



**District Plan Committee meeting
Held on Wednesday 28 November 2018 at 9.00am
at Selwyn District Council, Rolleston**

Present: Mayor S Broughton, Councillors M Alexander, M Lemon, P McEvedy, D Hasson, N Reid, B Mugford, G Miller, M Lyall, J Bland, C Watson, J Morten, P Skelton (Environment Canterbury), Mr D Ward (CEO SDC), & Mr Hirini Matunga (Te Taumutu Rūnanga).

In attendance: Messrs T Harris (Chair), J Burgess (Planning Manager), B Rhodes (Strategy & Policy Team Leader), S Hill (Business Relationship Manager), R Love (Strategy and Policy Planner), A Mactier (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), R Phillipson (Student Planner) & N Brown (District Plan Administrator).

Standing Items:

1. Apologies

Ms T Wati (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)

Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

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

CARRIED

2. Declaration of Interest

Councillor Miller declared a limited financial interest in a company potentially affected by the ‘Outstanding Natural Landscapes’ topic. Legal advice received from Adderley Head determined that he can retain voting rights for this topic and partake in discussions.

Councillor Lyall declared an interest in regards to the ‘Heritage’ topic.

The Chair summarised legal advice received in relation to declarations of interests. As long as the interest is declared, the Committee member is able to take part in discussions. A conflict may arise in the decision-making process and potentially when

Council approves the Plan. However, as long as there is a clear declaration of any potential conflict at this stage then this can be managed on a case by case basis. Mr Rogers from Adderley Head will provide a summary sheet and circulate this to the Committee to remind them of how to identify and address any conflicts of interest. The Chair welcomed comments from Committee members, no further discussion was held.

3. Deputations by Appointment

Nil.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

No minutes to confirm.

Councillor Lyall out 9.05am

Councillor Lyall in 9.09am

Councillor Reid out 9.09am

5. Outstanding Issues Register

Subject	Comments	Report Date / Action	Item Resolved or Outstanding
Community & Recreation Facilities	Clarification of Preferred Option for non-custodial community corrections facilities	28 November 2018	Outstanding
The preferred option report considered whether a more lenient status could be afforded to non-custodial community corrections facilities, which due to their nature require a community based location, as requested by the Department of Corrections. The Committee will be able to consider this matter further when draft provisions are developed.			
Earthworks	Clarification of how bunds are managed in the rural area, including the permitted activity threshold	28 November 2018	Outstanding
The creation of bunds to mitigate noise or visual effects are dealt with in the resource consent process. The bund will trigger the need for the resource consent or as part of a wider proposal. The Earthworks preferred option report recommends that the permitted volume limits are reduced. Councillor Hasson asked whether amenity effects fall under landscape provision. Ms Ashley answered that the amenity effects of bunds are considered during the resource consent process.			
Earthworks	Clarification of Preferred Option relating to provisions recognising	28 November 2018	Outstanding

	the need to safeguard the mauri of soils		
<p>The preferred option recommends additions to the policy framework and assessment matters to recognise the need to safeguard the mauri of soils. This stems from both the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan and the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p><i>Councillor Reid in 9.10am</i></p> <p>Ms Ashley commented that the current District Plan does not acknowledge the cultural value of soils. Recommendation is for this to be addressed at a policy level so that when an earthworks consent is triggered, consideration is given to the cultural value of soils. A question was asked whether this would impact agricultural practices. Ms Ashley responded that it was unlikely, but depended on compliance with the permitted activity standards for earthworks.</p>			
Sites and Areas of Cultural Significance	Engagement with SDC Assets and all affected landowners	28 November 2018	Outstanding
<p>Ongoing liaison with Council assets team and stakeholders. The post engagement report would be shared with key stakeholders and landowners who provided feedback during the consultation period.</p> <p>1,425 landowners are affected by the draft provisions. Of those, 46 responded and provided feedback. Additional stakeholders were identified, including the Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated (who represent a number of parties).</p> <p>Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc. and Federated Farmers are working in partnership with Environment Canterbury as part of the Farm Environment Plan process and therefore seek to ensure the use of robust data (springs locations) and to avoid duplication with the District Plan. The Committee commended the work Environment Canterbury's Mananui Ramsden has completed to date to and wants to ensure stakeholder relationships are protected.</p> <p>Councillor Hasson queried land and water drainage. Ms Ashley responded that the Council Assets team are using consultant planner, Jane Whyte, to input into the District Plan Review process.</p>			

