the ground floor that must cover at least 50% of the buildings frontage to a main street and at least 25% for all other streets and public areas, such as walkways and public parking areas. - No car parking, other than underground parking, shall be located within 10m of any steel boundary Note: For the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan Area this requirement shall not apply.	
	8	6	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose	These proposed amendments are examples of how the standards of the commercial zone and its usual activities, as envisaged by the Operative District Plan, are unsuitable to the apparent intentions of the Te Puna Springs development and its immediate community.	Car parking in and around the environs of the community hall should be carefully consulted on and designed into the development to ensure the interests of all those coming and going from the area are catered for.	
	14	9	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Car parking in and around the environs of the community hall should be carefully consulted on and designed into the development to ensure the interests of all those coming and going from the area are catered for.	
	15	24	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Car parking in and around the environs of the community hall should be carefully consulted on and designed into the development to ensure the interests of all those coming and going from the area are catered for.	
PC93-07: Appendix 7 - Structure Plan	01: Structure Plan	4	2	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited	Support with Amendment	The reason for this change is that the change to the order better aligns with District plan formatting.	Reorder the List of Structure Plans in appendix 7 such that the Te Puna Structure plan is listed by geographic area.
		4	8	Te Puna Springs Estate Limited		The reason for this change is that the amendment better aligns with plan formatting. The title block incorrectly refers to "industrial" and areas A & B appear to have been cropped from the plans/maps.	Amend Appendix 7 by removal of the title block from the Structure plan drawing and add areas A and B Labels to the Structure plan drawing in Appendix 7 and the planning maps to show the demarcation between the two areas.
		5	3	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	Agree with the use of a Structure Plan to guide future development. Earlier development at the south-eastern end of the Te Puna Village has occurred on an ad hoc basis. This should be avoided.	That the structure plan be approved
		6	2	Forest And Bird	Support with Amendment	Some information and maps used appear to be out of date which is confusing, for example with respect to the location of the Te Puna Memorial Hall and its surrounding reserve area. This has not assisted in understanding the existing environment of the proposed development. The google satellite image and pictures used in the proposal show vegetation on the site however there is no mention of what this vegetation is or plans for its retention or removal.	Updates to maps is required.

8	8	Te Puna Heartlands		<p>Heartlands has grave concerns that the application's Structure Plan is in various ways inadequate and its inclusion in the Operative District Plan would, without substantial amendment, be unhelpful to future planning processes. Heartlands is in generally in favour of avoiding the piecemeal approach. But we object to the claim that the application enables "development of a new community hall, village green and pond".</p> <p>Heartlands also accepts that the "main street" bias evident in the commercial zone rules is not particularly applicable to the layout and topography of the Te Puna Village. Nevertheless the general concept of a commercial zone as a 'bumping place' where people engaged in a variety of business and social activities can come and go and meet up easily (and maybe even live in), is important and useful as a design guide. There is not much evidence of that in the proposed Structure Plan. On the basis of intentions as stated in the application, the locality is likely to be quite tightly packed with heavy and dangerous machinery, and non-motor traffic would have to be equally tightly controlled to be safe.</p>	Heartlands does not object to the proper use of zoning procedures to establish and encourage careful commercial development in some parts of Te Puna. Nevertheless provide evidence of the commercial zone as a 'bumping place' where people engaged in a variety of business and social activities can come and go and meet up easily (and maybe even live in).
10	4	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	<p>References to Areas A, B and C in 19.2.2 in the proposed plan change are not reflected in the planning maps as notified; and</p> <p>The reference in the plan be amended to accord with the district plan i.e., 19.3.2 as additional permitted activities to those provided for in the underlying commercial zone.</p>	Amend the proposed planning provisions for the plan change
11	4	Muggeridge, Lorraine Glenys	Support	We consider use of a Structure Plan to guide future development of the site is appropriate. This includes the applicant's proposal to manage stormwater, provide landscaping requirements, and develop a general roading and pattern for servicing.	This needs to include both fencing and landscaping in relation to our boundary. It also needs to ensure sufficient space for maintenance for any planting in the future.
12	1	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	<p>There are references to the hall site in three different locations in different documents for west boundary, north east corner and the current actual location as well as being omitted from some data.</p> <p>It appears that this zone change is occurring in isolation with no wider analysis or direction on how these objectives intended to benefit the community will be implemented. The proposal for the village green is commendable, but as neighbours we have questions about the suggested location, with a new presumably artificial spring being created with possible drainage implications down to the easily eroded three metre plus retaining wall on the eastern boundary of the Hall. Due to this steep barrier there would not be direct access between these two community owned sites and there has been no discussion with TPMHC about the integrated use of Hall facilities or parking for events. We suggest that this valuable high profile Te Puna Road roadside site could be better used for mixed use retail/residential as is occurring elsewhere, to encourage permitted affordable housing supply for local workers. The site is in a strategic position that could be used for a range of intensive rural activities using new technology.</p>	Clearly label on a larger to scale map the various proposed activity zones eg. where is A and B? Where will any proposed 12m buildings be located and is there still to be a village green and where is it to be linked to the Hall facility?. Please provide one revised and more detailed structure plan map showing the current intentions and widths of roads and buffer areas for the whole zone including the hall and its parking area. Ensure that any future permitted uses are of a scale and nature that encourages local retail and specialist businesses, some associated upper storey residential, and with a light footprint on the local environment.

