

Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: City Centre Zone					
Issue: City Centre Zone Purpose [17.1.1]					
Mainstreet Tauranga Inc.	718	2	S	Supports the new City Centre Zone and its objective to support the city centre as the principal centre of the sub region.	Retain the City Centre Zone.
Shearman Family Trust	612	2	S	Supports the establishment of the City Centre zone.	Retain the City Centre zone.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	21	S	Support the new City Centre zone and its focus on the city centre role and function as the principal retail, commercial, civic, entertainment and cultural centre of the sub region. Supports the waterfront area (sub zone) in general with some increase in area. Supports the range of land uses that can establish in the new zone.	Retain 17.1.1 -Purpose of City Centre zone.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: City Centre Zone					
Issue: Rule - Building Height [17.4.1.2]					
Shearman Family Trust	612	1	SA	Generally supports the establishment of a City Centre Zone but subject to height changes because redevelopment of the Strand to the proposed new height will block views of properties behind the Strand.	Redefine the max height limits, with max height limits on the ridges graduating downwards to lower levels at the Strand (no specifics given).
Venagi Limited & Others	813	2	S	Support proposed City Centre Building Heights and Appendix 17A map.	Retain Appendix 17A height area map.
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	5	S	Support the increase in building height applying to area 3 in the zone, and recognition of other constraints.	Retain provision for increased building heights in rule 17.4.1.2 and Appendix 17A.
Hickson, Paul	527	5	S	Support the increase in building heights particularly at First Ave, to help site redevelopment be more economic. The ground floor should also be higher.	Support Rule 17.4.1.2.
Mainstreet Tauranga Inc.	718	5	SA	Generally support height areas but have concern over incentivising development outside the city core and with proposed height of Height Area 3.	Retain proposed heights but amend Height Area 3 to become part of Height Area 1.
Hills, Roger	705	6	SA	Restricting building heights will lead to expensive redevelopment options. Need to encourage site amalgamation (not specified).	Amend building height rule 17.4.1.2 (not specified).
JWL Investment Trust	830	12	O	Oppose building Height Area 3 along the Strand, as contained in Rule 17.4.1.2, as it restricts economic redevelopment of sites. The building height should be the same as elsewhere in the core - the airport height control of 49m RL.	Delete Height Area 3 (16m) under Rule 17.4.1.2. Merge Height Area 3 land into Height Area 1 (49m RL).
City Centre Action Group	698	14	S	Supports the various height areas identified under Rule 17.4.1.2 to create incentives for site redevelopment, but concerned about the heights outside the city core (unspecified).	Support the height areas but concerns for some areas not specified as to location.
Parry, Jill	814	17	O	Oppose the increase in building height in the blocks between The Strand and Willow Street, along the Strand and near Red Square. The result will be loss of ambience and sunlight as well as unsustainable for businesses.	Opposed but no height specified.
Manor Group Investments Limited	808	18	SA	Support the changes to additional building heights in the zone, but note some inconsistencies between the plan text and Appendix 17A. Height Table 17.4.1.2 has Height Area 5 as 9m, whereas on Appendix 17A Height Area 5 is 11m. In appendix 17A Height Area 5 is in waterfront subzone B, yet separate Height Area in Rule 17.4.1.2. Amend to align text with Appendix.	Retain changes to heights in City Centre zone but align text in Rule 17.4.1.2 with illustration of height areas in Appendix 17A - particularly for Area 5.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	31	S	The changes to heights will encourage redevelopment in the city centre.	Retain the proposed changes to heights.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	39	S	Support the proposed height of 19 metres on Cameron Road (Elizabeth St corner site) owned by submitter.	Retain the 19 metre building height on Cameron Rd site.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	188	SA	Support general approach for most of City Centre zone but not Height Area 3 which should become part of Height Area 1 in the city core. This would promote redevelopment of The Strand.	Retain Rule 17.4.1.2 and Appendix 17A, but delete Height Area 3 and merge into Height Area 1.
Issue: Rule - Active Frontage [17.4.2]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	13	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.2 (b) in relation to glazing and visibility of building frontages, which is a matter best left to the development sector/ building owner/tenants.	Delete Rule 17.4.2 b).
Issue: Rule - Pedestrian Links [17.4.8.2]					
Bowen, Allan & Kay	359	1	O	Oppose the proposed pedestrian link shown in Chapter 17 running down the service lane next to 55-61 Devonport Rd, and through to Grey St. It will inhibit potential redevelopment of sites, and the functioning of the service lane and property security.	Remove the pedestrian link shown in the Plan.
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	7	O	Delete Rule 17.4.8.2 because it fails to give effect to the relevant policy on pedestrian links in the city centre, which talks about facilitating by direct negotiation.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.2.
Manor Group Investments Limited	808	19	SA	Support the general idea of pedestrian links through city blocks (as in Rule 17.4.8.2) but needs to be more descriptive as to what and how this is to be delivered in a property.	Provide a description of what a pedestrian link looks like in the rule to clarify the intent and outcome needed.
Tauranga City Council	492	181	SA	The identification of future pedestrian links required upon redevelopment in the City Centre need to be revised to reflect the existing pedestrian connections and those further connections discussed with landowners in this area.	Revise pedestrian connections to reflect the existing pedestrian connections and those further connections discussed with landowners in this area.
Issue: Rule - Development Under 1000m2 [17.4.8.3]					
Hills, Roger	705	7	O	The limit of 1000m2 is very low and has no basis.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.3.
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	10	O	Oppose the requirement of permitted development being up to 1000m2 gross floor area, and above that needing a resource consent. There is no sound resource management reason why the 1000m2 is chosen as the trigger.	Delete rule 17.4.8.3 -Development Under 1000m2 gross floor area.
JWL Investment Trust	830	15	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.8.3 with the max 1000m2 floorspace trigger, from permitted activity to restricted discretionary activity status. Not justified.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.3.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	189	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.8.3 as it has no basis for the floor limit.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.3.
Issue: Sunlight Admission [17.4.8.4]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	14	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.8.1 requiring sunlight to public places and associated Appendix 17C. Specific concern about Hamilton St between Strand and Willow St. Shading is across a road and footpath anyway. Effect on building height along the Strand not considered.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.4 and associated Appendix 17C.
Dillon, Mary	709	15	SA	Support Rule 17.4.8.4 generally, but think it should be enhanced by providing viewshaft and sunlight provision especially in Wharf St, Spring St and Hamilton St. Provide potential developers with incentives for good urban design.	Provide viewshaft and sunlight (especially Wharf St, Spring St and Hamilton St) - details not specified.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	192	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.8.4 on the basis that shading occurs across the road by balconies, and the effect on the Strand building height has not been considered.	Delete Rule 17.4.8.4.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: City Centre Zone					
Issue: Rule - Non Notification [17.6.1.2]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	16	SA	Support with amendment to cover non notification for all applications that do not meet permitted activity conditions, when they become restricted discretionary. Without non notification status significant delays to the redevelopment process could occur.	Amend Rule 17.6.1.2 to relate to all such restricted discretionary applications as non notified, not just those listed in the proposed rule.
Issue: Rule - Restricted Discretionary Activities - Matters of Discretion & Conditions [17.6.3]					
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	8	O	Oppose Rule 17.6.3.4 - Pedestrian Links as part of the matters of discretion in the City Centre. The matter of link should be negotiated.	Delete Rule 17.6.3.4 Pedestrian Links - Matter of Discretion.
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	11	O	Oppose Rule 17.6.3.6 specifically, as there appears to be no resource management reason for the 1000m2 trigger for a resource consent.	Delete Rule 17.6.3.6 (related to 1000m2 gross floor area) Matter of Discretion.
Issue: Activities in the City Centre Zone [ACTIVITIES]					
Tauranga Farmers Market	306	1	SA	Events should be allowed in the waterfront area as of right.	Provide for events, such as the Farmers Market, to be extended along the waterfront, and into downtown.
Parry, Jill	814	18	O	Oppose the waterfront plan and its transfer into the City Plan, as it fails to acknowledge beauty, natural ambience, outstanding natural landscape, nautical uses and berthage on the waterfront.	Delete waterfront plan and related documents and start again.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	190	U	Submits there is no permitted activity table for City Centre zone?	Seek permitted activities be identified?
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	191	S	Support Rule 17.6 where non compliance with permitted activity conditions becomes Restricted Discretionary under Rule 17.6. approach better than full Discretionary.	Retain Rule 17.6.
Issue: Maps & Notations [MAPSNOTAT]					
Catholic Bishop Of Hamilton	784	5	O	Oppose the identification of the frontages of St Mary's Church as "pedestrian environment street" in Map R104. None of the related rules are appropriate to this site given its use.	Delete the notation on Planning Map R104 of pedestrian environment street on St Mary's church frontage.
Manor Group Investments Limited	808	7	O	Pedestrian environment notation along frontage of 314 Cameron Rd, 61 and 51 Third Ave is impractical and not consistent with other neighbouring side streets.	Remove pedestrian environment notation from north side of Third Ave east (on Map 105).
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	9	O	Oppose the pedestrian link shown on map L 105 in respect of 62-64 Grey Street properties and across the service lane at 53-55 Devonport Rd, as good pedestrian movement is already provided by the two existing links between Devonport Rd and Grey Street (Goddards and Piccadilly). The link requirement will prevent reasonable use of the properties.	Delete the "pedestrian link " requirement which is shown on map L105 in respect of 62-64 Grey St and across the service lane shown between 53-55 Devonport Rd.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	28	SA	Support the waterfront area indenification in general on planning maps, but extend area as per map attached to submission.	Amend waterfront area as per attached map.
Tauranga City Council	492	197	SA	The identified 'Pedestrian Environment Street' frontage should be amended to provide for pedestrian linkage between the city centre and Monmouth historic area via Aspen Reserve and Anson Street to incorporate heritage sites including the Old Post Office, Aspen Tree and No 1 The Strand.	Identify the area from the city centre and Monmouth historic area via Aspen Reserve and Anson Street to incorporate heritage sites including the Old Post Office, Aspen Tree and No 1 The Strand as Pedestrian Environment Street frontage.
Issue: Objective & Policies [OBJPOL]					
Mainstreet Tauranga Inc.	718	3	S	1.Support objective 17.2.2.1 -City Centre Role and Function 2. Support Policy 17.2.2.1.1 - City Centre Role and Function Both seek to support the City Centre Strategy, including educational tertiary precinct.	1. Retain Objective 17.2.2.1 2. Retain Policy 17.2.2.1.1
Hills, Roger	705	4	S	Support the City Centre objective -17.2.2.1.	Retain objective 17.2.2.1.
Mainstreet Tauranga Inc.	718	4	S	Supports Policy 17.2.2.3.1 Site Layout and Building Design in City Centre, which will guide a pleasant and attractive place.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1.
Hills, Roger	705	5	SA	Lower buildings along the Strand needs to be considered carefully, as lower height will restrain redevelopment due to low yields.	Amend Policy 17.2.2.2.1 (b) to support higher buildings along Strand (no height specified).
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	6	S	Support Objective 17.2.2.4 and associated Policy 17.2.2.4.1 - City Centre Accessibility and methods such as direct negotiations with property owners, but not the related rules.	Retain Objective 17.2.2.4 and associated Policy 17.2.2.4.1 - City Centre Accessibility.
Hickson, Paul	527	6	S	Support the active frontage policy approach at ground floor level. Note that The Farmers building needs to have this also. Active frontage should be along the First Ave frontage between Devonport Rd and Cameron Rd.	Retain Policy (note rule not specified) . Both sides of First Ave should be active and pedestrian friendly between Devonport Rd and Cameron Rd.
Tourism Bay Of Plenty	455	7	S	Supports the proposed new City Centre zone in achieving specific actions in the City Centre Strategy. A vibrant city centre is vital in attracting new businesses , highly skilled people and visitors.	Retain all the objectives, policies and rules for the City Centre zone.
JWL Investment Trust	830	8	S	Support for Objective 17.2.2.1 City Centre Role and Function and the associated Policy 17.2.2.1.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.2.1 and associated Policy 17.2.2.1.1.
Tourism Bay Of Plenty	455	8	S	Support the objectives and policies and rules for the City Centre waterfront subzone. It caters for a range of events - based activities.	Retain the objectives, policies and rules for the City Centre, waterfront sub zone.
JWL Investment Trust	830	9	SA	Amend Objective 17.2.2.2 Bulk and Scale of Buildings, to reflect economic investment as the priority.	Amend Objective 17.2.2.2 Bulk and Scale of Buildings, to reflect economic investment as the priority.
