

## Speaking to our submission - Priority Te Puna

Good Morning. My name is Sarah Rice. I am speaking today on behalf of myself, on behalf of Otumoetai Te Puna Pony Club, for which I am a past president, and on behalf of Priority Te Puna Incorporated Society, for which I am the current Secretary.

I HAVE LOOKED AT THE COUNCILS SUBMISSION AND IN THE MAIN, THEIR VIEWS ARE CONSISTENT WITH MINE. I SUPPORT THEIR RECOMMENDATION THAT THE APPLICATION BE DECLINED. MY SPOKEN EVIDENCE TODAY WILL INCLUDE CLARITY ON WHERE I DISAGREE WITH THE COUNCIL SUBMISSION.

Please bear with me. Its been a bit of a mission to work out what to say on behalf of all the people Im speaking on behalf of today. I have done my best to condense things and I suppose this is where you get to understand some of the personal impact this has had on me. Being hundreds and hundreds of hours of my time. This is the second week I've taken off work to deal with the TINEX Site in 3 months.

I moved to Te Puna in 2005. Before building our home, I asked questions of locals about what was happening in Station Road. It was clear that something was happening even back then. I was directed to the 2005 Court Ruling which I read and was comforted by.

This was going to be a rural business park. A nice little hub that would service the local community. An asset. I took seriously note 98. "For our part we have concluded that one advantage of this proposed change is that it would **directly provide for enhancement of the environment** and amenity of the area rather than merely its protection. "

I read the list of permitted activities and pictured the type of businesses that may move into the park.

A mix of rural businesses that would include nurseries, vets, tractor/mower repairs, cafes - all businesses that would enhance the area and be of use to local residents.

The buildings would be painted to fit in with the environment, the roads would be sealed, Wetlands would be developed and managed. This was to be a destination for Te Puna people, a place where you could come and buy some plants, some animal feed, run a few errands, meet a friend for coffee, enjoy the reserve.

\*\*\*\*\*

Fast forward a few years.

We have established ourselves in Te Puna and our daughter, who was born in 2006 is into horses so we join the local Pony Club which owns approximately 10 acres of land in Teihana Road, just over the railway from the Tinex site.

The business park still looks a mess but there is stuff happening. We assume that, despite delay, the business park is finally going ahead and we will finally get what we were promised.

\*\*\*\*\*

In 2016 AJ Demolition move in.

Next, the concrete crushing operation began. Banging, Dust. What the heck? How does this sort of thing get consent without the Pony Club being consulted? We are a community group providing outdoor activity to children.

The dust would travel to the club grounds as we rode. As president, I had a responsibility to find out more about what was going on.

The club was used to development. We are surrounded by a new housing development. That developer has kept us in the loop and has been an excellent neighbour, managing dust, noise and helping the club out in many practical ways.

\*\*\*\*\*

At this point, I began engaging more with those in the community who had had serious concerns about the Business Park development for years and years. Some of them we have heard from in this hearing. This is when I found out about harmful airborne silica, produced during concrete crushing. This is when I found out about the level of the unconsented activities and lack of compliance generally.

\*\*\*\*\*

Fast forward again to 2021.  
Concerns about the business park were growing in the wider community.

In late 2020 the council had issued an abatement notice for the concrete crushing. Thank goodness. But what next?

There had been complaints about so many different issues. People were living in the relocatable houses that were on the site and making noise at night, people were questioning the earthworks? Where were the promised wetlands and overland flowpath?

There were also documents that community members had received about council meeting with ContainerCo . They also wanted a piece of this Business Park. Concern in the community continued to grow.

\*\*\*\*\*

In January 2021 a few concerned community members held a public meeting at Te Puna Rugby Club. This was in the midst of COVID level 2 restrictions. Over 100 concerned locals turned up. The Mayor and councilors turned up to listen.

I think this meeting was a turning point for our community. We all came together. We knew we had each others backs.  
We heard concerns from all and sundry.

