

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC75 - 01	Floodable Maps	1	Property Specific	1	1	Healy, Donald William	Oppose	Stormwater gets into my property (25 Donovan Street).	Needs a new sump in the road reserve to catch the stormwater.
				2	1	Doo, Barbara	Oppose	I strongly oppose that my land (134E Cameron Road) is being marked as floodable. I have talked to Council engineers/council members who agree that my land needs to be removed from the floodable zone.	Remove the flood hazard overlay from 134E Cameron Road.
				3	1	Mends, Dawn Neita	Oppose	Flooding has occurred on 34 Oxford Street in the past. The reason for the flooding was mainly due to engineering design of the footpath, road crossing and undersized stormwater infrastructure. However, actions have been taken to alleviate the problem by upgrading the stormwater catchpit and modifications to a security gate.	Opposed to flood hazard overlay on 34 Oxford Street.
				4	1	Mischewski, Lesley Ann	Support	Support revised flood plan, but have noted the flooding into my property (14 Nettingham Place) occurs when debris has blocked the pipe under the Raymond Ave Bridge.	Investigate the design of the culvert under Raymond Ave bridge.
				5	1	Masters, Norman James	Oppose	I have lived at 23 Seddon St for 38 years and it has never flooded. In 1979 Te Puke received more than 400mm of rain in 24 hours. However, no flooding occurred at 23 Seddon St during that storm and has never flooded during any other storm event.	Opposed to floodable zone.
				FS 27 [5]	1 [1]	Feist, Aileen Margaret [Masters, Norman James]	Support	I have lived at 25 Seddon Street for 39 years. The only time I have seen the water flowing through the property was in 1979 and that was only ankle deep and about 3 meters wide at the widest point.	Oppose to the floodable zone and would like it removed.
				FS 32 [5]	1 [1]	D Hardie Family Trust [Masters, Norman James]	Support	Flooding in this area can not be justified. Who is the engineer?	Opposed to flood zone. Please consult contour maps and calculate fall.
				6	1	Macneil, Warren James	Oppose	Do not support reducing the flood hazard boundary re the farmland valley on the south side (upstream) of Cannell Farm Drive. Since 1994, I have seen this valley in heavy flood three times (bank to bank) and in a semi-flood state with rapids/waterfalls. I've attached a photo of the valley in flood in 1999. In addition, I am concerned that the recent encroachment of dwellings into this valley as I believe that the next flood will destroy the most recent accommodation and put lives at risk.	Do not support reducing the flood hazard boundary.
				6	2	Macneil, Warren James	Oppose	Regarding Cooney Place #7 and #9. I do not support reducing the flood hazard area to the small shape shown on Map U131 and in fact the existing boundary is incorrect as #7 is not affected by flooding.	The new flood hazard area should be shown as being an area immediately around the stormwater drain and continuing out to the edge of the bank, via the north west boundary of #9.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
				9	1	Retter, Yvonne Mary	Oppose	I totally disagree with this change. I have lived here (17 Seddon Street) for 10 years and have never seen the bottom of my section flood. The neighbour has lived there 40 years and has never seen it flood. I would like to know will my rates go down as it will affect the value of my section?	An exact survey of the area instead of a guesstimate. Talk to the landowners. I would like it left as it was.
				10	1	Taylor, Isabelle Capon	Oppose	While from time to time storm water access our driveway overland and crosses the north eastern part of our site (154 Cameron Rd) before draining away, provision has been made for this by the shaping of our driveway.	We would like you to amend the proposed plan change to reflect what occurs now - that is any water flow overland on our property is limited to the drive area only.
				11	1	James, David Isaac	Oppose	We occupy 152 Cameron Rd. The proposed change indicates that a significant area under our dwelling will be flooded up to a depth of 200mm. We do not accept the accuracy of this. No such flooding has occurred in six years we have lived here due to the property being approximately 200mm higher than the immediate neighbour's land.	That the overland flood-line be limited to the shared access land, and be deleted from all dwellings.
				12	1	Brann, Geoffrey John	Oppose	Do not support inclusion of 45 Fairview Place. Three adequate rainwater drains well control recent downpours. Inclusion is based on unproven scientific model. Inclusion would be detrimental to property values.	We object to the decision to include our property in the Te Puke floodable area.