The Committee agreed that the outstanding issues register is a useful tool for reporting back on questions raised during the course of the meeting.

Specific Reports

15. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Noise and Vibration

Ms Barker briefed the Committee on the post engagement report. The endorsed preferred option is that noise and vibration is managed by amended provisions to enable improved and continued management of noise and vibration. CIAL related

provisions will be further considered and amended as required in consultation with CIAL.

Stakeholder/landowner feedback included managing noise between zones with suggestions being setbacks, noise standards, and noise contours/buffers. General support to increase the night time noise limit in the Living Zone and decrease it in the Rural Zone (rural productive activities continue to be exempt). Horticulture NZ and Federated Farmers provided specific feedback about rules for bird-scaring devices and frost fans. CDHB are wanting an additional shoulder limit introduced between 7-10pm. CIAL are working on revised airport noise contours, which are anticipated to be available next year. Council are working closely with CIAL and will have the opportunity to review draft provisions once available.

Public feedback was mostly around specific one-off events and in regards to proximity to residences. Mixed feedback received about motor sports and exemptions and some wanted exemptions for rifle ranges. The majority considered there should be vibration limits for certain activities as vibration is intrusive. There is no change to endorsed preferred option.

The Committee asked about certainty and protection of existing activities, including gun clubs and raceways. The NZ Defence Force has also advised that they are considering advancing options to protect the West Melton rifle range from reverse sensitivity effects derived from noise-sensitive development in the vicinity. The site is currently designated. Ms Barker advised that long established activities without a resource consent should legally establish and protect their activity. Noise consultants are currently reviewing noise data to develop noise-specific rules.

Exemptions are supported for emergency services, special events, agriculture, and some also sought exemptions for noise-producing activities (i.e. rifle ranges and established motorsport facilities). Agriculture production will continue to be exempt from the rule. The definition of agricultural production will be carefully considered.

Councillor Morten out 9.36am

Moved – Councillor Lyall / **Seconded** – Councillor Watson

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

6. Preferred Options Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Leeston Industrial Zoning

Mr Rhodes introduced Ms White from Incite. Ms White provided an overview of the investigations undertaken to date to rezone additional land for industrial purposes in

Leeston. This is dependent on suitably located land being able to be feasibly developed for this purpose. The report recommends which site should be the subject of further detailed investigation and consultation.

A two-step process was taken. The Ellesmere Area Plan identified an area 'LEE 3' as the preferred strategic location for industrial land in Leeston, as well as identifying a further 'possible future area' for industrial development. Preliminary investigations have identified that both sites can be serviced and landowners are supportive of the LEE 3 area being rezoned. There is a reasonable expectation for the community that expansion may occur. However, the 'possible future area' is not considered suitable for rezoning due to its strategic importance for wastewater treatment plant purposes.

Councillor Morten in 9.40am

A question was asked whether additional industrial capacity needs to be provided given that the triangle area of LEE 3 is largely already developed. Ms White responded that it is about zoning the general area of LEE 3 so as to connect the two industrial areas. The actual size of the area to be rezoned will be determined after further growth and demand analysis and consideration of onsite servicing and stormwater treatment and disposal as part of stage 2. The Committee commended Ms White on the report and agreed with moving to stage 2.

A question was asked about the indicative size of land being rezoned. Mr Rhodes responded it was approx. 2.8 hectares. In speaking with landowners, they have aspirations to develop land further.

