

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**")

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

Resource consent applications by Te Puna Industrial  
Limited in relation to 297 Te Puna Station Road

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF KENNETH DAVID HARRIS ON BEHALF OF  
TE PUNA INDUSTRIAL LIMITED**

**(CORPORATE)**

**25 JUNE 2024**

---

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 ContainerCo (NZL) Limited ("**ContainerCo**") and ContainerCo Management Limited provide services essential to the Bay of Plenty region's export supply chain from on port facilities and at major cargo nodes. ContainerCo supports these facilities by providing administrative and specialist support services from secondary sites close to, but not, on port.
- 1.2 The site at 297 Te Puna Station Road in the Te Puna Business Park area has been selected for development as a support site, due to its appropriate zoning and location advantages. The development of our Te Puna site facilitates the movement of non-intensive support activities off port. This frees up port land for intensive cargo and container use.
- 1.3 As I will detail below, the site development establishes a long-term home for the company. The development enhances environmental and sustainability outcomes as well as supporting employment, and the training of our e-teams. The development will improve health and safety outcomes, reduce overall traffic movements, and reduce carbon emissions. It is important for regional economic wellbeing but also sees the creation of amenity value through the establishment of wetlands, walkways and landscaping features. The development, in my view, also creates immediate and enduring opportunities for Pirirākau.
- 1.4 My evidence should be read in conjunction with Dr Harris's evidence, also on behalf of Te Puna Industrial Limited and ContainerCo.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 My name is Kenneth ("**Ken**") David Harris.
- 2.2 I am the Chairman of ContainerCo's Board of Directors, and until April of 2024 was the Managing Director of ContainerCo. I am also the owner of ContainerCo Management Limited, the company managing ContainerCo. I am the controlling shareholder of ContainerCo. In these capacities, I have power of appointment for one Director of Te Puna Industrial Limited ("**TPIL**"). Currently this person is Jesse Reynolds. TPIL is the owner of the site at 297 Te Puna Station Road ("**Site**") and has made the relevant application for resource consents ("**Application**").

- 2.3 Until April, I was Managing Director at ContainerCo, a role I had been in for eleven years and previous to that NZL Group from 2005. My career has also included roles heading the New Zealand Quarantine Service and various New Zealand port companies. ContainerCo was formed by myself by merging NZL Container Services with another industry player in 2013.
- 2.4 ContainerCo provides essential services in support of the container shipping lines relied on by New Zealand exporters to move their goods to market. This work includes preparing and testing shipping containers.
- 2.5 ContainerCo's 300 staff provide our light industrial services nationwide and from various facilities. On port and at major transport nodes, ContainerCo holds and processes large volumes of container stocks. On port and cargo node land is limited in availability, therefore, supply chain efficiency needs this land to be reserved for intensive cargo and container uses.
- 2.6 Other facilities accommodate support functions and need to be close to the ports and cargo nodes but not on the same sites. These satellite sites accommodate and support related services such as training, safety, administration, EV truck charging, refrigerated engineering services, and container hire and sales services. These satellite operations can support the provision of essential services to exporters in the immediate vicinity. This includes supporting container supply in the immediate area thereby reducing people and freight movements.
- 2.7 I have appointed two directors of TPIL since 2021, but have never been a director myself. TPIL is a joint venture between ContainerCo and Beaumont Investment Trust. It was formed as a vehicle to own and develop the Site for light industrial activity. The development of the Business Park on the Site will include elements specifically intended for the low-intensity sections of ContainerCo's business.

### 3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 My evidence relates to the proposal by TPIL to develop its Site at 297 Te Puna Station Road for yard-based industrial activities.
- 3.2 Our application has been carefully designed in general accordance with the Site's bespoke Te Puna Business Park Structure Plan ("**Structure Plan**") and zoning under the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan ("**District Plan**"). We have taken expert advice throughout the process of our Application and

consider we have put together a world-class proposal that will significantly benefit the Bay of Plenty region as a whole.

3.3 In this statement of evidence I will:

- (a) provide a summary of TPIL and ContainerCo and our proposed development of the Site;
- (b) explain the significant benefits of our proposed development of the Site, particularly for the region's primary production sector and exporters;
- (c) explain the proposed upgrade of the Te Puna Road / Te Puna Station Road intersection that TPIL is proposing as part of the Application. This is in direct response to the Commissioners' recent decision to decline retrospective resource consent to Tinex Group Limited ("**Tinex**") for industrial activities on the site at 245 Te Puna Station Road;
- (d) describe the consultation and engagement that has been undertaken for this Application in respect of Pirirākau in particular, but also the wider community;
- (e) describe the engagement undertaken with certain parties who have made submissions on the Application including steps taken by TPIL to address matters raised by submitters; and
- (f) set out the cultural conditions and mitigation package that TPIL is offering to Pirirākau, to address the concerns they have raised with us through engagement, including in their Pirirākau Assessment of Cultural Effects ("**PACE**").

#### 4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Since at least the early 2000s, there has been noticeable growth in the Te Puna area. There has also been investment in local infrastructure to better service the area including an upgrade of the Te Puna Road / State Highway 2 ("**SH2**") roundabout. Works have begun on the Stage 1 of the new 6.8km four-lane road connecting State Highway 29 Takituma Drive through to SH2 west of Te Puna.

4.2 Te Puna is now, in my opinion, a location very well positioned for export related operations due to its proximity to the Port of Tauranga (Aotearoa, New

Zealand's largest export Port) and proximity to the Bay of Plenty region's core primary production industries including kiwifruit production for international export. Te Puna has the potential to support those critical activities in a significant way, specifically by enabling the continued growth in exports of primary produce to global markets. This is fundamental to the economic and social well-being of Aotearoa New Zealand as a whole.

4.3 The Site itself was re-zoned through a private plan change process approved by the Environment Court in 2005 for the Structure Plan.<sup>1</sup> As Mr Murphy explains,<sup>2</sup> the Structure Plan provides for yard-based light industrial activities which (unlike other light or heavy industrial activities such as those located around the Port of Tauranga) do not have the potential for significant off-site adverse effects such as discharges of contaminants to air, significant noise, or 24/7 lighting and other operational requirements.

4.4 In this regard, I highlight that the Environment Court in its 2005 decision to rezone the Site said:<sup>3</sup>

[45] Overall we conclude that there are more similarities between this proposed zone and the Rural zone than there are with the Industrial zone....

....