We learned about cultural concerns and history, we heard from people who talked from their perspective and their place of knowledge.

We made connections.

We formed an informal group which in March 2022 became Priority Te Puna Incorporated Society.

\*\*\*\*\*

Membership currently stands at 121 and is growing. Our membership includes a wide cross section of the local community and those who whakapapa to the area. We also enjoy support from people outside of our membership in Te Puna, Whakamarama, Omokoroa, Katikati and Waihi.

\*\*\*\*\*

Evidence of the Concern felt about TINEX specifically, includes, the HUGE community effort to fund legal costs to be an s274 party to the recent abatement appeal hearing. The community donated approximately \$44000 to PTP to date. Pretty much ALL of that has been spent on legal support regarding the applicant. Donations varied between \$5 and \$2000. We have received donations from over 100 households. In addition, many have given up their valuable time to support the efforts of the group which speaks to the strength of feeling.

\*\*\*\*\*

The community feel cheated and angry that they have had to weather continual issues with this site since 2002, when the three owners first proposed a joint zone change and commissioned the Opus report. (Evidence apdx 1)

\*\*\*\*\*

NOW LETS START WITH WHERE WE DISAGREE WITH COUNCIL.

We disagree with Point 48 in Council Officers Report written by Heather Perring.

Would you like me to read that point?

48. The site was initially zoned Te Puna Rural Business Park Zone when it was first inserted into the District Plan following the Environment Court's decision in 2005. In 2008 Council notified a District Plan review, which included a proposal to remove sub-zones from the Plan and included rezoning of Te Puna Business Park to the Industrial Zone (rather than remaining as Rural Business Park Zone). No submissions were received on the proposed change in zoning, rather 41 submissions were received that opposed the Business Park altogether, mainly on the basis of traffic effects. The proposal was retained, and the District Plan became operative on 16th June 2012.

The rationalization of zones was NOT mentioned in the 'KEY CHANGES' publicised in the district plan review 2009-2012 (apdx 2 Page 19)

The community were completely blindsided when they learned, only in 2019 that the Business park was no longer a 'subzone of rural' as ruled by Judge Smith in 2005. They couldn't appeal because they had no idea changes had been made.

At no time in the 2009-2012 Western Bay district plan review process was the zone 'rationalization' communicated to the public.

The changes, an unconsidered clerical issue, we fear have served to undermine the rural compatibility and enhancement aspects assured by Judge Smith.

We advocate strongly that the integrity of the 2005 zone change ruling is adhered to. It's the bare minimum that our community deserve.

There our criticism of councils evidence ends.

\*\*\*\*\*

This may be stating the obvious, but it needs to be said.  
Another 2 years of operating without full compliance of Structure Plan requirements will infuriate the community beyond belief.

The applicant has been operating commercial activity starting with AJ Demolition since 2016.

The applicant as a founding party to the zone change was, and is, very aware of the prerequisites to any commercial activity.

The applicant has, through abatement, had the District Plan requirements reinforced over and over again and yet persisted with his non compliance.

Through the abatement appeal process we saw that the applicant communicated the compliance issues to his tenants with varying levels of transparency. For instance Mr Keagg, the Total Relocations manager had never seen or heard of a noise management plan when questioned in court a couple of months ago.

\*\*\*\*\*

The tenants who spoke at the recent court hearing, (AJ Demolition manager, Roy Lehdorf and Total relocations David McKegg) clearly understood that the rent that they pay to Mr Daniel is well below market rates. They would never pay so little for a site that was compliant and professionally developed.

We submit they knew and accepted the yards were provided as an ad hoc development with no infrastructure and, included, associated risks of operating on an unconsented site. These risks include, being ordered to relocate, by a process such as this.

On a side note...

Both these tenants and other witnesses have spoken about the lack of 'AFFORDABLE' industrial land in the Western Bay. We submit that Mr Daniels Land is affordable because its poorly developed, lacks basic infrastructure, and lacks consents for use.

