

FURTHER SUBMISSION

Variation 1 to Plan Change 33 to the Tauranga City Plan

Under Clause 8 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Chief Executive Officer
Tauranga City Council
Private Bay 12022
Tauranga 3143

By email: city.plan@tauranga.govt.nz; janine.speedy@tauranga.govt.nz

Further submission by: Urban Task Force for Tauranga (**UTF**)

Address for Service: Collier Consultants Limited
PO Box 14371
Tauranga Mail Centre
Tauranga 3143

Attention: Aaron Collier

Email: Aaron@collierconsultants.co.nz

- 1 Urban Task Force for Tauranga (UTF) made a submission (21) on Variation 1 to Plan Change 33 to the Tauranga City Plan.
- 2 UTF is a person has an interest in Variation 1 that is greater than the general public has for the reasons that the submitter lodged an original submission on Variation 1 on behalf of its members and UTF also represents an aspect of the publics interest.
- 3 This submission does not relate to trade competition and/or the effects of trade competition.
- 4 UTF wishes to be heard at the hearing in support of their further submission, and if others make a similar submission, UTF will consider presenting a joint case at any hearing.
- 5 The further submission matters raised are detailed in the attached table which identifies the original submitter and the submission points made by UTF.
- 6 A copy of this further submission with be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it has been served on Council.



Aaron Collier
For Urban Task Force for Tauranga
10 June 2022

Further Submission Points

This further submission by UTF is in relation to the original submission of:	The particular parts of the original submission UTF support/oppose are:	Our position on the original submission:	The reason for UTFs support/opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or reject the original submission:	Details of why UTF wish to allow/reject (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make
Tauranga Crossing Limited (Submission 27)	Submission point 27.7 – 27.15	Oppose	The submission seeks a number of changes and amendments to the variation in relation to prerequisite provisions and the sequencing/staging of development, by amending the activity status for subdivision and development to a non-complying activity where the prerequisite, staging and sequencing requirements are not met.	Reject	The proposed amendments sought are inappropriate and are not supported by objectives and policies. The current enabling activity status should be retained as it will enable development to be appropriately considered which does not comply with Plan standards as a discretionary activity.
NZ Transport Agency (Submission 22)	Submission point 22.1, 22.13	Oppose	It is inappropriate to include a policy in the variation which recognises the need to protect the future offline alignment of State Highway 29 which does not currently exist.	Reject	The proposed amendments are inappropriate for consideration in the variation. The protection of the future alignment of State Highway 29 will need to be determined, confirmed and provided for through a future designation process
Tauriko West Limited (Submission 42)	Submission point 42.3	Support	The reasons for providing lower yield (shortfall) as set out in the submission are appropriate.	Allow	The inclusion of reference to the management of landscape character at the interface with the Wairoa River and the inclusion of geotechnical constraints and typography are appropriate matters to justify the provision of a lower yield.

This further submission by UTF is in relation to the original submission of:	The particular parts of the original submission UTF support/oppose are:	Our position on the original submission:	The reason for UTFs support/opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or reject the original submission:	Details of why UTF wish to allow/reject (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make
	Submission point 42.4, 42.5	Support	A definition of “infrastructure ready” is required.	Allow	The variation did not contain a definition of “infrastructure ready” and the submitters definition clarifies “infrastructure ready” in terms of the intended policy outcome.
	Submission point 42.6 – 42.8	Support	There are a number of Tauriko West specific objectives and policies for stormwater which are inconsistent with the general stormwater objectives and policies in the City Plan.	Allow	To remove this potential for conflict between various objectives and policies, the specific stormwater objectives and policies and rules for Tauriko West should either be deleted or the variation should identify that general citywide provisions do not apply at Tauriko West.
	Submission point 42.13	Support	The current rule overlooks the landscape character and interface with the Wairoa River in relation to yield shortfall.	Allow	We consider that the submission should be accepted and that the Council should add a new standard which considers how the management of landscape character at the interface of the Wairoa River has affected the ability to achieve yield as per the submission.
Classic Group & Tauriko Property Group (Submission 49)	Submission point 49.4	Support	We agree that it is inappropriate to label a future offline State Highway 29 on the Structure Plan as the language is too absolute, recognising that the alignment will still need to go through future processes including a designation.	Allow	We consider that the wording “location of current preferred design for future offline State Highway 29” as sought by the submitter is appropriate. The alignment (and protection) will be determined

This further submission by UTF is in relation to the original submission of:	The particular parts of the original submission UTF support/oppose are:	Our position on the original submission:	The reason for UTFs support/opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or reject the original submission:	Details of why UTF wish to allow/reject (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make
					through a future designation process.
	Submission point 49.10	Support	The Plan objective in relation to infrastructure should require that infrastructure is efficient.	Allow	The variation as notified does not promote the <u>efficient</u> development and use of infrastructure and an amendment to the Plan objective is required as per the submission.
	Submission point 49.11	Support	We agree that the variation cannot “protect” the functioning of the State Highway network.	Allow	We consider that the amendment proposed to “promote” the functioning and safe operation of the State Highway network is appropriate.
	Submission point 49.13	Support	We consider that it is inappropriate to include policies in a plan which simply repeat requirements in regional plans/regional consents.	Allow	We consider that the policy is unnecessary and acts like a rule. The requirements of relevant stormwater consents are enforceable and are subject to a separate process and should not be repeated in a City Plan. The policies are unnecessary.
	Submission point 49.19	Support	The proportionment of financial infrastructure burden should be fairly shared across the Tauriko West Growth Area.	Allow	We agree that the financial contribution scheme should be amended to more fairly apportion the costs of infrastructure across the entire Tauriko West Growth Area.
Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Submission 29)	Submission point 29.3 – 29.4	Oppose	The inclusion of policies which require applicants to meet the requirements of relevant stormwater	Reject	The opposed amendments are inappropriate for consideration in a City Plan as applicants are required

This further submission by UTF is in relation to the original submission of:	The particular parts of the original submission UTF support/oppose are:	Our position on the original submission:	The reason for UTFs support/opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or reject the original submission:	Details of why UTF wish to allow/reject (in full or in part) to indicate the decision you want Council to make
			consents are unnecessary and are inappropriate.		to meet requirements of any relevant stormwater consent/Regional Plan. It is not the function of a City plan provision to repeat/enforce these legal requirements
	Submission point 29.21	Oppose	City Plan's should not prescribe regional consenting requirements and processes, nor should they set out what Regional consent applications should contain.	Reject	The relief sought is inappropriate in the context of a City Plan provision and regional consent requirements should be addressed under Regional Plan provisions.