JWL Investment Trust	830	10	O	1. Oppose Policy 17.2.2.2.1 a) in relation to building height, as there should be no building height in relation to height areas 1 and 3 (other than airport approach control) 2. Oppose 17.2.2.2.1 b) as it promotes lower building heights along the Strand. The policy should encourage taller buildings along the Strand to assist economic redevelopment of sites. Amend the policy to enable that. 3. Oppose Policy 17.2.2.2.1 e) related to low rise buildings along the Strand, as it restricts economic redevelopment of sites. The CBD is a business area, not a landscape feature.	1. Delete Policy 17.2.2.2.1 a) 2. Amend Policy 17.2.2.2.1 b) to promote higher buildings in the CBD (and Strand) 3. Delete Policy 17.2.2.2.1 e) entirely.
Priority One Western Bay of Plenty Inc	699	10	S	Support the policy direction of potential redevelopment of City Centre through increased building heights.	Retain the increased building height opportunities and supporting objectives/ policies.
City Centre Action Group	698	11	S	Supports the purpose of the City Centre zone - under section 17.1.1.	Retain Purpose of City Centre zone - 17.1.1.
JWL Investment Trust	830	11	S	Support in general Policy 17.2.2.3.1 a) -h), as it encourages the private sector to apply good design principles in the City Centre.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: City Centre Zone					
Issue: Objective & Policies [OBJPOL]					
Priority One Western Bay of Plenty Inc	699	11	O	Oppose Policy 17.2.2.2.1 Bulk and Scale of Buildings in City Centre zone, and the word "maximum" in subclause a) as it does not take into account site limitations that may require higher levels of construction or costs associated with geotechnical issues.	Remove reference to "maximum" in Policy 17.2.2.2.1 a) specifically.
City Centre Action Group	698	12	S	Supports Policy 17.2.2.1.1 Policy: City Centre Role and Function as it provides for a wide range of activities to be established. This includes the support of a tertiary precinct.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.1.1 content.
City Centre Action Group	698	13	S	Supports the policy direction in 17.2.2.3.1 Policy: Site Layout and Building Design, to ensure the design and development of the City Centre contributes to it as a pleasant and attractive place - including the pedestrian environment and public spaces. Suggest the Council work on a public art strategy to give guidance to artists.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1 Site Layout and Building Design in the City Centre.
Western Bay of Plenty District Council	609	15	S	Support these objectives and policies.	Retain these objectives and policies.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	22	S	Supports the direction of the Objective 17.2.2.1 and associated Policy 17.2.2.1.1 - City Centre Role and Function. It supports a wide range of activities to establish and interact within a defined city centre. Supports the City Centre Strategy outcomes.	Retain Objective 17.2.2.1 and associated Policy 17.2.2.1.1 - City Centre Role and Function.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	23	S	Support Policy 17.2.2.2.1 - Bulk and Scale of Buildings in City Centre.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.2.1.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	24	S	Support Policy 17.2.2.3.1 Site Layout and Building Design in City Centre zone, and the aim to ensure design and development of the city centre creates a pleasant place for people to live, work and play.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	25	S	Supports Policy 17.2.2.3.1 Site Layout and Building Design in City Centre, particularly need to mitigate reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1.
SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group	357	26	S	Supports Policy 17.2.2.1.1 on the city centre role and function, as it recognises the Tauranga CBD remaining the business and cultural heart of the sub region.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.1.1.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	26	SA	Support Policy 17.2.2.4.1 generally but think clause c) could be clearer wording.	Amend Policy 17.2.2.4.1 City Centre Accessibility clause c) to clarify intent (no specific wording provided).
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	27	S	Support the policy intent of Policy 17.2.2.5.1 City Centre Waterfront for activities and where people congregate.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.5.1, but extend area.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	183	S	Support Objective 17.2.2.1 City Centre Role and Function.	Retain Objective 17.2.2.1.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	184	S	Support Policy 17.2.2.1.1.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.1.1.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	185	O	Oppose parts of Policy 17.2.2.2.1 as follows: 1. Clause a) of the policy refers to maximum heights and so does not give site development flexibility 2. Clause b) of the policy refers to taller buildings but not along the Strand and the blocks back to Willow Street. Consider that conflicts with clause c) of the same policy 3. Clause e) of the policy seeks to retain low rise buildings along the Strand and waterfront for views and sunlight to key public spaces. The appropriate way to deal with views is a view shaft in the area. Further building height is required for the City Centre.	1. Amend Policy 17.2.2.2.1 a) to delete the word "maximum" in reference to building heights. 2. Amend Policy 17.2.2.2.1 b) to delete words "(apart from The Strand and the blocks back to Willow Street)" 3. Delete Policy 17.2.2.2.1 e) completely.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	186	S	Support Policy 17.2.2.3.1, as the policy encourages the private sector to apply good design principles and mitigate adverse effects.	Retain Policy 17.2.2.3.1.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	187	SA	Support Objective 17.2.2.2 but only if modified to give economic investment opportunities a priority.	Amend Objective 17.2.2.2 Bulk and Scale of Buildings in City Centre zone, to make economic investment a priority (not specified).
Issue: Zoning of Specific Sites [ZONINGSS]					
Tauranga City Council	492	196	O	A reclaimed area of land near the Railway Bridge (City side) is zoned Conservation, however is used for access and parking. The Road Zone would better reflect the existing uses. There is no title for this area, however it is reclaimed and above MHWS.	Amend carparking and access area at the end of the The Strand (near Harbourside Restaurant) from Conservation to Road Zone.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial - Pedestrian Environment Streets					
Issue: General [GENERAL]					
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	1	S	The objectives and policies relating to the provision of active street frontages are generally supported, however the rules that seek to implement these policies (17.4.2(b)) are too prescriptive and are not necessary or appropriate matters for the Council to control.	Delete Rules 17.4.2(b) and 17.6.3.1(b).
Gartshore Investments Limited	649	2	O	The provisions relating to vehicular access are too restrictive and unnecessary requirements that are inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA. Pedestrian convenience should not be given primacy over vehicle site access where this is required by the plan for parking purposes.	Delete rules 17.4.2(d) and (e) and 17.6.3.1(c). Amend Policy 17.2.2.4.1 to remove primacy afforded to pedestrian access over site access, and to provide a more balanced approach to addressing the competing interests.
Progressive Enterprises Limited	851	3	O	Supermarkets in particular are high generators of pedestrian activity and play an important role in contributing to the vitality, vibrancy and positive economy and amenity of a suburban centre. While the need for careful treatment of frontages is recognised, the use of landscaping and other mitigation measures are often appropriate to address amenity effect on adjacent and surrounding zones. This needs to be balanced against the operational and functional needs of supermarkets. Specific design features such as verandahs and active frontages are inappropriate and not practical for large format retail.	Delete Rule 17.4.2, if this rule is not deleted then amend the assessment criteria in Rule 17.6.3 to acknowledge the operational requirements of large format retail, or as an alternative, delete the identified pedestrian environment street frontage at 1368 Cameron Road, Greerton.
Tauranga City Council	492	10	SA	Rule 17.4.2(a)(iii) is subjective and could be deleted as provisions of the transportation provisions of the Plan address the safety and convenience of vehicle and pedestrian activity.	Delete Rule 17.4.2(a)(iii).
Western Bay of Plenty District Council	609	11	S	Rule 17.4.2 is supported.	Retain Rule 17.4.2.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	19	O	Rule 17.4.2 contains requirements in terms of glazing of buildings and unobscured openings as well as fascia heights and building access. It is considered that the extent of visibility and prescriptive detail for building frontages are not matters that the Council should regulate. This is a matter that is best left to the development community and future tenants.	Delete Rule 17.4.2 or include as policy guidance.
S & L Consultants Limited	804	22	O	There is no indication how far into a building pedestrians are meant to be able to see.	Amend Rule 17.4.2(b)(i) to provide clarity on the depth into a building pedestrians are meant to be able to see.
Grasshopper Farms Ltd	506	24	O	Rule 17.4.2 (b) is too restrictive and doesn't provide enough flexibility to encourage new business into commercial areas or account for the types of businesses with different frontage requirements.	Delete Rule 17.4.2 (b).
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	29	S	Support Rule 17.4.2.	Retain Rule 17.4.2.
Thompson, Max	864	29	S	Support Rule 17.4.2.	Retain Rule 17.4.2.
Issue: Greerton [GREERTON]					
McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	617	4	O	The identification of the frontage of 1272-1286 Cameron Road as Pedestrian Environment Street Frontage is inappropriate as this is frontage to the existing service station and drive-through food premises which are vehicle orientated developments, the land is located at the north of the Greerton shopping centre where pedestrian activity is relatively low, and the controls on vehicle orientated activities are unrelated to the existing and foreseeable use of the land.	Delete the pedestrian environment street frontage from these properties (1272 and 1286 Cameron Road) and including the frontage to Cameron Street.
Issue: Tweed Street [TWEEDST]					
The National Trading Company Of New Zealand	623	2	O	While the importance of the application of the pedestrian environment street rule in certain situations in the City is recognised, it is not appropriate to apply this rule to Lots 1, 2, 67, 68 and 69 Tweed Street/Maunganui Road. This site has only recently been developed and is unlikely to be substantially redeveloped in the future.	Remove the pedestrian environment street frontage from adjacent to Lots 1, 2, 67, 68 and 69 Tweed Street/Maunganui Road.
Topic: Commercial Zone - Tauriko					
Issue: Policy - Urban Form & Protection of Values [17.2.4.2.3]					
Department Of Conservation	848	64	S	Support these policies to ensure that the natural heritage remaining in these zones will be recognised and provided for in development, especially vegetated links associated with stormwater management areas.	Retain this Policy.
Issue: External Appearance of Buildings [EXTAPPBUIL]					
Element IMF New Zealand Limited	786	3	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.10.3(a) and (b). These rules have not been applied to the Commercial Zoned area at Tauriko, with these rules only applying to the Industrial Business Zone (under the Operative Plan). None of the commercial land currently comes within the Height Control or Recession Plane area.	Delete Rule 17.4.10.3(a) and (b).
Issue: Height [HEIGHT]					
Pyes Pa Limited	724	3	S	Support Rule 17.4.1(a).	Retain Rule 17.4.1(a).
Element IMF New Zealand Limited	786	4	S	Support Rule 17.4.1(a).	Retain Rule 17.4.1(a).

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zone - Tauriko					
Issue: Streetscape [STREETSCAP]					
Pyes Pa Limited	724	2	O	Oppose Rule 17.4.10.3(a) and (b). These rules have not been applied to the Commercial Zoned area at Tauriko, with these rules only applying to the Industrial Business Zone (under the Operative Plan). None of the commercial land currently comes within the Height Control or Recession Plane area.	Delete Rule 17.4.10.3(a) and (b).
Pyes Pa Limited	724	4	O	Rule 17.4.3.2 relating to the design of building frontages is opposed. The streetscape provisions were included in the Tauriko Business Estate Private Plan Change on the basis of Council's Urban Design Strategy. It is now apparent that Council has not extended this level of urban design intervention to any other Commercial Zone areas. These rules serve no significant resource management purpose. The planting of large specimen trees provides appropriate mitigation of effects to surrounding areas.	Delete Rules 17.4.3.2(a)(i)-(vii).
Element IMF New Zealand Limited	786	5	O	Rule 17.4.3.2 relating to the design of building frontages is opposed. The streetscape provisions were included in the Tauriko Business Estate Private Plan Change on the basis of Council's Urban Design Strategy. It is now apparent that Council has not extended this level of urban design intervention to any other Commercial Zone areas. These rules serve no significant resource management purpose. The planting of large specimen trees provides appropriate mitigation of effects to surrounding areas.	Delete Rules 17.4.3.2(a)(i)-(vii).
McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	617	5	O	The setback of 5 metres from the Taurikura Drive frontage is a wasteful use of valuable land that could not be used for such items as an electricity transformer, or tables and chairs.	Rule 17.4.3.2(a) be amended to delete to reference to activities needing to be setback from Taurikura Drive, and replace with 'loading areas', so that only buildings are subject to the setback requirement, and amend the required setback from 5 metres to 3 metres.
McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	617	6	O	The requirement of Rule 17.4.3.2(a)(v) requiring specimen tree planting on Taurikura Drive as the required setback cannot be used for any part of an activity, except for landscaping, there are alternative ways in which streetscape amenity can be provided such as a median strip in the carriageway, and the planting timeframe might not coincide with the completion date of a building. In addition the term 'the start of an activity on site' is unclear whether it relates to site works, construction or the use of the building.	Rule 17.4.3.2(v) be replaced with a requirement for tree planting within Taurikura Drive, or the ratio of tree planting be amended from 1 tree per 15 metres of lineal road frontage, and the last sentence of 17.4.3.2(v) be amended to require tree planting within the first season following the completion of the building or establishment of an activity.
