

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING

RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES: of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Rodney District Council which commenced at 9.00 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Centreway Road, Orewa on Wednesday, 10 March 2010 and reconvened on Tuesday, 16 March 2010, for the purpose of hearing submissions and deliberations on Proposed District Plan 2000 – Variation 132 – West Coast Rural Policy Area.

PRESENT: Penny Webster, Mayor (Chairperson)
Crs Ross Craig
Pat Delich
Michael Goudie
John Kirikiri
Grahame Powell
June Turner
Greville Walker
Wayne Walker (from 9.12 a.m.)
Suzanne Weld

IN ATTENDANCE: Assistant Chief Executive (Warren MacLennan)
Alison Pye (Policy Planner)
Democracy Services Officer (Elaine Stephenson)

* * * * *

132/03/10 APOLOGIES

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

Powell/Goudie

That the apologies from Crs Harding, Parker and Taylor (for absence) and from Cr W Walker (for lateness) be received and sustained.

Carried

133/03/10 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN 2000 VARIATION 132 – WEST COAST RURAL POLICY AREA

FILE REF TP/14/4/132

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

9.05 a.m. Open Space Planner (Leo Jew) and Democracy Services Administrator (Therese McDonald) in attendance.

*Note: Evidence was tabled by Submitter 1174/1 - 7 – R J Pride Family Trust and Estate of R J and A M A Pride.
Submitter 1111/1 – Pauline B Stables was present at the meeting and wished the meeting minutes to include her endorsement of her submission.
Copies of all evidence submitted placed on file TP/14/4/132.*

10 March and 16 March 2010

Policy Planner (Alison Pye) introduced a PowerPoint presentation on the background leading to the variation.

Submitter 1175/1 - 4 –The Auckland Regional Council (ARC), represented by John Carter

Mr Carter read from his written evidence.

9.12 a.m. Cr W Walker present.

Mr Carter drew attention to the maps attached to his evidence which identified areas of landscape quality and sensitivity rated from 1 - 7 (green = 5, blue = 6 and red = 7).

In response to a question Mr Carter said that the most important areas were the ones shown on the maps and that a lot of the West Coast Rural Policy Area (WCRPA) contained sensitive landscapes which would come under pressure from development. He said that he considered areas from Kaukapakapa north still qualified as being in close proximity to Auckland and that it was reasonable to apply an overlay to the whole of the area.

Submitter 1201/1 – Barry and Susan Hart, Audrey Propst, Woodhill Stud Ltd and Woodhill Holdings Ltd; represented by Anna Murdoch and Shane Hartley

Ms Murdoch read from her written evidence, pointing out the position of her client's property on the maps attached to her evidence. In response to questions Mr Hartley said:

- plenty of restrictions already existed in the District Plan
- standards and conditions could be imposed
- the zone should be limited to areas of landscape significance
- property owners believed the premise across the whole area was not correct
- this was just another restriction, an unnecessary regulation.

Submitter 1218/1 – Neville A and Andrea R Miller and Submitter 1219/1 Kaukapakapa Area Residents' and Ratepayers' Association (KARRA), represented by Neville Miller

Mr Miller read from his written evidence relating to the submissions and pointed out what he felt were anomalies in Appendix 2 of RDC report number V132/1000. Mr Miller said that he felt it was nonsensical that Kaukapakapa should be included in a coastal zone as there was a massive range of hills between it and the coast.

Submitter 1148/1 – Noel Lane on behalf of Keystone Trust, represented by Holly Patrick and Nick Roberts

Ms Patrick said that Noel Lane of Keystone Trust would shortly be present to speak to the submission. She read from the written evidence provided. Responses to questions that followed included:

- that economic effects had been brushed over and not adequately assessed
- the Keystone Trust property was not near areas of significant landscape quality
- the updated landscape area map that was referred to had not come into effect yet but still had statutory effect and was the latest thinking, although it still needed further work
- that some areas did deserve control and the Council needed to look at which areas were visible
- it was onerous to use a blanket approach when most sites would not see the sea
- very little growth had occurred in some areas of the Western ward.

