

Summary Report for the District Plan Change 94 - Washer Road Business Park

Topic	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req	
PC94-01: 21.4.1 - Activity Performance Standard	01: 21.4.1 (b) - NEW - Setbacks to gas transmission line	4	2	First Gas Limited	Oppose	Earthworks and buildings / structures within 20 m of the Gas transmission network should be avoided	An appropriate setback standard and advice note should be added to 21.4 Activity Performance Standards as follows: b. Yards and Setbacks • Washer Road Business Park Structure Plan Area Provisions: i. Buildings, structures and earthworks shall be set back 20 m from any gas transmission pipeline. Advice note: when assessing resource consent applications for these activities Council should take into account the outcomes of consultation with Firstgas.	
	02: 21.4.1(c) - NEW - Visual Amenity - Washer Road Business Park	4	3	First Gas Limited	Oppose	There should be no planting of any vegetation capable of reaching over 1 m in height required over top of or within an easement over a Firstgas pipeline	Amend the proposed standard and include an advice note as follows: c. Visual amenity - Streetscene • Washer Road Business Park Structure Plan Area in respect of any boundary with Washer Road and any future public road, except that there shall be no planting of any vegetation capable of reaching over 1 m in height required over top of or within an easement over a gas transmission pipeline. Advice Note: A permit is required to work within the gas easement. This includes digging/earthworks, driveway construction, laying services, planting, and fencing.	
PC94-02: Appendix 7	01: Structure Plan	1	2	Eastpack Limited	Support	Eastpack Limited support the proposed rezoning of the site from Rural to Industrial. The rezoning will provide much needed Industrial Land in Te Puke and make efficient use of the subject land which is currently under utilised.	Rezone from Rural to Industrial	
			3	3	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	While the concept of the landscape buffer is supported, the proposed location is not. Access is required to both sides of the Ohineangaanga Stream in order to maintain the canal banks and the adjacent stopbanks. Consequently any landscape buffer should be from the landward toe of the stopbank only. It should be noted that the stopbanks in this vicinity are likely to be raised in the near future. This will mean that the existing toe of the left bank stopbank will be pushed further to the west.	Updated modelling to confirm that the proposal would not undermine the integrity function, efficiency and safety of the flood protection assets. Relocate the proposed location of the vegetation buffer outside the toe of the stop bank. Details of the proposed vegetation buffer are reserved to ensure: (i) access is provided to the stop bank to the satisfaction of the Bay of Plenty Rivers and Drainage Department; and (ii) the stability of the stop bank and bridge can be is maintained to the satisfaction of the Bay of Plenty Rivers and Drainage Department.
			4	1	First Gas Limited	Oppose	The Gas Pipelines need to be shown on the Planning Map. They should also have a 20 m buffer either side in which buildings, structures and earthworks should be avoided via a non-complying activity status. With regard to the Landscape Strip, Firstgas oppose planting of any vegetation capable of reaching over 1 m in height over top of or within an easement over a gas transmission pipeline.	The gas transmission pipelines and a 20 m buffer either side, are added to the Planning Map / Structure Plan below; and - the Landscape Strip is removed from the area over the gas transmission pipeline easement.

Summary Report for the District Plan Change 94 - Washer Road Business Park

Topic	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
PC94-03: General	01: Transportation	1	1	Eastpack Limited	Support with Amendment	<p>Concerns over the ability of the existing single lane bridge on Station Road to efficiently accommodate traffic generated by existing development and 7ha of additional Industrial Development. The single lane bridge is already constrictive during the kiwifruit season between March & November resulting in queues of both light traffic and heavy traffic. The additional traffic generated by the additional future Industrial Development could potentially be significant given the type of activities that would be permitted to operate within the Zone. It is acknowledged that Stantec have undertaken a survey and noted a short queuing time during vehicles giving way crossing the bridge, however the survey is only a minute fraction of the overall time period for traffic generated and it is therefore considered not to represent a complete representation over a longer time period.</p> <p>To accommodate the potential increased traffic flow, it is considered that the existing bridge should be upgraded to a double-lane bridge prior to any development occurring on the rezoned site.</p> <p>Eastpack also supports the proposed Jellicoe Street roundabout, however, considers this should be constructed prior to development on the site occurring.</p>	Approve the rezoning of the land subject to the upgrading of the Station Road single lane bridge to a double lane bridge and the construction of the roundabout at Jellicoe Street prior to development on the site occurring.
		2	1	Salt, MC & HF	Support with Amendment	<p>The single lane bridge that connects Washer and Station roads is not suitable for the current traffic. It is structurally not suitable.</p> <p>The current single lane right of way use gives the right of way to all traffic coming from Washer Road. The traffic coming from Station Road does not have a clear and unobstructed view of Washer Road itself. Sightlines are obscured. The bridge right of way, even without any rezoning, should be changed to give the Station Road traffic right of way.</p> <p>The erection of a footbridge (on single lane bridge) would be a waste of funds. It is still unsafe for pedestrians to be walking in this area of town after dark.</p> <p>There should be a round a bout at the intersection of Cameron Road & Jellicoe Street. This would not only make it safer for the Station Road traffic, but would be a great safety feature for the 3 schools that use the intersection. To not have a round a bout at Cameron Road and have the heavy traffic use a left turn coming off the bridge and send it back through to the round a bout in the centre of town would be a disaster as it is suffering from over use now. Station Road is not capable of the extra heavy traffic, it is suffering now with the concrete trucks.</p>	Install roundabout prior to development, upgrade the single lane bridge to two way or reverse the righ of way on the single lane and make safer

