



**District Plan Committee meeting
Held on Wednesday 22 August 2018 at 9.00am
at Selwyn District Council,
Rolleston**

Present: Mayor S Broughton, Councillors M Alexander, M Lemon, P McEvedy, N Reid, Cr B Mugford, G Miller, M Lyall, J Bland, C Watson, J Morten, & Mr D Ward (CEO SDC)

In attendance: T Harris (Chair), Messrs J Burgess (Planning Manager), B Rhodes (Strategy & Policy Team Leader), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), C Friedel (Planning Consultant), Mesdames J Ashley (District Plan Review Project Lead), R Carruthers (Strategy and Policy Planner), J Tuilaepa (Senior Strategy and Policy Planner), V Barker (Planning Consultant), K Johnston (Communications Consultant), & N Brown (District Plan Administrator).

Standing Items:

1. Apologies

Councillor P Skelton (Environment Canterbury), Mr Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga), Ms T Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga) for absence, and Councillor D Hasson for lateness.

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Miller

‘That the apologies received from the above Councillors be received for information.’

CARRIED

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

Given the apologies received for the 26 September District Plan Review Committee meeting, the Chair asked for feedback from the Committee whether the meeting should be rescheduled to the proposed date of Wednesday 10 October.

The Committee members agreed to the cancellation of the meeting of 26 September 2018 and to reschedule the meeting on 10 October 2018. N Brown to confirm proposed date and schedule in Committee members' calendars.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

25 July 2018

- Page 11 – Councillor Murray – Should be '**Councillor** Lemon'
- Page 18 – Watson out 11.31am – Should be '**Councillor** Watson out 11.31am'.
- Page 19 – Watson in 11.37am – Should be '**Councillor** Watson in 11.37am'.

Amendment of the following recommendation:

That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for 'Noise and Vibration' for further development and engagement, except that Recommendation 3.1.8(a) be amended to "further consider the CIAL related provisions and update and amend as required in consultation with CIAL."

Councillor Reid wished to clarify a comment on page 8 of the Agenda considering Port Zone in Rolleston and their difference to a normal shipping based port zone.

Councillor Watson wished to clarify his comment on page 8 of the Agenda concerning the hierarchy of townships. Councillor Watson acknowledged the explanation that the township hierarchy was based on population, but wished to have it noted that Southbridge although having less population has more functionality than West Melton.

Councillor Miller is concerned about the effects of the paper presented previously by Mahaanui Kurataiao and the ramifications for the ratepayer around wahi tapu and wahi tāonga and the significant cost added to the consenting process. Councillor McEvedy added that the rules have to be complementary to those of regional plans, particularly around sites of cultural significance when it comes to undertaking an activity.

Councillor Miller asked for clarity on how recommendations are approved. The Chair stated that the range of opinions during the discussion are noted and recognition given that it is the Committee's view that the preferred option paper is to be endorsed and that these documents are the preferred starting point for consultation. The views from the Committee will be factored in, in terms of the overall development of the preferred option. Ms Ashley added that feedback from the Committee is taken into account and staff will return post consultation with recommendations confirming the preferred option or any amendments to it.

Councillor Hasson in 9.12am

Mr Burgess gave an example about the quarrying topic. Feedback was received from the Committee on setbacks which has filtered through to the public consultation. Mr Burgess agrees with the Chair and Ms Ashley that feedback has been taken on board and those views from the community also.

Councillor Miller asked about the process to pass an amendment if he felt particularly strong about a certain issue. The Chair responded that if there was support from the

Committee, then raising an amendment would be an appropriate way to address concerns.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Mugford

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 25 July 2018 as amended being true and correct’.

CARRIED

8 August 2018

Taken as read and accepted

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Mugford

‘That the Committee accepts the minutes of the 8 August 2018 as being true and correct’.

CARRIED

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Subject	Comments	Report Date / Action	Item Resolved or Outstanding
Family Flats	Confirm implications of Preferred Options for the rating and development contributions of a minor residential unit	8 August 2018	Resolved

The Chair asked for a verbal report from Ms Lewes and to provide clarification of the above issue raised at the last meeting.

