

Community's Frequently Asked Questions



The technical options assessment to facilitate access for potential urban development of land in the Ohauiti area

This document contains questions that have come in from the Ohauiti community. Please note that some of the questions we received were similar, so we have combined questions where appropriate.

Questions and answers

Q1: Traffic is already very bad in the area, adding extra 200-300 houses will make it worse, any plans to alleviate this?

A: There is broader programme of work across Tauranga to improve the transport network – simply known as the Transport System Plan. At a high level, this plan is looking to provide people with greater and safer transport choices. This work has a strong focus on the shift the City needs to make towards public transport and active modes (likely cycling) with less reliance on cars and our ability to always build our way out of congestion. It is also focussed on how we can reduce the need for travel by providing amenities like parks and shops locally.

Under this plan, in the short term an investigation to improve Hollister Lane / Poike Road intersection is to get underway next year. In addition, Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency have undertaken some preliminary investigation of some relatively minor improvements to the SH29a / Poike Road roundabout. This work identified that a more significant and costly improvement was needed than first anticipated. Next steps for any improvement of that intersection are still to be identified by Waka Kotahi.

There is also an investigation into how 15th Ave/ Turret Road and Welcome Bay Road can be improved. This is getting underway now. In the medium / longer term Waka Kotahi have an investigation into how to improve SH29a.

Q2: Have consideration for more amenities such as playgrounds, schools and shops been made to minimise motor vehicle trips? (Any provisions for community, social club?)

A: A broader piece of work known as the Welcome Bay and Ohauiti Planning Study has been completed. As a result of this work TCC is investigating options for sportsfields in Ohauiti and the upgrade of the Welcome Bay Community Hall and Centre, it also involves working with the Ministry of Education on schooling provision within the Ohauiti area. The need for additional retail and commercial facilities in Ohauiti has also been highlighted and will be considered in future when the City Plan is reviewed (or an alternative to the City Plan is developed as part of the government Resource Management reforms).

At the development level for the land the need for a neighbourhood reserve and playground would occur through consenting process if development moves ahead.

Q3: Why is the entrance to this new development site not made in Oropi Road?

A: Access to the site from the west via Oropi Road (known as Option 2) was investigated. However, this option needs to cross a river, multiple-owned Maori land and was identified as having greater social / cultural, geotechnical / infrastructure and environmental impacts than a number of other options including the preferred via Rowsdale Drive. These factors contributed to an Oropi Road connection not being preferred.

Q4: Has the land behind Bertrowe Drive already sold? If so, when would we expect building to start?

A: We understand developers are negotiating with some of the current landowners to purchase properties within the Residential Zoned site.

The timing for any development will ultimately be determined by a developer. Access to the land will be a pre-requisite to this and is Council's focus. At this stage, we are anticipating a High Court Hearing on the Property Law Act application in mid-2022. Should this be successful then development of the land might progress in the next 1 to 2 years plus but that timing is dependent on a number of factors e.g. the PLA application being successful; the developers' timeframes; subdivision consenting timeframes.

Q5: When is it likely that you will open-up the end of Rowsdale Drive (Timeline)?

A: As noted above in respect to Q.4, this is subject to a number of factors but possibly within the next 1-2 years plus.

Q6: We paid higher premium to buy in this subdivision, as we understood that there was no more land to build. This development would devalue our properties.

A: The land in question has been zoned Residential and part of the Ohauti Structure Plan since the 1990s. Private covenants have restricted access to the land and Council is now looking to address these.

We have no basis to inform how property values may be affected outside those that benefit from the private covenants. Any statutory entitlement to compensation under the PLA (for extinguishment of the covenant) or PWA (for compulsory acquisition) is only available to property owners who are actually losing a property interest (i.e. the benefit of the land covenant), these being the 21 directly affected properties in Rowsdale Drive. For clarity, it is the loss of a registered property interest itself which is the legal issue, as opposed to any effects which might arise from a subsequent development. Compensation is not available to residents who are simply exposed to the effects of urban development, such as increased traffic.

Q 7: This development will add more pressure to the services, such as water supply and internet (which is already slow in the area)?

A: Services will need to be provided to the development. The land has been part of the Structure Plan for the area since the 1990's and as such the planning of the water network has anticipated the demand from the urban development of this land.

Council and the developer would work with other utility providers like broadband to design and deliver services if the development proceeds.

Q8: What area of land is designed for redevelopment?

A: There is a map on the 'Background' slide which shows the development area.

Q9: What are the proposed roading changes to Rowsdale Drive and Bertrowe Drive?

A: A concept plan for the access from the end of Rowsdale Drive in the land is provided in the Slide pack.