Mr Lane distributed a Gibbs Farm booklet and spoke about the property, noting:

- the uniqueness of the property
- a blanket resource consent was in place allowing (engineered and non-habitable) sculptures on the property

10 March and 16 March 2010

- farming processes had been removed to enhance the natural environment, this included the removal of fences, the downgrading of grazing and the planting of trees
- the Trust's priority was to look after the land, if the variation went ahead it could mean the planting of deciduous trees instead of natives
- the Trust hosted charity events, guests and students
- the farm was already regulated by many other authorities in the region
- variation 132 would restrict the development of the farm
- controls were already in place, what was proposed was too general and needed to be more specific
- the view of the farm from the sea had been considered, it was a struggle to get a view of the farm from the water.

10.30 a.m. Democracy Services Administrator (Therese McDonald) retired from the meeting.

10.30 – 10.45 a.m. Morning tea adjournment.

Submitter 1273/1 – Federated Farmers of New Zealand, represented by Richard Gardner

Mr Gardner read from his written evidence. Mr Gardner's response to questions included:

- it appeared that the driver for the variation was anticipated growth pressure on the west coast
- if the intent was not for farm buildings but for further subdivisions; would it not be better to look at the rules pertaining to subdivisions?
- had the variation been confined to the subdivision issue, Federated Farmers would probably not have made a submission
- the only areas that should have further environmental controls were areas of outstanding natural landscape and no further than 500 metres from the coastline
- the east coast was a very different scenario
- there was not the same incidence of growth from Kaukapakapa north
- there had been a strong direction from its board for Federated Farmers to be more strident in cases like this.

Submitter 1279/1 – Allan McCracken

Mr McCracken spoke to his original submission and said that:

- the sheer level of opposition to the variation showed that the consultation process had not been sufficient and that it should not have happened in this format
- this was governance gone wrong on both the part of council staff and councillors
- the variation should be thrown out and the issue should be looked at again
- the plan should not impose undue limitation on farming practices
- the variation showed no understanding of the rural industry
- there were high risk areas that had not been included and other land that would never be developed included as one big heap
- landowner farmers should be allowed to build a house on their property under the District Plan
- this variation should be thrown out and some true consultation undertaken involving the real issues
- this variation was a failure
- the west coast was going to grow, so doing nothing was not an option
- he was concerned that the issue would not be resolved before the new Auckland Council came into being and would therefore be brought back up.

Submitter 1234/1 - 10 – Highview Investments Ltd, represented by Peter Thorpe

Mr Thorpe read from his written evidence, noting that the requirements of today were vastly different to those of old.

10 March and 16 March 2010

Submitter 1171/1 – Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), represented by Brian Boyd and Submitter 1024/1 - 10 – Hancock Forest Management, represented by Ursula Buckingham

Mr Boyd spoke to MAF's original submission, noting that MAF administered Part 3a of the Forests Act 1949 to promote the sustainable management of indigenous forest land. Mr Boyd said that to maintain the ability of the forest growing on that land to continue to provide a full range of products in an indigenous forest was not forest clearance and that a rigorous review process existed regarding permits. Measures were taken to protect the forest from pests and to provide limits of harvest in regard to maintaining the ability of the forest to supply a non-diminishing yield. He said that a key point was that authorities issued by MAF did not cover forest clearance and that there were five submissions in support of the MAF submission.

In response to questions Mr Boyd confirmed that the proposed rule would require that the removal of any tree over three metres tall would require consent and said that any resource consent would be an extra burden on landowners.

Ms Buckingham spoke to Hancock Forest Management's original submission and said that Hancock's biggest concern was that zoning put in place to control subdivision had captured rural activities, including forestry, and it wished to ensure its operations were not affected. She said that Woodhill Forest was a recreational forest which included buildings to support its activities and that table 7.9.2 did not recognise this.

Submitter 1143/1 – Te Tiro Farms Ltd (Michael G R Webber, Guy F Webber and Jonno R Webber), represented by Michael Webber

Mr Webber tabled three pieces of evidence which he referred to. He said that as a farmer and land surveyor in Auckland, he felt he could give some light on the issue. Mr Webber said that he did not agree that South head was under pressure, he felt that the opposite was true. Mr Webber acknowledged that a variation had to be tabled but that the majority of the population in that area felt that it expressed the views of the few. He said that the report was spin and not what most people wanted as it relied on theory. Mr Webber said that many people had objected and questioned what would the content of the submissions had to have been to actually be considered over the planner's report. He said he did not agree with the uniqueness of the area and that the altered rules (50m²) would only cover an oversized skyline garage. He said that the beef schedule prices that he had tabled showed what the area was about and that this was the important issue. Mr Webber requested that earthworks of up to 1000m² be permitted.