[112] Overall the proposed change would be more liberal than the Rural H provisions, although imposing some significant costs on the developer. On the other hand it is less liberal than the general Industrial provisions and therefore is a measured response to the issues outlined in the [District] Plan and proposed change. In short, although there is an acceptance of a greater density of buildings, this is compensated for by the concept plan method, provision of wetland and a series of other controls. Increased effects in terms of traffic and noise are specifically addressed by particular provisions of the proposed change.

[113] Having identified the need for industrial land within the district (page 7 – 1 of the Plan) we conclude that the promoter of the proposed change has balanced the benefits of this with the mitigated effects of the proposal now put before the Court. The general objective to be added is to ensure development within the Te Puna Industrial Business zone is compatible with the amenity values of the rural environment of the neighbourhood. This is a response to sustainable management

---

<sup>1</sup> *Thompson and Flavell v Western Bay of Plenty District Council* NZEnvC Auckland A026/2005.

<sup>2</sup> Statement of Evidence of Vincent Murphy dated 26 June 2024.

<sup>3</sup> *Thompson and Flavell v Western Bay of Plenty District Council* NZEnvC Auckland A026/2005, 3 February 2005 at [45], [112]-[114], [116] and [117].

as identified in and the various matters we have identified from Part II of the Act generally. The objective essentially assumes that sustainable management can be met by providing for the change while protecting the amenity values of the rural environment of the neighbourhood. This is undertaken through the general provisions of the proposed change, which seeks to minimise effects.

[114] As we have already stated, we consider that an analysis has properly been undertaken to provide a more certain outcome than would be achieved under the Rural H provisions. To that end we have considered that the zoning as generally envisaged (and modified by our decision) is most appropriate for this land. In reaching that conclusion, we take into account the existing use of the site including the light industrial sheds, the contracting companies and the hardfill.

...

[116]...We have concluded that the zone now envisaged is something different to either a Rural or Industrial zone. In our view it would more properly fit as a subzone of the Rural zone rather than as an Industrial zone in its own right. This is on the basis that although activities within it have a more industrial flavour the zone, nevertheless, is defined by its effects. It is intended that this area fit within and remain compatible with the rural area.

[117] ...Looking at the matter in context, we see the noise, visual and traffic outcomes as appropriate for the Rural zone. It is intended to limit the activities to ones which are generally in keeping with the rural area.

- 4.5 I am aware that some of the submitters who oppose our application do not agree with the Environment Court's decision to rezone the Site. These submitters would prefer for its zoning to revert back to Rural. While I acknowledge that these submitters hold this view, ultimately we are not here to re-litigate the Environment Court's decision to re-zone the Site made almost 20 years ago.
- 4.6 The Environment Court's decision to rezone the Site has driven our decision to invest in its development (I discuss this further below). I agree with the Environment Court's characterisation of the relatively benign nature of the activities anticipated in the Business Park and their compatibility with the surrounding rural environment.<sup>4</sup> As the anchor tenant, ContainerCo is simply proposing to house services such as training, safety, administration, EV truck charging, refrigerated engineering services, and container hire and sales

---

<sup>4</sup> *Thompson and Flavell v Western Bay of Plenty District Council* NZEnvC Auckland A026/2005 at [116].

services. The Site will also support Bay of Plenty's exporters by providing local services for the storing, upgrading, and leasing / selling limited stocks of shipping containers, including high-value refrigerated and bespoke customised containers.

4.7 I also wish to reiterate and make very clear here that we, TPIL and ContainerCo, are not proposing industrial activities of the kind people may associate with the industry surrounding the Port of Tauranga itself. There will be no discharges of contaminants or odour to air from our operations (indeed there are none from our operations on port either), our operations will not be 24/7, and we do not require extensive lighting. Our evidence is that any noise effects will be acceptable within the surrounding rural environment.<sup>5</sup> The proposed construction and operation of the Site is explained in more detail in the evidence of Dr Harris.<sup>6</sup>

4.8 Fundamentally, as Mr Murphy explains in his evidence,<sup>7</sup> while we require resource consent, the actual use of the land we intend to undertake is in fact permitted under the Structure Plan.<sup>8</sup> Further, I consider our proposal to be an improved outcome on the Environment Court's 2005 decision to rezone the Site. This is because we are expanding the attractiveness of our landscaping plans, increasing the mitigating effects of the wetlands on downstream properties against what was anticipated in the Structure Plan, and proposing to complete the upgrade the intersection at the top of Te Puna Station Road / Te Puna Road intersection (which, to date, WBOPDC has not done itself despite there being an existing safety issue, as confirmed in the recent Tinex decision).<sup>9</sup>

#### **Purchase of the Site**

4.9 There has been very significant growth in the primary production sector in the Western Bay of Plenty district and wider Bay of Plenty region since the Environment Court's decision to re-zone the Site in 2005. In my view, there is a critical need to support and enable primary production in the region through activities exactly like those that we are proposing. Ultimately this will be for the significant benefit of everyone in Aotearoa New Zealand.

4.10 ContainerCo became aware of the critical shortage of land nearby the port in 2018. ContainerCo also became concerned about hosting its low-intensity

---

<sup>5</sup> Statement of Evidence of Alex Jacob dated 25 June 2024 at [10.3].  
<sup>6</sup> Statement of Evidence of Margaret Harris dated 25 June 2024 at [5].  
<sup>7</sup> Statement of Evidence of Vincent Murphy dated 26 June 2024.  
<sup>8</sup> Statement of Evidence of Vincent Murphy dated 26 June 2024.  
<sup>9</sup> Decision Report Tinex Group Limited Application RC13924L (22 October 2023) at [74].

operations on intensively used port land as a health and safety risk for our staff on-site due to the intensive use of on port land.