				FS 28 [12]	1 [1]	Edkins, David Frank [Brann, Geoffrey John]	Support	I oppose our property being labelled as a floodable property as it does not flood. In the case of the drain grates blocking the water flows down the right of way and does not enter our property at all. To label it as floodable would be totally erroneous.	Leave 51 Fairview Place off the floodable area maps.
				13	1	Mortensen, Kirsty	Oppose	The value of my section (8 Beatty Ave) is now not what it was 15 months ago. Insurance may now be unaffordable for us.	If my section is amended to a 'localised puddle' I hope Council make a more conscious effort to regularly clean and maintain the whole Beatty Ave street drainage system. Not just sweeping the leaves off the man holes but physically removing the grills and cleaning our the dirt and sediment. I would also think that the rates of the section should be reduced because of reduced value. I hope this change doesn't proceed as the consequences are massive for us. If it does proceed, I would like to know what Council plan to do to minimise the likelihood of this happening in future and would like to be involved with the discussions and decisions that Council take around this.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
				FS 31 [13]	1 [1]	Robertson, Lynn Shirline [Mortensen, Kirsty]	Support	I totally disagree with the change to the floodable map. We have lived at 6 Beatty Avenue for three years. Inclusion would be detrimental to our property values and insurance would be excessive. This could also make it difficult to sell our property in the future. If Council would regularly clean the 6 drainage systems (grills and pipes) along the lower end of Beatty Avenue on a regular basis our property would never flood. Our property has not flooded since these drains have been cleaned. The drain situated behind our property in the property at 5 Bellvedere Street needs to be cleaned by the responsible party (either the council, owner of the property or citizens club. This should be specified on the Council's permits or plans).	We support submission 13.1 and oppose the flood plan.
				23	1	Lomay Properties Limited	Oppose	We are currently carrying out earthworks at 17 No 1 Road (Te Puke) in accordance with subdivision consent 9821. The earthworks will provide building platforms above the flood levels and also remove the flood hazard of our property. It would be appropriate to amend the flood maps to align with the new finished levels which are due to be completed by Christmas.	Amend Planning Maps U132 to reflect new finished levels from approved subdivision.
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	1	Utilities (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	8	1	Gamble, Jason Gregory	Oppose	The site map depicts stormwater pond four as proposed over half my property (67 Macloughlin Drive). Without knowing the full layout I oppose this.	Opposed to stormwater pond four.
				19	2	Dorr Bell Limited	Oppose	It is noted that the SW Pond one extends along the majority of the frontage of Dorr Bells land (Lot 1 DPS 22590) adjoining No 3 Road. The location of a large drainage swale in a residential environment adjacent to the rear of future sections is a poor urban design and safety outcome in a residential area.	The stormwater swale adjacent to No 3 Road should be removed with the storage capacity being incorporated into the stormwater pond to the north.
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	2	Roads	19	1	Dorr Bell Limited	Oppose	The location of RD 11 (and WS4) is not in an optimal position and does not promote for efficient subdivision and development.	RD 11 (and WS4) should be relocated further to the north.
				FS 29 [19]	1 [1]	Pieters, Simon Jan & Pieters, Hendrik & FL Trustees 2013 Limited as trustees of the Redwood Trust [Dorr Bell Limited]	Oppose	The location of RD11 (and WS4) on the proposed plan 75-80 is logical and best serves all property owners equally.	Retain the originally proposed configuration of RD11 and WS4 in Plan 75-80.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	3	Walkways	7	1	Lee, Alan Jefcoate	Oppose	I object to the proposed walkway through my property at 66 McLaughlin Drive, Te Puke. My reasons are the topography of the section suggests that it will only ever be a lifestyle block, with avocados and oranges. A walkway would compromise the security of the property. This would also contravene the health and safety regulations applied by the packhouse for this type of business.	I would like a meeting to discuss my objections to this plan further.
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	4	Reserves	16	3	Puketaha Limited	Support	Support removal of proposed reserve from the Te Puke District Plan Map U129.	Retain the proposal to delete the reserve from District Plan Map U129, Te Puke.
				FS 30 [16]	1 [3]	Lee, Alan Jefcoate	Support	I wish to support the proposed change to the Te Puke District Plan Map U129, that reduces the proposed reserve and recommend that it is deleted in its entirety at this stage.	It is my view that council should investigate alternative sites to create recreational reserves. There are a number of sites available within Area 4 due to either their topography or because they are contaminated sites that have been used in the past as rubbish dumps. I believe council have an obligation to review these sites and utilise them for the general communities benefit. In April 2006 Richard Coles "Policy Analyst" Resource Management WBOPDC wrote in his report that council should address the contaminated sites and carry out remedial work to make sites safe for the public. To my knowledge this suggestion from this report has not been actioned. I believe that before council progresses with Area 4 it should investigate the possible alternative sites and include them in the proposed plan.