Ms Lewes provided clarification on the correlation in terms of the District Plan and Council’s rating policy. In terms of the District Plan, we take into consideration the built form, and the proposed location. The way the Plan is currently worded, the occupancy is restricted to family only. The preferred option for the Proposed Plan would remove the occupancy restriction and look at the built form.

In terms of rating, the Council’s approach to rating is to use the definition of “a separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit”. A family flat or minor residential unit by definition is separately used (own kitchen, bathroom facilities), and is separate from the main dwelling. The approach currently taken is to rate the demand on Council service. It is considered that a family flat puts a demand on the services of Council. In regards to development contributions, these are determined by looking at the household unit equivalent and the demand that it puts on Council Services. Family Flats have a smaller footprint, so a discount factor is applied, however, the built form still creates the demand. From the point of view of rating or development contributions, Council is not concerned with occupancy.

There is currently a misalignment between the District Plan which says only family can occupy Family Flats and rating and development contributions policy, which is not concerned with occupancy, only of the demand that is placed on council services.

The recommendation that the Committee previously adopted is to remove occupancy restrictions on minor residential units in the proposed District Plan. This will address the misalignment between the ratings approach and the District Plan and it becomes more equitable.

6. Preferred Option Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Coastal Environment

Mr Mactier introduced Mr Bentley and Ms Kelly (Boffa Miskell). Mr Bentley spoke to his presentation and explained the extent of the Coastal Environment through showing diagrams and photos.

The recommendation is to adopt the findings of the Coastal Environment Study and Planning Assessment, identify the coastal hazard line, include a section for the coastal environment policy framework and generally rely on rules in other appropriate chapters/sections. Mr Mactier commented that we are currently waiting on updated Coastal Hazard Lines information from ECAN.

A discussion point was raised whether there was support from the Rūnanga regarding the boundaries around the lake. All reports have been reviewed by Rūnanga representatives and this work purely identifies the coastal environment.

Councillor Hasson asked about the Wahi Tapu sites located near the Rakaia River and near the Te Taumutu Marae. Ms Kelly responded that this topic 'Coastal Environment' brings together various workstreams and related topics, so it will all be integrated– including cultural aspects.

Mr Ward asked what assumptions have been made and what science is behind variations to the coastal margins over the next 30-50 years, as a result of climate change? Mr Bentley responded that what is currently mapped is influenced by the coastal hazard line, which includes things like sea change and large surf breaks that occur.

A question was asked about Coopers Lagoon or Muriwai which was marked on the map and asked what rules are relevant in regards to the practicality of activity that already occurs there. Mr Mactier responded that rules which apply to the coastal environment are covered by the general rural rules and states the need to ensure that relevant workstreams are integrated. The next phase will be talking to landowners including about strategic infrastructure in a lower Ellesmere sense.

The Mayor supports the preferred option presented and highlighted the importance that the lake is identified as a coastal environment, which the map presented depicts.

A discussion was held on the importance of integration of workstreams. Across all topics, it is critical that the rules are complementary. The principle of the District Plan

is that rules aren't duplicated, and acknowledged that it is a challenge. Ms Kelly added that this is the reason why there are no specific rules relating to the Coastal Environment included in any of the preferred options. To address Councillors' concerns, the Chair proposed adding to the recommendations:

"The Committee notes the need to integrate and not to duplicate work programmes and rules".

The Committee agreed with the addition of the proposed recommendation.

Moved – Councillor Miller / Seconded – Councillor Morten

Recommendation

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for 'Coastal Environment' for further development and engagement."

"That the Committee notes the summary plan."

"The Committee notes the need to integrate and not to duplicate work programmes and rules".

CARRIED

7. Preferred Option Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Heritage Items and Protected Trees

Mr Mactier gave a brief overview and introduced Dr Ann McEwan and Stephanie Styles (Boffa Miskell).

The Committee discussed the unintended consequences of nominating heritage items, and nomination of earthquake damaged historic buildings and the associated upkeep costs. Dr McEwan explained that she engaged with nominees in April and explained the iterative process. Nominations need to go through a robust vetting process. Whilst Mr Ward agrees with the Committee's point, he stated that he is concerned about the resource and cost of doing the exercise of the process and urged the Committee to be aware of the time and significant additional cost.