Mr Webber asked where the devastation was in South head, noting that he felt there was no difference in tree felling in South head to what had taken place in the Dome valley over the last 20 years. He felt that positive rules worked extremely well and had got farmers talking about planting native trees but there was nothing positive in the draft. He said that development was not a dirty word and that every development affected someone. He felt that expense would be loaded onto farmers.

In response to questions, Mr Webber said that people had already subdivided and that he would expect growth to be slowing down and evening out. He felt that we should not look at the negative side of growth and that it had caused the planting of around 5,000 kauri trees. He said this was a great achievement in South head where manuka and kanuka grew like weeds.

Submitter 1242/1 – John Glasson

Mr Glasson spoke to his original submission, noting that the economic situation was not great and that this variation would greatly restrict people trying to make a living. He said that with regard to growth pressure, that there would be growth caused by the provision of tar seal roads, power and phones and that this was called progress. He suggested that if growth wasn't wanted, then facilities should not be put in. Mr Glasson said that his submission had not been included in the second summary.

In response to questions Mr Glasson said:

- rather than degradation, enhancement was occurring and that this would be reversed if the variation came into force

10 March and 16 March 2010

- the cost of fees and charges for cattle yards and earthworks would be a real imposition on top of what these already cost
- that rules that affected economic well-being were wrong
- the subdivision at Rimmer Road had been beneficial as it had got people back in the area
- small farms were being taken over by big ones and this policy would be contrary to economic farming
- rates relief would be better for the area and would be a big incentive for owners.

Submitter 1274/1 – Horticulture New Zealand, represented by Andrew Barber and Annette Waugh

Mr Barber read from his written evidence, highlighting sections 4, 5 and 8. He said the construction of buildings was one of the biggest aspects of concern to Horticulture New Zealand, pointing out that there was not the income to cover consents for all buildings over 50m² and agreeing that 2000 ft² was the average size for a packing shed.

12.15 p.m. Assistant Chief Executive (Warren MacLennan) retired from the meeting.

12.15 – 1.00 p.m. Lunch adjournment.

Submitter 1184/1 – David Maxwell Gray

Mr Gray spoke to his original submission and said that:

- the WCRPA was a rehash of the 2000 proposal, the details were identical and the principle was the same
- farmers were appalled then and were again to see it brought back in the same format
- this would make a lot of individual things difficult for farmers and ratepayers
- the reason that more submitters were not there to represent their submissions was because of the long hours involved in farming
- he had been approached by lots of people and 55 submissions had been made
- the rules and regulations were impractical as far as farming was concerned as farmers could not get resource consent for things that need to be done instantly
- a 50m² implement shed/hay barn would not hold implements, a tractor, boat, horse float etc.
- equipment needed to be locked away to protect it from being vandalised
- a typical shed was 300 – 400 m² and that was not big; calf and bull sheds and hay barns were all much bigger
- earthworks and watercourse modification should be practical so that farmers could go about their business, they were already restricted by the ARC
- Appendix 7H should be re-presented so that people could see what it was
- the building of maimais (game bird hunting structures) was permitted but not the building of sheds
- ratepayers should be allowed to build to their requirements
- new buildings should not have any more additional controls on them than in any other area
- the Dune Lakes area of South head had been under similar constraints as this area for years
- this would mean up to \$25,000 of fees to build a small building in this area
- a farmer's three bay shed blew away and he was told he needed consent to pull out the one pole still standing
- consent would be required to pull down any building
- this would make it difficult to carry on farming in desperate times and many farms were under mortgagee option and not achieving council valuation
- times were very hard and beurocracy was making it harder to deal with.

Submitter 1183/1 – Brendon Gray

Mr Gray read from his written evidence.