No changes to Bertrowe Drive are proposed.

A traffic assessment, as part of the subdivision or land use consent for the land would consider the need for any further improvements to the wider network e.g. safety improvements at a roundabout or intersection.

Q10: What is the outline development phasing plan and timescale?

A: The development phasing plan and timescale will be determined by the developer(s) of the land. They may choose to stage the delivery of the development. Councils focus is on facilitating access to the site.

Q11: Will the development affect the easement and ROW (access through the Pukemapu Road) for properties at 49 Pukemapu Road?

A: Any developer of the land will need to work with those who benefit from existing easements and ROWs if changes to these were required as part of developing the land – which we anticipate will be the case.

Q12: We would expect that a development of this size would have other outlets onto 29A?

A: At this stage there are no plans to construct new access roads to SH29a. The focus is on how we improve the performance of key intersections (e.g. Hollister / Poike intersection) and more generally make other mode choices (to the private car) more viable/feasible, attractive and safe.

Beyond the Ohauti area there is an investigation which looks at improving Welcome Bay Road and 15th Avenue.

We are also working with Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency to see whether investigations for improving SH29a can be brought forward.

Q13: How will the development impact on the Bertrowe Drive Reserve?

A: The proposal is not expected to have any impact on the Bertrowe Drive Reserve. Noting that stormwater from the development may discharge to this area and in addition there may be pedestrian access to the existing walkways within the reserve. The subdivision design of the site will determine these matters.

Q14: Why we (wider group) are being treated separately from 21 when they will still have increased traffic flow through the area? and whether they might be entitled to any compensation?

A: The reason for separate meeting is based on the land covenants and how they are registered over the separate and distinct stages within the Rowsdale subdivision. The 21 properties are those having the benefit of the covenants registered over 206 and 202 Rowsdale Drive. Any statutory entitlement to compensation under the PLA (for extinguishment of the covenant) or PWA (for compulsory acquisition) is only available to property owners who are actually losing a property interest (i.e. the benefit of the land covenant), these being the 21 properties. The land covenant in question only benefits that select group of properties. Compensation is not available to residents who are simply exposed to the effects of urban development, such as increased traffic.

Q15: Against the online/Zoom meeting and want to have a face to face meeting?

A: Due to COVID-19 issues and the lack of clarity on the traffic light system when we scheduled the meeting, the online arrangement was considered to be the most appropriate and to continue with as planned.

Council is happy to provide an opportunity for face-to-face information sessions after the Christmas/New Year break.

Our current thinking is that we could potentially host three separate information sessions at the Ohauti Settlers Hall so that we can retain safe physically distancing between people and this will also offer people with a choice of times that best suits them.

Council will be in touch about these face-to-face sessions in the new year.

Q16: Whether the ‘Parliamentary Bill on High Density Housing in Residential Areas’ will override existing District Plan Provisions?

A: The Government’s Housing Supply Bill is still developing so we can’t be certain of the impact until it is confirmed. As currently proposed, the Housing Supply Bill would override the existing District Plan provisions however it should be noted that through Plan Change 26 Housing Choice, TCC was already well progressed in putting in place planning provisions similar to those suggested in the Bill to enable housing typologies like duplex, townhouses and terraced housing in suburban areas.

Q17: The current community engagement is too narrow and should include a wider area which covers all of the Rowsdale development?

A: Council identified an area containing 233 households who may be impacted by the investigation and have engaged with this group of residents. This area was identified based our understanding of the investigation and the residents who might be affected by options at that time.

In addition to the online meeting on 7 December we have received requests to meet face-to-face to discuss the investigation with people beyond the initial 233 households. We are happy to provide the opportunity for face-to-face information sessions after the Christmas/New Year break. Our current thinking is that we could potentially host three separate information sessions at the Ohauti Settlers Hall so that we can retain safe physically distancing between people and this will also offer people with a choice of times that best suits them. Council will be in touch about these face-to-face sessions in the new year and this could include a wider community invite.

Q18: The options directly through the Rowsdale subdivision (4-11) have a much higher positive scoring than those down towards Oropi Road (1,1b,2,3). If you compare option 8 this is +7 compared to option 1 at -4. There is no mention of added congestion down Hollister Lane/Poike Road or for the advantages of taking traffic to Oropi Road.

A: The transport category of the multi-criteria assessment included four criteria against which options were assessed. These were network integration, land use integration, safety and directness. The assessments considered all modes of travel, not just cars. Options through the Rowsdale subdivision scored more positively for having existing facilities for walking and cycling, access to buses and access to parks and reserves. The Pukemapu / Oropi Road routes require mitigation to address safety issues and would need significant upgrades to achieve an urban standard of road and similar access to parks and reserves. The impact on congestion at Poike Road was noted in the MCA. As already Residential Zoned the traffic effects and mitigation will be considered in more detail at the resource consent stage, and as part of city-wide transport plans (e.g. the Hollister Lane / Poike Road intersection investigation).

