

STRATEGY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

MINUTES: of a meeting of the Strategy and Community Committee which commenced at 9.05 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Centreway Road, Orewa on Tuesday, 24 August 2010 for the purpose of hearing submissions to the Draft Kaukapakapa Structure Plan.

PRESENT: Penny Webster, Mayor (from 9.09 a.m.)
Cr. Zane Taylor (Chairperson)
Pat Delich
John Kirikiri
Dave Parker, QSM
Grahame Powell
June Turner
Greville Walker
Suzanne Weld

IN ATTENDANCE: Manager: District Plan (Peter Vari)
Project Manager - Hibiscus Coast (James Copley)
Consultant (Lee Joffe)
Democracy Services Officer (Elaine Stephenson)

* * * * *

505/08/10 APOLOGIES
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

Powell/Taylor

That the apologies received from Crs Craig and Harding (for absence) and the Mayor (for lateness) be received and sustained.

Carried

506/08/10 KAUKAPAKAPA STRUCTURE PLAN
HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT STRUCTURE PLAN
FILE REF TP/9/69
AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

Note: Copies of all written statements provided and a copy of the Draft Kaukapakapa Structure Plan (amended as per the officer's report) tabled at the meeting have been placed on file TP/9/69.

9.09 a.m. The Mayor, Penny Webster, present.

Lee Joffe (Consultant) gave an overview of the Kaukapakapa Structure Plan, noting that there were 43 submissions and giving a brief explanation of them.

24 August 2010

9.20 a.m. Communications Advisor (Allanah Jarman) in attendance.

Submitter number 22 – Roger Prout

Mr Prout introduced and circulated a PowerPoint presentation in support of his submission, which he read, noting that he had included a letter that he had previously sent to the Kaukapakapa Residents' and Ratepayers' Association (KARRA) together with maps and photographs of the area.

In response to a question Mr Prout said that he felt including Clover Park in the Countryside Living zone would condense the heart of the village and reduce the sprawl.

Discussion followed which included:

- covenanted bush, which meant that when driving into Kaukapakapa, the backdrop of the town would not change as it was covenanted
- the property fell away towards the harbour
- some areas would be beautified if his proposal went through
- a walkway and cycleway would be provided on the property for public use
- clarification of the cycleway/walkway start and finish points and the gap from the property
- he felt that facilities already existed in the north such as the shopping centre, pub and service centre which could be a nucleus for further development.

It was acknowledged that geography was important and should be discussed in deliberations.

In response to further questions Mr Prout said that out of his 96 hectares, 75 hectares was effective land and that the rest was bush. The walkway was proposed in gaps in the bush and up to the top of Alpine Road and back to the village. He said that he was currently milking 200 cows. He said that it was not an economical dairy unit and that he felt it was better suited for families to live and play in rather than farming. He pointed out that it was safer for families to live and play there than by the main highway and that it was better suited than the south.

Submitter number 8 – Tom Henderson

Mr Henderson gave a verbal statement in support of his submission. He said that the proposal to ignore the existing village in the commercial zoning was incomprehensible. He spoke of the history of commercial services in the village and said that he thought that the Rodney District Council (RDC) had ignored the needs of residents to enjoy the services that they had received for 30 years by not zoning the village Commercial.

Mr Henderson said that he had talked to RDC's Project Manager - Hibiscus Coast (James Copley) about the New Zealand Transport Agency's (NZTA) concerns regarding traffic safety when turning right into the village and said that that the NZTA refuted this. He said that this was confirmed by the NZTA's written submission and he quoted clause 10 of that submission.

Mr Henderson said that rail usage was not a major traffic safety concern. He said that the RDC had permitted development in the village such as a hair salon, two takeaways, a greengrocer, a liquor store, a vet etc. and said that any future development was provided for by the zoning of vacant land west of the railway line. He said that he did not understand the Council's reluctance to allow commercial zoning and that this denied the opportunity of the benefits of allowing the village to develop in the future. Mr Henderson said that he had been told that the land was originally purchased because the RDC District Plan killed the village by not allowing commercial zoning and that KARRA had been assured that subsequent rezoning would also be provided to existing premises not in the flood zone.

In response to a question regarding existing use rights, he said that he thought the simplest way forward was to zone the existing village Commercial as it had been that way for 83 years. He said that the NZTA was not concerned with the railway line and that it was not of any significant concern at all.

24 August 2010

Submitter number 26 – the Ashby Family Trust, represented by Graham Parfitt and Jo Ashby

Mr Parfitt circulated and read a written statement in support of the Trust's submission and said that the submission concentrated on the area shown on Figure 7 (page 31) of the officer's report.

Discussion followed on proposed (indicative) roads and it was noted that further discussion would take place during deliberations.