10 March and 16 March 2010

Submitter 1170/1 - 5 – Mighty River Power, represented by Trevor A Nash and Poul T Israelson and supported by the Otakanini Topu Trust, represented by Hemi Rau and Submitter 1237/1 - 3 – Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust, represented by Malcolm Paterson and supported by Glen Wilcox

Mr Wilcox offered a mihi to the meeting. Mr Rau spoke to the Otakanini Topu Trust's written evidence introducing the Trust, giving a brief history, and telling of the close relationship between the Trust and Mighty River Power, which was about maximising assets for future generations. He said the Trust believed any future investment in the Kaipara area had to have benefit for the residential community and that the Otakanini wind farm development would provide the opportunity to serve the surrounding area. Mr Rau said that the Trust sought the same relief as Mighty River Power's submission.

Mr Wilcox said that he spoke on behalf of the five marae of the Kaipara manawhenua. He said that they were the people who had lived there for eons and would still seek to live there for eons, that this variation would put more cost on to the people who were struggling, as it was, to live on their own land as it would add an extra burden on communities. Mr Wilcox said that the South head peninsula was of extreme value to Ngati Whatua o Kaipara, that it contained many heritage sites and this variation created a hurdle for its people to move forward. Mr Wilcox asked how would they be able to live together if this variation went forward, he said they were trying to look after their children. Mr Wilcox said that food on the table was important for future generations and that they could not eat the view; Kaipara was the food bowl of Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara.

1.45 p.m. Assistant Chief Executive (Warren Maclennan in attendance).

Mr Paterson spoke on behalf of Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust's submission. He said that the Trust was the mandated agency responsible for the environmental management of its tribal area. Mr Paterson voiced his support for what Mr Wilcox and Mr Rau had said and noted that this came at a moment in history when Ngati Whatua were to become major land owners in the area through the settlement of Ngati Whatua o Kaipara ki te Tonga Tribunal claim WAI312.

Mr Paterson said the Trust would try to turn returned property into tangible benefits for the people it represented. He said they would become the owners of forest and that they wanted to bring their people home and house them in the area, allowing them to rejoin their communities.

He said that opportunities in the area included wind farming and aquaculture and that, for decades, Kaipara had been developed in many ways. Mr Paterson said that farming, housing, tourism and wind farming would all become more difficult under this variation and that Kaipara was not an untouched environment as things had already been built. He said that the Trust had not been a part of its development and that it did not want to ruin the environment but it wanted to be part of the mechanism that decided what happened. Mr Paterson said the Trust opposed the variation as it stood and that if it could be restarted with the Trust as partners to the Crown it would be part of it. The Trust wished to become co-managers of the Kaipara and he noted that no local government had devolved resource consent powers to an iwi.

2.00 p.m. Democracy Services Administrator (Therese McDonald) in attendance.

Mr Nash read from the written evidence provided in support of Mighty River Power's submission. In response to a question, Mr Nash said that the length of area required to produce 210,000 – 220,000 volts would be approximately three to four kilometres, that the amount of turbines would depend on the amount of wind and that if there was less wind more turbines would be required.

Discussion followed which included:

- Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust was supportive of sustainable development but wished to become co-managers of Kaipara harbour as a Treaty partner and as the largest landowner in the area
- there were limited areas where a wind farm could be placed
- there was more variation with hydro power than wind power
- Otakanini Topu Trust had worked together with Mighty River Power, no discussion had taken place between Mighty River Power and Ngati Whatua
- talks had taken place between Mighty River Power and Vector regarding the use of existing power lines, the bigger the farm, the more power lines that would be needed

10 March and 16 March 2010

Mr Israelson read from his written evidence, noting that he would be dealing with the planning aspect and highlighting the Proposed National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation which was attached to his evidence.

Mr Wilcox farewelled the meeting.

Submitter 1259/1 - 6 – James M Forgie

Mr Forgie showed pictures of his existing property which was sited on top of a ridge and asked where the house would have to be sited under the proposed variation. He said that he felt he had the right to place it where he wanted. He displayed pictures of the other side of the property showing the topography of the land and house situation. Mr Forgie said that the visual impact of the access track was greater than that of the wool shed. Mr Forgie showed a picture of the results of erosion and of a closed canopy and open canopy forest, noting that under the proposed legislation he would have to get consent to cut it down which would make him wish he had never planted it. He said that he would like to take a third of the trees out of the gullies and that this would still go a long way to holding the soil. He said that he wouldn't want to develop the land for housing or farming but the variation would take away that option. Mr Forgie said that with regard to fencing and farm tracks, farmers wouldn't build fences unless they had to.