Q19: Social/Cultural: What are the cultural issues with the Oropi Road accesses all -3? Also with the Historic Heritage and Archaeology why are options 4-7 all +2, yet options 1, 1b -1 and 2 at -3?

A: Routes 1, 2 and 3 impact on multiple owned Maori land which presents a high cultural impact risk. There are no heritage or archology sites in the vicinity of routes 4 – 7. A potential archeological site is located at the end of the driveway close to routes 1 and 1b, and 4 potential archeological sites are located in the vicinity of route 2.

Q20: Can you outline what will happen if the homeowners don’t agree to change the covenants?

A: Council is proceeding with an application to the High Court to modify the covenants (by way of extinguishment) registered over 202 and 206 Rowsdale Drive. That application is expected to be filed early in the New Year. Council’s preference is to negotiate with directly affected residents on a willing basis, but otherwise will be seeking to address the covenants through the court process in the New Year. Homeowners that are losing registered property interest would be able to be involved in the High Court process.

Q21: Will normal RMA objections apply after the developer design is released?

A: Normal Resource Management Act plans, rules and processes apply to the development of the Residential zoned land. Any development proposed for the site will be considered against the City Plan provisions. If the developer(s) proposes a development consistent with the City Plan provisions for the Residential zone then notification is unlikely and often not an option but that decision needs to be made once the development proposal for the site is known and can be assessed by Council.

Q22: Does the raising of the Public Works Act indicate that irrespective of the High Court decision (being against your intention) and the high opposition from residents, that you plan to push this through regardless?

A: Council's preference is to negotiate with directly affected residents on a willing basis, but otherwise will be seeking to address the covenants through the court process in the New Year with the application under the Property Law Act to modify the covenants over 202 and 206 Rowsdale Drive. At this stage, Council has only given approval for negotiations with directly affected residents and the application to the High Court under the Property Law Act. Any decision to use of the Public Works Act would require further approval from Council.

Questions received from the 210 indirectly affected property owners

Questions received as they were written	Answers
Traffic on Poike Road and Hollister Lane in morning peak is worst. Any plans to levitate this with alternative exit routes?	See answer to Q1 above
Has consideration for more amenities such as playgrounds, schools and shops been made to minimise motor vehicle trips?	See answer to Q2 above
I notice only the immediate residents are being asked for opinions on the use of an access way at the end of Rowsdale Drive. Adding 300 potential houses that will travel through this subdivision affects a lot more people than just immediate neighbours.	See answer to Q14 above
This is a quiet subdivision, but the traffic in the morning is already horrendous and queuing far up Hollister lane. This starts at 7.30am.	See answer to Q1 above
Why is the entrance to this new development site not made in Oropi Road?	See answer to Q3 above
Has the land behind Bertrowe Drive already been sold for development? If so, when would we expect building to start?	See answer to Q4 above
As it looks you will be going ahead with opening the end of Rowsdale Drive, when is this likely to commence?	See answer to Q5 above
What provisions will be made for the additional road traffic?	See answer to Q1 above
What provisions have or will be made for a social and or retail hub?	See answer to Q2 above
Will the 'Parliamentary Bill on High Density Housing in Residential Areas' will override existing District Plan Provisions?	See answer to Q16 above
Under the new Traffic Light system there should be a group face to face meeting (rather than on-line).	See answer to Q15 above