				17	2	Eynon, Grant Scott	Support	Support the removal of the active reserve designation from the structure plan.	Remove the proposed reserve identification from planning map U129, Te Puke.
				18	3	Montgomery, Michael John	Support	Support removal of proposed reserve from the Te Puke District Plan Map U129.	Retain the proposal to delete the reserve from District Plan Map U129, Te Puke.
				19	3	Dorr Bell Limited	Oppose	Council is proposing to remove reserve TP3-3. We are opposed to the removal of the reserve and future urban zoning of the reserve area. We consider such a change would be premature, until the need for a reserve is finalised. We consider at this stage that sufficient information is not available to change the status of the reserve. The reserve will provide significant amenity and recreation opportunities for the Te Puke Community.	Retain reserve.
FS 34 [19]	1 [3]	Eynon, Grant Scott [Dorr Bell Limited]	Oppose	Council need to confirm the need for the reserve if the status is to be retained and purchase reserve at residential zone market rates.	1. Remove the proposed reserve identification from the planning maps. 2. Retain the residential zoning of the reserve area.				

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
				FS 35 [19]	1 [3]	Puketaha Limited [Dorr Bell Limited]	Oppose	Council needs to confirm the need for the reserve if the status is to be retained and purchase reserve at residential zone market rates.	1. Remove the proposed reserve identification from the planning maps. 2. Retain the residential zoning of the reserve area.
				FS 36 [19]	1 [3]	Montgomery, Michael John [Dorr Bell Limited]	Oppose	Council needs to confirm the need for the reserve if the status is to be retained and purchase reserve at residential zone market rates.	1. Remove the proposed reserve identification from the planning maps 2. Retain the residential zoning of the reserve area.
				FS 37 [19]	1 [3]	Eynon, Colin McBride [Dorr Bell Limited]	Oppose	Council needs to confirm the need for the reserve if the status is to be retained and purchase reserve at residential zone market rates.	1. Remove the proposed reserved identification from the planning maps 2. Retain the residential zoning of the reserve area.
				FS 37 [19]	2 [3]	Eynon, Colin McBride [Dorr Bell Limited]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones across Structure Plan area and Planning Maps.
				22	2	Eynon, Colin McBride	Support	Support the removal of the active reserve designation from the structure plan.	Remove the proposed reserve identification from planning map U129, Te Puke.
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	5	Zoning	16	1	Puketaha Limited	Oppose	Oppose removal of medium density zone from the structure plan and district plan map U129, Te Puke.	Retain medium density areas and add additional areas around the stormwater ponds.
				16	2	Puketaha Limited	Oppose	Oppose changing land zoned residential to future urban.	Retain existing residential zone.
				17	1	Eynon, Grant Scott	Oppose	Oppose the change making the residential zone future urban zone.	Amend the structure plan to show the future urban zone as residential zone.
				17	3	Eynon, Grant Scott	Unknown	Provide for medium density housing around the stormwater facilities.	Add to the District Plan Maps for Te Puke areas for medium density housing around/near proposed stormwater ponds and on the Te Puke Structure Plan 3.
				18	1	Montgomery, Michael John	Oppose	Oppose removal of medium density zone from the structure plan and district plan map U129, Te Puke.	Retain medium density areas and add additional areas around the stormwater ponds.
				18	2	Montgomery, Michael John	Oppose	Oppose changing land zoned residential to future urban.	Retain existing residential zone.
				19	4	Dorr Bell Limited	Oppose	Part of our land (Lot 1 DPS 22590) on No 3 Road along the northern boundary is zoned medium density residential. The Section 32 does not address the removal of the medium density zone. It only addresses the medium density residential zone directly north of the proposed active reserve.	We oppose the removal of the medium density zone as it affects our ability to provide a range of residential housing types and lot sizes.
				FS 34 [19]	2 [4]	Eynon, Grant Scott [Dorr Bell Limited]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones across Structure Plan area and Planning Maps.
				FS 35 [19]	2 [4]	Puketaha Limited [Dorr Bell Limited]	Support	Support retention of medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones across Structure Plan area and Planning Maps.