Submitter number 25 – Capital Group (KK) Ltd, represented by Matthew Feary

Mr Feary circulated and summarised a written statement in support of the Group's submission.

Discussion followed which included walkway networks and reserves/proposed reserves.

In response to a question Mr Feary said that the Peak Road block subdivision consent was still in force, it had been granted in 2006 with a life of five years and the proviso of seeking an extension. He said that pedestrian connectivity was the way to go.

Submitter number 13 – Hugh McLennan and submitter number 5 – the Kaukapakapa Residents' and Ratepayers' Association (KARRA) represented by Hugh McLennan and Neville Millar

Mr McLennan circulated and read a written statement in support of his own and KARRA's submissions. He noted that points one and two were related to his submission and points three and four related to KARRA's submission. He said the community supported the walkway shown on the original concept plan. Discussion followed which included:

- defensible boundaries
- proposed development and flood plain lines
- the primary and secondary walkways
- land available for subdivision
- the safer walkway route was away from the state highway.

In response to a question, the submitters said that there were some design problems with the current retail commercial area and traffic because of its age. They noted that some property owners would like to redevelop and that proposals put forward should be considered. They said that a proposal to move back from the road had been put forward and refused some years ago.

KARRA was thanked for work it had done on the Structure Plan and was assured that the Plan would go on the Issues Register to be forwarded to the new Auckland Council.

Submitter number 42 – The Auckland Regional Council (ARC), represented by John Carter

Mr Carter circulated and read a written statement in support of the ARC's submission. He pointed out where versatile soils existed in the Kaukapakapa area. Discussion followed which included:

- whether the proposed Countryside Living was ideally situated for the potential spillover growth in 20 - 30 years time
- the benefits of zoning now going to give certainty for the future
- the use of countryside living areas as a barrier to further urban development
- the possibility of the argument that there was already some development so it may be easier to get additional development there in the future
- the likelihood that expensive properties would be located there
- it was better to develop at the density that was hoped for at the start
- the Countryside Living zone was not in a bad location in relationship to the village
- buffers around countryside towns were not the approach used everywhere
- it was a valid point that farmers wishing to retire and come off productive units would want to locate in or close to the village
- it was good to have range of opportunities, but not at the detriment of farming communities.

10.45 – 11.02 a.m. Morning tea adjournment.

24 August 2010

Submitter number 7 – Alistair McNish

Mr McNish circulated and read his written statement, noting that it was a further revised proposal with a remodelled Figure 7 attached, which highlighted land that he proposed as residential on his block of land on North Crescent. Mr McNish said that the property was bordered by other residential properties and that there were already a lot of residential sites on that side of the road. He said that developing a frontage would complement the layout of the town and supply residential lots required for the growth of Kaukapakapa. Discussion followed which included:

- Mr McNish would be happy to provide the size of site required
- others in the community supported their bid as it seemed logical
- North Crescent had been in place a long time, the infrastructure was there and earthworks would be minimal
- the land could possibly supply five residential sites
- he felt the focus on residential land was moving towards the flood plain; that the Council seemed to be into wetlands and as such, it seemed to be ironic that they were now wanting to build right beside them
- he felt their land was better suited than, or well suited alongside the others and that it met the criteria.

Submitter number 30 – Dennis McAulay

Mr McAulay circulated and read a written statement and showed a newspaper report regarding the sale of RDC land at Kaukapakapa. He said that the community had always wanted the commercial area zoned as existing use rights meant nothing and stopped any development. Discussion followed which included:

- his concern regarding a conflict of interest
- he felt there was a bias towards favouring a council-orientated land sale
- the lack of mention of the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) and the fact that the land could be planted with pine trees for ETS credits in the future.

11.22 – 11.25 a.m. The Mayor, Penny Webster, retired from the meeting.

Mr McAulay clarified the position of his property on the map and said it comprised 28 hectares including bush and flood plain; that there was very little subdividable land left and that he would be lucky to get two lots. He said his property was very limited and trapped because of the zoning of surrounding areas.

Mr McAulay said he felt the existing commercial area should be reconfirmed and that he had extreme concern over the whole proposal. He said that people were making applications and hitting a brick wall and cited examples of this. In response to a question he said he had 40 acres of effective land, including flood plain.

Submitter number 24 – Steve Perris

Mr Perris gave a verbal statement in support of his submission. He said that his property was 19 Henley Road and clarified its position on the map (Land Unit 5). He said that he agreed with the recommendation that it be rezoned Township Living. He spoke of walkways and said that with the population increase he would like the road tar sealed; there were lots of children and that measures should be taken to reduce the speed limit. It was noted that this was outside of the structure plan process.