How will the block of land currently at address 18/49 Pukemapu Road be assessed?	See answer to Q11 above
Will this affect the easement and ROW that our property, and other properties at 49 Pukemapu Road, have in order to access our homes?	See answer to Q11 above
We do not consider a “Zoom” (online) meeting a satisfactory forum. It would be more advisable to defer the “Zoom” event until those affected can meet at a satisfactory venue in person.	See answer to Q15 above
Have misplaced the map of the affected properties, can you please re-send the map?	Council emailed the map of the 21 directly affected properties as requested
We don't want to attend the Zoom (online) meeting and want it to be delayed until such time it can be held in person.	See answer to Q15 above
Strong objection to the online meeting, as some neighbours will be unable to participate due to their level of computer knowledge.	See answer to Q15 above
The time to consider the technical submission is very short and therefore to make a useful contribution to the Council is limited.	See answer to Q15 above and proposal to hold face-to-face meetings in the new year, which will give people further time to consider
Question around MCA scoring: Transport: the options directly through the Rowesdale subdivision (4-11) have a much higher positive scoring than those down towards Oropi Road (1,1b,2,3). If you compare option 8 this is +7 compared to option 1 at -4. There is no mention of added congestion down Hollister Lane/Poike Road or for the advantages of taking traffic to Oropi Road. Please explain.	See answer to Q18 above
Question around MCA scoring: Social/Cultural: What are the cultural issues with the Oropi Road accesses all -3? Also with the Historic Heritage and Archaeology why are options 4-7 all +2, yet options 1, 1b -1 and 2 at -3?	See answer to Q19 above
Objection to the online/Zoom meeting and want an in-person meeting.	See answer to Q15 above
There is excessive speed and the back-up of traffic in the morning on Hollister lane (the new development will make it worse).	See answer to Q1 above
It is insulting that you are meeting 21 first and the meeting us afterwards. We should have the opportunity as well at the same time. We want to know what Council have discussed to the 21 directly affected before sending the questions.	The information pack (Presentation, Frequently Asked Questions and Map), which was presented to the 21 directly affected in the meeting was posted to the 210 indirectly affected property owners / wider group on 2 December

<p>We do not accept the online/Zoom meeting. The decision is of such importance its needs to be given more consideration and shown more respect than using this form of communication.</p> <p>Council should consider an open meeting in the traffic light system for the whole Rowesdale subdivision.</p> <p>Many residents are senior citizens who do not own computer let alone understand the online concept.</p>	<p>See answer to Q15 above</p>
<p>I object to the proposed online meeting.</p> <p>This is undemocratic and unnecessary under the traffic light system. A Zoom meeting is completely beyond my computer skills.</p>	<p>See answer to Q15 above</p>
<p>We decline the online meeting and request a face to face meeting.</p> <p>In the new traffic light system an in-person meeting can take place.</p> <p>You haven't considered the age of many Rowesdale residents to participate on computer/laptops/tablets.</p> <p>Online meeting is undemocratic.</p>	<p>See answer to Q15 above</p>
<p>We don't wish to attend the Zoom meeting.</p> <p>Meeting should be delayed until such time that it can be held in person.</p>	<p>See answer to Q15 above</p>
<p>We wish to request concept drawings and analysis information in relation to this meeting (online/zoom).</p>	<p>The information pack (Presentation, Frequently Asked Questions and Map), which was presented to the 21 directly affected in the meeting was posted to the 210 indirectly affected property owners / wider group on 2 December</p>
<p>The increase of traffic movement on Hollister Lane and Rowesdale roundabout. The proposed development would increase congestion. Buses just take as long.</p>	<p>See answer to Q1 above</p>
<p>I bought in this subdivision as I understood there was no more land to build. It's quiet and safe for families. This would devalue my property.</p>	<p>See answer to Q6 above</p>
<p>Before I can send any question, I need to understand what is planned for the land adjacent to the Rowesdale Drive. Please send me supporting documentation before the meeting.</p>	<p>The information pack (Presentation, Frequently Asked Questions and Map), which was presented to the 21 directly affected in the meeting was posted to the 210 indirectly affected property owners / wider group on 2 December</p>
<p>I have water and roading easements that may be impacted. The water easement is from the property to be accessed by this development and the roading easement includes access to Pukemapu Road.</p>	<p>See answer to Q11 above</p>

If necessary treat this as an Official Information request for information that should be available to rate payers.	See answer to Q11 above
We paid a higher premium for the land due to covenants that gave protection and security over future development in the area.	See answer to Q6 above
I am totally opposed to a Zoom meeting and believe that a proper face to face meeting should be held.	See answer to Q15 above
Long travel times to get to work due to vehicle movement caused by developing McFetridge Lane and Adler Way.	See answer to Q1 above
Issues with water supply and slow internet.	See answer to Q7 above
We are not opposed to the development itself but are concerned at the traffic this will create to the already busy street. Delays getting out of Hollister Lane can be as long as 20 minutes.	See answer to Q1 above
We would expect that a development of this size would have other outlets onto 29A.	See answer to Q12 above
How will the development impact on the Betrowe Drive Reserve?	See answer to Q13 above
We also need information from the meeting on the 1 Dec to be available before Zoom meeting.	The information pack (Presentation, Frequently Asked Questions and Map), which was presented to the 21 directly affected in the meeting was posted to the 210 indirectly affected property owners / wider group on 2 December
I believe the meeting should be in-person. When will we have the opportunity to discuss this with you directly?	See answer to Q15 above
We request the meeting be rearranged as a face-to-face meeting.	See answer to Q15 above
What area(s) of land is designed for redevelopment?	See answer to Q8 above
What are the proposed roading changes to Rowsdale Drive and Bertrowe Drive?	See answer to Q9 above
What is the outline development phasing plan and timescale?	See answer to Q10 above
We oppose Rowsdale Drive being an access to the proposed development, there are existing traffic flow issues. This will severely adversely affect the quiet enjoyment of our place.	See answer to Q1 above
When we bought the land, we were advised that the land at the rear of our property could not be redeveloped.	See answer to Q6 above