13	3	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment	<p>The plan change area proceeds in a manner that enables integration with future development on adjacent land, including 35 and 49 Armstrong Road, and delivers good outcomes in terms of urban design and amenity. DCK has no fixed development proposal for its land but, having reviewed the plan change request, recognises that, if approved, kiwifruit operations will become less suitable for the site. Over the medium-to-long term, the land may be suitable for a retirement village or light commercial development similar to that located at the Te Puna Road/SH2 intersection.</p> <p>DCK therefore seeks that the development of the plan change area occurs in a way which recognises and does not compromise the potential for future development of 35 and 49 Armstrong Road, including in terms of locating appropriate activities on the site, orientation of buildings and consideration of connectivity.</p>	<p>Include specific requirements for the design of commercial development which make the plan change area subject to urban design standards addressing visual amenity, pedestrian network cohesion and logical transport network linkages. Identify 35 and 49 Armstrong Road as a future development area in the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan; and Require assessment of the extent to which proposed development in the plan change area provides for appropriate integration with future development of 35 and 49 Armstrong Road, including in terms of the orientation of buildings, infrastructure provision and roading layout.</p>
14	10	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Updates to maps is required.
14	11	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Heartlands does not object to the proper use of zoning procedures to establish and encourage careful commercial development in some parts of Te Puna. Nevertheless provide evidence of the commercial zone as a 'bumping place' where people engaged in a variety of business and social activities can come and go and meet up easily (and maybe even live in).
14	12	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Amend the proposed planning provisions for the plan change
15	12	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>Include specific requirements for the design of commercial development which make the plan change area subject to urban design standards addressing visual amenity, pedestrian network cohesion and logical transport network linkages. Identify 35 and 49 Armstrong Road as a future development area in the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan; and Require assessment of the extent to which proposed development in the plan change area provides for appropriate integration with future development of 35 and 49 Armstrong Road, including in terms of the orientation of buildings, infrastructure provision and roading layout.</p>
15	4	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Amend Appendix 7 by removal of the title block from the Structure plan drawing and add areas A and B Labels to the Structure plan drawing in Appendix 7 and the planning maps to show the demarcation between the two areas.
16	10	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose		Amend Appendix 7 by removal of the title block from the Structure plan drawing and add areas A and B Labels to the Structure plan drawing in Appendix 7 and the planning maps to show the demarcation between the two areas.
16	11	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		That the structure plan be approved
16	23	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Amend the proposed planning provisions for the plan change
16	25	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>Clearly label on a larger to scale map the various proposed activity zones eg. where is A and B? Where will any proposed 12m buildings be located and is there still to be a village green and where is it to be linked to the Hall facility?. Please provide one revised and more detailed structure plan map showing the current intentions and widths of roads and buffer areas for the whole zone including the hall and its parking area.</p> <p>Ensure that any future permitted uses are of a scale and nature that encourages local retail and specialist businesses, some associated upper storey residential, and with a light footprint on the local environment.</p>

		16	30	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		Include specific requirements for the design of commercial development which make the plan change area subject to urban design standards addressing visual amenity, pedestrian network cohesion and logical transport network linkages. Identify 35 and 49 Armstrong Road as a future development area in the Te Puna Springs Structure Plan; and Require assessment of the extent to which proposed development in the plan change area provides for appropriate integration with future development of 35 and 49 Armstrong Road, including in terms of the orientation of buildings, infrastructure provision and roading layout.
		16	9	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose		Reorder the List of Structure Plans in appendix 7 such that the Te Puna Structure plan is listed by geographic area.
PC93-08: General	01: Fish and bird habitat	6	3	Forest And Bird	Oppose	It is not clear whether the pond and waterways support much fish, or provide habitat to birds.	Give consideration to NPSFM and NES for Freshwater
		14	13	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Give consideration to NPSFM and NES for Freshwater
		16	13	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Give consideration to NPSFM and NES for Freshwater
		17	6	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		Give consideration to NPSFM and NES for Freshwater
	02: Rural Zone, amenity and reverse sensitivity	7	1	Cooney, Tim and Merry	Oppose	The basis for the existing commercial zoning was established to provide commercial activities to support the immediate rural/residential area. Any expansion of the present commercial zone of the applicant's total land area will have adverse effects on the amenity values and rural environment of the adjoining rural properties and community. The rezoning request based on the fact that the site is unlikely to be used for rural use is unsupported. The large majority of the submitter's property is zoned rural and is eminently suited for horticulture crops. The land is largely of excellent, flat contour and is highly fertile. The close proximity of post-harvest facilities and avocado processing further enhance the horticultural prospects as economic land. There are many examples in the Te Puna Catchment of smaller rural lots being economic	That the zoning remain as the status quo.
		11	5	Muggeridge, Lorraine Glenys	Support	The applicant has agreed with us that they will ensure that suitable covenants are imposed on the land to provide for quality commercial development in the future. This includes a specific reverse sensitivity covenant in relation to rural horticultural activities which are carried out on our land including spraying, noise, and the operation of rural machinery. Our primary concerns, that we seek the Plan Change provisions address are: (a) Reverse Sensitivity effects (b) Rural Amenity and Rural Character effects; (c) Adverse effects on appellants including from commercial uses on the site such as from noise, traffic, and contaminant discharges;	Protect rural activities, rural amenity and other adverse effects ie. reverse sensitivity effects.

13	1	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment	<p>The existing artificial shelterbelt is likely to be insufficient to prevent dust from operational, and in particular, construction activities in the plan change area from permeating the orchard.</p> <p>Dust can have a catastrophic impact on productivity and the quality of the fruit produced. Minute particles lodge under the calyx of the fruit, rendering an entire crop unsuitable for export.</p> <p>Kiwifruit vines are highly susceptible to attack from an Australian pest species, the Passion Vine Hopper. Passion Vine Hopper is extremely difficult to control and an infestation at Okaro Orchard would inevitably render kiwifruit unsuitable for export. It is therefore critical that plant species for landscaping in the plan change area are carefully selected so as not to harbour them or other potentially invasive or damaging species of organisms, to avoid inadvertently introducing them to the orchard.</p> <p>Spraying needs to be undertaken at the appropriate times which are dictated by wind speed and direction. The timing of spraying therefore cannot be constrained by activities on adjacent land. The plan change request states that in light of prevailing winds the most significant risk in terms of spray drift is from the orchard at 648 SH2. However, the Okaro Orchard is significantly closer to the proposed development area than that orchard. In northerly winds, the existing artificial shelterbelt is likely to be insufficient to prevent spray drift towards the plan change area and the proximity of the orchard is more likely to give rise to anxiety from neighbours about spraying activities.</p>	<p>Require an appropriate barrier between the plan change area and Okaro Orchard to prevent dust incursion into the orchard from construction and operational activities;</p> <p>Limit activities in the plan change area to those which do not produce significant quantities of dust</p> <p>that all planting on the site utilises plants that are not attractive to Passion Vine Hopper or other potentially invasive or damaging species of organisms, as determined by a suitably qualified independent ecologist.</p> <p>DCK therefore seeks amendments to require an appropriate barrier between the orchard and the plan change area that is capable of preventing spray incursion.</p>
14	14	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Protect rural activities, rural amenity and other adverse effects ie. reverse sensitivity effects.
15	10	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>Require an appropriate barrier between the plan change area and Okaro Orchard to prevent dust incursion into the orchard from construction and operational activities;</p> <p>Limit activities in the plan change area to those which do not produce significant quantities of dust</p> <p>that all planting on the site utilises plants that are not attractive to Passion Vine Hopper or other potentially invasive or damaging species of organisms, as determined by a suitably qualified independent ecologist.</p> <p>DCK therefore seeks amendments to require an appropriate barrier between the orchard and the plan change area that is capable of preventing spray incursion.</p>
16	15	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That the zoning remain as the status quo.
16	24	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		Protect rural activities, rural amenity and other adverse effects ie. reverse sensitivity effects.
16	28	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		<p>Require an appropriate barrier between the plan change area and Okaro Orchard to prevent dust incursion into the orchard from construction and operational activities;</p> <p>Limit activities in the plan change area to those which do not produce significant quantities of dust</p> <p>that all planting on the site utilises plants that are not attractive to Passion Vine Hopper or other potentially invasive or damaging species of organisms, as determined by a suitably qualified independent ecologist.</p> <p>DCK therefore seeks amendments to require an appropriate barrier between the orchard and the plan change area that is capable of preventing spray incursion.</p>
17	3	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		Protect rural activities, rural amenity and other adverse effects ie. reverse sensitivity effects.