- 4.11 We therefore began seeking a place where the low-intensity operations co-located on port land could be moved. ContainerCo became aware of the Site on Te Puna Station Road and its zoning in 2019. As our low-intensity operations support rural businesses, we require access to the rural primary producers by SH2, which this Site provides. The Site will also be further supported by extensive upgrades to the local roading network. Wwe therefore, approached the previous owners about purchasing the property to host our low intensity operations.
- 4.12 TPIL was then formed as purchasing land is expensive and difficult, and is outside of ContainerCo's core competency. Beaumont Investment Trust offered experience in investing and were logical partners for ContainerCo.
- 4.13 There was some confusion about if Overseas Investment Office ("OIO") consent was required given that ContainerCo while controlled by myself entirely, is partly owned by an overseas entity. For completeness, OIO consent was retroactively applied for, and granted. The OIO, in approving the purchase considered that the proposed transaction would likely result in a "substantial and identifiable benefit to New Zealand".<sup>10</sup>

## **5. POSITIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL**

- 5.1 As I have already explained, the proposed development of the Site is intended to directly support the Bay of Plenty region's primary production exporters. The export of kiwifruit and other primary produce directly employs a very large number of the region's residents, as well as supporting the economic and social well-being of the Bay of Plenty region as a whole.
- 5.2 The very significant growth in the region's primary sector over the last two decades has led to the Port of Tauranga becoming New Zealand's largest and most important export Port. It is New Zealand's most critical connection to overseas markets and essential to New Zealand's ongoing economic well-being. However, as Dr Harris explains in more detail in her evidence, there is limited capacity and it is not economic to undertake the types of activities we are proposing for this Site on, or adjacent to, the port itself.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Toitū Te Whenua Land Information New Zealand Decision, case number 202100568 (17 October 2022).

<sup>11</sup> Statement of Evidence of Margaret Harris dated 25 June 2024 at [7.4].



- 5.3 In my view, the activities we are proposing for this Site are now more important than ever in supporting the region's export industries and enabling the Port to operate efficiently. More specifically:
- (a) the low intensity operations are valuable to the Te Puna area and the wider regional economy. The Project will enable us to offer fundamental services such as peak season kiwifruit storage, refrigerated engineering support, shipping container supply and make available specialised shipping containers (eg atmosphere, or humidity or temperature controlled). These services support and benefit growers and packers, and reduce the risk to the kiwifruit crops by providing power and storage for packed containers at a facility with repairers and stocks of spare parts. A container might be filled with \$85,000 of Kiwifruit, and these kiwifruit could spoil if the container does not have power, or if the on-board equipment breaks and is not swiftly repaired;
  - (b) the Te Puna Business Park location will reduce traffic pressure on SH2 and also on the projected NorthLink road, by allowing more mediated truck travel. Trucks including ContainerCo's EV trucks prefer to deliver containers outside of peak traffic, but the current system means they must travel to power as quickly as possible without any regard for other road users. Further, the Port of Auckland is our biggest import port, and substantial amounts of empty containers need to be transferred from Auckland to Tauranga to provide for exports. Empty containers coming from Auckland must travel through urban centres to be serviced and repaired before coming back out through those same urban centres to reach their packhouse customers. With power at our Site available before you reach urban centres, transport operators can time their travel more effectively, and avoid travelling through urban centres altogether in some cases;
  - (c) importantly our high-intensity operations on port can intensify and be made safer, by removing space-consuming low-intensity operations creating needed high value capacity on wharf and avoiding freight movements. This means high-intensity functions can remain in areas currently provided for them, rather than needing to relocate. It would also improve health and safety outcomes. Having both high-intensity and low-intensity operations co-located otherwise places

stress on on-site pedestrian controls and training, which could be eased by removing the low-intensity operations off port;

- (d) we can locate our hire and sales business close to our main container leasing customers (rural customers including the produce growers in the Western Bay of Plenty and the dairy and sheep-and-beef customers in the Eastern Waikato). This lowers the cost to provide containers for sale or hire to these customers by decreasing transportation costs. The Site's location also facilitates the hire and sales teams to provide supplementary support for other operations during peak season;
- (e) we will build the wetland envisioned by the Structure Plan, providing significant ecological and amenity benefit to the community. Our works will include extensive paths for biking and walking (including along the front of the property) and a mixture of native and exotic planting to enhance overall amenity outcomes. Development of this wetland will improve mitigation of stormwater as anticipated by the Structure Plan; and
- (f) our plans include an increase in regional employment. We support a large training system, and promote staff internally. For instance, our General Managers of Information Technology, Operations, Container Depots People and Capability, and many of our branch managers began as entry-level employees. We represent a good-earning, stable provider of quality employment to the communities where we operate.

## **6. TE PUNA ROAD / TE PUNA STATION ROAD INTERSECTION**

- 6.1 One of the most significant positive effects of the Project is the upgrade of the Te Puna Road and Te Puna Station Road intersection ("**Intersection**") which we will be delivering (if consent is granted). More specifically, the provision of a permanent right turn bay on the Te Puna Road southern approach.
- 6.2 In its 2005 decision to rezone the Site, the Environment Court imposed the following special activity performance standard:<sup>12</sup>

To mitigate the impact on the Te Puna Road / Te Puna Station Road Intersection:

---

<sup>12</sup> *Thompson and Flavell v Western Bay of Plenty District Council* NZEnvC Auckland A026/2005, 3 February 2005 at Appendix C: Proposed Changes to Industrial Zone provisions 6.3(vii)(b).

*Prior to commencement of any industrial or business activity on the Industrial Business Zone land, Te Puna / Te Puna Station Road intersection must be upgraded to include provision for left turn and right turn movements or similar traffic management alternatives.*

- 6.3 Separate left and right turn lanes have been provided on the Te Puna Station Road approach to this intersection. A left turn lane has also been provided on the Te Puna Road northern approach. Currently however, there is no right turn lane on the Te Puna Road southern approach.
- 6.4 We have closely considered the Commissioners' recent decision to decline retrospective resource consent to Tinex for industrial activities on its site at 245 Te Puna Station Road. As we understand it, one of the key reasons for declining that application was that, in the absence of a right turn bay on the Te Puna Road southern approach, the Commissioners considered the intersection is currently unsafe.<sup>13</sup> That is, additional truck movements through the intersection, in the absence of right turn bay, have the potential to cause significant adverse effects (ie a crash).
- 6.5 Given the above, we have spent considerable time and money to develop a design for the required right turn bay, which we have agreed with the Western Bay of Plenty District Council. This is discussed in more detail in the evidence of our traffic engineer, Mr Harrison.<sup>14</sup> Because of the significance of this issue, and our desire to ensure a safe intersection for all in the Te Puna community, we also commissioned a peer review of Mr Harrison's assessments from Mr Brett Harries, who I understand is one of the most experienced expert traffic engineers in the country.<sup>15</sup>
- 6.6 We have committed to delivering the significant upgrade of the Intersection as part of our proposal for resource consent. To that end, conditions of consent to lock in this outcome have been proposed by Mr Murphy.
- 6.7 The delivery of this public roading infrastructure upgrade, at significant cost to TPIL, will directly benefit the whole Te Puna community by resolving a serious existing traffic safety which exists now and irrespective of our proposal. As I understand it, there is no current proposal by the Western Bay of Plenty District Council to upgrade the Intersection itself and resolve the existing safety issue, independent of our proposal to deliver this as part of any resource consent we may be granted. In other words, a very significant positive effect of the Project

---

<sup>13</sup> Decision Report, Application RC13924L to Western Bay of Plenty District Council (22 October 2023) at [127].