Dr McEwan commented that the requirement of buildings to meet the criteria for scheduling is significant. It is positive that Selwyn District Council waives the resource consent fees for heritage buildings and has an incentive fund. No council in the country has done anything yet about demolition by neglect. The current District Plan provisions are a reactive measure for protecting historic heritage.

A question was asked about having assets in Reserve Management Plans, versus having them in the District Plan proposal. Ms Styles commented on heritage items, if it is nominated or comes through in a submission, then an assessment would be

carried out. Reserve Management Plans have a different purpose and have a more holistic management of resources and what's in it and the intentions for the uses of this (ie: protection of elements). This can work in parallel with the District Plan.

The Committee spoke about a few specific examples: a historic cottage in Edward Street, and the first church in Rolleston (built in 1975). Dr McEwan responded that to be nominated, it would need sufficient evidence to make a case whether it can be applied to assessment criteria. It was suggested at least 30 years plus minimum. 1970s is borderline. Councillor Watson commented on the recommendation to remove Rolleston clock tower from list. He wished to make it clear that there will be backlash and that it is risky removing it from the list.

A question was asked whether it is possible to remove items from the list. Ms Styles responded, yes, although it will go through the submission or plan change process. It can be removed if something changes, such as if it no longer meets the criteria or another reason that outweighs significance. Dr McEwan commented that there are isolated cases of owners applying for a plan change to remove buildings from the heritage schedule, but it more customary if you want to get it out of the District Plan, to apply to demolish the building and have a consent granted.

The Mayor highlighted that there is a social significance of these sites and the question is whether our society value these things in a way is greater than what an owner might. That is why they are on the list – to protect them, or have steps in place to protect these items.

Councillor Lyall stated that he won't take part in voting as he has a clear conflict of interest as his property is on the list but encouraged the Committee to consider the economic consequence of having an item listed on the schedule.

There was a discussion on the Rolleston Inn. Councillor Watson asked what level of changes to the original design before it is not of heritage value? In a previous Committee meeting, 'partial heritage recognition' was discussed. Ms Styles responded that she thought the conversation was about the degree of alteration and change, and whether things are distinguishable parts. Dr McEwan would determine through the assessment of each part of the building as a whole or in components, and determine whether that structure passes the threshold to be considered.

Councillor Watson stated that he does not support the addition of the Rolleston Inn building to the schedule, as the owner rightly is looking to demolish it. The Chair confirmed that Councillor Watson's concerns have been noted, and that there are definite plans that the building will be demolished before plan is notified. However, it does not take away from the principle of Councillor Watson's point.

The Chair asked Dr McEwan for confirmation specifically in regards to the Rolleston Inn, whether the pub as a whole structure deserves inclusion on the schedule, taking into account the assessment criteria? Dr McEwan responded yes, that her recommendation is that the building as a whole should be included on the schedule. Via submission, the necessity would be for someone to provide the evidence for partitioning off some aspects as typically the whole building would be scheduled. You could do a conservation plan for the least significant aspects and agree more readily

to the demolition whilst maintaining and enhancing the significant aspect. This tends to happen more in a Conservation Plan, and not in a District Plan schedule.

The Chair echoed the Mayor's view that if we value preserving heritage items, there is a clear set of criteria against which we have assessed various nominations and a schedule is in place. There is also the formal submission process available. The Chair notes the Committee's concerns regarding the cost involved. It comes back to the fundamental philosophical question in front of us, whether we as a society/community have a public good that potentially outweighs the private rights of individual?

The Committee raised the issue that there is not sufficient financial help available to the owner to remove a heritage item from the schedule. The onus and significant expense is on the owner to deregister part of a building. The Chair responded that through this process we are imposing restrictions on private property rights. It is on the onus of the Council to provide that evidence. Therefore, costs would be shared, or more heavily fall on Council to provide justification on the restrictions. This is the tension between private property rights and the public good.

The Chair suggested that this could be part of discussion at full Council meeting – regarding the funding support of heritage items and confirmed that a recommendation can be added to highlight this issue.