				FS 35 [19]	3 [4]	Puketaha Limited [Dorr Bell Limited]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones on Planning Maps.
				FS 36 [19]	2 [4]	Montgomery, Michael John [Dorr Bell Limited]	Support	Support the retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones across Structure Plan area and Planning Maps.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
				22	1	Eynon, Colin McBride	Oppose	Oppose the change making the residential zone future urban zone.	Amend the structure plan to show the future urban zone as residential zone.
				22	3	Eynon, Colin McBride	Unknown	Provide for medium density housing around the stormwater facilities.	Add to the District Plan Maps for Te Puke areas for medium density housing around/near proposed stormwater ponds and on the Te Puke Structure Plan 3.
				24	1	R & M Orchards Ltd	Oppose	We object to the removal of the medium density zoning from our property. Council's stated aim is to encourage affordable housing in the areas but the change will hinder the future development of this land into affordable housing. We disagree with Council that affordable housing options will be created by adjoining property owners transferring subdivision potential between themselves to create higher and lower density pockets within the overall area. It also creates a less flexible environment for us to operate in should we agree to our property being subdivided. The proposed change to residential zoning combined with increased orchard values now makes it unlikely that our property will be subdivided.	We object to the removal of the medium density zoning from our property.
				FS 34 [24]	3 [1]	Eynon, Grant Scott [R & M Orchards Ltd]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones on Planning Maps.
				FS 36 [24]	3 [1]	Montgomery, Michael John [R & M Orchards Ltd]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones on Planning Maps.
				FS 37 [24]	3 [1]	Eynon, Colin McBride [R & M Orchards Ltd]	Support	Support retention of Medium Density Zones.	Retain Medium Density Zones on Planning Maps.
PC75 - 03	Te Puke Structure Plan - Rules	1	Maximum Average Net Land Area / Lot Size (Rules 13.4.1 (i) and 13.4.2 (a))	19	5	Dorr Bell Limited	Oppose	Council is introducing a maximum average net lot size of 650m ² . We oppose this as it reduces the ability to provide a range of lot sizes and has been justified based on development at Omokoroa. However, the Te Puke market is different to Omokoroa and a range of lot sizes is desirable in so long as the RPS yield targets are met.	Proper Section 32 analysis and consultation with the development community is required in relation to this change. Smaller sites can be achieved by retaining the medium density zone and enabling a variety of residential development to occur.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC75 - 03	Te Puke Structure Plan - Rules	3	Other	15	1	Mr Dave Harwood	Unknown	<p>The Orchard Trust recognises the responsibility of both Council and land developers to provide sufficient stormwater infrastructure to cater for new development and as appropriate avoid, remedy and/or mitigate effects from stormwater, particularly on downstream properties and the downstream network.</p> <p>The Trust seeks that there be flexibility in how this stormwater infrastructure is provided, flexibility in the location and the provision of stormwater infrastructure and also that once stormwater solutions are provided (i.e. subdivision development is undertaken and appropriate stormwater infrastructure built and vested) that the stormwater pond areas on the planning maps are removed/amended to best reflect the location of the actual stormwater infrastructure.</p>	<p>Add to sections 12.4.10 and 13.4.2 of the District Plan a rule enabling the following:</p> <p>Specific design of stormwater management infrastructure may result in 'Stormwater Pond' areas as identified on the Planning Maps not accurately defining actual stormwater ponds when subdivision development is completed. As part of any subdivision design, specific assessment and detailed design may demonstrate that a Stormwater Pond area can be reduced/amended in size or deleted in its entirety. Therefore, the Stormwater Pond areas on the Planning Maps will be amended to accurately define actual stormwater ponds once development is completed and new titles for that development are issued.</p>
				FS 34 [15]	4 [1]	Eynon, Grant Scott [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support	<p>Support the need to provide flexibility in the provision of stormwater solutions. Our property is similarly shown with large areas designated for stormwater ponds. The ability to provide design solutions to reduce the requirement for the number and size of ponds needs to be incorporated into the Plan Change Structure Plan and Rules.</p>	<p>Support a flexible approach to the stormwater solutions required which will allow for alternative solutions to be provided which may reduce the need for designated ponds and/or their size.</p>