Mr Perris queried why the Capital Group property had not got the same restrictions placed on it as his property and it was clarified that it was covered by an existing resource consent.

24 August 2010

Submitter number 14 – Kai King Khoo, represented by Hamish Firth of Mt Hobson Properties Ltd

Mr Firth circulated and read a written statement in support of the submission. He pointed out that the owner of the site would want to develop it over the next ten years and noted that this was an eleventh hour bid as his client had not been aware of the consultation process.

Submitter number 23 – Jeff and Sarah Down, represented by Jeff Down

Mr Down circulated and read his written statement in support of the submission by himself and his wife. He clarified the position of his property on Land Unit 6 (of Figure 8).

Submitter number 44 – Rodney Pomfrett

Mr Pomfrett gave a verbal statement in support of his submission and said that he was a local resident but that he was not in the Structure Plan area and that he had no vested interest. He noted that he was KARRA member. He said that his interest was as a parent and was in how the Structure Plan would impact the community, school and facilities. Points he highlighted included:

- access and egress to the roadway
- the proposed primary walkway along the state highway was dangerous, he would not encourage children to use it
- road works done over time on the road meant it had got higher and higher and the drains had got deeper
- the ability to walk safely from the school to the park was important
- the secondary walkway was supported
- he supported what the plan was trying to achieve.

In response to a question regarding commercial zoning, Mr Pomfrett said that he believed what the village had was the basis of a great commercial hub and if there was confusion, the Council should tidy it up. He felt it was adequate but could be improved appropriately and that residents wanted certainty, as it was not always clear what would be happening. People wanted to maintain a small village.

In response to a question Mr Pomfrett said that the idea of roading being opened up behind the school was fully supported, as long as there was adequate turning for buses. It was noted that other speakers had opposed this. It was clarified that he opposed the primary walkway, but supported the secondary one.

Submitter number 20 – Kaukapakapa School Board of Trustees, represented by Rodney Pomfrett and Mike Armour

Mr Pomfrett reminded councillors the school was a significant community asset. He said as the area grew, more people would move there to enjoy the lifestyle and the school. He said the school was limited by the state highway and residential properties which restricted where the school could grow. Mr Pomfrett said that the school wanted to secure access to some reserve land behind the fire station; the land may lie within the flood plain but it might be adequate as a playing field. He said that this would allow some additional parking away from the state highway and that the key thing was safety.

Mr Pomfrett said that Sinclair Park needed to be linked so that people, both in the north and south, could walk to it, as opposed to driving. He said that when the school had used the park in the past they had to take kids on the bus to get there; the provision of a sensible walkway would be of huge benefit.

Mr Armour said that Kaukapakapa was not blessed with warning features such as those that existed at Waitoki, as the NZTA had not deemed to put them there, he reiterated that safety was the main concern. The school was struggling with how to deal with infrastructure. He said that the school could not legally hold its prize giving ceremony in the Kaukapakapa Hall, it needed to build a new hall and car parking facilities, but they were locked in and looking for extra resources and that a roadway would assist.

24 August 2010

He said the school supported the existing use of the commercial area as it did not want children and staff to have to walk further north, including crossing the railway line.

A suggestion was made that an underpass be included in the link way for children to cross the state highway. It was noted that this was a safety issue for deliberations.

Submitter number 2 – Philip Kirk on behalf of the Patel family

Mr Kirk circulated and read his written statement. He commented that the shops needed redeveloping, but that the Patels had not done so because of the difficulty in getting planning permission. He agreed that the Council needed to be careful not to put people out of business.

Submitter number 15 – Gary Muir

Mr Muir gave a verbal statement in support of his original submission, noting that he used to be the publican of the Kaukapakapa hotel and that his interest was in the land next to the hotel and what was going to happen to it. He said that he felt there was a conflict of interest and told of what had happened when the land was put on the market previously. He said that the developer who was planning to buy it would not purchase the land until the plan was passed by the Council and that selling the land in advance before passing the plan was legally and morally wrong.

Further points he highlighted included:

- he had been advised that there would be no more than ten shops, with no living quarters above and that the petrol station would not go next to the hotel
- there had been no mention of the high rise building which was supposed to be going in now
- he could not understand why anyone would want to put dangerous goods next to a hotel, when a site existed around the corner where dangerous goods were already held
- the dangers of putting a petrol station next to the hotel with regard to smoking
- he felt everything was being lumped into one development to make it viable and to make the land sell for more than it was worth
- he felt the land was previously only worth \$400,000 as no one wanted to live next to a hotel, now there were rumours that it was selling for \$860,000 - \$1 million
- he was concerned that the RDC would pass this plan but that it would not be here after 1 November, so he asked why the Council would rush the process; he thought it should be left to the Supercity Council to give its views and manage the land appropriately
- he had moved to Kaukapakapa for the rural setting, he knew people were coming from the Hibiscus Coast because they were sick of the traffic, concrete and neighbours
- he knew that shops in the village were struggling to survive
- he could not see how the shops that were going to be built would survive, as the residents of Kaukapakapa did not support them, preferring to go to Albany and Silverdale
- he asked that councillors make sure they get a petrol station before 2012 because they needed one now.