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: 10 Domain Road [10DOMAIN]					
Hawridge Developments Limited	967	1	S	Any change in zone from that set out in the Proposed Plan would be opposed. The land should remain zoned Open Space. This land is not required for commercial purposes as existing land in the vicinity is adequately zoned and available for that purpose.	Retain the Open Space zoning of this land.
Tauranga City Council	752	7	O	This property is owned by Council and not proposed to be used as a reserve. It should be rezoned.	Rezone this property Commercial, the same as adjacent land uses.
Issue: 10 Owens Place [10OWENSPL]					
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	1	S	Support rezoning to Commercial.	Retain the proposed Commercial zone.
Issue: 1216 Cameron Road [1216CAMRD]					
Bryce Campbell Car Sales	23	1	O	The site at 1216 Cameron Road (Bryce Campbell Car Sales) should be included within the Commercial Zone as there is already a significant amount of commercial zoned land adjacent to the site and the land is used for commercial purposes as an existing commercial block. The area south of Sheppard Street should remain as residential.	Include the area from 1216 Cameron Road to Sheppard Street within the commercial zone.
Issue: 1229 Cameron Road [1229CAMRD]					
Oh, Jennifer & Steven	966	1	O	This property is 0.43ha zoned residential and is currently used for commercial purposes (a Motel). The present commercial use of this land should be recognised. The inclusion of this land within the Commercial zone would give much better flexibility and opportunity for redevelopment to benefit the Greerton village.	Include this land within the Commercial zone.
Hills, Roger	705	8	O	1229 Cameron Road is included in the Suburban Residential Zone. This is the site of a motel and it should be included in the Commercial Zone.	Include 1229 Cameron Road in the Commercial Zone.
Issue: 1260 Cameron Road [1260CAMRD]					
GOC Trust	24	1	S	It is appropriate to change the zoning of 1260 Cameron Road to Commercial for the reasons provided (in the s32). All properties in Greerton Town Centre should be zoned the same.	Include 1260 Cameron Road within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: 12 Owens Place [12OWENSPL]					
B O P Holdings	248	1	SA	The expansion of the Commercial Zone in Owens Place up to and including 10 (Harvey Norman) and part of 12 Owens Place is noted. This zoning should be extended over the balance of 12 Owens Place as: 1. The Commercial Zone now includes a portion of 12 Owens Place. 2. The existing unsightly noxious industry plant on 12 Owens Place is no longer appropriate and redevelopment to large format retail development, contiguous with existing similar development, seems logical. 3. Redevelopment would be a vast improvement in local landscape impact and amenity value. 4. The site is closely aligned with public transport, walking and cycling access. 5. Having assessed public demand, several large format retailers are looking for space in Owens Place. 6. There would be no impact on residential neighbours. 7. There should be no additional stormwater requirements.	Rezone the balance of 12 Owens Place Commercial.
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	2	S	Support the retention of the Industry zone over Lot 12 Owens Place.	Retain the proposed Industry zone over Lot 12 Owens Place.
Issue: R151/R120 Domain Road [151-120DOM]					
Shane Armstrong & Others	795	1	O	Requests that rural zoned land at R151 and R120 Domain Road (being Pt Lot 3 DPS 54529 and Pt Lot 2 DPS 54529) be rezoned Commercial to reflect the established consented activities and provide a transition to the rural residential land to the east, residential land to the north and State Highway to the south.	Rezone R151 and R120 Domain Road (being Pt Lot 3 DPS 54529 and Pt Lot 2 DPS 54529) Commercial.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: 15th Avenue [15THAVE]					
Wand'rin Star Family Trust	186	2	O	Opposes the Suburban Residential zoning of properties fronting Fifteenth Avenue between Cameron Road and Turret Road. Submit that traffic levels and associated noise and vehicle emissions have already created adverse impacts on these properties which means these areas are not ideal residential environments. Request that these properties be rezoned so they can be utilised for offices and commercial activity.	Rezone properties fronting Fifteenth Avenue from Cameron Road to Turret Road to provide for offices and commercial activities on these sites.
Issue: 164 Sixteenth Avenue [164SIXTEEN]					
Tauranga Repertory Society Inc	367	1	O	The proposed residential zoning of 164 Sixteenth Avenue is opposed. This land is owned by Tauranga Repertory Society and has been used for many years as a theatre. The zoning of this land should be amended to enable the ongoing management, operation, maintenance and enhancement the use as a theatre and place of assembly.	Include 164 Sixteenth Avenue within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: Objective - Network of Centres [17.2.1.1]					
Progressive Enterprises Limited	851	1	S	Generally support the Plan insofar as a centres based approach to supporting the growth of a mix of activities in these centres.	Retain a centres based approach in the Plan and ensure the Plan: Maintains that network; meets the needs of future generations; promotes the purpose of the RMA; adopts objectives, policies and rules that are the most appropriate; enables the efficient use of resources; and promotes the sustainable management of resources.
Priority One Western Bay of Plenty Inc	699	4	S	Support the policy direction for an efficient network of commercial centres and the identification of the city centre as the primary commercial and civic centre of the sub-region.	Retain policy direction for a network of commercial centres.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	8	S	Objective 17.2.1.1 is supported.	Retain Objective 17.2.1.1.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	12	O	Proposed Objective 17.2.1.1 is not supported appropriately by Policy 17.2.1.1 to meet the objective of a network of commercial centres. Policy 17.2.1.1.1 requires amendment.	Amend Policy 17.2.1.1.1 to provide: 'By encouraging commercial business activities, together with associated civic, cultural and entertainment uses, to consolidate within or adjacent to a wide range of existing Commercial Zones each with various functions and of varying scales.
Brown Street Partnership & Mackenzie Elvin	478	15	O	Amend the wording of Policy 17.2.1.1 because it also needs to acknowledge that educational facilities are an appropriate use in the Commercial Zones.	Add the words 'Educational Facilities' to Policy 17.2.1.1.
Issue: Policy - Network of Centres [17.2.1.1.1]					
SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group	357	2	S	Support Objectives in Section 17.2 including the network of commercial centres approach contained in Policy 17.2.1.1.1.	Retain Policy 17.2.1.1.1.
Thompson, Max	864	50	O	Policy 17.2.1.1.1 should be amended to appropriately promote a centres based planning approach to commercial development within the City.	Amend Policy 17.2.1.1.1 to read: 'By encouraging commercial business activities, together with associated civic, cultural and entertainment uses, to consolidate within or adjacent the wide range of existing Commercial Zones each with various function and of varying scales'.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	51	O	Policy 17.2.1.1.1 should be amended to appropriately promote a centres based planning approach to commercial development within the City.	Amend Policy 17.2.1.1.1 to read: 'By encouraging commercial business activities, together with associated civic, cultural and entertainment uses, to consolidate within or adjacent the wide range of existing Commercial Zones each with various function and of varying scales'.
Issue: Objective - Efficient Distribution of Commercial Development [17.2.1.2]					
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	13	O	Objective 17.2.1.2 and associated policies 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.1.2.2 do not adequately reflect a centres based planning approach and should be amended.	Amend Policy 17.2.1.2.1 to read: 17.2.1.2.1 - New Commercial Development: By ensuring that commercial activities are located, where possible within existing commercially zoned centres or adjacent existing commercially zoned centres to consolidate business activities within a network of commercial centres which will: (a) Ensure that development is of a form and scale anticipated by the surrounding environment; (b) Provide a distribution of commercial centres efficiently located within the transport network, with particular regard to the provisions of Policy 17.2.1.2.2; (c) Ensure a positive nett benefit to the community with respect to the range of services provided and the location of those services; (d) Ensure the amenity of the surrounding environment is not compromised by out-of-zone commercial business activities; (e) Avoid business activities in Residential Zones and Industrial Zones in accordance with the objectives and policies for non-residential uses in these Zones. Amend Policy 17.2.1.2.2 - Efficiency of the Transport Network through the addition of the words 'small scale convenience' in relation to retail opportunities under part (c) of Policy 17.2.1.2.2.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Policy - New Commercial Development [17.2.1.2.1]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	1	S	Support Policy 17.2.1.2.1(d).	Retain Policy 17.2.1.2.1(d).
Jaglem Limited, Greenwater Developments Limited, Kenepuru Properties Limited, Tipene Holdings Limited, Matua Charitable Trust Limited and Others	826	2	SA	Further objectives, policies and rules should be included in the Plan to give priority to promoting the extension of existing commercial zones over the introduction of new stand alone commercial areas. The introduction of new spot zones is inappropriate.	Introduce further objectives, policies and rules to enable commercial development contiguous with a commercial centre and delete any further areas of stand alone 'spot zoning'.
SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group	357	3	S	Policy 17.2.1.2.1 aligns with the SmartGrowth strategy commitments to ensure that retail leakage is minimised and that big box retail in particular is appropriately located. Smartgrowth supports retaining areas for industrial land and not allowing these areas to be compromised by incompatible uses. Commercial development in residential areas should likewise be discouraged as this can create a dispersed and uncoordinated land use pattern.	Retain Policy 17.2.1.2.1.
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	6	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	9	S	This policy is supported, particularly part (d) and (e) of the Policy which seek to limit the leakage of commercial activity along arterial routes in the City and to ensure that commercial activity is within commercial zones.	Retain Policy 17.2.1.2.1.
McAlpine, Jon	664	23	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Goup	497	23	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Benton, Jason	498	27	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	27	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	27	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	34	S	Support Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.	Retain Clauses 17.2.1.2.1 and 17.2.3.1.
Thompson, Max	864	51	O	This policy doesn't promote a centres-based planning approach and should be amended to do so.	Amend this policy as detailed in this submission.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	52	O	This policy doesn't promote a centres-based planning approach and should be amended to do so.	Amend this policy as detailed in this submission.
Issue: Policy - Efficiency of the Transport Network [17.2.1.2.2]					
SmartGrowth Implementation Management Group	357	4	S	Policy 17.2.1.2.2 provides for consideration of the efficiency of the transport network and aligns with the SmartGrowth integrated planning objectives, efforts to encourage modal shift, and the live, work, play principle. Ensuring that commercial land is integrated with the transport network is a key part of achieving good land use transport outcomes.	Retain Policy 17.2.1.2.2.
Issue: Objective - Bulk & Scale [17.2.3.1]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	2	S	Support Objective 17.2.3.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.1.
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	3	S	Support Objective 17.2.3.1 and associated Policy 17.2.3.1.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.1 and Policy 17.2.3.1.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	4	S	Objective 17.2.3.1 and its associated Policy 17.2.3.1.1 is supported.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.1 and its associated Policy 17.2.3.1.1.
Western Bay of Plenty District Council	609	10	SA	Objective 17.2.3.1 and associated policy 17.2.3.1.1 do not address the bulk and scale of buildings. In a number of commercial areas there are already buildings that do not complement the surrounding environment (ie. Mega Mitre 10). New developers may argue that as a result of the scale of existing buildings there development can be of the same scale. It is also important that commercial development along Cameron Road is not of a scale that will impact on the town centre. Although the heirarchy of commercial centres is mentioned, the objective, policies and rules do not support the statement.	Reword 17.2.3.1 and 17.2.3.1.1 to address bulk and scale more clearly and add an additional objective and policy to ensure that the bulk and scale of commercial development will not impact on the role and function of the town centre.
The Elms Foundation	659	15	SA	This objective should also make reference to historic values of adjacent zones.	Amend objective 17.2.3.1 to make reference to adjacent zones.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	25	S	This objective and associated policy 17.2.3.1.1 is supported.	Retain this objective and associated policy 17.2.3.1.1.
Thompson, Max	864	25	S	This objective and associated policy 17.2.3.1.1 is supported.	Retain this objective and associated policy 17.2.3.1.1.
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	39	O	Oppose Policy 17.2.3.1 as it does not address the need for scale sufficient to achieve legibility. The reference to maintaining landscape character is unrealistic given the character of commercial development and is potentially in conflict with objective 17.2.3.3.	Amend the words 'landscape character' in (a) to read 'urban amenity values' and include the following point: '(d) Provides for legibility of commercial centres within the local area.'
Issue: Policy - Bulk & Scale [17.2.3.1.1]					
The Elms Foundation	659	14	SA	This policy refers to the reference of nearby zones, the policy should also reference historic values.	Amend Policy 17.2.3.1.1 as identified in this submission, to make reference to the historic value of adjacent zones.
Issue: Objective - Site Layout & Building Design in the Commercial Zones [17.2.3.2]					
Progressive Enterprises Limited	851	2	O	There is some concern that this objective and related policy 17.2.3.2.1 fail to adequately acknowledge the operational requirements of many businesses (especially large format retail) and impose inappropriate restriction on the layout and building design of business activities.	Amend objective 17.2.3.2 and policy 17.2.3.2.1 to reflect the concerns raised.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	26	S	Support proposed Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1, which promote an appropriate site layout and building design in the Commercial Zone.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.