				FS 35 [15]	4 [1]	Puketaha Limited [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support	<p>Support the need to provide flexibility in the provision of stormwater solutions. Our property is similarly shown with large areas designated for stormwater ponds. The ability to provide design solutions to reduce the requirement for the number and size of ponds needs to be incorporated into the Plan Change Structure Plan and Rules.</p>	<p>Support a Flexible approach to the stormwater solutions required which will allow for alternative solutions to be provided which may reduce the need for designated ponds and/or their size.</p>
				FS 36 [15]	4 [1]	Montgomery, Michael John [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support	<p>Support the need to provide flexibility in the provision of stormwater solutions. Our property is similarly shown with large areas designated for stormwater ponds. The ability to provide design solutions to reduce the requirement for the number and size of ponds needs to be incorporated into the Plan Change Structure Plan and Rules.</p>	<p>Support a flexible approach to the stormwater solutions required which will allow for alternative solutions to be provided which may reduce the need for designated ponds and/or their size.</p>

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
				FS 37 [15]	4 [1]	Eynon, Colin McBride [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support	Support the need to provide flexibility in the provision of stormwater solutions. Our property is similarly shown with large areas designated for stormwater ponds. The ability to provide design solutions to reduce the requirement for the number and size of ponds needs to be incorporated into the Plan Change Structure Plan and Rules.	Support a flexible approach to the stormwater solutions required which will allow for alternative solutions to be provided which may reduce the need for designated ponds and/or their size.
				15	2	Mr Dave Harwood	Unknown	Any proposal to establish Medium density housing on The Trust site under the provisions of the Residential Zone (rule 13.3.3 (a)) as proposed by the Plan Change will be more restrictive than under the provisions of the Medium Density Residential zone because it is unlikely The Trust land will meet any of the criteria defined in rule 13.3.3 (a) (ii). This change effectively 'down zones' the site and provides less certainty going forward with respect to the development options for the site.	Delete the existing rule 13.3.3(a) (i) - (iv) and replace it with: 13.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities: (a) Development in accordance with the Medium Density Residential rules contained in Chapter 14 except that any permitted or controlled activity as detailed in Chapter 14 shall be a restricted discretionary activity when applying this rule.
				FS 34 [15]	5 [2]	Eynon, Grant Scott [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support with Amendment	Support in part. The retention of the medium density zone provides certainty to landowners. Proposed rule changes provide flexibility for other sites to be more intensely developed.	Retain existing Medium Density Zones and provide flexibility within the District Plan Rules for further areas of Medium Density Housing to be developed.
				FS 35 [15]	5 [2]	Puketaha Limited [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support with Amendment	Support in part. The retention of the medium density zones provides certainty to landowners. Proposed rule changes provide flexibility for other sites to be more intensely developed.	Retain existing Medium Density Zones and provide flexibility within the District Plan Rules for further areas of Medium Density Housing to be developed.
				FS 36 [15]	5 [2]	Montgomery, Michael John [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support with Amendment	Support in part. The retention of the medium density zones provides certainty to landowners. Proposed rule changes provide flexibility for other sites to be more intensely developed.	Retain existing Medium Density Zones and provide flexibility within the District Plan Rules for further areas of Medium Density Housing to be developed.
				FS 37 [15]	5 [2]	Eynon, Colin McBride [Mr Dave Harwood]	Support	Support in part. The retention of the medium density zones provides certainty to landowners. Proposed rule changes provide flexibility for other sites to be more intensely developed.	Retain existing Medium Density Zones and provide flexibility within the District Plan Rules for further areas of Medium Density Housing to be developed.
PC75 - 03	Te Puke Structure Plan - Rules	4	MacLoughlin Drive/Whitehead Avenue Structure Plan Area (Rule 12.4.14.2)	15	3	Mr Dave Harwood	Support	The Trust supports the deletion of Rule 12.4.14.2 for the reasons outlined in the Section 32 report.	Retain the proposed deletion of Rule 12.4.14.2.