Councillor Watson asked for clarification that in the endorsement of this report today, this means that the Rolleston Inn will be added to the list, and therefore the onus is on the owner to provide the evidence in order to opt out of the schedule? The Chair confirmed that this is the preferred option, so there will be further opportunity for engagement. Through that process, if the Rolly Inn remained on list, then it would go through a formal submission process where the evidence will be weighed by a set of Commissioners.

Councillor Reid asked for clarification that in the consultation going forward, whether the individual owners with heritage items on the list will be contacted? Mr Ward clarified what we are saying is that this is our preferred position - for consultation. Owners will be contacted as part of the engagement phase. Mr Ward reiterated Councillor Lemon's point about the unintended consequences, and stated that Council needs to be conscious about the resource required, cost of this exercise and timeframes.

The Chair summarised that an additional recommendation will be added to reflect the position of the Committee.

A question was asked why certain trees did not meet the threshold criteria, namely some oak trees in the Waihora Reserve. Ms Styles confirmed that Treotech have confirmed that individual trees did not pass the thresholds to meet list.

Councillor Watson out 10.38am

Councillor Alexander asked about a tree in the Rolleston College grounds and another in Foster Park, and commented that there is a reluctance to list trees that are on a designation. Perhaps it could be part of the Management Plan?

Mr Ward out 10.46am

Ms Styles commented that none of the trees in their own right passed the threshold. The parameters of a protected tree is about assessing trees against the criteria. Ms Styles suggests that the Council recommend to the group that looks after the Reserve Management Plans that they protect and manage these trees appropriately through other processes also. Given the hierarchy of the Resource Management Act, the designation would always override this. It is a pragmatic approach, but she has noted Councillor Alexander's concerns and is happy to raise this with the school. The Chair commented that this will be noted in the minutes for clarification.

Councillor Watson in 10.47am

Mr Ward in 10.50am

The Mayor stated that he will move the two recommendations presented, and would like the following recommendation added to address what the Committee has raised: *"Following public consultation, the Committee request a report that includes current owners' willingness to work with Council on new heritage items and trees being listed, and those that are against, and that the Council prioritises working with the willing".*

The Chair summarised that following public consultation, a further report will be presented that will identify who are willing to work with Council.

Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Mugford

Recommendation

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for 'Heritage Items and Protected Trees' (Parts A & B) for further development and engagement."

"That the Committee notes the summary plan."

"Following public consultation, the Committee request a report that includes current owners' willingness to work with Council on new heritage items and trees being listed, and those that are against, and that the Council prioritises working with the willing".

CARRIED

8. Preferred Option Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Water

Ms Hunter (Stantec) provided a summary of the key findings of the *Water Baseline Report*, which evaluated the statutory obligations on Selwyn District Council relating to the management of water and waterbodies in the District.

No discussion was held, summary plan was taken as read and accepted.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Hasson

Recommendations

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for ‘Water’ for further development and engagement.”

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

9. Update and Preferred Options Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Transport

Mr Friedel introduced Ms Jeanette Ward from Abley Transportation Consultants, who was also involved in the preparation of the earlier baseline report along with Jasmax.

Councillor McEvedy out 11.08am

It was mentioned that ECan has the ability to adjust bus routes as new subdivisions happen, but advice is needed from Territorial Authorities when a large subdivision is at Resource consents/Plan Change stage to actively include public transportation routes. The example of Faringdon was given. In terms of strategic planning, a roading hierarchy has been identified in the greenfield areas and referenced in outline development plans. Bus networks are catered for in the higher classification roads. ECan determine the alignment of bus routes in consultation with the community and Council. Ms Ward added that it comes down to the roading hierarchy and road design standards for those high level roads that allows for buses in the future and to ensure that road widths reflect that. Other infrastructure, such as bus stops can be retrofitted at the public transport route planning stage.

Councillor McEvedy in 11.13am

Councillor Alexander suggested working with ECan so when subdivisions are developed that public transport networks are simultaneously planned for. Ms Ward confirmed that it is important that public transport is reflected in the policies and objectives. The conversation about where bus routes go can happen after developments are done, as long as there is some future-proofing also. So, likely routes within the likes of Faringdon, allow for that.

A question was asked whether the Council's Engineering Code of Practice and Subdivision Guidelines would be reviewed so that they are up to date. Mr Friedel responded that both documents will be reviewed in line with the District Plan to ensure there is a connection.