3.00 p.m. Democracy Services Administrator (Therese McDonald) retired from the meeting.

3.00 – 3.20 p.m. Afternoon tea break.

Submitter 1235/1 - 3 – The Environmental Defence Society (EDS), represented by Natasha Garvan and supported by Vivien Holme

Ms Garvan noted that the EDS was a party to the consent order requiring the variation to be prepared and highlighted points from her written evidence. Discussion that followed included:

- the unique special coastal environment
- the critical aspect was the coastal character
- the protection of the coast from development was paramount
- that a lot of submitters did not believe that the area was remote
- that a lot of the area was nowhere near the coast and could not be seen from the coast because of sand dunes
- that landscape character and amenity value was key
- that the EDS was not challenging existing controls for subdivision
- that the variation provided more leniency for farm buildings
- the need to plan for the worse case scenario, specifics helped control
- the plan needed to strike an appropriate balance
- who was going to determine whether ancillary buildings were needed for farm buildings
- the identification of significant ridgelines would avoid the blanket approach
- farmers had a duty under the RMA to protect the coastal environment
- the need to take note of the economic well-being of farmers
- that sometimes the only place to build was on ridge lines
- that the EDS was not here to relitigate but unfortunately, farmers in that area had to comply with more harsh provisions
- that it was a balancing act, allowing both protection and the economic survival of people
- that the variation did not say that farming can't occur, it provided some control over buildings
- that wire fences were not appropriate for horses
- that in a particularly good year for hay, a farmer would need consent to build an extra barn but farmers should be able to erect buildings as required
- whether the variation should be put on hold until change 8 to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement had been progressed
- that Auckland City Council had identified significant ridge lines
- that what was needed was changes to discretionary activity control
- that the EDS relied on expert evidence and the Council should consult a landscape architect expert

10 March and 16 March 2010

- that the EDS would like the variation to be tailored to layer on top of areas of high ecological concern
- that ridgelines were very important
- that the Council should accord activity status dependent on where regulation was needed and the rules should be more targeted.

Submitter 1101/1 - Alina Wimmer

Ms Wimmer introduced a PowerPoint presentation and spoke to her original submission, saying that:

- rural infrastructure was key
- there were a lot of things to consider, for example, farm animal welfare
- the variation set the tree height limit so low that significant natural areas were created by stealth, making things difficult for farmers
- ease of access to stock ramps and water supply was important
- there was a need for cluster housing for farm employees
- the style of fencing depended on the stock
- a new farm wouldn't be allowed to build a hay barn on a ridgeline without resource consent
- farmers would need a bevy of experts to apply for consent
- farms could contain a number of sheds and buildings but still be beautiful
- there was no need to hide farm buildings away
- a building height limit of less than four metres was ridiculous
- a mix of elements was desirable and this was what tourists came to see
- the variation introduced a level of red tape over and above what was expected
- farmers provided significant income for the country, this variation would mean that busy people would need to juggle several Acts on top of other things
- the Council needed to think practically about how much regulation was needed for something that was working well
- the section 32 report was deficient, that she would expect to see who assessed her property
- her neighbours over the road were not affected
- the report did not adequately address the costs to landowners
- ecological backup had not been provided
- Rodney was the food bowl of Auckland, it was a unique and valued environment cared for by the people who lived there
- horticulture and farming were dynamic and did need to respond to changing needs
- requirements needed to be flexible to ensure people could continue to farm
- she believed zoning provisions would have difference in terms of property values, as a prospective purchaser could go up the road and not need resource consent
- colour was a personal choice and at people's discretion, rural people tended to be more conservative generally
- she wanted less regulation on farming
- the policy area should be reduced back to what the Council knew it could logically protect
- the variation should ideally be withdrawn
- it was important to keep investment in Rodney
- the Council needed to be consistent, to allow sound business investments, it should keep the rules the same for a few years
- she was happy with the proposed amendment to a nine metre height limit
- there should be no height limit on accessory buildings
- 50m² was not big enough for rural buildings
- if more restriction was wanted on residential properties, then this was ok.