				19	6	Dorr Bell Limited	Support	Support as notified.	Retain

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC76 - 01	Floodable Area / Coastal Inundation Area Rules	1	Permitted Activity for Uninhabited Farm Buildings (Rule 8.3.1 (c))	20	1	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Change 76 does not give effect to the RPS natural hazards provisions in the district plan. In particular, its reference to "uninhabited" buildings is inconsistent with the RPS metric of building-related consequence which is the proportion of buildings that are "functionally compromised" by a hazard event. If a building being flooded does not result in the building's functionality being compromised, there is no building consequence for RPS risk purposes and no building-related risk. (Other consequence elements, such as lifeline service, health and safety, may be triggered and would need to be assessed.)	Amend Rule 8.3.1(c)(iii) to read: "Uninhabited farm buildings including, but not limited to, pump sheds, implement sheds and storage sheds, provided that an appropriate notice under s73 of the Building Act has been attached to the title that the property owner certifies to the Council that they acknowledge: - the building is subject to inundation from flooding; - any damage to the building or its contents arising from that hazard does not affect the building's functionality.
PC76 - 01	Floodable Area / Coastal Inundation Area Rules	2	Exemption from Minimum Floor Levels for Sheds and Garages for Non-Habitable Purposes (Rule 8.5.1.2 (b))	20	2	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Change 76 does not give effect to the RPS natural hazards provisions in the district plan. In particular, its reference to buildings "used for non-habitable purposes" is inconsistent with the RPS metric of building-related consequence which is the proportion of buildings that are "functionally compromised" by a hazard event. If a building being flooded does not result in the building's functionality being compromised, there is no building consequence for RPS risk purposes and no building-related risk. (Other consequence elements, such as lifeline service, health and safety, may be triggered and would need to be assessed.) Also, in its establishment of three levels of risk (High, Medium and Low) each with corresponding policy direction, the RPS takes an absolute position on risk that is not affected by liability. Concerns about liability under the Building Act have no place in being addressed under RMA instruments such as a district plan, particularly when the plan must give effect to the RPS.	Amend Rule 8.5.1.3(b) to read: "Council will consider granting consent for sheds and garages (used for non habitable purposes) without meeting minimum finished floor levels provided the property owner certifies to the Council that they acknowledge: - the building is subject to inundation from flooding - any damage to the building or its contents arising from that hazard does not affect the building's functionality."
PC76 - 01	Floodable Area / Coastal Inundation Area Rules	4	Permitted Activity for Earthworks, Closed Boarded Fences, Retaining Walls, Retained Gardens and Concrete and Block Walls (Rule 8.3.1 (c) (i))	11	2	James, David Isaac	Support	Support.	That the plan change be adopted as notified.
				20	4	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	The proposed change is supported but it should be expanded so that the consideration is not only whether the activity is affected by the Floodable Area but also whether the activity affects the Floodable Area.	Amend the second bullet of Rule 8.3.1(c)(i) to read: - The activity will not affect or be affected by the floodable area.

Summary Report for the 2016 Proposed Plan Changes 75-80

Topic ID	Topic	Issue ID	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
PC76 - 01	Floodable Area / Coastal Inundation Area Rules	5	Other	20	3	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	Proposed paragraph (ii) proposed Section 8.5.2(c) of Change 76 does not give effect to the RPS natural hazards provisions. The natural hazards provisions of the RPS require that land use activities be managed according to the level of natural hazard risk that they are subject to. Risk varies with likelihood and the RPS requires that flood risk be assessed at three likelihoods: 2% AEP, 1% AEP and 0.2% AEP. Paragraph (ii) of the matters to be considered relates only to the highest likelihood of the RPS range: 2%. No risk assessment has been or is required to be undertaken. ('Risk' means the likelihood and consequences of a hazard.)	Amend 8.5.2(c)(ii) as follows: Delete: "For Waihi Beach (Planning Maps,403 and U01 UO4) the flood level shall be based on the 2% AEP (inclusive of climate change". Replace with: "In all situations, site levels shall be such that the flood risk level (inclusive of climate change is low at 2%, 1% and 0.2% AEP. "
PC79 - 01	Screening	1	Other	14	1	Smith, Sandra Evelyn	Oppose	Oppose any proposed screening reduction in or around the Omokoroa industrial land currently owned by Crapps, Omokoroa General Carriers (OGC) and adjoining owners. Originally the current industrial area was proposed to us adjoining land owners as "Light Business" Zoning with a 10m planted buffer surrounding the entire boundary supported by maps/plans provided by council. Council have already granted a reduction of the screening in front of OGC to 5m without notification. This is clearly ineffective and not what was previously agreed with/promoted to the affected adjoining owners. Our concern is that council may use this plan change to further reduce the screening around the industrial area without the need to consult with adjoining owners and residents affected by the unpleasant look of the current industrial.	We want confirmation from council that the existing 10m buffer around the industrial area will remain at 10m.