Total Relocations pay approximately \$17 inc GST per square metre per year. AJ Demolition are paying approximately \$12 inc GST per square metre per year.

It occurs to me on a personal basis that the businesses operating here are competing with similar businesses on an unfair basis. Their competitors have to pay a fair market rent for properly developed and consented land. It would be naive of the tenants to think they were getting such preferential rates with no risk attached. This is a real effect that leaving this businesses in situ would have on other businesses on compliant business parks.

\*\*\*\*\*

We see a continuation of scope creep away from the Structure Plan and away from the Intent of the Environment Court decision 2005 (Apdx 3). We ask that the commissioners compare what we have now with what we were led to expect from the 2005 ruling.

\*\*\*\*\*

We note that Mr Daniel has other Resource consent applications being processed that request a waiver of some of the structure plan. This speaks to the lack of intention by the developer to comply in full with the existing structure plan within the next 2 years.

This application, RC13924L, that we are here to discuss today notes another application (RC12979) that is in for retrospective consent for earthworks that have been undertaken and there is yet another, (RC13474) for waiving of compliance for an incorrectly built bund and non-compliant planting.

The bund, which as others have spoken to, is already collapsing and polluting the drains along the side of the road. I endorse Neville Bidois AND Bev Cain's statements about the state of this bund.

The 2 years being sought assumes that these 2 further RCAs will be approved and does not allow time for earth to be removed, and the bund to be reconstructed and replanted correctly if those RCAs are refused.

\*\*\*\*\*

The applicant is keen to downplay the effects that the existing tenants have on the community. The community disagrees. PTP would not be receiving the financial and moral support of so much of the community to oppose this application if the effects of the existing activity were minimal. The non complying activities affect people and property in our area on a frequent and ongoing basis.

\*\*\*\*\*

Lets talk about TRAFFIC

**APDX 3.1 SLIP To be shown on large screen**

Referring to the possibility that TPSR may be opened one way in the future. It is significant that over 60 Pirirakau Hapu Members said 'Do not open the road' when they completed a WBOPDC survey about whether the road should be opened at the Pa Site. A lot of the concern was regarding vibrations from heavy vehicles, exacerbating the slip issues.

**APDX 4 SWIMMING POOL CLARKE RD To be shown on large screen**

We have no faith that the proposed traffic management plan will be adhered to by the tenants as regards Clarke Road. Clarke Road is just too convenient. The unsuitability of ALL the local roads for heavy traffic mean that the Chicanes in Clarke Road are not a sufficient deterrent. Mr Daniel has proved himself incapable of communicating, managing and enforcing other management plans such as the noise management plan to his tenants, so the promise to stick to yet another plan provided to him by a consultant does not fill us with hope for compliance.

**APDX 5 LARGE TRUCK CLARKE RD To be shown on large screen**

These photos show the impact of large trucks using Clarke Road. In our submission you will also see evidence specifically of AJ Demolition Trucks and McLeod Cranes on their way to the TINEX Site using Clarke Road. A further problem that we have with the condition proposed, is that the applicant knew that the chicanes were put in place to prevent business park traffic using Clarke Road. In fact he even paid partial costs for the chicanes to be built, but he did nothing to stop any of his tenants using Clarke Road until publishing the recent traffic plan which suggests his tenants no longer use Clarke Road. This is typical of the applicant's behaviour and is beyond tiresome for the community.

\*\*\*\*\*



The proposal to only use Te Puna Road increases safety issues in other areas. So lets work our way along the access route to the business park from Te Puna Roundabout.

\*\*\*\*\*

Te Puna Road is a rural residential road. It is used by commuters, pedestrians, rural and horticultural contractors, cyclists, people traveling to and from the local school and Rugby Club. It is not made for oversize vehicles.

**APDX 6 video on big screen (Swimming Pool on TPR)**

This video shows the issue of oversized vehicles using Te Puna Road. Its actually traveling toward the roundabout. As heard on the audio, the truck has had to swing across two lanes to exit the junction with Te Puna Station Road. You can also clearly see it cross the centre line as it goes around the corner.