Councillor Reid commented about walkable blocks and questioned the pedestrian links to cul-de-sacs. Mr Friedel confirmed that the ideal is to have through connections, which are required by the current rules – which encourages those through

connections. This will be covered in further detail in the section 32 evaluation phase when rules and provisions will be drafted.

The Chair confirmed the position that we aren't at this level of detail yet and suggested adding a general statement to the recommendation that:

"The Preferred Options for 'Transport' for further development and engagement which will be refined through further detail. The Committee agreed.

Councillor Reid asked whether having minimum cycle parking rates was considered, as it would be easier than having a floor area rate. Ms Ward responded that the intent would be reflective of the activity. The example of an office was provided, where the amount of people in that floor area would be different to that of a warehouse. It is the same philosophy as car parking. Councillor Reid added that a minimum rate would be easier to put across. Ms Ward responded that this is essentially the same approach as the CCC is taking.

A point was raised in regards to the provision for on-road or off-road cycle facilities on state highways, Arterials and Collector Roads. There needs to be planning for the use of E-bikes and provided for also. A start would be to have cycle ways on arterial routes and Collector Roads as well. Ms Ward explained the rationale behind providing cycle facilities in a network and stated that it is problematic to try and define things too prescriptively in a District Plan, especially when it's unknown what the adjacent land use is. That is the rationale behind not changing what is in place currently, and encouraging those discussions to happen at the outline development plan and early planning stages.

Councillor Reid asked specifically about having cycle ways on all Arterial Roads. Mr Friedel responded that the current category status enables both on-road and off-road to be accommodated in the Arterial and Collector Road classifications. It comes down to capital works upgrades and whether Council has a preference for on or off road facilities.

A suggestion was made to investigate increasing the single footpath width as an alternative to requiring double sided footpaths to support mobility scooters and in particular for emergency service access. Mr Friedel noted the Councillors' concerns for further development and that it has informed the preferred option to re-evaluate the widths.

Moved – Councillor Reid / Seconded – Councillor Hasson

Recommendations

"That the Committee notes the report, including the update on car parking management."

"That the Committee endorses:

- the approach to address car parking management (Section 5.0); and*
- the Preferred Options for 'Transport' for further development and engagement which will be refined through further detail.*

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

10. Preferred Option Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Vegetation

Mr Love spoke to his report, and clarified the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) definitions for Plantation Forestry, and the District Plan definitions for Plantations, Amenity Planting, and Shelterbelt terms.

Councillor Watson asked about the definition regarding plantation forestry, and what percentage of the block needs to be plantation as opposed to a normal working farm? Mr Love responded that the NES doesn't go into that type of detail. The definition of a plantation forestry is a forest over one hectare, commercially harvested, which does not include shelter belts less than 30 metres wide.

Councillor Alexander out 11.35am

Councillor Miller made reference to the recent landowner consultation completed, and asked what the outcome was in relation to the discussions. ONL covers his entire farm and is likely to restrict his activities heavily.

Councillor Alexander in 11.36am

Mr Love responded that the landowners would like to see Council remove all restrictions completely and allow everything to be permitted. However, activities in an ONL is a section 6 matter under the Resource Management Act, so it is a matter of national importance. As such these areas need to be provided for and protected under the District Plan.

Councillor Miller asked, if the landowner wanted to plant a forest tomorrow, what would the restrictions be under the Proposed Plan? Mr Love concluded that the landowner would need to apply for a resource consent as a non-complying activity for a plantation forestry within the ONL.

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Mr Ward

Recommendations

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for ‘Vegetation’ for further development and engagement.”

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

11. Preferred Options Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Business: Ellesmere & Malvern capacity

Ms Tuilaepa gave a brief background of the Ellesmere and Malvern Area Plans and outlined the capacity of business zones.

There was a discussion about the proactive rezoning for industrial land in Leeston. Councillor McEvedy supports the option to investigate further industrial zoning in Leeston and urged the Committee to take initiative in this area to support this option also. Councillor Miller agrees with Councillor McEvedy and stated a strategic approach to possible locations should be taken. The Committee supports this view.

