

My name is Peter Lochhead.

I am a Fourth Generation Te Puna resident, and I am proud to say that I have two more generations coming through enjoying the Te Puna lifestyle.

Further to my submission, I raise concerns, firstly with the flood water modelling 26/6/2024 where in Paragraph 4.4, it is stated that he hasn't analysed the flood water flow north of the railway line embankment, because he was satisfied the railway line would not overflow.

As a resident that lived and farmed this whole area with my forefathers, there is a catchment area of flood water in excess of 24 hectares that flows into a wetland area full of springs which then goes through a culvert under the railway line, into this catchment area that is being designed. Some of this catchment area is not overland but is overhead canopy orchard roofing, this is different, the flow is different, the ground slowing and soaking is not there. The volume and speed is massive when it comes off the edge of the canopy. In 1 hour at last Anniversary weekend, this roof catchment area created a lake on my property, 70 metres by 10 metres and over my red band gumboots (350mm) in less than an hour. But thankfully, 4 hours later, it had disappeared. I can only assume it disappeared into the ground soakage layer which goes back to the catchment swamp area, the North side of the railway line. Then in turn, goes under the railway line, into this applications catchment area. One of the springs that feeds the wetland area on the North side of the railway line, was tapped and used to supply the total farm inclusive of houses, milking sheds and water troughs throughout the year. In drought conditions, it never ran out. It still had water that flowed back in to the wetland area.

In paragraph 4.5 the analysis for 24 hour storm, 10 year, 50 year and 100 years but there is no comment or formula allowing for the many springs which run continuously 24/7, 365 days a year. Also, I note that there is no comment on the drain on the north side of the railway line, up to Paparoa Road and the overland flood water off properties that fall into this drain.

From my history in being involved in this land, in the wintertime when the land is more likely to be saturated and a heavy storm hits, it doesn't take much to flood the land. I have heard comments, that the land was drained so that it could be turned into horticulture or farming benefits. It was also drained to control the spring water and divert it into the drains once Te Puna Station Road was put in and the railway line put in, these became the main drains on either side of these carriage ways to the river effectively. What is now called Te Hakao Stream, was a drain created by my Great Grandfather to effectively assist in the farming of this area.

The Commissioners questioned whether there should be an easement in the stormwater drain or culvert that crosses Te Puna Station Road at the bend from Overton's property to Daniel's property, I would imagine it wouldn't have been required back when Te Puna Station Road went in as it went through and split the family farm who maintained ownership of the land either side of the road as well as the culverts under the railway line, that split the farm as well.

With regards to the Geotech Report and the filling and preloading for this site, there is no mention of how the springs will be dealt with, with the filling let alone the preloading.

I also note, in the Te Puna Station Road widening, I see the formula on how this is to be done, but there is no comment about the Omokoroa to Tauranga sewer main which is right on the Southern edge of Te Puna Station Road. However, I do know with earthworks consideration comment, that it is suggested that the removal of existing structures and services to stop differential movement.

I am somewhat confused with the earthworks. I read that the removal of the topsoil, I am assuming this is removed off site. I am not quite sure whether these truck movements have been included in the traffic report. Also, the imported fill that is being included in the traffic report, I am assuming the traffic movements were calculated on a 2 metre fill basis to get to the approved platform but then I see, that with the preloading, this fill could settle 1400 mm. So has this extra fill been allowed for or is the preload basically been left there to create the new platform level from the settlement that has happened. With regards to archaeology of these sites, in the years that we farmed and maintained the desilting of the drains, it was on a regular basis that we found greenstones axes, mere mere's and other shaped instruments. Often were found in the scrapings of the digger. Sometimes the digger driver would point and we would hop in the drain and obtain these articles that were still coming out of the side of the drain as though they travelled through the water layer or seepage layer in the ground.

With regards to the applicant suggesting the improvement and the re-construction of Te Puna Station Road intersection and the widening of Te Puna Station Road with a righthand turn lane to the entrance way, there is no comment about the width of the road from the applicants entrance way to Te Puna Station Road. Also, there is no comment in the traffic report in the change of use loading of Te Puna Road or its width for the use of heavy trucks. Nor is there any comment as per the 2005 Judgement of contribution to NZTA regarding Te Puna Road, State Highway 2 roundabout.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak.