Thompson, Max	864	26	S	Support proposed Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1, which promote an appropriate site layout and building design in the Commercial Zone.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Policy - Site Layout [17.2.3.2.1]					
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	4	S	Support Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	5	S	Support Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.2 and associated Policy 17.2.3.2.1.
Issue: Objective - Activities Within the Commercial Zone [17.2.3.3]					
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	5	S	Support objective 17.2.3.3 and associated policy 17.2.3.3.1.	Retain objective 17.2.3.3 and associated policy 17.2.3.3.1.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	6	S	Support Objective 17.2.3.3 and associated Policy 17.2.3.3.1.	Retain Objective 17.2.3.3 and associated Policy 17.2.3.3.1.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	27	S	Proposed objective 17.2.3.3 and its associated policy 17.2.3.3.1 is supported.	Retain objective 17.2.3.3 and its associated policy 17.2.3.3.1.
Thompson, Max	864	27	S	Proposed objective 17.2.3.3 and its associated policy 17.2.3.3.1 is supported.	Retain objective 17.2.3.3 and its associated policy 17.2.3.3.1.
Issue: Activities in the Commercial Zone [17.2.3.3.1]					
Tauranga City Council	492	7	SA	Amend Policy 17.2.3.3.1 to provide a clear link to Rule 17.4.2. Policy 17.2.3.3.1 does not effectively identify the direction for residential development controls on pedestrian environment streets.	Modify Policy 17.2.3.3.1 to state: By providing for business, civic and community uses in the zone, and providing for the integration of these activities with residential activities where: a)Residential development mitigates the potential impacts of noise from business activities on the amenity of that residential activity; b) On identified pedestrian environment streets independent dwelling units are set out in a mixed use environment through these activities above ground floor level or at the rear of sites so as not to interrupt a continuous business, community and civic frontage at ground floor level; c)Providing for residential activities at a high density; d)Ensuring that residential development outside of pedestrian environment streets does not compromise the efficient distribution of a network of commercial centres, and provides a level of amenity consistent with medium density development in the Suburban Residential Zone.
Tauranga Chamber Of Commerce	621	10	S	This policy is supported, particularly part (b).	Retain this policy.
Issue: Parton Road North Commercial Plan Area - No Vehicle Access [17.4.11.4B]					
Papamoa Business Park Limited	42	1	O	Some of the sites within the Parton Road North Commercial Plan Area have no alternative vehicle access and so shouldn't have vehicle access restricted to Parton Road.	Add the words 'unless there is no other legal access available' to 17.4.11.4(b) and amend Appendix 17H accordingly.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Boundaries of Commercial and Sensitive Zones [17.4.4]					
Cross, Rebecca	1002	1	SA	The operating hours of fast food outlets should be restricted when adjacent to a residential zone.	Limit the operating hours of fast food outlets when adjacent to a residential zone (either specifically or through modifications to clause 17.4.4).
McDonald, Bain	41	1	O	The wording of 17.4.4(a) should be amended so that building setbacks in commercial zones are no more onerous than in the adjoining non-business zone. Where there is an esplanade reserve boundary, these setbacks should reflect the non-business setback and daylighting requirements.	That the words 'at least 5 metres' are replaced with 'by the same or greater distance as is required in the adjoining non-business zone' in rule 17.4.4(a).
McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	617	7	O	The required setback imposes too many constraints on valuable land and is excessive, and does not provide for items with a minor effect, such as lights and freestanding signs, and there are other methods by which the amenity of adjoining zones can be protected without an arbitrary physical separation.	That the 5 metre setback of Rule 17.4.4(a) be amended to 3 metres, and that the last sentence of Rule 17.4.4 (a) be amended to read 'This rule shall exclude basement areas located entirely below ground level and structures not exceeding the height to boundary recession plane and occupying a total area of not more than 10sqm.
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	9	SA	Rule 17.4.4 (a) provides a mechanism to deal with the amenity effects of commercial development adjacent to non-business activities. The Plan recognises that a buffer is not required between Industrial and Commercial Zones, and this should be extended to provide that a buffer is likewise not required between the Commercial and Rail Zone.	That Rule 17.4.4 (a) is amended to exclude boundaries of the Commercial and Rail Zone from being subject to that rule.
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	9	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) 'or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner.'
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Goup	497	20	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) "or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner."
Benton, Jason	498	24	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) 'or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner.'
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	24	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) "or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner."
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	24	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) "or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner."
McAlpine, Jon	664	26	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) "or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner."
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	31	O	Disagree with the prescriptive requirements of Rule 17.4.4. 1.8 metre high screen wall is not always the best outcome, there is no ability for passive surveillance or to borrow amenity value where appropriate. Close boarded fences are not permanent and attract graffiti. Foliage or visually permeable options may provide a preferable outcome. Rule 17.4.4(b) should provide options for compliance as does 17.4.4(c).	Delete Rule 17.4.4(b) and incorporate the words 'residential zone' in Rule 17.4.4(c). Add a new sub-clause (iii) "or treated as otherwise agreed with written approval of the adjacent property owner."
Issue: 187 Welcome Bay Road [187WELBAY]					
Kumar, Kuldeep	646	1	O	The Welcome Bay Store is currently within the residential zone and has been for over 50 years. This causes issues when making changes to the store.	The land on which the Welcome Bay Store is located is rezoned Commercial to better reflect the use of the land.
Issue: 18th & 19th Avenue [18TH19THAV]					
Hamilton, Neil	844	1	O	The properties in the block located by Cameron Road, 18th and 19th Avenue are zoned residential. The land would be more appropriately zoned Commercial, excluding retail, with the exception of medically aligned retail as: a resource consent has been granted for a medically aligned purpose built development on the land; the site is near to the hospital and will complement the function and operation of the hospital; consent for development has acknowledged that development will not compromise residential amenity.	Amend the zoning of this land from Residential to Commercial (limited to medically aligned, ancillary use and residential accommodation).
Issue: 1 Domain Road [1DOMAINRD]					
Tauranga City Council	752	8	O	Oppose the zoning of 1 Domain Road as Passive Open Space. The property has a community centre on it which is being relocated and has been approved by the Council for sale. The land is located on a prominent corner.	Include this land within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: 250 State Highway 2 [250SH2]					
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	32	O	The zoning of this site should be Commercial and included within the Bethlehem Commercial Plan Area.	Zone this land commercial and include within the Bethlehem Commercial Plan Area.
Thompson, Max	864	32	O	The zoning of this site should be Commercial and included within the Bethlehem Commercial Plan Area.	Zone this land commercial and include within the Bethlehem Commercial Plan Area.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: 52 - 60 Christopher Street [52-60CHRIS]					
Tauranga Citizens Club	970	1	O	The zoning of the Tauranga Citizen's Club is proposed partly as Suburban Residential and partly as Commercial. The majority of this land is used as a carpark for the Club. The house at Christopher Street is used as an office with 4 FTEs, and the house at 52 is leased by the Club Manager. Therefore the residential zoning is not consistent with the long-term use of the property. Surrounding land is zoned commercial and where residential the interface rules of the plan deal with that issue. It is consistent with the sustainable management purpose of the RMA to ensure that where a property has been used for a particular activity for a long period of time that the zoning and rules related to that zone are compatible with the use or activity of that land.	Rezone the Tauranga Citizens Club at 52, 56 and 80 Christopher Street as Commercial.
Issue: 53 Fifth Avenue [53FIFTHAVE]					
Osbaldiston, Kevin & Irene	85	2	S	Support the inclusion of 53 Fifth Ave within the Commercial Zone. The re-zoning of this property makes sense as it will give the required viable depth to any commercial development fronting Cameron Road and aligns the commercial zone boundary with the remainder of the block.	Retain 53 Fifth Ave within the Commercial Zone.
Osbaldiston, Kevin & Irene	85	3	O	Oppose the streetscape rule being applied to 53 Fifth Avenue.	Remove the application of the Streetscape Rule to 53 Fifth Avenue.
Issue: 95 Ngatai Road [95NGATAI]					
K Trailer Hire	631	1	O	Opposes the residential zoning of the land. The site is adjacent to the Commercial zone and has a purpose built commercial development on it (tyre fitter and supply). The site is screened from adjoining residential properties and separated to the rear from residential properties by the rail line. The site has never been used for residential purposes and has sufficient space for a range of commercial uses.	That the site is included within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: Bay Central [BAYCENTRAL]					
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	1	S	Support the inclusion of the Bay Central site within the Commercial Zone.	Retain the Bay Central site within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: Bethlehem Town Centre [BETHTOWNC]					
Jaglem Limited, Greenwater Developments Limited, Kenepuru Properties Limited, Tipene Holdings Limited, Matua Charitable Trust Limited and Others	826	1	O	The land on the south side of State Highway 2 in the Bethlehem Town Centre between the proposed Commercial zone and Te Paeroa roundabout (as identified in this submission) is proposed to be included within the Suburban Residential zone. This does not promote the efficient use of this land. The predominant use of this land is commercial. There are a number of businesses that have established by way of existing use rights or resource consent, including a future service station. The Te Paeroa roundabout will provide the entry gateway to the Tauranga urban area. There are a number of access points to SH2 that could be rationalised enabling other access to be closed when commercial development is undertaken. Council could facilitate a service lane to enable access points to to SH2 to be reduced.	Extend the Commercial zone to the land on the south side of State Highway 2 in the Bethlehem Town Centre between the proposed Commercial zone and Te Paeroa roundabout (as identified in this submission).
Manor Group Investments Limited	808	15	O	The commercial zone in Bethlehem south should be extended further west to include all the land on the south side of the State Highway from the roundabout at Moffat Road to the east side of the proposed extension of Te Paeroa Road. It is inconsistent to expect this land to be developed for higher (than current) residential density when there is a restriction on access. This land is already used for commercial purposes. It is unlikely that the site on the corner of Moffatt Road will ever be used for rural purposes, although it may be valuable as a reserve.	Amend the extent of the commercial zone in Bethlehem from western corner of Moffatt Road to the eastern corner of the new (Te Paeroa Road) roundabout.
Issue: Boundaries of a Commercial & Sensitive Zone [BOUNDARIES]					
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	31	S	Support proposed rule 17.4.4.	Retain proposed rule 17.4.4.
Thompson, Max	864	31	S	Support proposed rule 17.4.4.	Retain proposed rule 17.4.4.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Building Height [BUILDHEIGHT]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	5	S	Support the maximum building height of 12 metres.	Retain the maximum building height of 12 metres.
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	8	O	The proposed permitted height in the Commercial Zone should be increased to provide for intensification of business activities on Commercial Zoned sites and so avoid the need for these activities to locate on land not zoned for that purpose.	Amend Rule 17.4.1.1 - Building Height, to provide a permitted building height of 16 metres within the Commercial Zones.
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	8	S	Support 12 metre height limit.	Retain 12 metre height limit.
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	15	O	Rule 17.4.1.1 provides for a height of 12 metres in the Commercial Zone, this should be increased to provide for the intensification of business activities on business zoned sites.	Amend the permitted building height in the Commercial Zone to 16 metres.
JWL Investment Trust	830	19	O	Rule 17.7.1 identifies that non-compliance with building height restrictions will result in an activity having a Discretionary status. This is inconsistent with non-compliance with other permitted activity conditions which default to a Restricted Discretionary status. Non-compliance with height should be a Restricted Discretionary matter and reference in Rule 17.7.1 should be amended from 17.5.1 to 17.4.1.	Amend non-compliance with the height permitted activity condition at 17.4.1 from a Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary matter and amend the reference from 17.5.1 to 17.4.1.
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Goup	497	19	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the Commercial Zones.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	20	O	Rule 17.7.1 lists as a discretionary activity in the commercial zone any activity that does not comply with Rule 17.5.1 (Building height). This is inconsistent with the approach taken for other performance standards and permitted activity conditions within the Commercial Zone.	Non-compliance with the height rule be considered as a restricted discretionary activity and the reference to Rule 17.5.1 is amended to the correct reference, 17.4.1.
Benton, Jason	498	23	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the commercial zones.
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	23	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the commercial zones.
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	23	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the commercial zones.
McAlpine, Jon	664	25	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the commercial zones.
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	30	S	The 12 metre maximum height for the Commercial Zones is supported.	Retain the 12 metre maximum height limit in the Commercial Zones.
Thompson, Max	864	53	O	Permitted building height should be amended from 12 to 16 metres to provide for intensification of business activities on business zoned sites.	Amend the permitted building height in commercial zones from 12 to 16 metres.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	54	O	Permitted building height should be amended from 12 to 16 metres to provide for intensification of business activities on business zoned sites.	Amend the permitted building height in commercial zones from 12 to 16 metres.