	17	4	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		Require an appropriate barrier between the plan change area and Okaro Orchard to prevent dust incursion into the orchard from construction and operational activities; Limit activities in the plan change area to those which do not produce significant quantities of dust that all planting on the site utilises plants that are not attractive to Passion Vine Hopper or other potentially invasive or damaging species of organisms, as determined by a suitably qualified independent ecologist. DCK therefore seeks amendments to require an appropriate barrier between the orchard and the plan change area that is capable of preventing spray incursion.
03: Stormwater and Natural Waterways	3	6	Shepherd, Julie	Support	The Oturu stream has multiple branches which the effects of the commercial zone will deposit stormwater surface run off to.	That the stormwater will be managed appropriately as clean and treated on site, prior to temporary or permanent discharge. Performance standards to be formed/checked to ensure this requirement.
	5	2	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	Support the applicants stormwater approach, which also caters for the stormwater from our land.	Approve the Stormwater approach
	6	1	Forest And Bird	Oppose	We understand that along the western boundary there is a natural waterway that is part of the wider Te Puna catchment, that has been modified over time, and this is referenced in the name "Te Puna Springs". We are concerned that there has not been appropriate consideration given to natural and cultural values associated with waterway and to the potential for restoration of this waterway. It is unclear whether the drain(s) on the side are modified water courses and should be considered within the RMA definition of "river". If this is the case then the NES for Freshwater may be applicable. Some consideration should be given to the NPSFM and the NES for Freshwater given the catchment flow paths and apparent adjacent stream and possible onsite stream. Forest & Bird have concerns that the stormwater management approach which would confine retention to smaller area (ie the lower area at the south west corner is to be level off for commercial development) will remove natural features. There appears to have been no consideration of retaining natural features and values of the natural contoured land. We also question whether there is any "wetland" or "natural wetland" on site or adjacent that could be affected. This would be expected given the low catchment location and pond. It appears that the pond may have replaced more widespread wetland at some point in the past and may still have natural values associated with it. There does not seem to be any consideration of downstream effects on natural values and an assessment of this should be undertaken. Given there is an expected increase in stormwater runoff	That consent is granted with amendments to address our concerns
	7	4	Cooney, Tim and Merry	Oppose	Being an affected property owner downstream of the Te Puna Springs site, we are concerned in regards to the stormwater management: • The proposed change of a large rural lot into hard surfaces and resulting run off into the Oturu Creek, flooding downstream properties. Why should such properties suffer as a result of the proposed change? • The water quality being contaminated from commercial activities as a result the proposed change impacting on fish life in the Oturu Creek and Waikaraka Estuary. • We note highly important wetlands have already been desecrated.	That the zoning remain as the status quo.

8	2	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose	<p>The threat to the ecology and water quality along the tributary watercourse that eventually feeds into the Oturu Stream is a concern.</p> <p>Heartlands, in its function as an advocate for community views as expressed in the Te Puna Community Development Plan, has put some effort into long-term measures intended to protect and if possible enhance the state of Te Puna's various watercourses. We have a record of patient attention to these issues dating back to 2011 and culminating in a Memorandum of Understanding between Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Pirirakau Iwi Incorporated, the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and Te Puna Heartland Incorporated that was signed off in mid-2020. In keeping with the spirit and intention of the MOU of June 2020, we inquire which of the signatories (Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Western Bay of Plenty District Council, Te Puna Heartlands Inc and Pirirakau Inc) will be involved in the practical function of monitoring and maintaining the effect the proposed (private) stormwater pond may have on the adjacent contributory to the Oturu Stream?</p> <p>Has consideration been given to the impact that this new element of wetland ecology will have in terms of the Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent (RM17-0121) that was, in 2020, renewed for a further 30 years. Heartlands regrets that an early suggestion, that WBoPDC should take on the management of the pond and its environs (as per Tauranga City's practice with the Gordon Carmichael Reserve) was apparently not taken up by the developer.</p>	<p>Give consideration to the Oturu Stream and tributaries ecology and water quality.</p> <p>Give consideration been given to the impact that this new element of wetland ecology will have in terms of the Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent (RM17-0121).</p>
10	3	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	<p>There is an identified a water course within the Plan Change area in addition to the other waterbodies (streams/wetlands) including a spring on the site. BOPRC seek that an ecological assessment is prepared to identify the values of this stream as required by Policy IMP1A in the Regional Natural Resources Plan (RNRP) which seeks to avoid losses in extent and values of streams.</p> <p>While peak flows are being controlled by attenuation, the PC does not provide for methods to manage run-off control/run-off reductions such as water sensitive urban options (at source controls, rain gardens and swales etc.) to manage stormwater quality and volume from the plan change into the receiving environment.</p> <p>The proposed access off the lay-by adjoining SH 2 would be located upstream of the identified stream. Accordingly, the proposed location of the access in this location will likely increase contaminants into the stream network overtime, particularly during large flood events.</p> <p>The proposed treatment ponds will be inundated during a large event and are highly likely to re-suspend metals into the downstream environment. BOPRC seek that the treatment ponds are located outside of the 1% AEP flood plain/overland flow path.</p>	<p>Oppose the proposal or elements of it, in so far as it would not give effect to the relevant provisions of the NPS-FM and the RPS and would be inconsistent with the relevant freshwater provisions of the Bay of Plenty RNRP.</p> <p>Undertake an ecological assessment of the proposed stream.</p> <p>Oppose the commercial zone on parts of the plan change area that include rivers/streams and or wetlands: appropriate buffers should also be provided;</p> <p>Relocate or design the 'Structure Plan Stormwater Pond', in particular the proposed treatment ponds, so that the loss of extent and values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP and NPSFM; and</p> <p>Control design matters to ensure the proposed access off the layby adjoining SH2 does not result in the loss of values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP;</p> <p>BOPRC seek that the plan change includes (but not limited to) methods to manage water quality).</p>
11	3	Muggeridge, Lorraine Glenys	Support	<p>We also support the applicant's stormwater approach, which also caters for stormwater treatment and detention prior to any discharge to the stream.</p>	