<sup>14</sup> Statement of Evidence of Bruce Harrison (dated 25 June 2024).

<sup>15</sup> Statement of Evidence of Brett Harries (dated 25 June 2024).

will be the delivery of a right turn lane on the Te Puna Road southern approach, and unless we deliver that essential upgrade, there is no certainty when (or indeed if) the Western Bay of Plenty District Council will be able to deliver that required upgrade itself.

## 7. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

7.1 We are very conscious that while our proposed development of the Site will significantly support the district's and region's primary production activities and particularly international export capacity, there are concerns held by Pirirākau and others about how the Project will also affect them and the local Te Puna community.

7.2 We take this very seriously and our approach has been to engage with local stakeholders at all stages of project planning and development. This is to ensure that the potential adverse effects of the proposal are appropriately managed while its significant positive effects can be realised. We have held public meetings in the local area, and attended meetings of community groups who have spoken on the topic of this development.

7.3 Below I summarise the consultation and engagement undertaken for this proposal with Pirirākau, the local community and key stakeholders. This is in addition to the extensive engagement we have undertaken with the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and the Bay of Plenty Regional Council throughout the processing and assessment of our Application.

### **Pirirākau**

7.4 I am proud of the approach our team has undertaken to seeking to engage meaningfully with Pirirākau. We commenced early engagement before lodgement of the Application and have continued in our attempts throughout the subsequent consenting process. Rather than go through our extensive engagement efforts in detail in my evidence, I have instead **attached** a summary table of all our engagement efforts to date as **Appendix A** to my evidence. Any of the correspondence referred to in that summary table can be provided in full, should that assist.

7.5 We had aspirations to reach a position whereby Pirirākau felt they could support our application for consent and partner with us in the delivery of our proposal, management of its potential adverse effects, and opportunities to achieve environmental enhancements including beyond the Site. Unfortunately, we have not been able to achieve that outcome to date, but we

remain absolutely committed to it and our hope is that we can achieve a meaningful partnership post-consent (I discuss the specific conditions we propose are included on a consent in this regard further below).

7.6 Three submissions have been received which I understand are on behalf of Pirirākau.<sup>16</sup> The submission on behalf of the Pirirākau Tribal Authority Inc attached the Pirirākau Assessment of Cultural Effects ("**PACE**").

7.7 From the engagement we have undertaken and the matters set out in the submissions and PACE, I consider we have a good understanding of the key concerns that Pirirākau have expressed. In saying this, I acknowledge that our understanding of these concerns comes necessarily through a Pākehā lens, but to the best of our ability we have sought to understand these concerns and have sought to meaningfully respond.

7.8 In summary, I understand the key concerns of Pirirākau to be:

- (a) effects on the wider and interconnected cultural landscape, encompassing Pukewhanake, Te Wairoa Awa and Te Hakao;
  - opposition to the 2005 rezoning of the Site by the Environment Court;
- (b) the restoration and protection of Te Hakao (the Hakao stream);
- (c) protection of koiwi;
- (d) protection of wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga areas;
- (e) opposition to earthworks and filling on the Site; and
- (f) supporting and restoring areas of mahinga kai.

7.9 With the assistance of Mr Murphy and our subject matter specialists, we have sought to meaningfully respond to the concerns raised by Pirirākau, as we understand them. Many of these matters are addressed, as relevant, in the expert evidence filed on our behalf. They will also be further addressed at the hearing itself including by our legal counsel.

7.10 In summary however, the cultural mitigation package, to be secured by conditions on our resource consents, that we have carefully developed with our expert team and offered to Pirirākau includes:

---

<sup>16</sup> Pirirakau Tribal Authority Incorporated, Submitter #50; Pirirākau Tribal Authority Incorporated, Submitter #142; and Carlton Bidois; Submitter #121.

- (a) Inviting Pirirākau to form with us an Environmental and Cultural Management Committee ("**ECMC**"). The ECMC is intended to create a framework for ongoing and long-term engagement and a working relationship between TPIL and Pirirākau. We are prepared to make the offer forming the ECMC an ongoing one, acknowledging that Pirirākau may not wish to engage in such a forum at the current time but may wish to do so in the future.
- (b) More specifically, we envisage the purpose and functions of the ECMC will include:
- (i) Recognition of importance of Pukewhanake, Te Wairoa Awa and Te Hakao and the interconnected cultural landscape with the ability for the ECMC to provide recommendations to TPIL as to how Pirirākau can exercise kaitiakitanga of affected whenua and awa.
  - (ii) Provision of comments on the draft management plans required by the conditions of our consents.
  - (iii) Provision of cultural inductions and karakia, as may be appropriate.
  - (iv) Reporting to TPIL (and the Councils) on any cultural indicators that identify or suggest increasing or decreasing mauri of Pukewhanake, Te Wairoa Awa and Te Hakao.
  - (v) Development of a cultural monitoring plan for the Te Hakao immediately upstream and downstream of the relevant discharge point, to identify whether a decline in mauri is occurring over time as a result of our Project and to identify processes and methods for improving the mauri of Te Hakao over time.
- (c) TPIL's obligations in respect of the ECMC have been set out in detail in the proposed conditions, such that they are enforceable on us. They include financial and other appropriate resourcing, the need to ensure tuna monitoring during all earthworks, overland flowpath and wetland formation, and the requirement to provide to the ECMC all monitoring and / reporting required under the consents at the same time that information is provided to the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and the Bay of Plenty Regional Council. We are also

required to promptly notify the ECMC of any non-compliances, in the unlikely event they occur.

- (d) Engagement with the ECMC on co-design of the wetland and overland flowpath features of the Project.

7.11 We also acknowledge that Pirirākau may never wish to engage in the ECMC. As such, we are also offering conditions placing ongoing obligations on TPIL in the event the ECMC is yet to be formed (or is never formed), to essentially replicate what TPIL will be required to do under the ECMC framework, but without any obligations or expectations on Pirirākau. Our intention is to ensure there is some certainty that Pirirākau's concerns as expressed through the consenting process will be appropriately addressed post-consent, as we have committed to doing, even where Pirirākau do not consider the ECMC is appropriate or would prefer an alternative forum for engagement.