Councillor Morten, Councillor Watson out 9.47am

Mr Matunga commented on the need to protect the cultural values of wahi tapu and wāhi taonga, indigenous vegetation and landscapes, and waterways. Ms Ashley responded that the issues raised traverse across a range of workstreams and the project team is working on the integration of provisions that recognise and protect cultural values across all chapters.

Councillor Watson in 9.51am

The Committee discussed topic integration. Mr Burgess added that workshops scheduled in 2019 will cover the draft provisions and integration of the Plan. The Committee are cognisant of the fact further work on the integration of topics will occur.

Councillor Morten in 9.54am

Mr Ward out 9.55am

Moved – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee endorses the Preferred Option for 'Leeston Industrial Zoning' for further development and engagement."

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

7. Preferred Options Report and Communications and Engagement Summary Plan – Supplementary Transport

Mr Friedel spoke to his report. The purpose of the supplementary workstream is to review the remaining issues relating to the Transport Topic that have not already been covered by the initial assessment that targeted a number of priority issues, with the exception of car parking.

Amendments proposed are to reflect best practice engineering and up-to-date standards, which will be coordinated with the Engineering Code of Practice review. The review is dependent on national planning standards and NZTA standards.

Council are liaising with Environment Canterbury particularly in regards to the regional public transport plan.

The Committee discussed the classification of various collector roads and arterial routes. Mr Friedel responded that Council follow a scheduled process to update classifications and that Mr Mazey from Council could provide further comment if necessary.

The Committee agreed that updating the District Plan Planning Maps to illustrate the road classifications would be useful. Mr Friedel will provide further comment during the workshop in 2019.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / **Seconded** – Councillor Morten

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Options for District Wide – Supplementary Transport are endorsed for further development and engagement.”

“That the Committee notes the summary plan.”

CARRIED

8. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Transport

Mr Friedel briefed the Committee on the Transport post engagement report.

There was overall positive support for the preferred options, which include the use of integrated transport assessments; integration of land use and transport (local road design); and provisions to encourage active travel modes (walking, cycling and public transport). Environment Canterbury also provided strong support for the preferred options.

Mr Matunga commented on the potential impact on waterways. This matter will be worked on in integration with other topics.

A question was asked about the consideration of footpath widths. Mr Friedel responded that design specifications will deal with this, and noted from a previous DPC meeting in August, the potential for flexibility of having a wider single footpath rather than mandatory double footpath. Further discussion on this area will take place in the workshop in 2019.

Moved – Councillor Lyall / Seconded – Councillor Miller

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Options previously endorsed by DPC progress to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

9. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Heritage Items and Protected Trees

Mr Mactier spoke to his report. Feedback on this topic was received from the general public, affected landowners and key stakeholders (including Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Canterbury District Health Board and Environment Canterbury). Feedback was generally positive, although some landowners have queried the rationale for listing heritage buildings on their properties.

Through recent engagement, the Hororata Hall was nominated. It was assessed and meets the criteria for listing but is subject to peer review. Trees in the Waihora domain have been reassessed and do not meet criteria to list, but will be protected by the reserve management plan.

A number of trees have been nominated including a tree in Tai Tapu, 8 Oak trees (planted for Prince Charles’ 40 birthday celebration), and trees by Terrace Station. A total of 19 challenged items will go through a peer review process. The cost of the peer review process will be met by Council.

The Committee discussed buildings/trees nominated on designated land, specifically Southbridge School and a Macrocarpa tree at Rolleston College. The designation would override Heritage provisions although it is still relevant to list items. The final list will be discussed in the workshop in March 2019.

Mr Matunga commented on removal of significant vegetation. This will be dealt with as part of the Ecosystems & Biodiversity topic and considered by the Biodiversity Working Group (which includes a Taumutu representative).