12	2	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee		<p>Clarify the actual minimum size and capacity of the ponds and the total wetland and location of the bunds and ponds there are several different figures listed in various documents.</p> <p>Will the planned private three ponds wetland achieve a high level of efficiency or environmental enhancement or be managed to standards expected by the Regional Policy Statements and Catchment Management Plans. We seek close study of the final detailed construction, planting and management plans by the relevant officials especially if the ponds are not to be acquired by Council as a public good stormwater reserve.</p> <p>There is considerable data about predicted flows and acceptable AEP and water quality. None refers to the practical impact of the new commercial block currently being completed on the opposite side of Te Puna Road. One earlier diagram shows a flow path directly down the slip road into the Hall carpark and no indication of flow from the large sealed area adjacent to the service station. How will the separate commercial area (proposed boat yard with all sealed surfaces?) surrounded by roads, control its offsite flows and be integrated into the wider catchment management plan?</p> <p>The Hall is at a lower level than much of the area and we seek further updated information that the final designs are integrated with existing systems and there is no flood risk to the Hall property or other adjacent roads and properties. Is there active commitment from the applicant to the development of the CMP for the three catchments and that both Councils ensure there is integrated planning and</p>	<p>Clarify the actual minimum size and capacity of the ponds and the total wetland and location of the bunds and ponds. Seek close study of the final detailed construction, planting and management plans.</p> <p>Confirmation that the hall property is at no risk to flood. That opportunities are provided for in the resource consent for shared environment enhancement projects in the Applicant's area of the Oturu catchment.</p>
13	2	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment	<p>A tributary of the Waikarakei Stream runs through the plan change area and downstream through 49 Armstrong Road and neighbouring properties. The plan change request refers to the stream as a "small drain" and makes no further reference to it. No ecological assessment is provided, nor does the plan change request contain any assessment of the proposal against the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020, National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Management 2020 and the freshwater provisions of the Bay of Plenty Regional Natural Resources Plan. Development of the site provides an opportunity to improve the health of the waterway</p>	<p>The stream and its riparian margins are properly identified and assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist.</p> <p>The location of the stream is identified on the proposed Te Puna Springs Structure Plan map</p>
14	15	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		<p>That consent is granted with amendments to address our concerns</p>
14	16	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		<p>Give consideration to the Oturu Stream and tributaries ecology and water quality.</p> <p>Give consideration been given to the impact that this new element of wetland ecology will have in terms of the Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent (RM17-0121).</p>

14	17	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		<p>Oppose the proposal or elements of it, in so far as it would not give effect to the relevant provisions of the NPS-FM and the RPS and would be inconsistent with the relevant freshwater provisions of the Bay of Plenty RNRP.</p> <p>Undertake an ecological assessment of the proposed stream. Oppose the commercial zone on parts of the plan change area that include rivers/streams and or wetlands: appropriate buffers should also be provided; Relocate or design the 'Structure Plan Stormwater Pond', in particular the proposed treatment ponds, so that the loss of extent and values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP and NPSFM; and</p> <p>Control design matters to ensure the proposed access off the layby adjoining SH2 does not result in the loss of values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP;</p> <p>BOPRC seek that the plan change includes (but not limited to) methods to manage water quality).</p>
15	11	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>The stream and its riparian margins are properly identified and assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist. The location of the stream is identified on the proposed Te Puna Springs Structure Plan map</p>
15	18	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		That consent is granted with amendments to address our concerns
15	19	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		That the zoning remain as the status quo.
15	20	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>Give consideration to the Oturu Stream and tributaries ecology and water quality. Give consideration been given to the impact that this new element of wetland ecology will have in terms of the Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent (RM17-0121).</p>
15	23	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>Oppose the proposal or elements of it, in so far as it would not give effect to the relevant provisions of the NPS-FM and the RPS and would be inconsistent with the relevant freshwater provisions of the Bay of Plenty RNRP.</p> <p>Undertake an ecological assessment of the proposed stream. Oppose the commercial zone on parts of the plan change area that include rivers/streams and or wetlands: appropriate buffers should also be provided; Relocate or design the 'Structure Plan Stormwater Pond', in particular the proposed treatment ponds, so that the loss of extent and values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP and NPSFM; and</p> <p>Control design matters to ensure the proposed access off the layby adjoining SH2 does not result in the loss of values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP;</p> <p>BOPRC seek that the plan change includes (but not limited to) methods to manage water quality).</p>
16	12	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That consent is granted with amendments to address our concerns
16	18	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That the zoning remain as the status quo.

16	22	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>Oppose the proposal or elements of it, in so far as it would not give effect to the relevant provisions of the NPS-FM and the RPS and would be inconsistent with the relevant freshwater provisions of the Bay of Plenty RNRP.</p> <p>Undertake an ecological assessment of the proposed stream. Oppose the commercial zone on parts of the plan change area that include rivers/streams and or wetlands: appropriate buffers should also be provided; Relocate or design the 'Structure Plan Stormwater Pond', in particular the proposed treatment ponds, so that the loss of extent and values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP and NPSFM; and</p> <p>Control design matters to ensure the proposed access off the layby adjoining SH2 does not result in the loss of values of any river/stream is avoided as required by Policy IMP 1A of the RNRP;</p> <p>BOPRC seek that the plan change includes (but not limited to) methods to manage water quality).</p>
16	29	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		<p>The stream and its riparian margins are properly identified and assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist. The location of the stream is identified on the proposed Te Puna Springs Structure Plan map</p>
16	7	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>That the stormwater will be managed appropriately as clean and treated on site, prior to temporary or permanent discharge. Performance standards to be formed/checked to ensure this requirement.</p>
17	11	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		<p>That the stormwater will be managed appropriately as clean and treated on site, prior to temporary or permanent discharge. Performance standards to be formed/checked to ensure this requirement.</p>
17	5	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support		<p>That consent is granted with amendments to address our concerns</p>
17	7	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		<p>That the zoning remain as the status quo.</p>
17	8	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		<p>Give consideration to the Oturu Stream and tributaries ecology and water quality. Give consideration been given to the impact that this new element of wetland ecology will have in terms of the Comprehensive Stormwater Discharge Consent (RM17-0121).</p>
17	9	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support		<p>The stream and its riparian margins are properly identified and assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist. The location of the stream is identified on the proposed Te Puna Springs Structure Plan map</p>