Summary Report for the District Plan Change 94 - Washer Road Business Park

Topic	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
	02: Stormwater	3	1	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	<p>The application proposes no mitigation of increased runoff from the site and is proposed for water treatment purposes only. Therefore, it is considered that the stormwater assessment from Lysaghts Consultants supplied with the application is incomplete and misleading.</p> <p>Mitigation of increased stormwater runoff shall be provided by detaining the increased runoff flow.</p> <p>Any stormwater detention pond or treatment wetland shall be located outside of the 1% AEP climate change adjusted (to 2130) floodplain.</p> <p>The subject site provides for a range of industrial land uses which involves high contaminant generating activities that will discharge into the adjacent stream. BOPRC consider water sensitive urban design to be a necessary intervention to manage water quality effects on the values of adjacent stream.</p> <p>The proposed location of the stormwater management devices, including the wetland is proposed to be located within the 100-year ARI floodplain.</p> <p>Stormwater management devices should be located outside of the 100-year ARI to avoid resuspension of sediments and contaminants during larger storm events.</p>	<p>Feasibility reporting to demonstrate the requirements for stormwater detention measures based on the updated modelling and, in accordance with BOPRC's Hydrological and Hydraulic Guidelines 2012/02.</p> <p>Limits on Impermeable surface coverage.</p> <p>On-site methods to manage run-off within the plan change area such as water sensitive urban design;</p> <p>Detailed design of stormwater mitigation measures for the business park.</p>
	03: National Policy Statement - Freshwater	3	4	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Oppose	<p>The Ohineangaanga Stream is directly adjacent to the plan change area. Policy IMP 1A of the Regional Natural Resources Plan (RNRP) is relevant as well as the overarching provisions of the National Policy Statement - Freshwater Management (NPS-FM).</p> <p>BOPRC request that the plan change applicant prepares an ecological assessment to identify the values of this stream as required by Policy IMP1A in the Natural Resources Plan which seeks to avoid losses in extent and values of streams.</p>	<p>The plan change does not include provisions to give effect to NPS-FM (2020) and would be inconsistent the relevant provisions of the RNRP and the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) to manage incremental degradation of water quality on receiving environments arising from urban stormwater.</p>
	04: Storage of hazardous materials	3	2	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	<p>Statutory provisions be included which recommend 'good site practices' to reduce contamination on industrial sites (e.g., storing chemicals indoors rather than in open yard areas) in the event of accidents and large flood events.</p>	<p>Amend the proposal to require that hazardous substances are stored outside of the 1% AEP flood event</p>

Summary Report for the District Plan Change 94 - Washer Road Business Park

Topic	Issue	Sub ID	Sub Point	Name	Inclination	Summary	Decision Req
	05: Regional Policy Statement	3	5	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council	Support with Amendment	<p>Regional Policy Statement (RPS) Policy UG 7A is particularly relevant to the proposal. BOPRC do not, in principle, oppose this plan change, notwithstanding that the area is outside the urban limits. BOPRC consider that the extent of the proposed change should align with the updated mapped extent of the 1% AEP flood event determined by updated modelling based on up to date climate change projections.</p> <p>Clause (a) of Policy NH 9B of the RPS requires using the methodology set out in Appendix L of the RPS for changes in land on urban sites of more than 5(ha). A risk assessment should be undertaken and identify which hazards are applicable to the plan change area. A development proposal is required to consider how a low level of natural hazard risk will be achieved as required under RPS Policy NH 4B.</p> <p>BOPRC do not consider the stormwater flood assessment undertaken by the applicant correctly accounts for increased volumes from the anticipated industrial land use or, correctly considers the effect of the proposed fill on the flood plain to determine whether there is an effect on the adjoining property or the flood protection assets both, on the site and downstream. Any proposed floodplain filling shall be compensated for by providing an equivalent amount of additional storage in the floodplain. This site could be developed to accommodate the proposed future development. However, land to the north of this site could not as it is all subject to flooding as shown by the Kaituna Model (2021). Updated modelling is being undertaken jointly between BOPRC and WBOPDC will be able to understand the constraints of existing development effects in and around Te Puke that would take into account up to date projections for climate change effects.</p>	<p>A risk assessment for each natural hazard the site is susceptible to, prepared in accordance with Appendix L of the RPS. Provisions to be included in the structure plan to ensure a low level of risk for the various hazards can be achieved within the plan change area without increasing risk outside of the development site. Further provisions maybe required to achieve a low level of risk for other hazards to give effect to the RPS (e.g. land instability building setbacks for landslide hazard).</p>