

Re notification of August 5 2022 delivered August 19 2022 proposed plan change 6 BOP Regional Policy Statement

Submission and Notification of objection to plan change 6

Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent, Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal

Please notice I use the word 'submission' only so that my document is counted as an objection. I do not submit to any decisions made by local government corporations.

I find your documents confusing and contradictory as they raise more questions than answers. I would like answers to my questions in time to potentially include the information you provide at the hearing of September 22. This hearing seems to be being pushed through in undue haste.

1 Why was there such a delay from the date of the documents to delivery of them?

2 Why is there not a referendum on this change, given the huge potential impact and cost to every ratepayer in the Bay of Plenty?

3 Why, therefore, has not every ratepayer in the region been given written information and notification of this proposed plan change? As there is no legal requirement for anyone to buy newspapers, TVs, radios, or computers, I believe it is not the regional council's place to tell people where to look things up, but rather to provide this information to ratepayers. I believe ratepayers are being deliberately disenfranchised.

4 Why are there no maps included showing the current urban limits? Please supply these.

5 Where are the definitions? For example, 'urban' 'urban limits', 'remove urban limits'. The statement 'remove urban limits' is in itself ambiguous. Does it mean extend outwards or does it mean remove the limits on what can be built within the current urban boundary?

6 The legislation is dated 2020. What is the BOPRC's current document on urban limits, and why now does it need to be changed?

7 Given the above questions, how can anyone be expected to make an informed decision or even understand what this is all about?

I can see nothing about removing urban limits in the directives and everything about working within current limits. Your plan of removing urban limits seems to contradict the intent of the policy statement.

I observe that your documents state that I 'received' this notification 'because your property is within the current western Bay urban limits and is not otherwise zoned.' It is zoned rural residential. My land is held in fee simple and I hold existing land use rights. Your document states that the directive is 'to be more responsive to urban development proposals and provide more intensification of urban areas.' I notice the use only of the co-ordinating conjunction with no punctuation of separation, which thereby makes this statement one item and intention. This would mean the intention is to intensify within the current urban areas only. Is this correct?

Regarding bullet point 1 'out of sequence or unplanned private development proposals,' Tauranga City Council and the Bay of Plenty Regional Council appear to do this already, although a definition of 'out of sequence' would be helpful. Does this mean putting in 'developments' before infrastructure

to cope with the 'development' is in place? Or do you mean allowing a private property developer to excavate a huge, clearly visible area of land without a resource consent, then telling him he needs one, which he immediately applies for, thereby avoiding any chance of prosecution once his application is in, the consent for which is then granted retrospectively? (Bay of Plenty Times, 2006) Then there are the 'private development proposals' at least some of which have historically had a 'hands-off' (Judge Dickey p18 s79, Bryce Donne court case 2021) approach by local councils. It would seem your proposed changes may well increase such happenings of poor, if any, monitoring. Not only do these cost ratepayers huge amounts, but the damage to the environment is also substantial. Some examples, I believe, are:

- Retrospective resource consents (2006 TCC)
- Bella Vista (TCC)
- Water discharge convictions related to the Tauriko Business Estate (2011,.2014,2021)

Removing urban limits, if this means extending outwards, allows for open slather of all rural land with extra costs for infrastructure, and added food mile costs once horticultural and farm food producing land is gone for good. This would also not be responsive to climate change directives. For example, the highest part of my farm has been decreed a flood zone by Tauranga City Council which says I am not allowed to build there. Yet from such lofty heights I can see the Tauriko Business Estate industrial area and a large part of the proposed Tauriko West housing 'development' some 10 metres below me, both in the Wairoa River catchment area (contaminated drainage going into the river) and adjacent to the tidal Wairoa River. Should this plan change go ahead and climate change related damage occur (slips, flooding etc) then I believe those who made this unwise decision and developers who benefitted financially should be named and made financially accountable, not ratepayers.

It also appears from the latest Kiwibank housing report that within the next 12 months there will be a housing surplus, in part from people leaving NZ, currently started housing and apartments, and because of a lot more building work is being completed now that gib wallboards are being made available, not hoarded, making the Tauriko West 'development' and the Winstone wallboard factory surplus to requirements before they are started/completed.

I suggest that the Tauriko West land be returned to farming/horticulture and that no further 'development' of any sort be done in areas likely to suffer flood related damage, such damage already happening in record fashion throughout New Zealand this year. I believe new housing restrictions to meet climate change are due out next year so perhaps such decisions should wait for that, unless, of course council's intention is to put things in place to avoid the new legislation.

Y James Auth Rep All rights reserved