04: Traffic, access and parking	8	7	Te Puna Heartlands	Oppose	<p>Although the developer is taking full advantage of the useful entry and exit points off SH2 to the south and Te Puna Road to the east, we see no provision being made for multi-modal transport linkages as required for a commercial zone under the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>The roadway seems to be conceived as being for wheeled, possibly many-wheeled, motor vehicles only and makes no obvious concessions to pedestrian and cyclist traffic safety. Nor - with the possible exception of the cul-de-sac at the northwards offshoot of the road - are there any areas set aside for parked or stationary vehicles. This is very unlike the sort of traffic management design that usually goes with commercial use, and is further evidence that the applicant has no sincere intention of creating opportunities for economic activity that are commercial as opposed to industrial.</p>	Heartlands would expect to see this useful access route through the heart of the site built to standards that allow for ordinary public access (motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians) and that may be - as often happens in other commercial developments - ultimately vested in the Council as a public road.
	9	2	Bp Oil New Zealand Ltd	Support with Amendment	<p>BP's concern relates to traffic and access (especially for fuel tankers and heavy vehicles) and the lack of clarity regarding the nature and extent of changes to the road network and proposed circulation of vehicles within the Plan Change area and the potential effects of the same on BP's operations, including tanker deliveries and heavy vehicle movements. This is particularly the case with the proposed private road that would circulate from the slip lane to the west of the BP site, through the PC area and intersect with Te Puna Road to the north. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) notes that T-Junction intersections would be installed on the slip lane from the state highway and at the intersection with Te Puna Rd. No review of the impacts in relation to the slip lane and access to the BP site has been tabled based on the assumption that Waka Kotahi (NZTA) accounted for the proposed amendments to the District Plan as being similar to those that were considered when the SH 2 roundabout was modelled. BP notes a lack of assessment and analysis on the local effects of the proposed private road as they relate to the slip lane and found little to no assessment in the s32 report related to traffic and associated effects.</p>	In the absence of robust s32 analysis and effects assessment in relation to traffic, access and parking, BP does not consider that PC93 has been developed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements nor demonstrated that the proposed zoning and provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. As such, BP seeks that PC93 be declined, such that the split zoning and lower intensity of use is retained.

12	3	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	<p>Our Hall northern boundary must be better protected from the anticipated high number of traffic movements. We accept an access road with suitable hedged planting on the west boundary with some form of traffic calming which avoids excess noise from heavy traffic, although future plans for our western grassed space are not yet decided.</p> <p>Parking will always be a problem as there are few public transport commuter options, very limited park and ride provisions and overflow from commercial activities to the Hall area is totally unacceptable. In addition to the required on site provisions, TPMHC suggests angle car parking adjacent to this hedge as a further buffer south of the 11m wide roading strip. It appears that only a 20m strip is being provided but it would be consistent to provide a 30m buffer zone as on the north and west boundaries.</p> <p>It is preferable that any oversize loads use the western access road but this is unlikely with the current SH2 configuration. Therefore we assume that there will be modification of the exit on to Te Puna Road and widening south to the SH2 roundabout for safer traffic merging and to reduce the impacts of the anticipated traffic pressure around the extended urban area.</p> <p>The western access road is labelled a private road but does this refer to the full length of the proposed access road?</p>	<p>Request further consultation and assessment of the impact of the proposed activities.</p> <p>We request a solid 2m. concrete block wall or similar to best mitigate impacts from the traffic and any other adverse effects. Inside this we accept a 2m wide well maintained evergreen and disease resistant hedge strip with a height restriction to be confirmed by the landscape designer (4m?) to ensure no shading to the Hall's grass spaces that are used for outside events.</p> <p>To give long term certainty about maintenance, quality standards and being fit for the purpose we recommend that the full length is built to Council public roading standards with a full length shared cycle/foot path and is vested in Council. Is this to be a road for general use or restricted to users in the zone?</p> <p>The quality of the seal makes a significant difference to the road traffic noise levels. We seek assurances that there will be a smooth asphalt or similar, rather than coarse chip surface.</p>
14	18	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		Heartlands would expect to see this useful access route through the heart of the site built to standards that allow for ordinary public access (motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians) and that may be - as often happens in other commercial developments - ultimately vested in the Council as a public road.
14	19	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		In the absence of robust s32 analysis and effects assessment in relation to traffic, access and parking, BP does not consider that PC93 has been developed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements nor demonstrated that the proposed zoning and provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. As such, BP seeks that PC93 be declined, such that the split zoning and lower intensity of use is retained.
15	25	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Heartlands would expect to see this useful access route through the heart of the site built to standards that allow for ordinary public access (motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians) and that may be - as often happens in other commercial developments - ultimately vested in the Council as a public road.
15	26	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		In the absence of robust s32 analysis and effects assessment in relation to traffic, access and parking, BP does not consider that PC93 has been developed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements nor demonstrated that the proposed zoning and provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. As such, BP seeks that PC93 be declined, such that the split zoning and lower intensity of use is retained.
16	19	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		In the absence of robust s32 analysis and effects assessment in relation to traffic, access and parking, BP does not consider that PC93 has been developed in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements nor demonstrated that the proposed zoning and provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. As such, BP seeks that PC93 be declined, such that the split zoning and lower intensity of use is retained.

	16	26	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>Request further consultation and assessment of the impact of the proposed activities.</p> <p>We request a solid 2m. concrete block wall or similar to best mitigate impacts from the traffic and any other adverse effects. Inside this we accept a 2m wide well maintained evergreen and disease resistant hedge strip with a height restriction to be confirmed by the landscape designer (4m?) to ensure no shading to the Hall's grass spaces that are used for outside events.</p> <p>To give long term certainty about maintenance, quality standards and being fit for the purpose we recommend that the full length is built to Council public roading standards with a full length shared cycle/foot path and is vested in Council. is this to be a road for general use or restricted to users in the zone?</p> <p>The quality of the seal makes a significant difference to the road traffic noise levels. We seek assurances that there will be a smooth asphalt or similar, rather than coarse chip surface.</p>
05: Regional Policy Statement - Natural Hazards	10	2	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	<p>Clause (a) of Policy NH 9B requires that a risk assessment is required using the methodology set out in Appendix L of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) for changes in land on urban sites of more than 5(ha). The risk assessment should identify which hazards are applicable to the plan change area. At a minimum, the risk assessment should consider flooding, landslide, liquefaction, and active faults. Once the risk assessment is completed, the development proposal is required to consider how a low level of natural hazard risk will be achieved as required under Policy NH 4B. Where appropriate, provisions in the structure plan will be required to ensure that a low level of risk can be achieved in the plan change area for each of the respective hazards.</p> <p>The flood maps in Western Bay of Plenty District Plan area do not identify the extent of the overland flow paths and therefore, are not protected unless the activities are discretionary or non-complying activities (refer to Rules 8.5.1.3 and 8.5.2 of the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan) which provides for the most up to date flooding information to be considered. In absence of provisions to protect 'unmapped' overland flow paths in the district plan, provisions to manage development and activities and protect the storage and conveyance function of the overland flow paths are sought to ensure future development would not increase risk outside of the plan change area.</p> <p>The Small Settlement and Rural Flood risk Model (T&T February 2021) held by the Western Bay of Plenty District Council shows that the proposed access from SH2 could be located above an overland flow path.</p>	<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>A risk assessment for each natural hazard the site is susceptible to, prepared in accordance with Appendix L of the Bay of Plenty RPS.</p> <p>Full details of the background flood model and associated maps used to inform flood risk including clarification as to which climate change scenarios.</p> <p>A feasibility assessment or similar reporting from Suitably Qualified or Experienced Person to confirm that the proposal would be safe to evacuate people in 1% AEP flood event.</p> <p>Provisions to ensure a low level of risk can be achieved within the plan change area without increasing risk outside of the plan change area.</p> <p>Further provisions maybe required to achieve a low level of risk for other hazards to give effect to the natural hazard provisions, in particular Policy NH 4B (i.e. land instability building setbacks for landslide hazard).</p>