Issue: Domain Road & Dickson Road [DOM-DICRD]					
Niamod and Others	796	1	O	There has been no consideration of an earlier submission to the Plan which sought rezoning of parts of Domain Road and Dickson Road to Commercial. Commercial zoning is required around the Papamoa Plaza commercial node to enable office type development as this will be affected by Plan Change 48 and the rules in the Proposed City Plan.	Rezone the eastern side of Domain Road Commercial and the land at 3 and 5 Domain and 4, 6 and 8 Dickson Road to enable commercial redevelopment of these sites.
Issue: Excelsa Village [EXCELSAVIL]					
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	40	O	Oppose the lack of provision for a Commercial Plan Area at Excelsa Village. The local area has no walkable local convenience shopping or other services. There is an existing resource consent for the commercial activities. Commercial activities are proposed to be non-complying in the Suburban Residential Zone.	Add to 17.2.3.4.1 policy for a local centre at Excelsa Village: 'Land zoned for new business activity at Excelsa has regard to: 1. Providing opportunities for convenience and comparison retail, employment, business and community services and serving a neighbourhood catchment. 2. Mitigation of visual effects from business activities and buildings when viewed from the surrounding residential area through landscape planting within both private and public spaces and building controls. 3. The opportunity for mixed use development with residential activities above street level. 4. The provision of buildings of a height that will provide capacity and legibility to the centre without detracting from the amenity of the surrounding area. 5. Comprehensive traffic management provision, including parking within both public and private space.
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	41	O	Oppose the lack of provision for a Commercial Plan for a local centre at Excelsa Village.	Make the following amendments: 1. Add to 17.4.1 - Building height in the Excelsa Village Commercial Zone - The maximum building height for a building or structure shall not exceed that shown on the Excelsa Commercial Outline Development Plan. In the Excelsa Village Commercial Zone no apartment/commercial buildings shall exceed 16 metres in height, plus an allowance of no more than 2 metres for any protuberance of the stairwell only. This shall be stepped back from the roof edge by a distance equal to twice the height of the stairwell addition. Add to 17.4.3 - All buildings in the Excelsa Commercial Zone shall comply with specified setbacks as shown in Excelsa Outline Development Plan. Add to 17.4.11.5 'Excelsa' to the heading.
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	42	O	Oppose lack of provision for a local centre at Excelsa Village.	Add to 7.5 a point (e) Excelsa, various standards and terms covering: 1. The provision of plans detailing the relationship of proposed buildings to open space. 2. Significant trees in car parks, streets, footpaths and reserves. 3. Details of acceptable species for planting. 4. Detailed engineering drawing specifying appropriate transportation measures. And add matters of control and conditions including: 1. Standards and terms specified for Te Reti. 2. Implementation of landscape management measures. 3. The application of financial contributions to mitigate unforeseen impacts. Full details are contained within this submission.
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	43	O	Oppose the lack of provision for commercial centre at Excelsa.	Provide Excelsa Village Commercial Outline Development Plan in accordance with plan attached to submission.
Bluehaven Management Ltd, Bluehaven Holdings Limited & Excelsa Village Limited	783	46	O	Oppose the lack of provision for a neighbourhood centre at Excelsa.	Identify provision for a neighbourhood centre within the Commercial Business zone at Golden Sands Drive on Map 61.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Fraser Street/Cameron Road [FRASERCAM]					
The Trustees of the Ross Mischewski Family Trust	833	1	O	The proposed zoning of 1069 and 1065 Cameron Road, and 7 Kauri Street, does not reflect either the surrounding use of the area or the lack of amenity in the neighbourhood. This land has little residential amenity, is located on a major arterial route, is in an area where many small commercial activities exist and are never likely to be used for residential purposes.	Zone 1001 -1071 Cameron Road Commercial Business and undertake an analysis of these areas to justify their inclusion in a specific strip zone along Cameron Road with the development of provisions and assessment criteria to protect the physical residential form of these properties and the neighbours located behind. Establish appropriate landscaping controls to create a "buffer" type zone between Cameron Road and any residential property located to the rear of the site.
Wand'r'in Star Family Trust	186	3	O	Opposes the Suburban Residential zoning of properties fronting Cameron Road from the city centre up to and including Gate Pa. Submit that traffic levels and associated noise and vehicle emissions have already created adverse impacts on these properties which means these areas are not ideal residential environments. Request that these properties be rezoned so they can be utilised for offices and commercial activity.	Rezone properties fronting Cameron Road from the city centre up to and including Gate Pa to provide for offices and commercial activities on these sites.
Carmichael, AJ & PG Family Trust	712	18	O	A further commercial plan area should be included which relates to existing business activities in Cameron Road and Fraser Street. The residential amenity of these areas has already been compromised as a result of roading and traffic effects over the last 10 years. Council should include these areas in a strip zone as they are never likely to return to residential use.	Further provisions included in the plan to address commercial strip development along Cameron Road and Fraser Street.
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	23	O	A further commercial plan area should be included for existing business activities on Cameron Road and Fraser Street. The residential amenity of these areas has already been compromised as a result of roading and traffic effects over the last 10 years and a significant number of small commercial developments have established in these areas. An analysis should be undertaken to justify the inclusion of these areas in a specific strip zone along Cameron Rad and Fraser Street with the development of provisions to protect the physical residential form of these properties and the properties behind. These properties will never return to residential use.	Further provisions should provide for commercial strip development along Cameron Road and Fraser Street.
St Michaels Limited	710	23	O	A further commercial plan area should be included for existing business activities in Cameron Road and Fraser Street. The residential amenity of these areas has already been compromised. Council should undertake an analysis of these areas to justify their inclusion in a strip zone along Cameron Road and Fraser Street with the development of provisions and assessment criteria to protect the physical residential form of these properties. These properties are never likely to return to residential use.	Further provisions are included to address commercial strip development along Cameron Road and Fraser Street.
Issue: Fraser Cove [FRASERCOVE]					
IMF Fraser Cove Limited	687	1	O	Pt Lot 2 and Lots 4-6 DPS9948, Lot 2 DP384136, Lot 3 DP 358476 and Lot 2 DP49348 are included within the Suburban Residential zone. This land has been consented and developed for commercial parking purposes.	Include this land within the Commercial zone to better reflect the use of this land.
Issue: Frasers Papamoa [FRASPAPA]					
Frasers Papamoa Limited	829	16	O	The Plan Maps should be amended to show the approved retail within 'the Coast' development.	Incorporate portion of 'the Coast' within the Commercial zone.
Issue: Girven Road [GIRVENRD]					
Fitzgerald, Ged & Others	812	1	O	The Suburban Residential zoning is inappropriate for Girven Road. The land is strategically located in the middle of a commercial growth node. This road has established commercial offices and has low residential amenity.	Amend zoning on Girven Road to Commercial between Gloucester Road and Maunganui Road. Change zoning of land between 3 and 23 Eversham Road to City Living Zone - Mixed Use to provide for comprehensively designed development.
Issue: Glasgow Street [GLASCOWST]					
Zuur, Hanz	17	1	O	The Glasgow Street area is identified within the Commercial Zone and the uses within that zone are more akin to Industrial land use. The area is within proximity to the CBD and not suited to industrial development, but should be zoned as a mixed-use environment to facilitate an eventual change in land use for mixed commercial/residential purposes.	The the Glasgow Street commercial/industrial area be rezoned for mixed-use commercial/residential purposes.
Issue: Hays Avenue [HAYSAVENUE]					
Scott, R W & E F	35	1	O	If the eastern side of Hays Avenue, Greerton was zoned to allow for service type businesses it would give balance to commercial development on Cameron Road and reduce the increasing use of Chadwick Road east from Cameron Road.	That the eastern side of Hays Avenue is zoned for service commercial development.
Issue: Historic Village [HISTORICVI]					
Fairway Holdings Limited	384	1	O	Rules relating to the further development of land at the Historic Village on 17th Avenue should include the following as a pre-requisite for further growth or land use activities being established: 1. Existing parking spillover onto surrounding streets needs to be accommodated on-site or on other sites in the locality. 2. Stormwater management and flood protection for the site and the surrounding locality needs to be improved prior to any further development on the site as this has the potential to impact on other sites in the locality. 3. Integrated stormwater and floodwater management being planned for the village needs to be provided in a manner that requires its design and implementation involving all other properties in the locality. 4. The parking, stormwater and flooding matters in this locality need to be assessed, managed and designed in a manner that integrates the requirements, interests and effects experienced by all of the properties and activities in the locality. 5. Resource consent procedures are able to achieve this integration through objectives, policies and rules to apply to a consent process.	Add a rule to Chapter 17 to set out development pre-requisites for anticipated land use activities or development to be permitted on the Historic Village site and to include the following matters: 1. Provision of sufficient parking to comply with the requirements of the Plan on-site or off-site in close proximity. 2. Provision of parking off-site is a restricted discretionary activity. 3. Integrated stormwater reticulation and flood protection capable of accommodating the requirements of properties in the locality. 4. Restricted discretionary in relation to parking to be limited to the adequacy of parking and the location of that parking. 5. Restricted discretionary rule in relation to stormwater to be limited to ensuring adequate capacity to accommodate stormwater in the locality and prevent flooding. 5. Non-compliance with provision of sufficient parking and stormwater flooding matters to be a non-complying activity. 6. The site is scheduled like other large holdings in the locality with specific rules to prescribe a range of commercial activities, development, design and appearance, operational and performance standards such as noise, lighting, parking etc. 7. Commercial land use activities are limited as with other sites in the locality to address effects on existing commercial centres. Activities should be limited to those already within the Historic Village.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Independent Dwelling Units [INDDWELUNI]					
Tauranga City Council	492	9	O	The potential establishment of residential land use within commercial zones is appropriately dealt with in areas of pedestrian environment streets, where rules of the plan meet the intent to provide for a predominance of commercial use while encouraging mixed use residential development within these zones. In other areas of the commercial zone there is the potential to establish high density residential land use without consideration of the impact on the commercial land resource.	Identify the development of residential land use in the Commercial zones outside of pedestrian environment streets as a restricted discretionary activity where not undertaken in a mixed use development with residential land use located above ground floor. Criteria for assessment should include: The provision of a residential amenity consistent with the expectations of the provision for comprehensive medium density development in the Suburban Residential Zone; Impacts on the cohesive development of the commercial zone, specifically the achievement of a network of commercial centres that provides opportunities to meet the foreseeable needs of the community; The provision of a consistent streetscape and amenity within a commercial centre; and The impacts of residential land use on the ability of commercial land use to establish and operate in an environment intended for commercial land use. Amend guiding policy 17.2.3.3.1 accordingly.
Issue: Jude Place/Millers Road [JUDE-MILL]					
Thorne Group Limited	834	32	O	Oppose the lack of provision for a local centre at Jude Place/Millers Road. The area has no walkable local convenience centre.	Provide for local convenience centre at Jude Place/Millers Road, as detailed in this submission.
Issue: Lot 1 Te Paeroa Road [LOT1TEPARD]					
Bruno Buechel and MagMed Limited	828	1	O	The Commercial zone to the east of this land should be extended to include this land. This land will have a significantly degraded amenity as Te Paeroa Road is a collector road. Residential land behind can be appropriately sleeved and is better served by the zoning of this land for commercial purposes. Financial contribution requirements significantly hinder the residential development of this land.	Include this land within the Commercial zone.
Issue: Lot 2 Hamilton Street [LOT2HAMST]					
JWL Investments Limited	823	1	S	Support the inclusion of this land within the Commercial zone.	Retain the Commercial zoning of this land.
Issue: Lot 3 Bureta Road [LOT3BURETA]					
Perry Developments Limited	689	26	O	Portion of Lot 3 (DPS 73660) Bureta Road is identified as 'Suburban Residential'. The land has been approved for commercial activities. Both the existing and consented environment represent character and amenity values more closely aligned with that of a Commercial zone.	Include portion of Lot 3 Bureta Road, as identified in this submission, within the Commercial zone.
Issue: Lot 3 Te Paeroa Road [LOT3TEPARD]					
BFAS Limited	825	2	O	This land will have a significantly degraded residential amenity as a result of proximity to Te Paeroa Road, which will function as a collector road. Residential land behind this property can be appropriately sleeved and better served by the zoning of this land for commercial purposes. The level of financial contributions for this property significantly constrain the residential development of this land.	Include Lot 3 Te Paeroa Road within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: Lot 4 Te Paeroa Road [LOT4TEPARD]					
BFAS Limited	825	1	O	Lot 4 Te Paeroa Road is at the same grade as the future roundabout of Te Paeroa Road and SH2. The land is not buffered and its location affects residential amenity. The roundabout is the logical extent of commercial development on both sides of the road. The financial contributions for West Bethlehem constrain its ability to be developed for residential purposes, precluding the development of this land.	Include Lot 4 Te Paeroa Road within the Commercial Zone.