Councillor Alexander supports growth in our communities but asked the question of who bears the cost of the reports and investigation of the zoning? Subject to further information, Councillor Alexander does not support that Council bear the cost. The Chair responded that the report sets out a series of work that would occur if we proactively rezoned land, including factors such as assessments around contamination, transportation, urban design etc. The cost of this investigation and assessments would be on Council in proactively rezoning land.

Councillor Lemon commented on the unintended consequences of not providing enough zoned land and gave an example of a current application for a business to operate out of a rural zone as their existing location could not support the expansion of their business. Leeston is an expanding town and rural economy that needs to be supported. It is a small investment to proactively rezone to achieve the town's future growth and to make it a viable place for people to live. Councillor Lemon supports Councillor Miller's strategic approach point but that further investigation is required for industrial land. Councillor Alexander commented that there is an increasing problem that people are setting up commercial businesses on rural properties due to the cost of setting up in Izone or IPort.

The Mayor stated that on two occasions previously, Council voted not to proactively rezone land during the DPR process. On both those occasions the discussion was focused on residential land but the recommendation that was passed stated that Council would not actively rezone land and the cost would fall on landowners through submissions. Both times, the Mayor voted the other way and he thinks we should be actively rezoning land in our towns, particularly in Leeston and Darfield. Industrial land is needed in Leeston, and Councillor McEvedy has articulated that issue well. Mr Ward is in support also.

Councillor Morten supports Councillor McEvedy and referred his comments to Darfield. There isn't the same degree of pressure (for industrial land) as there is in Leeston. Councillor Mugford is also in support.

The Chair summarised the view around table which was that proactive rezoning of industrial land around Leeston is warranted, with further analysis and assessment required. An amendment to the recommendation was suggested. The Councillors all agreed that the proposed recommendation meets the view of the Committee.

Moved – Councillor McEvedy / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

Recommendations

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the Preferred Options for ‘Business: Ellesmere & Malvern capacity’ for further development and engagement, with the exception of a further detailed report making an assessment for the proactive industrial zoning of land in Leeston.

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

12. Update Report on Dairy Processing Management Areas

Ms Barker provided a brief update on the development of the Dairy Processing Management Area (DPMA) Topic and Work Programme.

Councillor McEvedy asked what the changes in noise contours amount to in decibels. Ms Barker responded that detail has been provided but it wasn't able to be included with the report, due to when the Agenda closed. Ms Barker commented that this detail is still being worked through but at this stage an approximate-change of 5 decibels is proposed in relation to the development of sensitive activity within the noise contour. An Acoustic consultant engaged by Council will be reviewing the proposed changes.

Councillor McEvedy asked whether the noise contours were the same rules as Izone (considering there is rural area on both boundaries), given previous issues, the rules need to be consistent. Ms Barker reassured the Committee that the work will be integrated where appropriate.

Councillor McEvedy asked, if that was the case, whether through this review process the Izone rules would be reviewed as it is slightly different to Christchurch City; so everything is consistent regionally as well as throughout the District. Ms Barker responded that the noise limits that apply to the IZone / Rural interface are being considered as part of the Noise and Vibration Topic.

The Chair commented that this discussion is about DPMA noise contours which is different to the noise standards that apply to Izone. These are different mechanisms. There is a recommendation that noise-related rules relating to Izone are amended to reflect the industrial activity that occurs. It is currently at the boundary, and the proposal is to consider moving it back to the notional boundary of a house.

Noise was a contentious issue before Synlait got their processing zone. Have the affected neighbours been consulted with yet? Councillor Alexander stated that he would be unhappy at first glance to accept this proposal without the consultation occurring. Ms Barker responded that this has not been done yet, but reiterated that work is currently underway on an engagement strategy with both companies, which includes approaching affected landowners. This would address Councillor Alexander's concerns.

The Chair reiterated that this is an update and there will be a further update and information presented to the District Plan Committee in 2019.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Mr Ward

Recommendations

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee endorses the approach to the ‘Dairy Processing Management Areas’ topic and indicative work programme outlined in Section 3.0 of the report for further development and engagement.”

CARRIED

Minutes confirmed:

This day 10 of October 2018

Tim Harris

CHAIR PERSON