14	20	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support		<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>A risk assessment for each natural hazard the site is susceptible to, prepared in accordance with Appendix L of the Bay of Plenty RPS.</p> <p>Full details of the background flood model and associated maps used to inform flood risk including clarification as to which climate change scenarios.</p> <p>A feasibility assessment or similar reporting from Suitably Qualified or Experienced Person to confirm that the proposal would be safe to evacuate people in 1% AEP flood event.</p> <p>Provisions to ensure a low level of risk can be achieved within the plan change area without increasing risk outside of the plan change area.</p> <p>Further provisions maybe required to achieve a low level of risk for other hazards to give effect to the natural hazard provisions, in particular Policy NH 4B (i.e. land instability building setbacks for landslide hazard).</p>
15	22	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>A risk assessment for each natural hazard the site is susceptible to, prepared in accordance with Appendix L of the Bay of Plenty RPS.</p> <p>Full details of the background flood model and associated maps used to inform flood risk including clarification as to which climate change scenarios.</p> <p>A feasibility assessment or similar reporting from Suitably Qualified or Experienced Person to confirm that the proposal would be safe to evacuate people in 1% AEP flood event.</p> <p>Provisions to ensure a low level of risk can be achieved within the plan change area without increasing risk outside of the plan change area.</p> <p>Further provisions maybe required to achieve a low level of risk for other hazards to give effect to the natural hazard provisions, in particular Policy NH 4B (i.e. land instability building setbacks for landslide hazard).</p>
16	21	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>The following relief is sought:</p> <p>A risk assessment for each natural hazard the site is susceptible to, prepared in accordance with Appendix L of the Bay of Plenty RPS.</p> <p>Full details of the background flood model and associated maps used to inform flood risk including clarification as to which climate change scenarios.</p> <p>A feasibility assessment or similar reporting from Suitably Qualified or Experienced Person to confirm that the proposal would be safe to evacuate people in 1% AEP flood event.</p> <p>Provisions to ensure a low level of risk can be achieved within the plan change area without increasing risk outside of the plan change area.</p> <p>Further provisions maybe required to achieve a low level of risk for other hazards to give effect to the natural hazard provisions, in particular Policy NH 4B (i.e. land instability building setbacks for landslide hazard).</p>

06: Smart Growth, Te Puna Community Plan	7	2	Cooney, Tim and Merry	Oppose	The current District Plan, the Te Puna Community Plan, and SmartGrowth have identified Te Puna as a green zone, rural in character with good planning principles based on these aspects. The creeping of commercial activities onto rural land does not meet the objectives of these important foundation plans. The 2017 Te Puna Community sets out the objectives and aspirations for the local community including commercial activities. The applicants existing activities have failed on all key considerations to meet these objectives and aspirations. Any expansion of the commercial area will further exacerbate these failures.	That the zoning remain as the status quo
	8	9	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment	The Community Development Plan explicitly allows for such economic activity within the 'green wedge' that SmartGrowth has designated Te Puna to be. We ask, however, that if this land is to be zoned commercial, the rules applying to it have the result intended for "vibrant commercial environments that encourage social and cultural interaction". And if the activity proposed is in fact industrial in nature, that it takes place on land designated for that purpose. Heartlands agrees with this assessment of the importance to Te Puna of the commercial activities located around the Te Puna SH2 roundabout. We hope, however, that any continued commercial development actually conforms to the WBoPDC's Operative District Plan. As previously stated, aspects of these remarks on page 11 of the application are not inconsistent with the approach to economic development expressed in the Te Puna Community Development Plan. Commercial Zone criteria, quoted elsewhere in the proposal, would not in Heartlands' view be unacceptable to Te Puna residents familiar with their village.	Give regard to the Te Puna Community Development Plan.
	14	21	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Give regard to the Te Puna Community Development Plan.
	16	16	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That the zoning remain as the status quo
07: Cultural considerations, Puna & sign boards	3	1	Shepherd, Julie	Support with Amendment	The proposed commercial name is Te Puna Springs. The local hapu have a deep cultural and environmental association to the naming Te Puna (the spring). Given that the zone will be commercialised, and activities may not reflect the best environmental representation of the name. That the applicant considers an unrelated name of the zone and apply a name change.	To not allow the use of the name Te Puna Springs in association with the commercial zone and the applicant consider an unrelated name for the area.
	3	2	Shepherd, Julie	Support	Support statement that the plan change will provided for the naturalisation of environmental features such as the Puna (spring). This outcome was discussed through early stages of consultation - pre application by Tame Kuka and Julie Shepherd as Pirirakau representation at the time (2018-2020).	Confirm the requirement to ensure that the naturalisation of the Puna on site which has been capped but continues to seep in the gully system in the future layout is adequately provided for. Performance standards; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Puna shall be open from its capping with a minimum buffer of 20 metres to each side of the natural water features of the gully and Puna. • The Puna will fill and flow freely from its own overspill as separate to the gully but connected as adjacent. • That there is retention of the gully system which is an original feature that has been partially modified through time. • That a reserve be made and set aside to provide for public access of the gully system connecting back to the Te Puna Hall. • That the gully system will be planted with suitable native species and maintained under Council ownership.