Issue: New Business Land [NEWBUSLAND]					
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	22	O	The provisions in the Plan relate to the Commercial zone only. There are no provisions that provide for the inclusion of further business land as required by local demand. A further objective should be included in the Plan to provide for further business land to be zoned or developed by way of resource consent should a local need arise.	Include objectives and rules that provide for commercial development outside of commercial zones in response to local demand.
St Michaels Limited	710	22	O	The provisions of the Plan relate to the provision of commercial land in the existing commercial zone or commercial plan areas only. There are no provisions that relate to the inclusion of further business land as required by local demand. A further objective should be included to provided for land to be zoned or developed by way of resource consent should local demand arise.	Include an objective that provides for commercial land outside of the commercial zone or commercial plan areas should a local demand arise.
Issue: Palm Beach Plaza [PBPLAZA]					
Catalyst Commercial 2008 Limited	827	1	O	The application of the Streetscape Rule to the frontage of Palm Beach Plaza/Papamoa Tavern on Domain Road is opposed. 2 metres has been taken for road widening in this location and the 5 metre setback required should be reduce to 3 metres on the basis of this land take.	Reduce the streetscape rule setback to Palm Beach Plaza/Domain Road to 3 metres.
Catalyst Commercial 2008 Limited	827	2	SA	There is currently no legal road access to Palm Beach Plaza from Domain Road.	Amend the Plan Maps and Urban Growth Plan UG5 to provide for access as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Commercial Plan Areas [PLANAREAS]					
Progressive Enterprises Limited	851	5	S	The concept of site specific zoning is supported to the extent that the provisions adequately provide for the operational needs of supermarkets.	Retain commercial plan areas.
Tauranga City Council	492	8	SA	Introduce maximum permitted height of bund for landscaping planting requirements in Commercial Plan Areas 17 F, 17G and 17H of 1.5 metres to ensure that acceptable parameters are clearly defined.	Specify maximum bund height in Appendix 17F, 17G and 17H of 1.5 metres.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	11	O	The objectives for Commercial Plan Areas, outlined at 17.2.3.4 are opposed as it is not appropriate to seek mitigation of all effects, positive and adverse.	Amend objective 17.2.3.4 to: "The effects of development in the Commercial Plan Areas is managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate significant adverse effects on the surrounding environment."
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	12	O	Policy 17.2.3.4.1(f) is opposed as effects may not always be able to be mitigated.	Remove the words 'mitigation of' from Policy 17.2.3.4.1(f).
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	14	O	The non-compliance with a permitted activity rule resulting in activities being considered under the Discretionary status is inconsistent with the rest of the commercial permitted activity conditions and the restricted discretionary status is an appropriate level of control.	Amend the note at Rule 17.4.11, Rule 17.6(a) and Rule 17.7.1(a)(iii) so that height infringements are a restricted discretionary activity.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	15	S	Support the provision in Rule 17.4.11.5(a) for additions and alterations less than 1000sqm as a permitted activity.	Retain rule 17.4.11.5(a).
Property Council of New Zealand (Bay of Plenty Branch)	491	21	SA	Support the retention of the outline development plans for existing commercial areas, however, seek that these be a guide to development and that any matters of non-compliance are considered as restricted discretionary matters.	That non-compliance with commercial outline development plans be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity and removed from the non-complying category.
New Zealand Transport Agency	588	22	S	General support for the use of the Commercial Outline Development Plans. There should be amendments to clarify access locations as being either one-way or two-way.	Amend all Commercial Outline Development Plans to show whether accesses are one-way or two-way.
Department Of Conservation	848	60	S	The environmental mitigation measures outlined in 17.2.3.4.1 (a)(iii) and (iv) are supported as recognising the role of riparian margins on ecosystem health and the provision of access to and along waterways.	Retain policy 17.2.3.4.1 (a)(iii) and (iv).
Issue: Residential Properties with Resource Consent for Commercial Activity [RCCOMACT]					
Wand'rin Star Family Trust	186	4	O	Submit that there are many properties within the residential zones that are now not being used for residential purposes, that many of these properties have a land use consent which allows commercial activity within the zone and these properties need to be rezoned to reflect this.	Rezone residential properties that have a land use consent for commercial activities.
Issue: Reflectance Values [REFLECTVAL]					
Tauranga City Council	492	11	SA	These rules reference different standards for the same issue - reflectance value.	Ensure that a uniform approach is taken to the standard used for reflectance value.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones					
Issue: Streetscape [STREETSCAP]					
Danby, James	493	1	SA	In the majority of circumstances where the streetscape rule applies the road width separating the commercial zone from a sensitive zone is 30 metres. Along the end of Miro Street the road width between the commercial and residential zone is 20 metres wide. Given the permitted building height for the commercial zone is 12 metres this rule should recognise the additional proximity between zones in these instances and require additional setbacks for building height and require additional setbacks for building height above ground floor level.	Amend Rule 17.4.3.1 to require building above ground floor to be setback 3.5 metres from the road boundary (in addition to landscaping/active frontage requirements) where legal road width is 20 metres or less.
The National Trading Company Of New Zealand	623	1	SA	The rule is commended however further refinement is required to reflect operation requirements. While an option is good, the combined 15% active frontage and landscaping requirement is onerous. In some circumstances the streetscape rule would apply to 'back of house' operations where it is simply not possible to provide a proportion of active frontage.	Remove the 15% active frontage requirement in the option for the streetscape Rule 17.4.3.1(a)(ii).
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	3	O	Oppose the provision for a landscape strip to address streetscape interface (as in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i)) as this has been demonstrated to be a wholly unsatisfactory means.	Consider alternative options to landscape strip requirement.
Progressive Enterprises Limited	851	4	O	Supermarkets in particular are high generators of pedestrian activity and play an important role in contributing to the vitality, vibrancy and positive economy and amenity of a suburban centre. While the need for careful treatment of frontages is recognised, the use of landscaping and other mitigation measures are often appropriate to address amenity effect on adjacent and surrounding zones. This needs to be balanced against the operation and functional needs of supermarkets. Specific design features such as verandahs and active frontages are inappropriate and not practical for large format retail.	Delete Rule 17.4.3, if this rule is not deleted then amend the assessment criteria in Rule 17.6.3 to acknowledge the operational requirements of large format retail, or alternatively, delete the streetscape rule notation at 683 Cameron Road, Royal Palm Beach Plaza, and 243 Fraser Street.
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	7	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
Western Bay of Plenty District Council	609	12	S	Rule 17.4.3 is supported.	Retain Rule 17.4.3.
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Group	497	18	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
Benton, Jason	498	22	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	22	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	22	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
McAlpine, Jon	664	24	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
Grasshopper Farms Ltd	506	25	O	Rule 17.4.3.1(a) is too restrictive and doesn't provide enough flexibility to encourage new business into commercial areas or account for the types of businesses with different frontage requirements.	Delete Rule 17.4.3.1(a).
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	29	O	Disagree with the methodology outlined in Policy 17.2.3.2.1(b)(i) that landscape strips are not a suitable method for ensuring amenity of surrounding areas is maintained.	Amend this landscape strip requirement.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	30	S	Rule 17.4.3 is supported.	Retain Rule 17.4.3.
Thompson, Max	864	30	S	Rule 17.4.3 is supported.	Retain Rule 17.4.3.
Issue: Table 17.3A - Activities [TABLE17.3A]					
Bunnings Limited	765	3	SA	'Business Activities' are a use provided for in the Commercial Zones, which could include a Bunnings activity, however, reliance on the Business Activities definition creates difficulties in the case of operations within the Industrial Zones where 'Business Activities' are not provided for. To provide consistency throughout the Plan and certainty for Bunnings and other similar businesses, provision should be made for 'Building Improvement Centres' in the Commercial Zones as permitted activities. There should be no reservations about these activities being permitted given the urban design related controls in place for specific sites of pedestrian/streetscape or amenity value.	Provided for 'Building Improvement Centres' as permitted activities in the Commercial Zones.
Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand) Limited	642	7	SA	Services stations and vehicle sales premises are permitted under the Operative District Plan in the Commercial Business Zone. These activities should likewise be permitted in the proposed Commercial Zone.	That service stations and vehicle sales premises are identified in Table 17.3A as permitted activities.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	13	S	The provision for appropriate activities in the Commercial Zone as permitted activities (including in Rule 17.3.1) is supported.	Retain the provision for appropriate activities in the Commercial zone as permitted activities (including Rule 17.3.1).
DNZ Property Fund Limited	763	14	O	Table 17.3A excludes the previously permitted activities of service stations and vehicle saleyards. These activities are appropriate and should be reintroduced as permitted activities.	Provide for vehicle saleyards and service stations as permitted activities in Commercial Zones.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	28	S	Table 17.3A is supported.	Retain Table 17.3A.
Thompson, Max	864	28	S	Table 17.3A is supported.	Retain Table 17.3A.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Bayfair					
Issue: Appendix 17L - Bayfair Commercial Outline Development Plan [APPEND17L]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	6	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7 as the outline development plan for Bayfair is wholly inappropriate and conveys no useful information.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7.
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	7	O	If the Bayfair zone change is retained then increase the required setback in Rule 17.5.1.7(b)(ii) from 3 metres to 10 metres.	Increase setback required under Rule 17.5.1.7(b)(ii) from 3 metres to 10 metres.
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	10	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	12	O	Oppose the Outline Development Plan as it conveys no useful information, is not drawn to scale and is generally useless.	Remove the Bayfair Outline Development Plan.
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Goup	497	21	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
Benton, Jason	498	25	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	25	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	25	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	26	O	The notation requiring an active frontage on the northeast boundary should be deleted.	Remove reference to an active frontage in relation to the northeast boundary.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	27	O	The 12 building setback shown on the northwest boundary should be amended as it does not match the 10 metre setback requirement in Rule 17.5.1.7(b)(iii). The requirement for an active frontage should be removed and replaced with the requirement for a 3 metre landscape strip.	Amend the setback from the northwest boundary from 12 to 10 metres and delete the requirement for an active frontage.
McAlpine, Jon	664	27	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	28	O	The landscape strip diagram should be changed from 5 metres to 3 metres in width.	Amend the landscape strip requirement from 5 metres to 3 metres.
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	32	O	The required setback of 3 metres should be increased to 10 metres for consistency.	Amend the required 3 metre setback to 10 metres.
Issue: Financial Contributions [FINCONT]					
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	25	O	Oppose the requirement to mitigate unforeseen impacts as specified in Rule 17.5.1.8(f) as there is no certainty regarding 'unforeseen' or 'offset'.	Delete 'required to offset unforeseen impacts' from Rule 17.5.1.8(f).
Issue: Floorspace [FLOORSPACE]					
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	19	O	The economic assessment on which floorspace limitations are based was based on a timeframe to 2021 - it is unlikely that the Plan will be reviewed by this time. The economic assessment undertaken to derive GLFA was based on retail activities and associated services. There are a number of other activities that should not be constrained by this rule.	Amend Rule 17.5.1.7(d) by adding the following: '...by 2021; and additional building floorspace shall not exceed 30,000sqm of GLFA, or a combined total GLFA on the site of 64,000sqm by 2026.'
Issue: Frontages [FRONTAGES]					
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	16	O	The requirement for 5 metres of landscaping at the Maunganui and Girven Road frontages limits the effective use of the site, when combined with a 10 metre setback requirement. A 3 metre landscaping requirement would ensure sufficient amenity is maintained while ensuring 7 metres of usable space is maintained between the landscaping and the building. This space can be more readily used than if the landscaping requirement was 5 metre.	Amend Rule 17.5.1.7(b)(i) to require a 3 metre strip of landscape planting.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	17	O	A landscape planting requirement should replace the active frontage requirement.	Amend Rule 17.5.1.7(b)(iii) to state: 'A minimum of 10 metres from the northern boundary of the site with the adjacent Suburban Residential zone, of which the first 3 metres adjacent to the road frontage, exclusive of permitted vehicle access points, shall be provided with landscape planting...'
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	23	O	The matters of control and conditions includes the word 'ensuring'. This should be replaced with 'The extent to which'.	Replace 'ensuring' in 17.5.1.8(b) and (c) with 'the extent to which'.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	24	O	Rule 17.5.1.8(d) requiring the provision of active frontages is opposed.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.8(d).
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	30	O	The requirement to provide active frontages opposite a sensitive zone is opposed as active frontages and sensitive activities such as dwellings are not compatible. Active frontages need to be opposite other active frontages.	Amend Rule 17.4.3.1 to clarify how this impacts on Bayfair, including in relation to sensitive activities and the term 'opposite' and amend Rule 17.4.3.1 as identified in this submissions.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Bayfair					
Issue: Height [HEIGHT]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	8	O	If the Bayfair zoning is retained then reduce the height permitted under Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% height be permitted in this instance?	Delete the provision for additional height provided by Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Mathiesen, Anne-Marie	515	11	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	18	O	Oppose the 16 metres as taller buildings on the site will provide for more efficient use of the Commercial zone.	Amend the permitted height for Bayfair to 20 metres.