The TPR TPSR INTERSECTION.

The junction at Te Puna Road / Te Puna Station Road is unsuitable for oversize and heavy trucks. The slope, camber and sight line when exiting Te Puna Station Road is tricky to negotiate plus there is no turning lane to support a large vehicle turning right from Te Puna Road into Te Puna Station Road. Large vehicles have to cross the centre line to negotiate that turn in.

\*\*\*\*\*

**APDX 7 video of large truck leaving TPSR**

While we acknowledge that this truck is not from the TINEX Site, It is indicative and does demonstrate the issues of oversize vehicles using the junction. You can see, first of all, the slope of the junction means that oversize vehicle cannot STOP at it as they lose too much momentum to make the dangerous maneuver in a timely fashion. There is a STOP sign here.

The truck then clearly takes up the full two lanes of Te Puna Road, note the footpath on the right and the poor visibility to the South for traffic coming around

the corner and down the hill toward the junction. The truck is either on the berm or extremely close to it.

Note also the person taking the video is at a complete stand still in the left turn bay to allow the vehicle room to maneuver.

This video is 11 seconds long, and, at the point it cuts off, the truck is still occupying the entire width of Te Puna Road. This is a major safety concern. This video was taken by a mum on her way home from school pick up.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **APDX 8 - Nevs white truck pic**

These photos show the issues of a truck turning right into TPSR. To give everyone their bearings, in the top left quarter of the top picture you can see the junction to Borell Road where the school is.

Note the brake lights on the trailer in front of the photographer.

Recall the short sight lines to the rear.

Note the black car in front which has pulled over to the left to avoid the truck.

On the left of this photo is the pedestrian footpath.

Traffic expert, Justine Wilton, clearly identified safety issues with potential for nose to tail collisions encountering a traffic queue like this.

Now lets look at the maneuver itself. The white car approaching the give way has had to stop well back from the junction. The truck and trailer has had to cut the corner to negotiate it. The vehicle is fully using the northbound giveaway lane.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **APDX9 - crashed into power pole**

At Point 89 in Mr Crossans evidence, he quotes Mr Harrison who says there is no history of crashes at the TPR TPSR junction.

This is factually incorrect. Mr Harrison and Mr Crossen were part of the Tinex team at the recent Environment Court hearing where PTP presented

photographic evidence of a crash that happened literally days prior to the hearing. In addition to this crash, I and other local people have pulled people from their vehicles at this junction surprisingly often. A member of our community tragically lost her life there in August 2016.

The power pole is regularly damaged and only a couple of weeks ago our roads were congested as the lines company repaired yet more damage to it.

This picture shows an oversize vehicle that did not manage to make the turn successfully. This was taken on 27th July this year. Conditions were slippery, Camber is difficult and this truck just slid into the power pole causing disruption and line damage.

Vehicles from the TINEX site include similar oversize and heavy commercial vehicles. This intersection is wholly unsuitable for the traffic that TINEX tenants operate.

We support Ms Perrings conclusion that the intersection has not been upgraded to the level identified as necessary in 2005. It is morally irresponsible for the applicant to claim that the intersection is to standard, regardless of the clerical error in the MOU.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Sharp Corner

#### **APDX 10, 10a and 10b Sharp Corner**

Just down from the junction is a very sharp corner. I personally have met large vehicles coming toward me on the wrong side of the road. We have anecdotal evidence of other community members experiencing the same thing. It's a known crash site. We have seen cars in the drains on the side of the road there so many times.

\*\*\*\*\*

Regarding Road Widening at the Entrance to the Tinex Site

We agree with Ms Wiltons findings that there is a lack of capacity to accommodate trucks turning in and out of the site, causing risk of accident. Local people have experienced having to stop to allow trucks in and out of the site plus have been frightened of vehicles approaching the rear of their vehicle at speed whilst they are at a standstill awaiting TINEX traffic to get out of their way.

