

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.
				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 3 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	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.
				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	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.

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
								been made for this by the shaping of our driveway.	
				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.
				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 of 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.
				21	2	Fairvercoe Limited	Oppose	Further areas of flooding are identified on the submitter's land (No 2 Road / Tynan St). It is considered that these additional areas may be incorrect and require checking by way of ground survey (at the Tynan Street end of the submitter's site). Note from Council planner - this land is shown as 12 Dudley Vercoe Drive on Council's maps.	The decision sought from the Council is that the plan changes be approved, with necessary amendments to address the submitter's concerns.
				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.
				26	1	Classic Group Limited	Oppose	We oppose the extent of floodable areas shown on Planning Map U126 as they relate to 33 Station Road, Te Puke. The flood modelling is inaccurate and there are areas of land shown which may not be floodable.	We seek that Council works collaboratively with Classic Group Ltd to undertake further work to confirm the accuracy of the floodable area shown on the map.

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	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 4.
				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.
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.
				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.
PC75 - 02	Te Puke Structure Plan - Map	5	Zoning	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.
				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

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
									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.
				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.
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 650m2. 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.
PC75 - 03	Te Puke Structure Plan - Rules	3	Other	15	1	Mr Dave Harwood	Unknown	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. The Trust seeks that there be flexibility in	Add to sections 12.4.10 and 13.4.2 of the District Plan a rule enabling the following: 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

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
								<p>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>A particular outcome of this proposed amendment is to avoid situations where residential development locates in areas currently shown as being proposed for stormwater management, but following specific design and development these areas are no longer required.</p>	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.
				15	2	Mr Dave Harwood	Unknown	<p>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.</p> <p>To provide flexibility while still managing development in accordance with established Plan provisions, it is proposed that rule 13.3.3(a) (i) - (iv) be deleted and replaced with an amended rule which allows development in accordance with the existing Medium Density Residential controls as a restricted discretionary activity within the Residential zone.</p> <p>This is considered a superior option in terms of retaining consistency throughout the Plan in terms of the outcomes sought by the Plan Change, rather than either retaining the Medium Density Residential zoning on The Trust land, or creating some form of 'spot zoning' for the site.</p>	<p>Delete the existing rule 13.3.3(a) (i) - (iv) and replace it with:</p> <p>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.</p>
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