Tauranga Architect's Practice Support Goup	497	22	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Benton, Jason	498	26	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Brendon Gordon Architecture Limited	597	26	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Dimensions Limited Architects	517	26	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
McAlpine, Jon	664	28	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Campbell, Wendy Kathleen	101	33	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c). Why should an additional 50% building height be provided for in this instance? If combined with permitted intrusions under Rule 4.8.2.3 could end up with a potential height of 22 metres for 5400sqm of the building. This contributes nothing to the amenity values of surrounding neighbours.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.7(c).
Issue: Impacts on Landowners [IMPLANDOWN]					
Roa, T R & L H M	13	1	O	As a resident within the area proposed to be rezoned from Residential A to Commercial the proposed rezoning is opposed. Advice received from the Council says that consideration must be given to the protection of surrounding residents but does not mention those living within the area to be rezoned. The property owned by the submitter was brought for retirement and there is no intention of moving unless an offer is too good to refuse. Bayfair has been trying to bully the sale of the submitters land. The following points of concern are noted: 1. The Council are helping a multi-million dollar business achieve their aims without any consideration of those still in the Residential A area. 2. Bayfair's representatives threats will no longer be threats but fact thanks to rezoning as no consideration or consultation will be needed to develop around the submitter. 3. Whilst not against progress the submitter feels penalised and that there is little chance of preventing the rezoning. While the predicament Council are in is understood, Council need to ensure that Bayfair own all the properties rather than have Council force the issue in Bayfair's favour.	Council ensure that Bayfair own all properties within the area to be rezoned especially those adversely affected before rezoning from Residential to Commercial takes place.
Simpson, Jennifer & Michael	753	1	SA	The zoning of Bayfair should be subject to restrictions that will protect the amenity of adjoining residents.	To protect existing residents at the boundary of the proposed zoning the following measures should be put in place: 1. Limit the access to delivery vehicles to between 7am and 10pm due to noise; 2. Ensure buildings are at least 10 metres from the boundary with the residential zone; 3. Provide for a greenbelt instead of road between the residential and commercial zone; 4. Provide a service lane for Lot 644 Maunganui Road so that access isn't compromised by future development; 5. Provide suitable fencing on the boundary of the residential and commercial zone to deter noise and unwanted visitors.
Issue: Oppose General [OPPOSEGEN]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	4	O	Disagree with zoning residential land commercial as this is not supported by any report. District Plan review is not an appropriate place to carry out this change, which needs much greater scrutiny with more concrete proposals as to actual landuse.	Delete the change of zone from residential to commercial.
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	9	O	The reference to Courney Road in Rule 17.5.1.8(a) is incorrect.	Change reference in Rule 17.5.1.8(a) to Bayfair.
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	11	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.8(d) requiring an 'active frontage' as the term is not meaningful or adequately set out in the Plan.	Delete Rule 17.5.1.8(d).
Issue: Parking [PARKING]					
Stephen Bird Architect Limited	360	10	O	Delete Rule 17.5.1.8(b) - please demonstrate how specimen trees mitigate the effects of large parking areas.	Require parking to be accommodated in buildings screened from sensitive areas by concealing within the mall building itself, like secondary dwellings. Can't rely on a few trees here when not allowed elsewhere in the Plan.
Issue: Stormwater Mitigation [STWATMITI]					
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	20	O	The requirement to provide stormwater mitigation is opposed as it is not clear what 'extra stormwater' means. The rule should be amended to make it clear that the restriction only applies over the base stormwater load, and does not apply once the Council's system has been upgraded by the Council or the applicant.	Amend Rule 17.5.1.7(e) to specify that no additional stormwater can be disposed of into the council system over and above the base stormwater load (further detail is found in this submission).

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Bayfair					
Issue: Support General [SUPPORT]					
Tauranga City Council	752	9	S	Support the zoning of 25 Harris Street the same as the adjacent commercial zone for Bayfair.	Rezone 25 Harris Street as proposed.
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	21	S	The provision for stand alone developments requiring more than 5 parking spaces to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity is supported.	Retain rule 17.5.1.7(f).
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	22	SA	There is an error in a reference to Courtney Road rather than Bayfair.	Amend the reference to Courtney Road in Rule 17.5.1.8(a).
AMP Capital Bayfair Pty Limited & Tower Property Nominees	862	29	S	The rezoning of land Commercial about the Bayfair shopping centre is supported.	Retain the proposed Commercial zoning about the Bayfair shopping centre.
Topic: Commercial Zones - Bethlehem Town Centre					
Issue: Policy - Commercial Plan Areas [17.2.3.4.1]					
Thompson, Max	864	52	O	Guiding Policy 17.2.3.4.1 for the Bethlehem Town Centre should be amended for clarity.	Amend Policy 17.2.3.4.1 as outlined in this submission.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	53	O	Guiding Policy 17.2.3.4.1 for the Bethlehem Town Centre should be amended for clarity.	Amend Policy 17.2.3.4.1 as outlined in this submission.
Issue: Rule - Bethlehem Town Centre Development Conditions [17.4.11.5]					
Thompson, Max	864	54	O	This rule should be amended to clarify what the permitted activities are on the site.	Amend this rule as detailed in this submission.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	55	O	This rule should be amended to clarify what the permitted activities are on the site.	Amend this rule as detailed in this submission.
Thompson, Max	864	55	O	Development conditions outlined for the site (at 17.5.1.1) should be amended for clarification, reflecting discussions with NZTA over access, and rationalising landscape conditions.	Amend the floor space threshold to 24,400sqm. Provide for an additional access point to the State Highway, and amend 17.5.1.1(e) by removing point (e)(i) through (e)(vi) and make reference to the Outline Development Plan, as detailed in this submission. Should these amendments not be made then development should be provided for as a permitted activity.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	56	O	Development conditions outlined for the site (at 17.5.1.1) should be amended for clarification, reflecting discussions with NZTA over access, and rationalising landscape conditions.	Amend the floor space threshold to 24,400sqm. Provide for an additional access point to the State Highway, and amend 17.5.1.1(e) by removing point (e)(i) through (e)(vi) and make reference to the Outline Development Plan, as detailed in this submission. Should these amendments not be made then development should be provided for as a permitted activity.
Issue: Appendix 17I - Bethlehem Outline Development Plan [APPEND17I]					
Manor Group Investments Limited	808	16	SA	There should be a second option for access from the Bethlehem Town Centre to Te Paeroa Road at the location of the junction of the boundaries of the neighbouring properties to the west.	Amend to provide a second option for access from the Bethlehem Town Centre to Te Paeroa Road at the location of the junction of the boundaries of the neighbouring properties to the west.
Thompson, Max	864	56	O	Appendix 17I should be amended to include the Seventh Day Adventist site and through providing an additional access point to the Centre from State Highway 2.	Amend Appendix 17I to include the Seventh Day Adventist site and through providing an additional access point to the Centre from State Highway 2.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	57	O	Appendix 17I should be amended to include the Seventh Day Adventist site and through providing an additional access point to the Centre from State Highway 2.	Amend Appendix 17I to include the Seventh Day Adventist site and through providing an additional access point to the Centre from State Highway 2.
Issue: Support General [SUPPORT]					
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	1	S	The Commercial zoning and Commercial Plan Area overlay is supported.	Retain the Commercial zoning and Commercial Plan Area overlay.
Thompson, Max	864	1	S	The Commercial zoning and Commercial Plan Area overlay is supported.	Retain the Commercial zoning and Commercial Plan Area overlay.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	3	S	Support the rezoning of Council's reserve adjacent Te Paeroa road from Residential to Recreation.	Rezone Council's reserve fronting Te Paeroa road from Residential to Recreation.
Thompson, Max	864	3	S	Support the rezoning of Council's reserve adjacent Te Paeroa road from Residential to Recreation.	Rezone Council's reserve fronting Te Paeroa road from Residential to Recreation.
AMP Capital Investors (New Zealand) Limited	868	4	S	The rezoning of Te Paeroa Road from Residential to Road zone is supported.	Include Te Paeroa Road in the Road zone.
Thompson, Max	864	4	S	The rezoning of Te Paeroa Road from Residential to Road zone is supported.	Include Te Paeroa Road in the Road zone.
Topic: Commercial Zones - Courtney Road					
Issue: Bethlehem, Courtney Road, Te Reti & Bayfair Commercial Plan Areas [17.4.11.5]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	1	S	The provisions relating to the Courtney Road Commercial Plan Area are generally supported.	Unspecified.
JWL Investment Trust	830	2	SA	Rule 17.4.11.5 restricts development to a floor area not exceeding 1000sqm as a permitted activity, beyond which any development is to be a controlled activity. There are no assessment criteria regulating controlled activities in the zone. There is no justification for the approach taken.	Standards and terms identified in 17.5.1.3 should apply to permitted activities and reference to the controlled activity standard should be deleted.
JWL Investment Trust	830	3	O	Rules 17.4.11 and 17.7.1 identify that where an activity does not comply with a permitted activity rule it shall be considered as a discretionary activity. Specific matters of non-compliance should be dealt with by way of a restricted discretionary activity status and matters of assessment relate to specific matters of non-compliance.	Amend rules so that specific matters of non-compliance are dealt with by way of a restricted discretionary activity status and matters of assessment relating to specific matters of non-compliance.
Issue: Gate Pa Commercial [GATEPACOM]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	5	O	The zoning of land between the Courtney Road and Gate Pa commercial areas is an anomaly as it retains a residential zoning but is unlikely to be used for this purpose. The zoning of this land for Commercial purposes would more appropriately reflect the pattern of development in this area. A landscape strip consistent with that provided as part of Courtney Road could buffer adjacent land in Wellesley Grove.	Rezone the land between the Gate Pa and Courtney Road commercial areas, as identified in this submission, to Commercial and include a buffer to Wellesley Grove consistent with that in the Courtney Road commercial area.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Courtney Road					
Issue: Retail Floorspace [RETAILFS]					
JWL Investment Trust	830	4	O	Controls on retail floorspace have been established under Rule 17.5.1.3(b). The Council needs to adopt a consistent planning approach to retail uses across the district. There is nothing special about the Courtney Road Commercial Zone which requires these rules to apply.	Delete retail floorspace restrictions for the Courtney Road Commercial Zone.
Topic: Commercial Zones - Parton Road South					
Issue: Access from Parton Road [ACCESS]					
Parton Road Land Limited	259	2	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(b) doesn't allow any access to Parton Road other than by way of Te Okuroa Drive. This is contrary to resource consent granted by the Council which provides for access from Te Okuroa Drive. In addition Rule 4.2.5 identifies access as a Non-Complying activity. These rules have the effect of sterilising the ability to develop this land.	Rule 17.4.11.3(b) and 4.2.5 should be deleted in their entirety as Rule 4.2.3 appropriately addresses access as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Parton Road Land Limited	824	2	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(b) doesn't provide for any access from Parton Road to Lot 1 and 2 Parton Road. This is contrary to resource consent granted by TCC. In addition, Rule 4.2.5 identifies that access to Te Okuroa Drive is a non-complying activity. These rules effectively sterilise the land for future development.	Delete rules 17.4.11.3(b) and 4.2.5 in their entirety as rule 4.2.3 appropriately controls access as a restricted discretionary activity. If access to Te Okuroa Drive is to be restricted then access as per the granted resource consent should be provided for as a permitted activity.
Carrus Corporation Limited	661	15	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(b) doesn't provide for access from Parton Road other than by way of Te Okuroa Drive, which is contrary to a resource consent currently held.	Delete Rule 17.4.11.3(b).
Issue: Appendix 17G - Parton Road South Commercial Zone Outline Development Plan [APPEND17G]					
Parton Road Land Limited	259	1	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(a) and Appendix 17G which requires all site development landscaping and layout to be designed, laid out and managed in accordance with the Parton Road South Outline Development Plan. The Plan includes a 10 metre wide landscape strip which should be reduced to 5 metres in accordance with resource consent granted for Lots 1 and 2 Parton Road, Papamoa.	Reduce the 10 metre wide landscape strip required by Appendix 17G to 5 metres.
Parton Road Land Limited	824	1	O	The Parton Road South Outline Development Plan and associated Rule 17.4.11.3(a) is opposed on the basis that the 10 metre wide landscape strip has been reduced through resource consent granted by TCC. The landscape strip to the north is unnecessary as it adjoins a drainage reserve and other business land. The landscape strip along Parton Road should be reduced to 2 metres in width to act as an amenity strip rather than screening.	Delete the landscape strip along the northern boundary of the site and reduce the landscape strip along the boundary with Parton Road to 2 metres.