The road is too narrow.

There is no right turn bay.

There is no room for evasive maneuvers.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **APDX 11 - Flooded Road**

There is much much more that we could say about the unsuitability of our local roads to support the current activities remaining on this site. We understand it is built on old Kauri logs across soft alluvial silt. The road collapsed a couple of years ago on the northern side between TPR TPR Junction and the sharp bend. It took ages to be fixed as it was geotechnically difficult. It was coned off for months. Sometimes with traffic lights. Just before the corner there has been a history of water coming up through the road. Initially we thought it was a spring but I believe it was found to be a damaged water pipe that had moved in those soft alluvial silts that we keep talking about. Te Puna Station Road, in its current state is not a suitable road for ANY business park traffic.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **ENVIRONMENT**

As per our submission, AJ Demolitions have caused anger in the community for their lack of environmental understanding and care at all stages of their operation.

Ms Perring has referred to concerns around silica and asbestos.

We have provided photos in our submission of the Concrete crushing operation that locals repeatedly highlighted to Council.

Such was our concern for the possible damage to local ecology that in 2022, PTP undertook eDNA testing of the stream which showed threatened and at risk species as previously described (Long finned eels, Giant kokopu, freshwater mussels, Giant Bully, Brown Teal.)

This week we finally see evidence of water quality testing by the applicant.

It's unconscionable that it's taken this much time and pressure for the applicant to show any interest in water quality. One test, at the entrance to the site which is surrounded by water, 18 years after a zone change does not provide us with a satisfactory history of how the last 18 years worth of fill, earthworks and industrial activity have affected the environment. It also speaks to the lack of environmental care that has been applied to the development.

The current situation is that run off from the site is channeled through the bunds into the roadside drain. From the drain it flows to meet the Hakao Stream and from there into the Wairoa River, then the harbour. PTP Committee member and Pirirakau Kaumatua, Neville Bidois highlighted water quality concerns with images at the abatement hearing. He described discolored material oozing through the bunds directly into the unimproved stormwater system. Alison Cowley spoke about how water flowed in this area yesterday and I endorse her comments.

#### **APDX 12 - Pic of collapsing bund**

Let me explain this picture.

You can see the planted bund at the rear of the photo. Currently, pipes bring water from the site, under the bund then over the flat area and into the roadside drain.

The effect this is having is that the edge of the drain is collapsing and it should be noted that stormwater leaving the industrial site is unfiltered.

Priority Te Puna was shocked at the recent court hearing to hear that MrLehndorf, the manager of AJ Demolition didn't know that there was a HAIL classification on the land under his operation. Neither was he aware of the environmental dangers of leaching from crushed concrete potentially affecting

wildlife. This information is available via a simple search of the regional councils website.

Mr Lehdorf had no understanding of how stormwater from the site he manages exits into the environment and at the time of the hearing had made no efforts to investigate the environmental issues that PTP had raised in their evidence to the court. We feel that this lack of care is unforgivable and speaks to the *liaise faire* culture on the site. A manager of a site dealing in recycled materials including highly toxic materials should be all over the detail.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **APDX 13 - Flooded gateway**

In times of flood, the issue is exacerbated. The community is distressed at the lack of environmental protection and the lack of care to test and understand exactly how much toxic waste is escaping into our precious stream, river and harbour.

When Mr Crossan was asked under oath whether he could categorically state that the bunds are in the correct location he answered “no he could not state that”.

We know that the developer is legally required to move the drains inside the Tinex boundary. This has not been done.

The location of the bunds to accommodate the new drain position with structural integrity has not been presented or to our knowledge even been decided on.

We do not believe that the existing, potentially incorrectly sited bund was constructed to industry standards or in a manner that protects the environment. There is anecdotal evidence from members of the Rugby Club who planted the bund in return for a donation that they could barely get any plants dug into it as it was so full of rubble and rocks. On Monday, Mr May spoke about the potential of planting mature plants to speed up the process of providing the landscaping solution. He also advocated for a 1m set back rather than a 3 m setback. We submit that the hardscaping of the yards and rubble filled bunds would make it very hard to initially even plant mature plants. For them to establish themselves, especially with reduced setback would be near impossible.