3	3	Shepherd, Julie	Support	Support that the Pirirakau Hapu Management Plan 2017 has been considered.	Seek to secure an opportunity for information panels to share historic korero of Te Puna be provided for by the applicant.
3	4	Shepherd, Julie	Support	Commercial Zone, Support the formation of specific rules of activities to protect local community from future activities that may contrast the rural nature of Te Puna.	Performance standards to be formed which protect local community from future activities.
3	5	Shepherd, Julie	Support	Support that the landscape plans will be provided to Pirirakau and local community in particular the Te Puna Hall Committee for discussion.	Seek to ensure performance standards provide for this activity and that the Applicant must provide for. A mix of natural and built screening such as precast concrete panels with cultural design could be included. Provide screening and dust control to the southern boundary.
5	6	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	The proposal provides for and recognises the cultural relationship of Pirirakau with the area provided for the spring at the front of the site	Approve the Plan Change
8	3	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment	Many Heartlands members, just like Pirirakau hapu, value and understand the place our watercourses occupy in our cultural history and landscape. We find the gesture of installing a "naturalised spring" on the "village green" - uphill from the Memorial Hall site - to be entirely artificial and hydrographically unlikely. We share Pirirakau's respect for Te Puna as a place of springs. We prefer them to be in the place that the water naturally finds its way to, and to be sensitively dealt with there.	The obvious place for both a green gathering space and a spring is the section on the southern edge of the Hall boundary, downhill towards the store and workshop, and adjacent to the stormwater pond.
12	7	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	It appears that the proposal of a village green, cultural signage and a spring feature were considered to be adequate cultural acknowledgement and contribution to community heritage and sense of wellbeing. We support the general direction of Ms Shepherd's submission. The natural spring and waterway that should become an ecological and environmental public amenity is the natural spring and stormwater fed gully behind the service station.	Please give further consideration to how best such matters can be incorporated into a more significant contribution to the longterm desired 'placemaking' of the area.
15	1	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Seek to ensure performance standards provide for this activity and that the Applicant must provide for. A mix of natural and built screening such as precast concrete panels with cultural design could be included. Provide screening and dust control to the southern boundary.
15	6	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		The obvious place for both a green gathering space and a spring is the section on the southern edge of the Hall boundary, downhill towards the store and workshop, and adjacent to the stormwater pond.
16	27	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Please give further consideration to how best such matters can be incorporated into a more significant contribution to the longterm desired 'placemaking' of the area.

	16	5	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>Confirm the requirement to ensure that the naturalisation of the Puna on site which has been capped but continues to seep in the gully system in the future layout is adequately provided for. Performance standards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Puna shall be open from its capping with a minimum buffer of 20 metres to each side of the natural water features of the gully and Puna. • The Puna will fill and flow freely from its own overflow as separate to the gully but connected as adjacent. • That there is retention of the gully system which is an original feature that has been partially modified through time. • That a reserve be made and set aside to provide for public access of the gully system connecting back to the Te Puna Hall. • That the gully system will be planted with suitable native species and maintained under Council ownership.
	16	6	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		<p>Seek to ensure performance standards provide for this activity and that the Applicant must provide for. A mix of natural and built screening such as precast concrete panels with cultural design could be included. Provide screening and dust control to the southern boundary.</p>
	17	10	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment		<p>Confirm the requirement to ensure that the naturalisation of the Puna on site which has been capped but continues to seep in the gully system in the future layout is adequately provided for. Performance standards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Puna shall be open from its capping with a minimum buffer of 20 metres to each side of the natural water features of the gully and Puna. • The Puna will fill and flow freely from its own overflow as separate to the gully but connected as adjacent. • That there is retention of the gully system which is an original feature that has been partially modified through time. • That a reserve be made and set aside to provide for public access of the gully system connecting back to the Te Puna Hall. • That the gully system will be planted with suitable native species and maintained under Council ownership.
08: Village building and landscaping design	5	4	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	We have applied to our land a high standard of urban design and layout. The applicant has agreed with us they will ensure that suitable covenants are imposed on the land to provide for quality commercial development in the future.	Provide Urban Design requirements as part of Plan Change
	7	3	Cooney, Tim and Merry	Oppose	The "Roper Development" adjacent to the subject site is an example of a well-designed commercial centre which reflects accepted urban design principles meeting the objectives and aspirations of the local community.	Provide a well-designed village similar to surrounding developments
	12	6	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support with Amendment	Further consultation on possible themes for good building design that reflects the rural village character and that is complementary to the intentionally traditional rural hall appearance and function of our neighboring property. This could be an example of integrated mixed use planning that offers attractive upstairs apartments possibly in 1920s colours and with gabled roof lines, that are close to facilities and with safe connecting accessways. Such details can make a huge difference to the general future feel of a village and due to the large area involved	Further consultation on possible themes for good building design that reflects the rural village character.

	13	4	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment	DCK is concerned to ensure that future enjoyment of the property is not adversely affected by commercial operations on the site, including in particular by way of noise or light pollution (particularly from 24-hour security lighting). The area has a rural character and there is little activity at night. They also intend to construct an additional dwelling close to the boundary of 35 Armstrong Road.	Include provisions to mitigate any potential visual effects on 35 and 49 Armstrong Road. This should include standards for building scale, design and set back and boundary landscape treatment. Building scale and design standards should reference urban design standards and include façade modulation, colour and reflectivity treatment and overlook.
	15	13	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Include provisions to mitigate any potential visual effects on 35 and 49 Armstrong Road. This should include standards for building scale, design and set back and boundary landscape treatment. Building scale and design standards should reference urban design standards and include façade modulation, colour and reflectivity treatment and overlook.
	15	5	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Provide a well-designed village similar to surrounding developments
	16	17	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Provide a well-designed village similar to surrounding developments
	16	31	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		Include provisions to mitigate any potential visual effects on 35 and 49 Armstrong Road. This should include standards for building scale, design and set back and boundary landscape treatment. Building scale and design standards should reference urban design standards and include façade modulation, colour and reflectivity treatment and overlook.
09: Other Performance Standards - Lighting, hours, acoustics	13	5	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment	DCK is concerned to ensure that future enjoyment of the property is not adversely affected by commercial operations on the site, including in particular by way of noise or light pollution (particularly from 24-hour security lighting).	Require constraints on hours of operation to ensure that noisy activities are not undertaken at night, in the early morning and evening; Include provision for acoustic certification of any proposed activity prior to commencing operation with noise standards; and Control the use of lighting to ensure that it does not adversely impact on the rural residential environment on Armstrong Road
	15	14	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Require constraints on hours of operation to ensure that noisy activities are not undertaken at night, in the early morning and evening; Include provision for acoustic certification of any proposed activity prior to commencing operation with noise standards; and Control the use of lighting to ensure that it does not adversely impact on the rural residential environment on Armstrong Road
	16	32	Te Puna Heartlands	Support with Amendment		Require constraints on hours of operation to ensure that noisy activities are not undertaken at night, in the early morning and evening; Include provision for acoustic certification of any proposed activity prior to commencing operation with noise standards; and Control the use of lighting to ensure that it does not adversely impact on the rural residential environment on Armstrong Road