Councillor Lyall out 10.24am

Moved – Councillor Mugford/ **Seconded** – Councillor Morten

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Committee confirms that the Preferred Option(s), with minor changes, for the Heritage Items and Protected Trees topics progress to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

10. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Outstanding Natural Landscapes

Mr Mactier briefed the Committee on the post engagement findings. Feedback on this topic was received from the general public, affected landowners and key stakeholders (including Environment Canterbury, the Canterbury District Health Board, Waihora Ellesmere Trust and the Whitecliffs Township Committee). Feedback was generally positive, although some landowners are concerned about the rules constraining the use of private land. Following the drop-in sessions there were a number of subsequent site visits/meetings.

Minor changes to the endorsed preferred option as a result of consultation and site visits of affected properties, include:

- Some changes to boundaries of landscape areas.
- Rules to be refined by ensuring appropriate protection of landscape values without unnecessary constraint on appropriate land use, and by integrating with the rules coming out of the vegetation and ecosystem topic. For example, consider rules that allow higher levels of built development in the area where the property's homestead is based than in other parts of the property.

Density standards is subject to a different workstream, but based on the work carried out through the ONL topic. Recognition that the Port Hills is different to the High Country.

Mr Ward in 10.34am

The Committee discussed implications of Plan Change 6. Councillor Miller commented that a number of landowners around the base of the Port Hills are completely opposed. An ONL should not be considered as such, unless it is obviously so.

Councillor Miller seeks status quo, and queried why change is required. The proposed change is not well received nor what affected landowners want. The Chair responded that the direction Council is going is in line with the RMA obligations. Ms Ashley added that the original landscape assessment report did not give effect to the RPS. Councillor Miller suggested further engagement with landowners, and particular individuals affected is required. The Committee agreed with this approach.

The Mayor commented on Councillor Miller's stated conflict of interest and that he was uncomfortable if the view he supports only affects three parties. The Chair added that legal advice was taken on this issue and that Councillor Miller was permitted to provide feedback and continue to speak.

Councillor Watson requested the recommendation is amended.

"That the Committee confirms that the Preferred Options, with minor changes, for the Landscapes topic progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase, with the exception of the ONL and VAL associated with the Port Hills, which is to be subject to further engagement with affected landowners."

Councillor Lyall in 10.44am

Mr Matunga commented that ONL areas are critical for Tangata Whenua. Landscapes are socially constructed and linked directly to whakapapa. Stakeholders view this differently. The fundamental question is how this nuance will be incorporated into the planning framework, so it is not ideologically driven.

Councillor Skelton noted that the identification of landscapes is subjective and one of the biggest areas of contention before the courts. It is critical to apply the decisions already available. The landscape architect uses their skills and expertise, along with case law to come to a conclusion about what is outstanding and what is not.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Miller

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the Committee confirms that the Preferred Options, with minor changes, for the Landscapes topic progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase, with the exception of the ONL and VAL associated with the Port Hills, which is to be subject to further engagement with affected landowners."

"That the Committee notes the updated summary plan."

CARRIED

11. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Rural Density, Character and Amenity

Mr Love spoke to his report. Feedback received was both for and against the preferred options, with parties seeking both a reduction and increase in densities throughout the Rural Zone.

There was overwhelming support to protect the Rural Zone's primary production capability, which was suggested to be achieved through the raising of minimum lot densities, and tying development potential with the underlying soil quality. This sentiment is supported by the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which states through its objectives and policies that rural production should be protected within the Rural Zone. Raising the minimum density of an area to reduce residential/subdivision development of an area is a way to achieve this. Residential encroachment is reduced

(subsequently lowering the risk of reverse sensitivity) and prevents the fragmentation of rural land into units which are uneconomic to produce from.

The Committee agreed that the desire to protect rural land for primary production has been taken into account in the preferred option. No change to the density for residential development in the Inner Plains is recommended as it is not considered that the intensification of specific areas would achieve the desired outcome.

