



BEFORE THE KĀPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARING COMMITTEE
Cr. Mike Cardiff, Cr. Diane Ammundsen, Miria Pomare, David McMahon and
Chair Alistair Aburn

IN THE MATTER: of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the Act”) and the Hearings into the Kāpiti Coast District Council’s Proposed District Plan

AND

Chapter 2 - Objectives

IN RESPECT OF SUBMITTOR:

-  #319 and FS#177 Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc.
-  #369 and FS#58 Michael and Elizabeth Welch
-  #380 and FS#59 Barry, Suzanne and Timothy Mansell
-  #408 and FS#102 USNZ Forestry Group Ltd
-  #411 and FS#178 Land Matters Ltd
-  #425 and FS#180 Lutz Brothers Ltd
-  #487 and FS#181 Bellcamp Trust Company Ltd
-  #495 and FS186 Mahaki Holdings Ltd
-  #492 and FS#183 Kennott Trust Company Ltd and Kauri Trust

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANNA P. SISARICH CARTER (MNZPI) ON:

Kāpiti Coast District Council Proposed District Plan – Chapter 2 Objectives

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Tēna koutou katoa. Ko Anna Carter tōku ingoa. Nō Kāpiti Coast ahau. I am the author of this evidence. I am employed by Land Matters Ltd (“Land Matters”) as their Senior Resource Management Consultant. Firstly I would like to apologise for not providing this evidence ten working days prior to the hearing.
- 1.2 I have been employed by Land Matters since January 2014. Land Matters represents a number of landowners who made submissions on Kāpiti Coast District Council’s (“the Council”) Proposed District Plan (PDP). Those Submitters are listed on the front page (“the Submitters”) of this evidence. The Submitters have commissioned Land Matters Ltd to represent their submission at the relevant hearings on the PDP. All the Submitters are rural landowners and all own large areas of rural land.
- 1.3 Since lodging these submissions Council have undertaken pre-hearing meetings and other consultation with the community and subsequently released what is now the Submitter Engagement Version (“SEV”) PDP. We acknowledge that this hearing is considering the provisions of the PDP as it was publicly notified and not the SEV PDP.
- 1.4 This evidence is responding to the recommendations made in the s42A Report: Part B – Objectives and the recommendations set out in that report.

Qualifications and Experience

- 1.5 While at Land Matters I have prepared submissions for a number of landowners on statutory planning documents (such as Greater Wellington Regional Council’s Proposed Natural Resources Plan and Kāpiti Coast District Council’s Proposed District Plan). I have also prepared submissions for landowners affected by the Board of Inquiry for the McKays to Peka Peka expressway.

Predominantly I am involved in preparing and representing landowners seeking resource consents and private plan changes/structure plans from both local authorities and regional councils. I represent clients throughout the Wellington Region but also from the Manawatu and Auckland regions. I have been involved in the structure planning for the Ministry of Defence in Wellington (Shelley Bay) and Auckland (Hobsonville Point). The consents I have been involved in include construction of new apartment buildings, land use consents for commercial activities, tourism operations, construction of new roads, subdivision applications and forest harvesting applications to name a few.

- 1.6 Prior to working at Land Matters I was a consultant resource management advisor. In that role I provided planning policy advice to Kāpiti Coast District Council on previous plan changes, Porirua City Council on their Water Strategy and Rural Review, Greater Wellington Regional Council on their regional bylaws and I was contracted to Ministry for the Environment on the Land and

Water Forum for a period of eight months. I have also held positions at the Department of Conservation as a community advisor programme manager, at Local Government New Zealand in their environmental policy team, and as a policy planner and resource consents planner at Kāpiti Coast District Council.

- 1.7 I obtained a Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning degree majoring in Ecology from Massey University in 1997. I have been a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and since 1999.

Scope of Evidence

- 1.8 This evidence relates to the submissions made on the PDP where they relate to Objectives 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11 and 2.16.
- 1.9 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2011 and agree to comply with it. The evidence provided is within my area of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that may invalidate or detract from the opinions expressed.
- 1.10 My evidence considers the Submitters submission points with specific regard to the regulatory framework.

2.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

- 2.1 In general the Submitters **oppose** the inclusion of the explanations sitting underneath the Objectives. I understand that the SEV looked to delete the explanations for policies and consider that the explanations for the objectives should also be deleted. They provide additional information which at times can be helpful, but more often than not, as practitioners, we find that they result in uncertainty particularly if terms are ill-defined or when the explanations have not been given the same rigor of review that the objectives have been given.
- 2.2 Notwithstanding the above, the explanations have been reviewed and in some instances changes have been sought. However, the preference is that the explanations be deleted in their entirety.

3.0 RELEVANT OBJECTIVES

Objective 2.2 – Ecology and Biodiversity

- 3.1 The proposed wording of Objective 2.2 as set out in the SEV and amended by the S.42A report is as follows:

“To improve indigenous biodiversity and ecological resilience through: ~~the~~

- a) ~~protection of~~ protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;*

- b) ~~encouraging restoration of the ecological integrity of important degraded environments and habitats indigenous ecosystems [and recognising its importance¹];~~
- c) ~~enhancement of enhancing the health of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; and~~
- d) ~~enhancement of enhancing the mauri of waterbodies”~~

3.2 The Submitters support the rewording of Objective 2.2 up until the end of clause (a) on the basis that it aligns with the provisions of the Act and the relevant provisions of the Regional Policy Statement which is to “protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity values..”