We note that there is now an extra Consent Application to upgrade a culvert in that roadscape drainage area.

This speaks to the whole adhoc nature of development. Will that culvert be part of the broader drain relocation to inside the applicant's boundary as legally required? How can this all happen if the tenants remain in situ?

Has a plan been presented that confirms required drain location and therefore potential remediation with bund relocation? Mr Crossan presents evidence of soil testing from the location of the existing culvert but no soil testing from the AJ Demolition site where concrete was crushed. Too many questions remain to grant this consent.

\*\*\*\*\*

Priority Te Puna supports a full investigation of the platform itself as we can find no evidence of engineered preloading or monitoring of fill spread over these extremely compressible and waterlogged alluvial AND estuarine silts.

At 1.8 meters compacted site raising, over his 12ha site, Mr Daniel has deposited over 216,000 cubic meters of fill at the mouth of the valley. With No, fit for purpose, stormwater infrastructure.

As the type of fill has never been monitored by anyone other than Mr Daniel, questions remain about what the fill comprises, and how much toxic material could be leaching through those bunds into our environment. (This was addressed by Alison Cowley in her submission and I endorse her views on it.) The lack of compliance around distance from waterways has not been adhered to and Commercial activity is occurring closer to the waterways than the stipulated 20m that the environment court ordered in 2005.

\*\*\*\*\*

A line in the sand must be drawn. All commercial activity removed. The existing site examined, and remediated, drains moved, bunds repositioned if necessary,

Internal roads sealed, an examination and remedial works on stormwater and wetlands, full cultural engagement.

\*\*\*\*\*

For 4 years the community has been expressing concerns about fire risks on this site. To date, firefighting methods are still being discussed. This is in the heart of a export grade horticultural and residential area. The economic and health and safety risk of having no decent plan or availability of water immediately available is unacceptable and unbelievable.

\*\*\*\*\*

Portaloos. Really? In a high wind zone. This is where I feel I shouldn't have to say anything. Do I have to talk to how below par this is as a solution to waste management.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Cultural Issues

There are speakers more qualified than me who will focus on the cultural issues that surround this site. Its enough for me to say that this is an important area culturally and the Pa site should be protected and respected. I endorse Kaumatua Neville Bidois submission on cultural matters.

\*\*\*\*\*

In reply to additional points I have not yet covered but that appear in Mr Crossans planning evidence on Submissions:-

Point 62. Mr Crossan appears to undervalue the number of submissions received as some of them were pro forma submissions and some were from families including from children. Children's voices should and are to be heard clearly by council. Do the children who ride at the Pony Club and have been exposed to harmful airborne silica not have a right to complain? Does my daughter who wrote a submission (not a proforma) not count because she is only 17? She drives on these roads and has lived in Te Puna her entire life.



The community wanted to have their say. The issues with this site are complex and many. This is a foreign interaction for most people, some of whom don't have digital connection or skills but all of whom have a right to protect themselves and their community. They have made submissions that communicate what they need to say, and have actively taken the time to ask for help navigating the process.

Mr Crossan suggests there was 'something of a facebook campaign'. Is this even relevant to the evidence? If so, I would like to clarify what that so called campaign consisted of quickly.

The notice of public notification was made by council. Priority Te Puna contacted its members with that notice and further information on how to make a submission. In addition we shared that information on Facebook community pages between Te Puna and Omokoroa. To the people who it affects most. That hardly amounts to a campaign. A proportion of the facebook posts were interacted with by those in support of the applicant so also gave them the heads up to put in their submission.