Submitter 1121/1 - 12 – The Kaipara Branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc and Submitter 1295/1 - 4 – The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc, represented by Bill McNatty

Mr McNatty read from his written evidence and said that he represented organisations that supported the plan change, although he felt uncomfortable when he read the submissions of some of his friends. Points he made included:

10 March and 16 March 2010

- the cost of obtaining consents
- there should be a shift from permitted activity to permitted but controlled
- that a shift would still allow most activities to occur but another level of filter would be good
- the cost of compliance could be waived by the Council if proposed land use met accepted protocol
- in regard to protocols to allow a controlled activity to be a permitted activity, there was a possibility to have rules for a controlled activity if needed, but also have certainty for farmers and horticulture that if a proposal fitted the prescription, then it could become permitted
- if protocol existed and a proposal fitted the template, it would be deemed a resource consent and if it was broken then enforcement officers could act
- protocol would be a default resource consent
- as long as it created some measure of responsibility for future development then he did not have a problem with it
- the original concept of the variation was responsible and he did not see the need for change to the most part

Submitter 1023/1 – Gordon L Levet

Mr Levet spoke to his original submission and said that he had no vested interest but that growing bureaucracy would exacerbate the situation because of the impact of rules and regulations on farmers. He gave an example of issues that had arisen when an extra bridge at the upper reaches of the Hoteo bridge was required. He said that the original bridge had been built years ago with no consent. Ecologists had found that it would require the removal of three totara trees but they did not take into account that the family had reserved 80 acres of bush as they did not consult with the farmer. They recommended an alternative spot which would not require the removal of any trees, but the engineers were not happy with this location as they felt the bridge had to be located above flood level. All of this added up to a cost of \$130,000 for the landowner and this was an example of what was going on. He said he felt that it was taking money out of productive rural areas and putting it into urban areas and that the variation would make the situation worse.

Mr Levet said that the RMA came in and its intention was good but that sometimes the reverse happened and rules became more important than the preservation of the environment. He said that his property contained a creek bed which had deteriorated over time and that he had created six ponds which stopped most of the erosion problem. Mr Levet said that in doing so, he had shifted more earthworks than he should have but that this had stopped the problem. He had not obtained a consent. He said that he would not be creating any more on his 60 hectare property which was highly erodible. He thought the RMA was doing the opposite of what was intended.

Mr Levet suggested that new regulations were less to do with the protection of the environment and more about control by bureaucrats. He believed that if the Council passed this variation it would make the problem worse. He felt that corruption and extortion would be rife with more power and urged the Council to dismiss the variation. In response to a question Mr Levet said that his property contained thousands of trees.

Submitter 1025/1 - 6 – Whakatiwai Plantations Ltd and Timberwise Ltd, represented by Karen Pegrume and Submitter 1210/1 Karen Pegrume

Ms Pegrume read from the written evidence provided. She said that Whakatiwai Plantations Ltd and Timberwise Ltd had owned their land for forestry and farming purposes for sixty years. Ms Pegrume noted that the demolition of buildings had been removed from the variation. She voiced her concerns regarding the unknown content of Appendix 7H. Ms Pegrume opposed the zone in its entirety, saying that pressure on development was not there. She said that farmers were not interested in development and it was important to find a balance against urban encroachment and allowing farmers to do what they do. Ms Pegrume said that key areas not been identified.

In response to a question Ms Pegrume said that she felt the significant landscapes identified by the ARC in the Rural Policy Statement were grossly out of date and that Plan Change 8 had not achieved what it had wanted to. She felt there had been a shift in what was felt to be important. She said that significant landscapes in the area were difficult to find and that this was not a west coast issue, it was about understanding where those significant areas were and the criteria to identify them needed to be robust as things needed to make sense if they were to have any credibility.

Powell/Goudie

That the evidence tabled at the meeting be received.

Carried

Submitters were thanked for their submissions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5.06 p.m.

The hearing of submissions and deliberations on Proposed District Plan 2000 – Variation 132 – West Coast Rural Policy area reconvened at 9.00 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Centreway Road, Orewa on Tuesday, 16 March 2010.

PRESENT:

Penny Webster, Mayor (Chairperson)
 Crs Ross Craig
 Pat Delich
 John Kirikiri
 Grahame Powell
 June Turner
 Greville Walker
 Wayne Walker
 Suzanne Weld (from 10.00 a.m.)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Assistant Chief Executive	(Warren MacLennan)
Manager: District Planning	(Peter Vari)
Alison Pye	(Policy Planner)
Democracy Services Officer	(Elaine Stephenson)

Powell/Delich

That the apologies from Crs Goudie, Harding, Parker and Taylor (for absence) and Cr Weld (for lateness) be received and sustained.