In response to a question as to whether he would rather have the decision made by local people rather than by faceless people in the city, Mr Muir said no, that they were not going to be there to look after it; the new Council would be there to watch what happened.

It was pointed out that when there was a service station at Kaukapakapa the Council did try to lobby to keep it there, but that the Council could only do so much, unless people wanted to build one there, it could not make them go there.

Mr Muir pointed out that a petrol station would lower the tone of the shopping centre and would mean that trucks would go over the footpath where children walked and this would mean lights, noise and danger. He emphasised the danger of customers coming out of the hotel and possibly walking into a logging truck.

12.28 – 1.15 p.m. Luncheon adjournment.

24 August 2010

Submitter number 1 – Leena and Peter Wu

Mr Wu gave a verbal statement in support of the submission, he clarified that he and his wife were the former owners of the Kaukapakapa store business and were still the owners of the property.

Mr Wu said that he and his wife found it hard to understand why the Council would want to set up a new commercial area, he said their shop already existed there and everyone knew it, he pointed out that even though the building looked old, that it had a history, and said that it did not need to be demolished; that it was big enough to meet local needs. He said they were willing to extend the store to meet future needs. Mr Wu pointed out that most of the Kaukapakapa residents shopped at the weekend at Albany supermarkets, but that for milk, bread etc., the Kaukapakapa store was adequate.

He reiterated that if, in the future, the population increased enough they would rebuild or extend and that it would not be difficult for them.

1.22 – 1.25 p.m. Adjournment to await the arrival of submitters.

Submitter number 29 – Gillian Roberts

Ms Roberts gave a verbal statement in support of her submission and presented images on the overhead projector showing the site in question. (Figure 8 Land Unit 9). She pointed out that in March 2007, the land was proposed to be zoned Residential and that in 2009, a copy of the preliminary concept by RDC identified the property again as residentially zoned. Ms Roberts then presented an image of Figure 8 of the Structure Plan that she had received in August which showed that the property had reverted back to Countryside Living. She clarified that the southern boundary of the property was lower than the yellow line on the image.

Ms Roberts said that the whole property was less than 20,000 m² so it would get no benefit from being zoned Countryside Living and that it had been made a white elephant. She noted that all of the surrounding land had been zoned residential except hers. She said that she was not against development; that if this zoning was left in place it would seriously devalue her property.

She said that she was unsure of walkway rules, but that she had experience of the consequences of living with a residential boundary when she lived in Blackbridge Road, pointing out the problem of dogs chasing stock. Ms Robert felt that she should go with development rather than being singled out. She noted that her property had problems with rubbish from SH16 and that it was a full time job clearing it from the paddocks. She thought Henley Road was currently a nice rural road but said that when events were held she had to have her house washed afterwards.

In conclusion, Ms Roberts said that this would only have detrimental effects on her property and asked why the Council would multi-zone her property, noting that had she known this would happen, then she would have built her barn in a different area.

It was noted that the matter of splitting properties' zoning was to be followed up in deliberations.

Submitter number 43 – the New Zealand Transport Agency, represented by Coralie O'Brien and Murray Parker

Ms O'Brien circulated and summarised the Agency's written statement, noting that clarification was sought from Council officers regarding sections 3.10.2 and 3.10.4 of the officer's report, as stated in paragraph 30 of her statement of evidence. Discussion followed which included:

- safety around schools on state highways that run through villages
- the NZTA was comfortable with the concept at a structure plan level, but the detail was the next stage after the structure plan
- the NZTA did not have a problem with turning right into existing commercial areas
- the NZTA had no objection in principle to a proposed site for a service station in Land Unit 1, as this would provide support for the status of the state highway as an alternative to SH1
- the NZTA could not agree to a proposal for an underpass connecting the proposed walkways on either side of SH16 in the southern township area but may be willing to consider it

24 August 2010

- at this level, the NZTA was not promoting a commercial development on either side of the eastern side of SH16 (opposite the fire station).

Manager: District Planning (Peter Vari) informed councillors that a report would be presented to either the Strategy and Community Committee or the Council in September.

The meeting closed at 1.50 p.m.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD THIS 30TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2010

MAYOR

* * * * *

DATE