Priority Te Puna are careful to communicate openly and honestly with the community, presenting facts, presenting concerns, presenting opportunities for people to have their say. It is up to individuals to draw their own conclusions when presented with facts.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 65. The compliance history of the applicant should absolutely be taken into account in this hearing. It speaks to the lack of faith within the community that any agreed processes will be adhered to. Given the way the applicant does first and asks later, we feel it is unlikely that he'll fully comply within two years. Then what? Another extension, another last second appeal. The community is sick and tired of the never ending process.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 66. Mr Crossan suggests that even if it is true that Mr Daniel has done nothing to meet the structure plan in the last 18 years, that should be irrelevant

from a planning perspective. Why? If we all write plans but don't stick to them then at what point should someone step in and say enough is enough. We are all accountable for the decisions we make and the decision to ignore specific prerequisites that needed addressing prior to commercial activity is what has brought us to this point.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 67. The applicant has been working on consenting these activities since 2020 but the activities began years before. He knew what he was meant to do in 2005. He understood and agreed 18 years ago but it wasn't until council actually came after him that he started to look at getting consents. This does not sing of a respectable developer keen to work in harmony with the environment and community.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 69. The existing tenants are too close to the boundary and run off from the sites goes straight into drains surrounding the site. If the tenants are to stay in place it will not be possible to remediate the area, sort the bunds, test the fill, restore the riparian area and protect and restore the waterways.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 71. Mr Crossan notes that there are other activities in the area that generate heavy traffic. He is not wrong. However just because others are breaking the rules doesn't mean that the applicant should be consented to break the rules. Their time will come.

Furthermore Mr Crossan suggests that the other heavy vehicles should not technically be considered as part of the existing environment.

Using that philosophy, If I get hit by a heavy truck that is technically not supposed to be on Station Road, would I technically not be hurt? Honestly, I apologize for the sarcasm but you need to understand how fed up I am of playing these games.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 78. Mr Crossan is of the opinion that the issues raised in the submissions have been adequately dealt with in this application. This speaker disagrees.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 190. Mr Crossan states “I acknowledge that other business park owners may be watching what happens with interest.” They surely will be.

If this consent is granted then it gives everyone along that road a reason to do first, ask later.

Please please do not do this to our community. We are exhausted and all have better things to do with our lives than be bogged down in the minutiae of planning and development law.

Thousands of hours of lay peoples time has gone into fighting for what we shouldn't have to fight for. I have recorded and filed over 10 GB of data in the last 2 years all pertaining to the Business Park. I have read files going back to 2002.

Supporting the councils recommendations here, would allow the community to step back a little and let the council do their job without constant badgering, OIA requests, and weekends gone to reading documents like Mr Crossans 104 page planning evidence.

Whilst developers are allowed to continue with piecemeal unconsented activities, the community finds itself in limbo.

\*\*\*\*\*

Point 217. Mr Crossan refers to amenity. The Resource Management Act defines amenity values as those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.

I ask, On Tuesday's visit, did anyone appreciate natural and physical qualities and characteristics on Mr Daniels site that contributed to their appreciation of the pleasantness, aesthetic coherence and cultural and recreational attributes?

\*\*\*\*\*

The resource consent hearing is for a 2 year extension. No way will the outstanding issues be resolved within 2 years to the satisfaction of the community.

Will this applicant be able to:

- professionally develop all environment protections, and enhancement,
- fully understand and respond to cultural concerns,
- plan, and build, engineered road safety improvements in the immediate vicinity along with sealing of internal roads and parking. Widen a road that has deep drains on either side alongside a railway.
- work alongside the other two developers for a fully integrated cooperative stormwater system on this low lying, geotechnically challenging site,
- Plan and Implement the bigger roading upgrades , including a complete rework of Te Puna / Te Puna Station road intersection and wider traffic network issues.
- Satisfy all of the screening measures and, planting (especially if bunds have to be moved)
- Plan and develop the wetlands and overland flow path to meet catchment capacity.

WE DO NOT BELIEVE THIS DEVELOPER WILL DO THIS, HE HAS HAD 18 YEARS. IF HE IS GIVEN 2 MORE then I guarantee we will all be back here in 2025.

There ends my submission