Councillor Skelton noted that Environment Canterbury recently received a presentation from Lincoln University stating the shortage of productive farmland. There is a problem with commercial vegetable growers and inability to move from one area to another. A plan change is thus being prepared, and liaison between Council and Environment Canterbury was suggested.

Moved – Mr Ward / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

12. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Rural Business, Character and Amenity

Mr Love spoke to his report. Feedback was consistent with the preferred approach, with a common theme being that the Rural Zone should be protected for primary production and those rural service businesses that have a need to be there.

No discussion was held.

Moved – Councillor Mr Ward / Seconded – Councillor Morten

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

13. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Intensive Farming, Mushroom Farming and Composting

Mr Love briefed the Committee on the post engagement report findings. There was widespread feedback across many aspects of these activity types, including

definitions, jurisdictional control over odour and dust emissions, rule structures, and setbacks. This feedback was both supportive and against the preferred options.

A series of recommendations post engagement include:

- Creation of a split approach in managing the effects of dust and odour discharge by retaining provisions where an intensive farming activity occurs in close proximity to a sensitive activity;
- Introduction of a setback between intensive farming and sensitive activities and retain a reverse sensitivity buffer;
- Use the definitions provided by the draft National Planning Standards, unless new definitions are required to fill any gaps;
- That intensive farming should be a permitted activity, unless a standard is breached, then it should be a restricted discretionary activity; and
- That commercial compost manufacture and mushroom growing should be a discretionary activity.

The Committee discussed reverse sensitivity setbacks. Intensive Farming is a rural activity therefore some odour and dust is expected. Setbacks enable protection of other activities. In regards to free range poultry farming, reverse sensitivity setbacks will only apply where the activity is deemed to be intensive and there is a likelihood that dust and odour effects will occur. It is also likely that different setbacks for different livestock will apply. An air quality specialist will peer review the report in regards to setback distances.

A question was asked about the definition of 'intensive farming'. National Planning Standards will define this, with the overall approach adopted for intensive farming to be more enabling.

The Committee discussed the management of odour and asked which agency is primarily responsible for this. The original approach was to devolve all control to Environment Canterbury. However, due to the location of the activities the primary responsibility for land use lies with the District Council, not Regional Council. The Chair commented on the close partnership of Environment Canterbury and Council staff.

Moved – Councillor Mugford / Seconded – Councillor Bland

"That the Committee notes the report."

"That the preferred option previously endorsed by DPC be amended as follows:

- *Create a split approach in managing the effects of dust and odour discharge by retaining provisions where an intensive farming activity occurs in close proximity to a sensitive activity;*
- *Introduce a setback between intensive farming and sensitive activities and retain a reverse sensitivity buffer;*
- *Use the definitions provided by the draft National Planning Standards, unless new definitions are required to fill any gaps;*
- *That intensive farming should be a permitted activity, unless a standard is breached, then it should be a restricted discretionary activity; and*
- *That commercial compost manufacture and mushroom growing should be a discretionary activity."*

“That the updated preferred option described above be progressed to the Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.”

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

14. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Quarrying

Mr Love briefed the Committee on the post engagement report findings. There was overwhelming support from landowners and the public for the implementation of setbacks between quarrying activities and sensitive activities. There was a mix of thoughts about where a setback should originate. The majority wished to see the sensitive activity’s property boundary used. Setbacks will be included in the Plan, and should be measured from the notional boundary of sensitive activities within the rural zone, and from a residential zone boundary.

Environment Canterbury supported the approach clarifying the extraction component of quarrying is a rural activity, and managing the effects of quarrying through a resource consent process. They were supportive of the approach to include setbacks within the Plan to signal appropriate and inappropriate locations for quarrying activities which will help support the Regional Council when assessing applications under the Canterbury Air Regional Plan, and also give effect to the reverse sensitivity policies of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

The Committee queried setback distances. Feedback received was that setbacks are necessary and that people would like to know setback distances. An evidential basis to promote a setback is required. Definitive numbers will be available to be discussed in the workshops. A setback report is currently being developed but is yet to be peer reviewed. While unconfirmed, a setback distance of 200 metres may seem appropriate.