7.12 Our proposed cultural mitigation package was provided to Pirirākau on 14 June 2024, with an acknowledgment that there was by then not much time to discuss this directly before the hearing but that we would be very open to doing so if that would work for Pirirākau. We continue to be open to discussing our mitigation proposals, and indeed the Project more broadly, with Pirirākau when that may suit.

#### **Other key stakeholders**

7.13 Prior to lodgement I travelled to Te Puna multiple times in order to:

- (a) attend residents association meetings. At the first of these meetings our long-term plans for the Site were presented.;
- (b) meet various residents one-on-one, including on three separate occasions meeting residents on the Site itself to answer their questions and to understand their concerns; and
- (c) meet with residents at their homes on three separate occasions to discuss and ensure their specific concerns were understood.

7.14 More generally, not long after the purchase of the Site and prior to lodgement of the Application, ContainerCo adopted a policy of posting full and frank information as to what our development entailed to a publicly available website.<sup>17</sup> We invited questions and feedback. As a result, on a frequent and ongoing basis I have exchanged views, ideas and information with residents

---

<sup>17</sup>

<<https://www.tepunabusinesspark.co.nz/>>

by phone and e-mail. I have personally answered each and every such communication directed to myself.

- 7.15 In addition to the above I and / or close family have travelled to Te Puna and attended Te Puna rugby club (which we sponsor) events, to facilitate open and more informal discussion.
- 7.16 Following the receipt of submissions on our resource consent application, I also directly communicated (twice) with the Principal of Te Puna School reassuring the school that any trucks visiting our site would not be permitted to travel past the school. Subsequent to that discussions were held with Ministry of Education officials confirming the same. As set out in the evidence of Mr Harrison and Mr Murphy, conditions will be imposed that secure this outcome.<sup>18</sup>

### **CONCLUSION**

- 7.17 Our company's history began in Mount Maunganui in 1949. It has then supported the region's exporters and local employment for 75 years. Many of our staff have parents and grandparents who have contributed their skill and hard work. The development of the Te Puna Site as a home that we and the community can be proud of, for us represents a long-term investment that we consider is necessary for the region as a whole.
- 7.18 As I have explained this Project provides significant positive benefits, including:
- (a) the construction and maintenance of the wetland creates important habitats and the cycle and walkway through this area enhances local amenity.
  - (b) the "ground up" development facilitates the electrification on Site for container handling, and this together with the Site's location reduces CO<sup>2</sup> associated with supply chain activity;
  - (c) the Site's location facilitates the movement of exports at off peak hours and the facilities support local EV truck movements;
  - (d) the extensive landscaping and other features of the Project ensure the visual impacts are minimal, and in my view actually improve existing amenity.

---

<sup>18</sup>

Evidence of Vincent Murphy dated 26 June 2024.



- (e) roading enhancements including the provision of a right-turn bay for the southern approach of the Intersection are part of our proposal. They will significantly improve road safety, for the benefit of the community as a whole;
- (f) the ability to move low density operations off port land improves the health and safety of our staff and adds essential capacity needed to protect local exporters and employment;
- (g) the onsite training facilities planned for ContainerCo operations on the Site in Te Puna, mean we can maintain and increase the programs we and our staff rely on to develop entry level staff into trades and skilled work; and
- (h) the new facility creates employment and represents a substantial investment supporting supply chain productivity, local employment and the export community.

7.19 Overall, I consider we have a world-class proposal which is thoroughly deserving of consent. As such, I respectfully request, on behalf of TPIL and ContainerCo, that the Commissioners grant the resource consents we have sought, on the conditions proposed in the evidence of Mr Murphy.