Carried

Submitter 1233/1 - 11 – Cato Bolam Consultants Ltd, represented by Myles Goodwin.

Mr Goodwin read from his written evidence. Discussion followed which included:

- farmers were responsible for trees under power lines
- there was no need for an added layer of protection, the area was already adequately covered
- with regard to the visual impact of dwellings, landscape reports would be obtained as part of consent applications
- some plan controls were desirable to cope with projected Auckland growth
- it was not worth making a change that covered the whole area just to address something that might happen
- the rules for subdivision would stay the same
- more thought should go into this variation
- if the variation remained, better alignment of State Highway 16 was required
- the lack of visual analysis in the officer's report was a concern.

9.30 a.m. Cr W Walker retired from the meeting.

9.30 – 10.00 a.m. Meeting adjournment.

10.00 a.m. Cr Weld present.

10 March and 16 March 2010

Submitter 1198/1 Robin Kerr

Mr Kerr read from his written evidence and brought the meeting's attention to the map he had provided to show his point about the properties mentioned in his evidence.

10.08 a.m. Cr W Walker present.

Discussion followed which included:

- landmark properties added to the area and did not detract from it
- not everyone saw a problem with houses on sea frontage
- that the consent process did not achieve better results or contribute anything except to cost money and make delays
- that up to 70 – 80% of potential subdivision had already taken place
- that landowners tended to plant their blocks of land up as shelter from the Tasman winds was needed.

Mr Kerr pointed out a photo of a house in his written evidence that was sited on a ridge, noting that the house had become melded in with excellent shelter planting and that he believed this would not be approved today and asked why not as properties like this added to the area.

Submitter 1172/1 - 7 – The Auckland Regional Aquaculture Cluster (AquA), represented by Gray Jamieson and Leanna Covacich

Mr Jamieson spoke to AquA's original submissions, his points included:

- AquA was disappointed that no consideration had been given to aquaculture as it faced a massive battle to grow the industry by 2025
- AquA was a cluster formed out of the Rodney Economic Development Trust, (REDT) representing aquaculture farmers in the region and had now expanded to the whole of Auckland
- there was a big void within the freshwater aquaculture industry
- the New Zealand government had produced a document called Blue Horizon in 2007, talking about government commitment to aquaculture
- the industry was looking to produce jobs
- Rodney was a key player and it was important that the Council recognised this
- support had been received from the Prime Minister, the Minister of Conservation and the Minister of Fisheries
- meetings had been held with senior fisheries and government officials to make changes in the industry and to fast track New Zealand waterways and aquaculture in a big way
- AquA owned two of the top five production fisheries in the industry in the world and was based in Rodney
- AquA had taken over the Kaipara heads Chinese prawn farm
- AquA had contracts with 22 councils in New Zealand and led the control of pests and weeds throughout the country
- It needed to grow fish to 25cm in length so that they were not susceptible to predators
- AquA had plans to expand at Warkworth and Kaipara heads and also in the South Island because of difficulties with interisland transfer
- AquA needed to be able to extend its farm as required and build buildings to suit, this new variation has not considered its development in the region, which would lead a lot of initiatives

Mr Jamieson reiterated the decision that AquA sought from the Council. Ms Covacich highlighted that the impact of the variation on AquA was significant, saying that it was about economic development, providing education and employment and that population growth was a small aspect.

10 March and 16 March 2010

Submitter 1173/1 - 7 – Bio-Marine Ltd, represented by Jim Dollimore

Jim Dollimore read from his written evidence, and in response to a question, said that Bio-Marine Ltd had started to place pohutukawas along the whole boundary of the property to shield the buildings. He said that he had no objection to making the buildings blend in with the landscape. It was pointed out that the buildings were new at the moment and would become less noticeable in time.

Submitter 1078/1 – Valerie Shepherd, represented by Dennis Shepherd and Submitter 1080/1 – Dennis Shepherd

Mr Shepherd read from his written evidence.

Submitters were thanked for their submissions.

The meeting closed at 10.55 a.m.

Note: Deliberations on the variation will take place at a later date.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD THIS 15TH DAY OF APRIL 2010

MAYOR

* * * * *