Is it not possible to have a face to face meeting? A Zoom meeting is impersonal and makes It difficult to get points across.	See answer to Q15 above
The council has been very secretive about this planned access. As rate payers we have a right to a meeting with the Council to discuss the pros and cons.	See answer to Q15 above
It will bring extra traffic and Bertorwe Drive will be used as a rat run.	See answer to Q1 above
It seems that our access via Pukemapu road is to be removed?	See answer to Q11 above
Can we have a face to face meeting instead of an online/Zoom meeting?	See answer to Q15 above
I am opposed to the planned Zoom meeting on 7 Dec. We do need to have a face to face public meeting.	See answer to Q15 above
The current community engagement is too narrow and should include a wider area which covers all of the Rowsdale development.	See answer to Q17 above
People are against the Zoom meeting on the 7 th Dec. they see Council trying to push this through without a proper discussion.	See answer to Q15 above
Rowsdale Drive and Hollister Lane are not coping with the traffic now.	See answer to Q1 above
I request that a group face to face meeting be held instead of the online meeting.	See answer to Q15 above
I have been informed by a neighbour of the intention to build a housing development behind Rowsdale Drive. Why we were not been informed by the Council. We are at Albero Drive off Rowsdale Drive.	See answer to Q17 above
There is already huge traffic problem on Hollister Lane, Poike Rd, Ohauti Road and Highway 29a.	See answer to Q1 above
The proposed development will impact hugely on the traffic that uses Hollister Lane. We are especially concerned about the volume if heavy traffic, excavators & heavy delivery building materials during the construction of houses.	See answer to Q1 above
The grid-lock that is already created on Hollister Lane and around Ohauti during peak traffic hours will only be made worse by this development.	See answer to Q1 above
I do not agree that a Zoom meeting is the correct way to address the residents that you claim not to be directly affected by this development.	See answer to Q15 above
We request an in-person meeting with the Commission Chair as soon as can be arranged.	See answer to Q15 above
There is a back log of traffic, particularly in the mornings. The proposed development will significantly increase this problem.	See answer to Q1 above
A Zoom/online meeting is not the way to discuss this situation. It should be face to face so everyone can voice their concerns.	See answer to Q15 above

I would prefer a face to face meeting rather than the Zoom/online meeting. Many of my neighbours are elderly and Zoom will not be an option for them.	See answer to Q15 above
We want a face to face meeting. This is possible under the new traffic light system.	See answer to Q15 above
Online meeting is inadequate and want that the matter shall be discussed in a face to face community meeting.	See answer to Q15 above
We are not included in the Council communication. The proposed development would affect us as well and we want the Council to keep us fully informed.	See answer to Q17 above
We live in Cotswold Place and are very disappointed that we were not notified of this as we in the local area are all going to be affected.	See answer to Q17 above
Our main concern is the increased traffic that we will see as a result. With an extra 300 houses there could potentially be an increase of up to 600 cars using the Hollister Lane thoroughfare.	See answer to Q1 above
The amount of traffic in our neighbourhood is already very high during peak times. Concerns for high speed and Safety issues for children due to higher number of cars.	See answer to Q1 above
There is no school in the neighbourhood, where the children are going to go?	See answer to Q2 above
People purchased in this area which was completely developed. Many of us were told there were covenants protecting the neighbourhood to ensure it was quiet and safe, hence why we purchased.	See answer to Q6 above
Why is the development not being linked to Oropi Road instead?	See answer to Q3 above
I oppose this development and want a face to face meeting to learn more.	See answer to Q15 above
This (development) would put a huge strain on the access ways in and out of our community. Already there is lengthy traffic congestion on Hollister Lane and Ohauti Road.	See answer to Q1 above
I would like to be kept informed of all proceedings relating to this matter please.	See answer to Q17 above
Can you outline what will happen if the homeowners don't agree to change the covenants?	See answer to Q20 above
Will normal RMA objections apply after the developer design is released?	See answer to Q21 above
Does the raising of the Public Works Act indicate that irrespective of the High Court decision (being against your intention) and the high opposition from residents, that you plan to push this through regardless?	See answer to Q22 above