Peter Lochhead



My name is Peter Lochhead. I am a foundation member of Te Puna Heartlands and currently Chair of Te Puna Heartlands.

I was one of the Committee Members that belonged to Te Puna Residents Association that was involved in the Plan Change Environmental Court Judgement in 2005.

I would like to thank Priority Te Puna that they picked up the reins of the Te Puna Residents Association to carry on with the Te Puna peoples fight for this development.

Following on from our written submission, Te Puna Heartlands are not convinced that this application fits the District Structure Plan or the 2005 Judgement Plan. Both of these have small lots, with landscaping between each lot. This was to create a rural atmosphere and more a boutique size businesses. Not a 5 hectare block. Nowhere can we find in the District Plan or the 2005 Judgement Plan, a description of a yard based activity, because it was not acceptable to the people at the time. There was a list given in the judgement of the type of activities that could take place. Also, the maximum size of any building was to be 100 sqm.

The workshop appears to be somewhere between 400 sqm to 900 sqm (quote WSP Geotechnical 2/12/22 paragraph 3.1), depending on which document you read. We accept the evidence put forward by the experts that the workshop, although it is built out of containers with a linking roof, constitutes a building. Their words not ours. One must also point out, that containers stacked, look like a building and there is no reference to the colours to blend into a rural environment, as per both District Plan and 2005 Judgement. Stacked containers to a maximum height of 3 metres, is this to be measured from existing ground level or new ground level for the 9 metre height restriction?

With regards to roading, the Structure Plan and the 2005 Judgement Plan shows a link loop road through the TPIL's land and the adjoining tenants land. This proposal shows a cul-de-sac, just on TPIL's land. This is outside what the Te Puna Residents have accepted.

The community of Te Puna have long contributed and in good faith, to the management of Te Puna's character and amenities. A green wedge thriving between Tauranga City and the Urban developed Omokoroa. As per the Te Puna Community Plan 2007 and revised 2017. Te Puna Heartlands have been privileged to provide a Community voice and views since 2002 to the Council. With this whole development, it is hard to under estimate the sense of betrayal felt by the residents who have observed with steady increasing concern of the continuing retreat from the conditions set out in the 2005 Judgement, let alone the disregard to the Structure Plan which was especially designed to diminish the impact of industrial zone activities, within a predominantly rural riparian landscape. Which we must plainly ask on a balance of interest, is a container park suitable in a green wedge?

This Environmental Court Judgement was agreed to and signed by all parties being the 3 applicants, Councils, Iwi and the Te Puna Residents, reluctantly. But it was the best we felt we could achieve. We support the culvert under Teihana Road but are not convinced that the stormwater modelling has assessed the total catchment area for this development and what flows into this development. I will cover the stormwater in my submission later. The ability to have 3 sites to work as one package, this was to be done to avoid ad hoc development and this has not been done and this comment of the ad hocness and the development done as one is in the 2005 Judgement and we still have the three owners not agreeing or working together.

The first plan change application was turned down by Council on the provision of infrastructure eg. roading, water services, stormwater and wastewater. At the first hearing, the Councils water Engineer said the Councils water supply to these three sites would be ineffective for fire fighting facilities, yet WSP's report states that it meets these requirements but I believe they are only interpreting this site, not the other two. With regards to the wastewater for this site, we are told that the maximum daily staff, including visitors, will be less than 5 personnel. Yet we have been told in documents since, there will be a lot more than less than 5. But no clear design or instructions on how the foul water for people is to be dealt with.

So, in summary, we strongly reject the applicants wording that this fits into the Te Puna environment and the Structure Plan, both Councils and Environment Court, as it clearly doesn't.

We sympathise with the application on the advice he was given at a Council meeting when they were doing their due diligence on the purchase of this property as this was possibly misleading and definitely inaccurate as we have come to realise ourselves, with similar situations and comments. Sadly, at this meeting, the Councils representatives were Resource Management, Senior Consent Planner, Roothing Engineer, Team Leader Compliance Support, Senior Land Development Engineer, Utilities Manager and Minute Taker. The comments that the applicant got was, oh yeah, I think a container storage fits in the permitted activities. YEH RIGHT.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.



Peter Lochhead