

KCDC position around food security / sovereignty

KCDC position around food security/ sovereignty. For example Any plans for legislating for maintaining arable land in Otaki?

The Council have no formal position on this. In our proposed district plan there is nothing explicitly about food security however in the introduction to the rural chapter it states

Focus on Production

Collectively, the District's broad range of rural areas has significant potential for various *primary production activities*. This includes the production of food, fibre, fuel and building materials for local consumption, and for regional, national and global distribution. The continued use of the Rural Zones for these activities is important for the on-going resilience, health, and social and economic well-being of the District's communities.

The Plan provisions for all Rural Zones reflect the predominance of *primary production activities*. However, the provisions also recognise that these activities must be carried out in a manner that maintains the character and amenity of the rural area and adjoining non-rural zones. The Rural Zone provisions work in tandem with provisions in other parts of the Plan – for example the Natural Environment, Coastal Environment, Hazard, and Heritage Chapters – to ensure that new rural *subdivision*, land use and *development* proceeds in accordance with all relevant Plan Objectives.

The Plan also recognises the unique operational characteristics of some *primary production activities*, such as the harvesting of *plantation forestry* and *extractive industries*, and the need to provide for their efficient and on-going operation, whilst avoiding, remedying or mitigating their environmental *effects*.

Provision is also made for *new buildings* on sites in the Rural Zones, including a *household unit* and other potential *buildings* where they are *ancillary* to either the *residential* or *primary production activities* on the site. However, the scale and location of these *buildings* and *structures* must be managed to ensure the *productive potential* of the land is not compromised.

The Proposed District Plan's Objective 2.6 – Rural productivity sets a clear direction for rural land as set out below

To sustain the *productive potential* of land in the District, including:

- a) retaining land which is suitable for a range of *primary production activities*;
- b) achieving added economic and social value derived from *primary production activities* through *ancillary* on-site processing and marketing;
- c) enabling activities that utilise the *productive potential* of the land in the rural environment;
- d) reducing conflict between land uses in the rural environment and adjoining areas; and
- e) avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse *effects* on the efficient operation of existing *primary production activities* from *sensitive activities* establishing on adjoining sites;

while safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems by avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse *effects* on the *environment*.

This theme is followed through in policies in Chapter 7 including Policy 7.1- Primary production which states:

Primary production activities will be provided for as the principal use in the District's Rural Zones where adverse *effects* on the *environment* are avoided, remedied or mitigated and the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems is safeguarded.

And policy 7.9— Adding Value to Primary Production: On-site Processing and Retailing which states:

The ability to add value to *primary production activities* in the Rural Zones through *ancillary* on-site processing and *retailing* – including *roadside stalls* – will be provided for in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse *effects* on the safety and efficiency of the *transport network* and on *amenity values* of the Rural Zones.

In determining whether or not the scale of *effects* from the *ancillary* on-site processing and *retailing* activity is appropriate, particular regard must be given to:

- a) the *effects* generated by the activity on the safety and efficiency of the *transport network*;
- b) the *effects* generated by the proposed activity on landscape character and rural values of the surrounding *environment*;
- c) the appropriateness – in the design and total provision – of proposed access and *carpark*; and

the extent to which any proposed screening and *landscaping* successfully mitigates potential visual impacts of the activity.

This translates into rules which limit subdivision in the most productive land in the district and only allow one dwelling per rural lot.

What are the future challenges that the council perceives and are planning for with respect to food security.?

Council has no formal position on this. However, the Council supports a number of initiatives that are relevant to the conversation around food security:

- Community Gardens on Council owned land are an enabler to food security at a neighbourhood level
- Our contract support for EnviroSchools helps raise awareness of sustainable food production and the importance of food security
- The wider work of our sustainable communities programme (greener neighbourhoods and community gardens parties)
- Ongoing talks with Kaibosh about a joined up initiative for Kapiti.
- Community funding (Community financial support) for wellbeing initiatives have included food security projects in previous years as well as small amounts of funding for Community orchards and gardens.

When Will the green gardener be replaced?

With the Green Gardener services role becoming vacant the scope of services in this area is being reviewed.