**Ken Harris**

25 June 2024

## APPENDIX A

### SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT WITH PIRIRAKAU

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
<b>2021</b>		
12 November 2021	To: Gabrielle Rolleston (Pirirākau) From: Vincent Murphy	Meeting on site on 8 November 2021 with Gabrielle Rolleston and Noeleen Davidson. Attached further information regarding the project for consideration by Pirirākau. Asked for feedback and offered to meet with wider hapu members to discuss.
<b>2022</b>		
21 February 2022	To: Rachael Davie (WBOPDC) From: Margaret Harris	Asked to be connected to the Council's Kaupapa Māori team.
17 March 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Merehine Waiari (WBOPDC)	Introductory email regarding with the Kaupapa Māori team does and the right way to approach hapū of the site area, including contact details.
17 March 2022	To: Merehine Waiari From: Margaret Harris	Explained how ContainerCo has reached out to Pirirākau.
23 March 2022	To: Merehine Waiari From: Margaret Harris	Email address provided by Merehine had a bounce back email.
23 March 2022	To: Pirirākau From: Margaret Harris	Introductory email regarding what ContainerCo does, and the purchase of land in Te Puna. Suggested two meetings, one with limited participants and a larger more public meeting for any iwi members to attend.
24 March 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Merehine Waiari	Merehine provided new email address.
24 March 2022	To: Merehine Waiari From: Margaret Harris	New email address bounced back.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
1 April 2022	To: Pirirākau From: Margaret Harris	Follow up email from the 23 March 2022 email request in relation to whether Pirirākau has had to opportunity to consider the proposal for two meetings with Container Co to discuss the project.
7 April 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Gabrielle Rolleston	Advised that Pirirākau was in the process of hiring a new Environment Team and would be unavailable to meet until mid-May.
22 April 2022	To: Gabrielle Rolleston From: Jesse Reynolds	Jesse Reynolds introduced himself and updated Gabrielle Rolleston on progress of the application – working through council requirements for traffic management and potential road upgrades.
10 May 2022	To: Gabrielle Rolleston From: Jesse Reynolds	Asking why GM Property & Legal have been emailed an invoice.
10 May 2022	To: Jesse Reynolds From: Gabrielle Rolleston	Apologised for confusion, invoice disregarded.
18 May 2022	To: c.h.booth@xtra.co.nz From: invoicereminders@post.xero.com	Invoice reminder of \$1086.75 overdue.
18 May 2022	To: Gabrielle Rolleston From: Jesse Reynolds	Requesting Gabrielle delete the invoice to avoid further notices.
29 August 2022	To: Pirirākau (Julie Shepherd) From: Margaret Harris	Updating Pirirākau on the Te Puna development – working through questions from the Council related to light, sound, traffic, and water. Remain open to a meeting.
4 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Updating Pirirākau for September around the Te Puna development. Which includes working through questions from the Council
17 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Updating Pirirākau on half month of October around the Te Puna development. Stated that ContainerCo is open to meeting at a venue of Pirirākau's choice to discuss what has been done in the project and the plans for the project. Updates included that ContainerCo is working through last questions from Council, engineers have presented a few options around water and attached plans for approximate locations for the leasehold sites.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
18 October 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Julie Shepherd introduces self as chairperson for Pirirākau. Asked to discuss a restoration plan for the Hakao Stream through the Hakao Valley Floor southwest of ContainerCo's location.
18 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Asked to talk more about the plans for the Hakao Stream.
18 October 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Asked to meet with Margaret on site next Monday to discuss the Hakao restoration project. Requested to discuss a review of the application and an assessment of cultural effects and copied in key council staff to make them aware of Pirirākau commitment to this engagement.
25 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Container Co welcomed the opportunity to meet Pirirākau committee. Promised to provide updates as they happened. Asked about Pirirākau's plans for the Hakao Stream. Stated that the Hakao Stream seemed to touch on about 10m of TPIL's property, and is part of the overall plan for environmental enhancement as outlined by the Environment Court, offered that a boundary adjustment could be made so that part of the stream was part of the council reserve.
27 October 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Pirirākau will engage with Vincent Murphy regarding reviewing the resource consents and provision of the Pirirākau Assessment of Cultural Effects.  Pirirākau stated they are keen to capture and acknowledge reserve contributions to enable "multiple shared benefits".
27 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Again welcomed any meeting. Asked who else is on the executive team committee so they can be cc'd into correspondence. Asked whether there was an opportunity to work together to maximise employment and training opportunities for Pirirākau.
31 October 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Vincent Murphy	Scheduled meeting to discuss Pirirākau partnership.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
31 October 2022	To: Vincent Murphy, Carlton Bidois, Brigid Gallagher, Ken Phillips & Gary Allis From: Julie Shepherd	Email outlines Pirirākau cultural responses.
1 November 2022	To: Julie Shepherd, Carlton Bidois, Brigid Gallagher, Ken Phillips & Gary Allis From: Vincent Murphy	Vincent notes that he is not authorised to agree to any costs. To discuss further.
21 November 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Thanks Julie and Carlton for meeting with Ken on site. Attached thoughts on draft partnership.
21 November 2022	To: Gary Allis From: Margaret Harris	Emailed Western Bay of Plenty District Council for more information on proposed replanting of Hakau Stream as this was indicated by Julie as important to Pirirakau. Mr Allis replies with further information.
21 November 2022	To: Carlton Bidois From: Margaret Harris	Emailed Carlton to ask if emails are being received by Pirirākau as the operations email is reportedly full and received a bounce back email.
23 November 2022	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Emailed alternative email address as operations inbox was full and unable to receive.
28 November 2022	To: Margaret Harris From: Carlton Bidois	Advises Margaret that Operations email is no longer being used and there is no attachment in email.
28 November 2022	To: Carlton Bidois From: Margaret Harris	Thanks Carlton and attaches proposed partnership agreement with the view that it be forwarded on.
<b>2023</b>		

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
23 January 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Vincent Murphy	States that applicants are keen to progress a partnership agreement with mana whenua Pirirākau. Notes that cultural impact assessment, detail on contribution to stream restoration, training and employment benefits are provided for in draft partnership agreement and are keen to move it forward.
23 January 2023	To: Vincent Murphy From: Julie Shepherd	Clarifies that there are two matters: resource consent which requires CIA and the Hakao stream restoration, but states that both processes will complement the other and the agreed outcomes are to be discussed thoroughly so they are clear in communication of events to hapu members. Requests Vincent to propose meeting times.
24 January 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Updates on the services ContainerCo provide and the need to use Te Puna space – will moving some of the non-intensive activity to Te Puna including refrigerated engineering and hire and sales plus officers and will also hold and process a small stock of local supply containers to free up on-port land by moving these activities. Emphasises the engagement with Pirirākau thus far and summarises partnership agreement to better work with mana whenua.
25 January 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Copied in Carlton Bidois. Pirirākau has made request to review consents involved with Te Puna Business Park. Email outlines steps required for ContainerCo to engage with Pirirākau: attend a hui, full activity details expressed to hapu, presentation of Hakao restoration, payment of \$20,000.
27 January 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Expresses pleasure to meet with Pirirākau. Attempts to arrange this meeting with Julie and other representatives of Pirirākau. Accepts attending a hui also. Notes that a partnership would include all items detailed by Pirirākau, and that any discussions should be specific to the resource consent. Outlines that a mutually supportive scope/terms of reference should be agreed before work begins.
29 January 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Julie says she does not need to be a party to external arrangements. States partnership agreement would be made with the entire committee.  Requests confirmation of agreed amount upfront in writing again as “you are actually now engaging us voluntarily through these discussions.” Requests to be copied into all communications re: Te Puna.
15 February 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Thanks Julie for her email. Welcomes opportunity to meet with committee. Offers to host at venue of Pirirākau's choice at ContainerCo's cost. ContainerCo responds to request for payment. ContainerCo expresses it never

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
		agreed to a terms of reference that would cost \$20,000. Happy to host the hui and thanks for confirming capacity for Carlton's freelance services.
19 February 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Notes all committee members copied into this email should be copied into all other correspondence. States Pirirākau is in receipt of all applications for resource consent. States that Pirirākau are able to charge out rates for a Pirirākau Assessments of Cultural Effects, and references a neighbouring property in 2019 for \$17,000. States they will send an invoice for 50% when a draft is released for further discussion and then with the Applicant to enter into a MOU bound by responsive proposed consent conditions. The remaining 50% will be invoiced after the final PACE is released.
01 March 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Attached a copy of the proposed partnership agreement to seek feedback on. Emphasises that all partnership activities will be remunerated. States that over 60% of ContainerCo employees are Māori and the partnership agreement was drafted in discussion with them. States that it is just a first draft, and highlights the benefits of the proposal again. Requests a meeting, at ContainerCo cost, at a venue of Pirirākau's choosing, to discuss everything that has happened and develop a non-binding pathway.
01 March 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Heoi	From the secretary@pirirakau account. States they do not to support Pirirākau co-partnership with ContainerCo. Dislikes reference to high percentage of Māori employees and states this is nothing special in the port industry. Calls it procurement and coercion opportunities.
02 March 2023	To: Hoei From: Margaret Harris	Personal apology for any offence caused or division created. Explains statistics of Māori employees is given to demonstrate development of, and evidence to the delivery of, partnership agreements of this type. Highlights the misinformation given by Priority Te Puna and points to ContainerCo website for correct information, as well as a complete copy of the resource consent. States that the partnership offer is a sincere one and would set the ground to having a long-term positive relationship.
09 March 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	States that Pirirākau at no point have agreed to a partnership. Explains that Pirirākau agreed to do PACE and not enter into partnership. States that a fee of \$17,000 will be charged for the PACE. Thanks Margaret for her positive narratives towards whanau. States that Pirirākau is not misinformed by Priority Te Puna.
13 March 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Acknowledges that Pirirākau will work with council to discuss the cultural effects of the resource consent application. Explains that investment into Te Puna is long-term and is economically positive. Suggests a \$5000

