

Planners Report 6

Variation 1: Lifestyle Zones and Minden Structure Plan Area

Structure Plan – Stormwater and Geotechnical

1.0 Background

- 1.1 This report covers the remaining submission points made on features shown on the Minden Structure Plan and Planning Maps (stormwater ponds/streams and stability areas).

2.0 Issues

- 2.1 Seven submission points were received requesting miscellaneous amendments to the Structure Plan, Planning Maps and Map Legend.
- 2.2 Most of these submissions are due to 'confusion' that occurred because of an error on the Map Legend. The "Ecological Assessment for the Minden Structure Plan" Section 32 Report identified a number of freshwater courses that need to be protected. These water courses were transferred onto the various maps of the District Plan (hatched in blue), but the Map Legend refers to these areas as "stormwater ponds".
- 2.3 These submissions have generated the following options below.

3.0 Options

3.1 Option 1

- 3.1.1 Rename "stormwater ponds" on Map Legend as "freshwater protection sites".

3.2 Option 2

- 3.2.1 Rename "stormwater ponds" on Map Legend to "overland flow paths".

3.3 Option 3

- 3.3.1 Remove the stormwater pond on Map 95 until satisfactory solutions are progressed through the Structure Plan.

3.4 Option 4

- 3.4.1 Use design features such as riparian planting, holding ponds and wetlands to protect Te Puna Stream, Oturu Stream, Waikaraka Estuary and Tauranga Harbour from erosion and runoff.

3.5 Option 5

3.5.1 Complete the Structure Plan with regard to stability areas.

4.0 Discussion

4.1 Options 1 and 2 – Renaming “stormwater ponds”

4.1.1 The “stormwater ponds” shown on the Structure Plan are in fact wetlands and streams identified in the “Ecological Assessment for the Minden Structure Plan” Section 32 Report. This report states that these features “warrant ongoing improvement and improved riparian management” yet “are suitable however for use as components of stormwater detention and treatments systems, with associated riparian planting and enhancement”.

4.1.2 One submitter sought that these “stormwater ponds” be renamed as “overland flowpaths” while Environment Bay of Plenty sought that these be renamed to “freshwater protection sites” to be consistent with policy framework in Regional Plans.

4.1.3 These “stormwater ponds” should be renamed to reflect their multi purpose. They are protected as waterways under the Minden Lifestyle Zone rules and can be used for stormwater discharge, subject to an approved design to ensure that there is no adverse affects on the environment.

4.2 Option 3 – Removing stormwater ponds from Map U95

4.2.1 As indicated above, the wording on the Map Legend is incorrect. The legend refers to these features as “stormwater ponds” while they are actually freshwater protection sites/overland flowpaths. It is therefore understood why the submitter advocates for the deletion of what Map U95 refers to as “stormwater ponds”

4.2.2 However, it is important to continue to show these “freshwater protection sites/overland flowpaths” on the Planning Maps, including Map U95.

4.3 Option 4 – Design features to reduce runoff into waterways

4.3.1 A number of submitters have raised concerns with the impact that stormwater runoff may have on sedimentation and contamination of a number of waterways within or adjacent to the Minden Lifestyle Zone, including the Tauranga Harbour. Pirirakau in particular are concerned that this will affect “mahinga kai” (food gathering) which is essential to Maori wellbeing.

4.3.2 The need to employ design features to protect these waterways is strongly supported as is already reflected in the proposed Lifestyle Section rules which require riparian planting to protect

waterways and retention of planting to stabilize slopes from erosion.

4.3.3 There are also a number of requirements surrounding the design and location of stormwater and wastewater systems and the collection, treatment and piping of stormwater, through means such as soak holes and collection of roof water.

4.3.4 These controls are in addition to those implemented by the Regional Council who is primarily responsible for the control of erosion and general protection of waterways.

4.3.5 Wetlands, as suggested by one submitter, are another good treatment option also but have not been considered because of high operational and maintenance costs.

4.3.6 A number of rules and minimum development requirements are included in Section 12 (Subdivision and Development) of the District Plan and the Development Code to ensure that the stormwater affect on the environment is mitigated.

4.4 Option 5 – Reviewing stability areas.

4.4.1 Geotechnical requirements have been bolstered to cover the risk left by not giving every area within the Structure Plan a stability rating. All subdivision and development within the areas not reviewed will require resource consent and a full geotechnical assessment.

5.0 Recommendation

5.1 That the Map Legend is amended by renaming “stormwater ponds” as “freshwater protection sites/overland flowpaths”

5.2 That no changes are made to the Structure Plan or Planning Maps.

5.3 The following submission points are therefore

5.4 Accepted in Part

Submission	Point Number	Name
6	7	Bay of Plenty Regional Council
22	5	Gardiner, Hugh
73	4	Hume, Cushla
20	4	Hume, Nick
19	8	Pirirakau Incorporated Society
49	46	Surveying Services Ltd
21	1	Waikaraka Estuary Managers

6.0 Reasons

6.1 Options 1 and 2

- 6.1.1** The term “stormwater ponds”, as included on the Map Legend, does not represent what these features really are. They are a combination of protected waterways and features suitable for stormwater discharge, subject to a Resource Consent.

6.2 Option 3

- 6.2.1** It is important to continue to show these “freshwater protection sites/overland flowpaths” on the Planning Maps.

6.3 Option 4

- 6.3.1** Design features have already been put in place to protect waterways under the proposed Lifestyle Zone rules including riparian planting, erosion control and stormwater detention.

6.4 Option 5

- 6.4.1** Geotechnical requirements have been bolstered to cover the risk left by not giving every area with the Structure Plan a stability rating.