Councillor McEvedy out 11.48am

A question was raised whether a quarry is a rural or industrial activity. National Planning Standards will inform this. Under the RPS, quarrying is considered a rural activity. The District Plan Review is treating the extraction of the material as a rural activity and the processing of it as a rural industrial activity.

Councillor McEvedy in 10.52am

A comment was made on the pros and cons of quarry zones and whether the high quality gravel overlay should be used in a regulatory context in the absence of a quarry zone.

Councillor Lemon out 11.53am

Considering the queries raised regarding overlays, the Committee was asked for their views whether an overlay rather than reliance on rural zone provisions would be more appropriate. It was noted that any regulatory impact of a high quality gravel overlay has not been consulted on.

Councillor Lemon in 11.55am

Councillor Alexander discussed the cluster effect of quarries, and is supportive of the recommendation of setbacks and an overlay.

Councillor McEvedy commented it is difficult to make a decision without understanding the financial implications. No need for an overlay at the moment, but promoted discussion with quarries to better understand what that would mean and whether it would fit into the framework.

Councillor Watson agrees with setbacks but commented that an overlay would provide uncertainty. Councillors Miller, Lemon, Mugford, Bland, Morten, and Mr Ward also do not agree with an overlay. Quarries need to go through the RMA consenting process in any event.

The Mayor would prefer a quarry zone, but endorses the current recommendation/approach. The Chair summarised that an overlay would likely have less regulatory impact, whereas a zone would have considerable effect.

Moved – Councillor Watson / Seconded – Councillor Alexander

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the preferred option previously endorsed by DPC be amended as follows:

- Approach ‘2’: that setbacks be taken from the notional boundary of sensitive activities within rural zones, and residential zone boundaries. The setback will act as an activity status escalator which will enable a dust assessment. Outside of a setback margin the Selwyn District Council will not have the discretion to assess dust.*
- Approach ‘4’: remove this approach as it is superfluous to needs of the District Plan Review.*
- Approach ‘5’: to use the definitions provided by the draft National Planning Standards where possible.*
- Approach ‘7’: remove this approach as it is superfluous to the needs of the District Plan Review.*
- Approach ‘8’: to allow for a split approach in managing the effects of dust discharges, between the Selwyn District Council and the Canterbury Regional Council.*

“That the updated preferred option described above be progressed to the Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.”

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

16. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Geotech

Ms Carruthers spoke to her report and stated that the Resource Management Act directs that geotechnical risks must be managed. Feedback supports the preferred options to managing geotech risks. Mitigation risk is supported provided there is an evidential base that is supported by the section 32 report.

No discussion was held.

Moved – The Mayor / Seconded – Councillor Mr Ward

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

17. Post Engagement Report and updated Communications and Engagement Summary Plan for Relocated Buildings

Ms Carruthers briefed the Committee on the post engagement report for the ‘Relocated Buildings’ Topic. There was no targeted engagement, as no change is proposed from the existing approach, being a controlled activity status in rural and residential areas. However, the House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association provided feedback, with their preferred option being to make all relocated buildings permitted subject to standards. Their feedback however does not address any of the risks. The recommendation is to continue with the existing preferred option.

A question was asked about future liabilities of a relocated lead-painted house that could possibly contaminate the new site. Testing would likely be a condition of the resource consent. The Chair will discuss this with Council Building Manager.

Moved – Mr Ward / Seconded – Councillor Lyall

“That the Committee notes the report.”

“That the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC progresses to the ‘Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase.’

“That the Committee notes the updated summary plan.”

CARRIED

Minutes confirmed:

This day 13 of February 2019

Tim Harris

CHAIR PERSON