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
		payment for a term of reference for the consents under discussion to be drafted and discussed with more remunerated work to arise from this. Want to arrange a hui with Pirirākau committee but explains that competing persons are now suggesting they are the chair of Pirirākau. Asks for clarity. Explains that an MOU was also discussed, and that this might better reflect Pirirākau feelings.
13 March 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shephard	States that they have a statutory position when responding to resource consent applications. Outlined the rate is not for debate, and that Julie is the chair of Pirirākau. Explains that Carlton has no role.
26 April 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Email update to Pirirākau over plans for the future months. States that they have finished their responses to the section 92 requests. Talks about Ken Harris attending local meetings to discuss concerns with residents. Offers again to meet at ContainerCo's expense at the venue of Pirirākau's choice to discuss ways forward. Separately suggests employment of a landscaper of Pirirākau's choice and asks for co-design of the wetland.
02 May 2023	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	States that the application for resource consent requires a Pirirākau Assessment of Cultural effects, which is underway. States that council will not be allowed by Pirirākau to process the resource consent without this. Gives expected date of receipt of the assessment.
05 May 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Margaret re-emphasises the benefits of the works to the community, and acknowledges that Pirirākau is Mana Whenua. Asks to speak to Pirirākau kaumatua about the entire project and to take direct feedback.
06 June 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Margaret writes to update Pirirākau on proposal. Talks about landscaping. States council has resource consent under review, and asks again to meet with kaumatua to discuss a co-design with Pirirākau re: wetlands. Offers signage, developing of sustainable kai fisheries, and native plants.
14 September 2023	To: Ken Harris & Wayne Johnson From: Margaret Harris	Summary of meeting with local Pirirākau member about misconceptions of the site and attempts to better understand the objections. Member gave suggestions.
14 September 2023	To: Julie Shephard From: Margaret Harris	Margaret writes to update Pirirākau on proposal. Talks about stormwater. Discusses other public meetings attended by Ken, then states that in light of feedback ContainerCo will volunteer for public notification. Asks for a public meeting with all of Pirirākau to hear their concerns before the hearing. Asks permission to commission a Pirirākau master carver for a Pou Whenua to gift to Pirirākau to be placed inside the wetland.



DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
27 November 2023	To: Ken Harris and Margaret Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Treasurer for Pirirākau advised that payment and terms for the provision of the Pirirākau assessment of cultural effects have not been met. Set out that Ken Phillips is a Pirirākau preferred HNZPTA 2014, s140 approved archaeologist. Requested payment of the invoice.
30 November 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Ken Harris	Thanked Julie Shepherd for communication. Set out that TPIL had not requested or discussed a term of reference but that terms of reference could be developed on a remunerated basis. Suggests the partnership agreement that had been proposed (including job opportunities, training, joint governance of the wetlands development and support of Hakao Stream re-development, including a gift of land) might be a starting place. Suggested a compensated meeting to discuss. Also mentioned the wetland project, and how this could be progressed.
30 November 2023	To: Ken Harris From: Julie Shepherd	Julie Shepherd sets out that the cultural impact assessment was necessary to application and that once payment is made, they would be in a better position to discuss other matters.
4 December 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Ken Harris	Thanked Julie for her email, and for re-engaging with TPIL. Acknowledges that Julie has prepared and submitted a report that forms a part of the public submissions process. Welcomes a Cultural Impact Assessment on the consent application by TPIL. Suggests a meeting with Julie in Tauranga, and that TPIL would provide lunch for this. Also suggests a terms of reference for joint design for the wetlands area and any other immediate opportunities of interests that the parties identify.
4 December 2023	To: Ken Harris From: Julie Shepherd	States that tangata whenua can provide an assessment of cultural effects detailing cultural significance in any format, and that the PACE was provided to service the decision making of the consent application to ensure that consideration is given to the cultural effects. States that once payment is received for the services (provision of the PACE), then Pirirākau will enable a willingness to further discuss with TPIL.
5 December 2023	To: Julie Shepherd From: Ken Harris	Completely agrees that the assessment report can be done in any format that Pirirākau decides. Considers that the proposed partnership agreement can and hopefully will generate great outcomes for mana whenua and a solid foundation for a long term relationship. Suggests a meeting to discuss the above.
<b>2024</b>		

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
26 January 2024	To: Pirirākau From: Margaret Harris	Thanking Pirirākau for submission on resource consent application. Expresses that engagement would be an opportunity to work together on the streams restoration, or a permanent access for Pirirākau to the waterway. States that TPIL have done tuna surveys in the drains, and have hired an archaeological expert who will undertake a site survey. Explains that public notification has gone ahead and talks through other technical matters in detail. Asks again for a compensated meeting to discuss ways forward.
31 January 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: accounts@pirirakauinc.co.nz	Sent through tax invoice for \$17,250, and provided link for payment.
1 February 2024	To: Julie Shepherd From: Margaret Harris	Expressed confusion and requests that Julie Shepherd call Ken Harris regarding the tax invoice.
1 February 2024	To: accounts@pirirakauinc.co.nz From: Ken Harris	Asks about a recent AGM for Pirirākau, asked for clarification about leadership, and stated that they look forward to meeting with the Pirirākau leaders.
1 February 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Ben Urbanc	Thanks Margaret for the call, and explains that Pirirākau has an interim board. Gives Jacqui Rolleston-Steed as the new chair, and Julie as the environmental planner. Explains to continue to engage with Julie until noted otherwise.
5 February 2024	To: Julie Shepard From: Margaret Harris	Thanks Julie for the phone call, which had clarified that the invoice was for two things. Firstly, in relation to PACE. But secondly, as koha to secure a meeting with Kaumatua and the wider iwi. States that ContainerCo is excited by the progress, has paid the invoice, and will pay for the costs of this meeting.
5 February 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shephard	States there is a new committee. States that the PACE will address environmental effects. Retracts offer for a meeting, saying a meeting now would be improper. Objects to the zoning of the land. States ContainerCo did not provide a full email chain as part of the resource consent. Explains that ContainerCo gift vouchers were insufficient payment. States that ContainerCo will pollute the Hakao stream. States TPIL and ContainerCo are the same. States that ContainerCo gives Pirirākau a position on the ContainerCo website which is false. States that "TPIL-CC have taken a position to place yourself and your colleagues as the design perpetuator of environmental improvement sought by Pirirākau."