10: Wastewater	2	1	Toi Te Ora Public Health	Oppose	<p>There is inadequate detail within the Assessment of Environmental Effects regarding how human sewage and trade waste will be safely managed. Sanitary services have a significant impact on the health of individuals and communities. Toi Te Ora advocates for and supports the best practicable sanitary services to protect the health of the public. . Te Puna commercial area is not currently serviced by council reticulated sewage infrastructure. Therefore, landowners currently need to manage their wastewater in accordance with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council Onsite Effluent Treatment Plan, or store wastewater for frequent collection by a contractor. It is noted in the plan change request that "in September 2020 Council approved the proposed connection of the properties in the Te Puna village commercial area to the Omokoroa wastewater transfer pipeline. Council has subsequently received funding for the extension of the network reticulation". However, Toi Te Ora understands that while this will service the existing community, there is no further capacity in that line to service additional growth. Any further development in the area would generate the same environmental and public health issues experienced with the existing wastewater provision, which is clearly not acceptable. The private plan change request does not set out adequate detail regarding how human sewage and trade waste will be managed, and this in turn means that Toi Te Ora are unable to adequately assess the risk to public health and be assured that public health is protected for years to come.</p>	<p>Toi Te Ora requests further information about how wastewater for the new commercial area and new activities within the existing area will be provided in order to adequately assess the risk to public health.</p>
	2	2	Toi Te Ora Public Health	Oppose	<p>Onsite Effluent Treatment (OSET) is not a suitable technology for an urban environment. Te Puna has a history of OSET failure. A number of wastewater issues have already been identified due to failing systems and resultant issues of properties experiencing wastewater overflow. Council needs to consider whether individual onsite systems are the acceptable sanitary service solution for this situation. From our perspective, disposal of human waste by OSET systems is an acceptable solution to protect public health, but only for isolated and remote dwellings and provided they are properly designed, sited, maintained and operated. Toi Te Ora considers that onsite systems are not suitable for growing communities and propose that this area should be serviced with appropriate wastewater disposal. We are supportive of community facilities in a safe, well-serviced environment. Experience in this area has shown that reticulation is required. This private plan change should not be approved until a centralized reticulated wastewater scheme is in place.</p>	<p>Should this private plan change request be approved, Toi Te Ora recommends that a condition of approval requires a professionally designed, maintained and operated centralized sewerage system be in place before developments commence.</p>
	2	3	Toi Te Ora Public Health	Oppose	<p>The capacity to connect to a reticulated centralised sanitary system is necessary for all commercial zones. At the time of writing, Toi Te Ora understands that there is no further capacity in the municipal reticulation to support further development in this area.</p>	<p>That Council requires the Te Puna Commercial zone to be capable of being connected to reticulated wastewater management.</p>

2	4	Toi Te Ora Public Health	Oppose	Failures of sanitary sewage system are deemed a nuisance under the Health Act 1956. Section 29 of the Health Act 1956 states that the scenario "where any pool, ditch, gutter, watercourse, sanitary convenience, cesspool, drain, or vent pipe is in such a state or is so situated as to be offensive or likely to be injurious to health" is deemed a nuisance. If a nuisance occurs, this nuisance must be investigated and addressed by the local authority under the Health Act 1956. The wastewater failures already identified in this area constitute a 'nuisance'. Toi Te Ora is aware of at least one incident in October 2021 where an Environmental Health Officer from WBOPDC attended a significant statutory health nuisance in this area. Toi Te Ora is also aware of compliance issues with the regional onsite effluent treatment and raised intensification concerns with WBOPDC in 2018. The plan change request has not addressed how wastewater nuisances would be prevented in the interim time before the proposed extension of the network reticulation is completed. Therefore, if the plan change request were approved, our experience shows that further nuisances under the Health Act 1956 are likely to occur.	That Council takes into consideration their local authority responsibilities to abate and remove potential nuisance situations under the Health Act 1956 before they arise.
5	5	Zariba Holdings Ltd	Support	As part of the early consultation with us and council staff the applicant and ourselves developed a solution for the existing Te Puna wastewater system and the applicant should be permitted to connect to this system.	Approve the connect to the Te Puna wastewater system
10	1	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	BOPRC do not consider OSET as an appropriate technology to manage the effects arising from the range of activities the commercial land uses proposed by the plan change. Given the scale and nature of potential intensity of the commercial land uses in the proposed plan change, OSET is not considered an appropriate technology to manage the cumulative effects over time on water quality and human health. The application does not sufficiently assess the potential effects associated with the range of land uses for that zone or account for the changes of concentration that could occur overtime under the provisions for that zone. For the above reasons, BOPRC consider a long-term option to manage wastewater is essential to manage the cumulative long term effects on human health and the cumulative effects associated from point and non-point source discharges.	No definitive wastewater solution has been secured for the plan change area. If OSET is to be relied on, BOPRC oppose the plan change.
14	22	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		Toi Te Ora requests further information about how wastewater for the new commercial area and new activities within the existing area will be provided in order to adequately assess the risk to public health.
14	23	Dc Kirk Family Trust	Support with Amendment		No definitive wastewater solution has been secured for the plan change area. If OSET is to be relied on, BOPRC oppose the plan change.
15	16	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Toi Te Ora requests further information about how wastewater for the new commercial area and new activities within the existing area will be provided in order to adequately assess the risk to public health.

	15	17	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		Should this private plan change request be approved, Toi Te Ora recommends that a condition of approval requires a professionally designed, maintained and operated centralized sewerage system be in place before developments commence.
	15	21	Te Puna Memorial Hall Committee	Support		No definitive wastewater solution has been secured for the plan change area. If OSET is to be relied on, BOPRC oppose the plan change.
	16	1	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Toi Te Ora requests further information about how wastewater for the new commercial area and new activities within the existing area will be provided in order to adequately assess the risk to public health.
	16	2	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		Should this private plan change request be approved, Toi Te Ora recommends that a condition of approval requires a professionally designed, maintained and operated centralized sewerage system be in place before developments commence.
	16	20	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		No definitive wastewater solution has been secured for the plan change area. If OSET is to be relied on, BOPRC oppose the plan change.
	16	3	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That Council requires the Te Puna Commercial zone to be capable of being connected to reticulated wastewater management.
	16	4	Te Puna Heartlands	Support		That Council takes into consideration their local authority responsibilities to abate and remove potential nuisance situations under the Health Act 1956 before they arise.
	17	12	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support		That Council requires the Te Puna Commercial zone to be capable of being connected to reticulated wastewater management.
	18	2	Bp Oil New Zealand Ltd	Support		That Council requires the Te Puna Commercial zone to be capable of being connected to reticulated wastewater management.
	18	3	Bp Oil New Zealand Ltd	Support		No definitive wastewater solution has been secured for the plan change area. If OSET is to be relied on, BOPRC oppose the plan change.