Issue: Landscape Buffer [LANDSCBUFF]					
Parton Road Land Limited	259	3	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(c) requires amenity reserves and associated landscaping to be provided at a width measured from the perimeter zone boundary as shown on the Outline Development Plan - Appendix 17G. The width of this landscape buffer should be reduced from 10 metres to 5 metres in accordance with previous resource consent for the land. In addition, there are no amenity reserves identified within the Parton Road South area and reference to these should be removed from the Plan.	Amend Rule 17.4.11.3(c) by reducing the landscape strip width from 10 metres to 5 metres and deleting reference to amenity reserves.
Parton Road Land Limited	824	3	O	Rule 17.4.11.3(c) requires amenity reserves and associated landscaping to be provided. These widths have been varied through consent. The reference to 'amenity reserves' is opposed as there are no such reserves.	Amend the landscape strip from 10 metres to 2 metres and delete along the northern boundary. Delete reference to 'amenity reserves'.
Carrus Corporation Limited	661	14	O	The landscape strip shown on the Parton Road South Commercial Zone Outline Development Plan was reduced from 10 metres to 5 metres through resource consent.	Amend the Outline Development Plan to show a landscape strip of 5 metres.
Carrus Corporation Limited	661	16	O	Oppose the reference in Rule 17.4.11.3(c) to amenity reserves and the width of the landscape strip.	Delete the reference in Rule 17.4.11.3(c) to amenity reserves and amend the width of the landscape strip to 5 metres.
Topic: Commercial Zones - Te Reti					
Issue: Appendix 17G - Outline Development Plan [APPEND17G]					
Newman, Susan & Philip	747	1	O	Appendix 17G has a fundamental flaw in that the proposed commercial zone is located on the crown of the Te Reti ridge, while the proposed 10 metre high landscape strip is located at the bottom of the gully, meaning that the intent of the landscape trees (to soften the visual impact of commercial development) is not met - the trees will be too low to be effective.	Add a requirement to Appendix 17K that the landscape strip be on the western side of the proposed development, immediately adjacent to the commercial buildings, and at the same elevation as the commercial buildings to effectively screen them from view.
Te Reti Trustees	789	19	O	Appendix 17K omits information on access.	Include an additional access point to enable access to the land located below the service station site and clearly provide both entry and exit other than the on-ramp (to Route J).
Te Reti Trustees	789	20	O	Oppose Appendix 17K as it omits information on the service station referred to in Rule 17.5.1.5(b).	Include identification of the Service Station site on Appendix 17K.
Te Reti Trustees	789	21	O	Oppose Appendix 17K as it shows screen planting on the frontage of the Service Station site that will obstruct visibility.	Amend Appendix 17K to provide for lower height planting on frontage facing east.
New Zealand Transport Agency	588	23	SA	Appendix 17K should be amended to ensure that access from the link road will be separated 100 metres from the roundabout.	Amend appendix 17K to ensure that access from the link road will be separated 100 metres from the roundabout.
Issue: Appendix 17k - Outline Development Plan [APPEND17K]					
Te Runanga O Ngai Tamarawaho	794	61	O	Appendix 17K omits information on access.	Include an additional access point to enable access to the land located below the service station site and clearly provide both entry and exit other than on the on-ramp.
Te Runanga O Ngai Tamarawaho	794	62	O	The Plan omits information on the service station site referred to in 17.5.1.5(b).	Include identification of the service station site.
Te Runanga O Ngai Tamarawaho	794	63	O	The screen planting identified on the verge of the service station will obstruct intervisibility.	Provide for lower height planting on frontage facing east.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Te Reti					
Issue: Impacts on Open Space [IMPOPSPA]					
Flatt, Mr & Mrs D & V	671	1	O	Opposed the destruction of the 'Bethlehem Wetlands Reserve' for the Beaumaris Boulevard connection and oppose rezoning of this land directly alongside the greenbelt and wetlands area. This would be contrary to the spirit and purpose of Council Policy to preserve, maintain and enhance Council reserves, as noted in various Council Policies including the 'Open Space Policy'.	Retain the residential zoning of the land.
Schrijvers, J A J	8	2	O	Future development would destroy the beautification of the park and safety of those using it of which there are very few in Tauranga.	Do not rezone the land commercial.
Newman, Susan & Philip	747	3	O	The wetland and greenbelt of the surrounding area are of natural character and of value to local residents. In its current form the Te Reti commercial development places this character at risk. Situated on the crown of the ridge overlooking the wetland and greenbelt, the proposed commercial development will visually dominate and overshadow the surrounding area in an inappropriate manner, unless sufficient specific rules address this issue.	Add a requirement to Appendix 17K for the building design, landscape planting, signage and lighting to be designed to enhance the natural character of the area and to completely screen the development from the surrounding residential and greenbelt areas.
Issue: Impacts on Wetlands [IMPWETLA]					
Speak, Mrs E	48	1	O	Possible spillage could endanger surrounding wetlands.	Retain current residential zoning.
Issue: Landscape Impact [LANDSCIMP]					
Hoskin, Katrina	1021	2	O	View has already been ruined by an unwanted road and now property will be devalued by outlook over a petrol station.	Retain the land in the residential zone.
Newman, Susan & Philip	747	2	O	Oppose the Rules (17.5 - Controlled activities, Standards and Terms and Matters and Control and Conditions) for the Te Reti Commercial Zone Outline Development Plan Area on the basis that the proposed Outline Development Plan (Appendix 17K) does not address the requirements of Policy 17.2.3.1(b) (activities adjacent to or opposite a 'sensitive' zone). The objective is that activities do not diminish the amenity of the sensitive zone by minimising visual intrusion and overshadowing of the sensitive zone.	Change Appendix 17K to require buildings to be constructed further down the ridge and not situated on the crown of the ridge.
Speak, Mrs E	48	3	O	It will be an eye-sore.	Remain in residential zoning.
Issue: Oppose - General [OPPGEN]					
Burnett, Dave	34	1	O	The area does not need this kind of development with a large shopping centre close by at Bethlehem.	Not to proceed with proposed zoning.
Swanson, Kenneth & Denize, Emma	5	1	O	General opposition.	Keep the area within the residential zone.
Flatt, Mr & Mrs D & V	671	2	O	The proposed rezoning is not justified when consideration is given to existing and proposed commercial facilities in the area, which include: Townhead Crescent/Cambridge Rd (1.2km distance), Brookfield (1.5km), BP Waihi Rd (1.3km), Bethlehem Town Centre (1.7km), Caltex Otumoetai Road (2.3km). It is also relevant that major oil companies are moving away from investment in service stations to exploration.	That the zoning of the land remain residential.
Hoskin, Katrina	1021	3	O	This change in zone will create noise pollution.	Retain the land in the residential zone.
Issue: Preferred Alternative Locations [PRALTLOC]					
Hoskin, Katrina	1021	1	O	With a petrol station in Waihi Road and land zoned for one in Bethlehem why is there a need for one on this land.	Retain the land in the residential zone.
Issue: Support - General [SUPPGEN]					
O'Brien, Julie	26	1	S	The proposed Te Reti commercial zone is sound land use planning - providing local convenience services to the Bethlehem community. The proposed landscaping strip is important in order to maintain visual amenity.	Include the Te Reti land within the commercial zone as proposed.
Te Reti Trustees	789	14	SA	Support the inclusion of Te Reti in Policy 17.2.3.4.1 and identification as a Commercial Plan Area, however oppose the lack of site specific policy matters for the zoning of that land.	Include the following in Policy 17.2.3.4.1: Land zoned for new business activity at Te Reti has regard to: 1. Mitigation of effects on the transport network. 2. Providing opportunities for local convenience retail and other business opportunities serving a local catchment. 3. The location of the site is functionally linked to a major arterial with capacity to safely and conveniently service the refuelling and other needs of passing motorists. 4. Mitigation of visual effects from business activities and buildings when viewed from the surrounding residential areas through landscape planting within both private and public spaces and building controls.
Te Reti Trustees	789	15	S	Support Rule 17.4.11.5.	Retain Rule 17.4.11.5.
Te Reti Trustees	789	16	S	Support Rule 17.5 providing for controlled activities in the Te Reti Commercial Plan Area.	Retain Rule 17.5.
Te Reti Trustees	789	17	S	Support the standards and terms proposed for the Te Reti Commercial Plan Area outlined at Rule 17.5.1.5.	Retain Rule 17.5.1.5.
Te Reti Trustees	789	18	S	Support Rule 17.5.1.6 which provides for the matters of Control and Conditions in the Te Reti Commercial Plan Area.	Support Rule 17.5.1.6.
New Zealand Transport Agency	588	21	SA	The Te Reti commercial area is supported in principle. Work has been undertaken with the landowners to reach broad agreement on how the land can be developed. Because access is directly off a State Highway all site layout, traffic circulation and access needs to be very carefully planned to ensure that the safe and efficient functioning of the State Highway is not compromised. In meeting with the developers it was agreed that future development at Te Reti would be a restricted discretionary activity with regard to traffic. Because of access to the State Highway there needs to be direct consultation with NZTA.	Amend chapter 17 so that development of the Te Reti service station is a Restricted Discretionary activity with respect to site layout, traffic circulation and access. List consultation with NZTA as a matter of discretion.
Te Reti Trustees	789	22	S	Support the extent of the Te Reti Commercial Zone identified on the Planning Maps.	Retain the extent of the proposed Te Reti Commercial Zone.
Te Runanga O Ngai Tamarawaho	794	59	SA	The Policy outlined at 17.2.3.4.1 is supported, however, needs additional site specific matters for Te Reti, as detailed in this submission.	Include site specific matters for Te Reti in Policy 17.2.3.4.1, as detailed in this submission.
Te Runanga O Ngai Tamarawaho	794	60	S	The standards and terms, and matters of control and conditions for the Te Reti commercial plan area are supported.	Retain the standards and terms, and matters of control and conditions for the Te Reti commercial plan area.

Submitter	Sub Id	Sub Point	Posn	Summary	Decision Requested
Section: Commercial [17]					
Topic: Commercial Zones - Te Reti					
Issue: Traffic Flow [TRAFFLOW]					
Ballantyne Family Trust	124	1	O	The Commercial Zone would encourage more traffic onto Beaumaris Boulevard and make it a thoroughfare from Bethlehem and Tauriko areas, especially for petrol which should be in the Bethlehem Town Centre. The Beaumaris link is supposed to provide access for people to travel into the City, not for petrol and will make Beaumaris Boulevard much more congested.	The Te Reti area should remain residential.
Schrijvers, J A J	8	1	O	Traffic flow will be an issue because of noise and trucks.	Do not rezone the land.
Speak, Mrs E	48	2	O	There will be traffic flow problems on the busy round-about.	Remain in residential zone.
Flatt, Mr & Mrs D & V	671	3		The location is unsuited to commercial development as it does not satisfy the requirements for visibility, access and regard for traffic safety. This is evident from the proposed Outline Development Plan that entry and exit is only from the one way access to Route J, which could be an issue if a vehicle exits in the wrong direction.	That the zoning remain residential.
Topic: Commercial Zones - Welcome Bay					
Issue: General [GENERAL]					
Oakland Way Residence	1055	1	S	Support the proposed commercial zoning of this land, subject to appropriate provisions to address impacts on surrounding residential properties.	Retain the proposed commercial zone, and ensure that appropriate provisions limit the impact on surrounding residential properties.
Welcome Bay Community Centre Inc	471	1	S	The zoning of 260 Welcome Bay Road for commercial purposes is supported. During the past eight months the Welcome Bay Community Centre has facilitated a community development project that included a number of forum/hui with the community. A significant and consistent request from those who attended those forum was for a supermarket and/or more retail outlets/facilities. The rezoning of this land is consistent with the Council's Policy, and the community desire to have more facilities co-located with the existing Welcome Bay Village Shopping Centre.	Retain the proposed commercial zoning of Lot 260 Welcome Bay Road.
Issue: Height & Appearance [HEIGHTAPP]					
Oakland Way Residence	1055	2	S	Support the proposed zoning subject to: the normal height for commercial structures being measured from the Welcome Bay kerbside; the building restriction of 5 metres from all boundaries being fully enforced and shading requirements observed; that during any development of the site the developers take full recognition of the residential area surrounding the site, including hours of work, noise levels, dust etc.	Retain the proposed commercial zone and ensure that the normal height for commercial structures is measured from the Welcome Bay kerbside; the building restriction of 5 metres from all boundaries are fully enforced and shading requirements observed; and that during any development of the site the developers take full recognition of the residential area surrounding the site, including hours of work, noise levels, dust etc.