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
8 February 2024	To: Julie Shephard From: Margaret Harris	Thanks Julie for the communication. Explains that ContainerCo is only half of TPIL. Explains that TPIL and ContainerCo are both committed to mitigating cultural effects. Explains again that ContainerCo concern has been that ContainerCo understood that the PACE would relate to the zoning, but ContainerCo wanted commentary on the consents under review. Explains this is why the renumerated terms of reference was offered as a bridge. Explains that the PACE is being closely studied regardless. Explains that ContainerCo had thought a formal partnership including a contract would be better, but accepts that Pirirākau prefers alternative arrangements. Explains this offer is still open, and would provide preferential employment, procurement, training, and ongoing governance. Explains that Pirirākau objections to zoning is not within ContainerCo's scope, as it predated ContainerCo involvement with the land. Explains that the Hakao stream is not a part of ContainerCo's proposed stormwater plan, and all operations are to be separated from it physically by the wetlands. Offers co-design of the wetland again. Explains that ContainerCo's Christmas gift programme was run throughout the country in the areas ContainerCo operates in and was offered without obligation, and wasn't in payment for anything. Explains that ContainerCo cannot find reference to Pirirākau on the ContainerCo or any associated websites, and asks for clarification as to which parts of the website are not correct.
9 February 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Julie Shephard	States that Pirirākau will not meet with ContainerCo outside of the hearing process. States Pirirākau has signalled opposition to the application and to the wider premise of the industrial zoning and activities at this location given the intensity of cultural impact. Offers mediation within the hearing process as an option to engage in conversation.
9 February 2024	To: Julie Shephard From: Margaret Harris	Acknowledges email, and asks how ContainerCo can facilitate a mediation meeting in the manner of Pirirākau choosing.
12 February 2024	To: Julie Shephard From: Margaret Harris	Follows up and offers either mediation, or alternatively a process outside the notification process so feedback can be built into the submission if preferred.
20 February 2024	To: Ken Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Jacqui Rolleston-Steed introduced herself as the new interim secretary for the Pirirākau Tribunal Authority, and Ngawa Hall as the Chair. Said that they will table the email from Ken Harris for the next board meeting to determine a date and time where they can gather for a meet and greet.
20 February 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Ken Harris	Thanked Jacqui Rolleston-Steed for the update.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
13 March 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Ken Harris	Following up on the request for a meeting.
13 March 2024	To: Ken Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Asked whether Tuesday or Wednesday worked for a meeting.
15 March 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Ken Harris	Said that either day would work for a meeting.
4 April 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed and Ngawa Hall From: Ken Harris	Introduced the project, and thanked them for their time earlier in the week. Offered an opportunity for another meeting in May. Set out proposed relationship protocol, for discussion.
24 April 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed and Ken Harris From: Margaret Harris	Attached a draft "fifty year plan" for the site. Set out that ContainerCo had read submission from Pirirākau and would good to meet again to discuss this, including the proposed plan for the site (including with respect to wetlands).
3 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed and Ken Harris From: Margaret Harris	Provided an update on the project, including in relation to landscaping of the site.
3 May 2024	To: Margaret and Ken Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Requested a hui in the next couple of weeks.
3 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Agreed with this, and gave indication of availability.
3 May 2024	To: Margaret and Ken Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Acknowledged email. Said they will discuss availability with the board.
10 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Email to remind Pirirākau about the third stormwater culvert proposed under Teihana road, and to hear any feedback from Pirirākau on the proposed design for this.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
11 May 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Acknowledged email. Said that they would get back with any response by 15 May.
11 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Thanked Jacqui and stated that Ken would be the contact person while Margaret is away from 14 May 2024.
11 May 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	"Ka aroha in acknowledgement of your recent bereavement Margaret and Ken"
11 May 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Followed up separately to ask for copies of all Pirirākau submissions to regional council.
11 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Clarified that submissions had only been made to the district council, and asks if Pirirākau specifically wishes for the submission by Julie Shephard
14 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Asked whether 17 May would work for a meeting to discuss Pirirākau feedback on the project.
14 May 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Said that they will not be available on that date, requested copy of the submission from Pirirākau
14 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Acknowledged email. Stated that hopefully Ken can catch up with Jacqui and Ngawa once they return. Stated that there was a submission from Julie Shepherd but also a few others who suggested they were Pirirākau, and asked if they should also be compiled and sent through.
14 May 2024	To: Margaret Harris From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Agrees they would like all submissions from Pirirākau.
14 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Vincent Murphy	Apologises for delay, and provides all submissions from Pirirākau.
14 May 2024	To: Vincent Murphy	Thanks Vincent for the submissions.

DATE/S	AUTHOR / RECIPIENT	COMMENTS
	From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	
14 May 2024	To: Vincent Murphy From: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed	Asks if a copy of PACE could also be provided.
14 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Vincent Murphy	Provides the PACE report from Pirirākau.
31 May 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Follow up email to ask if a meeting can be arranged between Pirirākau and ContainerCo.
14 June 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Email to provide advance copy of proposed cultural mitigation package, and states ContainerCo would have liked to talk them through with Pirirākau, and time was now short, but there was still the option of having this meeting. Explains the package is based on PACE and that ContainerCo hopes it reflects community wishes.
17 June 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Apologises for delay, explains they have been busy on other projects. Asks for the date of the hearing with a view to meeting prior.
17 June 2024	To: Jacqui Rolleston-Steed From: Margaret Harris	Emails to advise date of hearing, and that Margaret is out of the country 22-29 June. Passes the matter to Ken to arrange a meeting date.