However in acknowledging clause (a) I would like to argue that “protection of areas” is not just meant to be about legal protection via rules or covenants or reserve status. Protection of land can come in the form of non-regulatory methods such as fencing out stock, wild pest plant and pest animal control etc.

I also challenge the statement made in the explanation in paragraph 9 of the s.42A report which states, “while significant areas in the District are already in public ownership and legally protected (i.e. Tararua Forest Park and Queen Elizabeth Park); outside these areas many remaining areas of remnant indigenous forest and wetlands have no legal protection...” That simply isn’t true. The Operative District Plan has contained rules for some years now that protect - endemic native trees over a certain height and circumference; larger areas of native bush in the rural zone; riparian areas and wetlands. Land vested as reserve or covenanted are not the only areas that have legal protection. In any event legal protection does little to protect the ecological integrity of a site on its own. It is active management that is the key to making biodiversity gains.

3.3 The Submitters oppose the original tenant of Objective 2.2 clause (b) which sought to create “priority areas for restoration” on the basis that there was no legislative framework within which to protect such areas outside of those identified under clause (a).

We are concerned that paragraph eight remains in the explanation when that was specifically written with the tenant of protecting ‘priority areas for restoration.’ **This paragraph should be deleted.** Furthermore it alienates rural landowners by making the claim that the “main threats to indigenous forest are clearance for residential living, pasture, exotic forestry and development, stock grazing and plant and animal infestation.” I discuss this in more detail below.

3.4 The Submitters sought that more balance be applied to Objective 2.2 by providing for ‘appropriate subdivision and land use and development’ where that land use achieves Objective 2.2(a). This has not been addressed in the s42A report even though it states that it would. The specific reference was that “possible recommended changes to the policy within this report may achieve the balanced approach sought by Submitters².” I am not sure whether the author is referring specifically to “policies” of the PDP or whether she is referencing a ‘policy approach’ in the adoption of the objective. I have not seen the wording for the proposed policies as that

¹ The parenthesis “[]” indicates information recommended to be added or deleted under the S42A report recommendations

² S42A Report – Chapter 2. Paragraph 150

section 42A report has not come out yet to confirm whether more balance has been provided there. However nor have I seen how the revised changes to Objective 2.2 have addressed this matter of providing more balance.

It appears that the author has adopted an contrary approach to the Submitters with the introduction of a new paragraph nine in the explanation under Objective 2.2, which states:

“...Pressures from subdivision, land use and development activities mean it is important to protect the remaining area of significant indigenous flora and fauna on a long term sustainable basis....”

Paragraph nine highlights the thinking behind the revised wording of Objective 2.2 which is that subdivision, land use and development is the main cause of declining biodiversity. I am unaware of the source for this claim and as far as I understand the Council have not undertaken State of the Environment (SoE) monitoring into the causes of biodiversity decline and instead are reliant on the Regional Council SoE monitoring which has a particular focus on water quality.

Having been involved in the national working party on the National Policy Statement on Biodiversity when I worked for local government; and having worked with landowners on the ground as a Community Relations Programme Manager; and even earlier having developed Kāpiti Coast District Council’s own ‘Non-Regulatory Framework for Biodiversity Management’ I am very aware that one of the most significant pressures on declining biodiversity is the lack of active management and in particular pest animal and pest plant management and the priority for turning this dismal record around is to work positively with landowners to improve biodiversity outcomes.

According to Project Kaka, a major restoration project run by the Department of Conservation in the Tararua Ranges which compares large areas of the forest park without active management and large areas with active management, the main reason for decline in biodiversity values is the lack of active pest (animal) management.

It is through the non-regulatory approaches that KCDC has adopted such as the rates relief, the heritage fund, the provision of advice from the Council’s biodiversity officer and the reciprocal agreements like the one that KCDC has with Greater Wellington Regional Council (GW) and Queen Elizabeth II Trust to contribute one quarter towards fencing and surveying costs with landowners, where we are actually seeing biodiversity gains on the Kāpiti Coast. This is not reflected at all in objective 2.2.

Furthermore, it is with sensitive design and comprehensive management through land uses where statutory bodies are working with landowners to achieve significant biodiversity gains. Examples include the Expressway, structure planned communities such as Waikanae North and Jonathan Smith’s Ngarara Development and well planned subdivisions such as Waterstone.

Why is it that practitioners are reluctant to acknowledge in statutory documents that biodiversity gains are best achieved through working with landowners? For many years biodiversity officers and DoC rangers have known that you need to work alongside landowners to obtain the real results on the ground. Statutory bodies can not halt declining biodiversity through restrictive measures alone.

We are seeking that Objective 2.2 clause (b) and (c) be amended as follows:

- “b) encouraging active management that restores the ecological integrity of indigenous ecosystems;***
- c) Supporting landowners to enhance the health of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.”***

3.5 The Submitters **oppose the current wording of Objective 2.2 (c)** in that they are seeking to *enhance* terrestrial and aquatic systems across all areas whether they are significant or not. Instead we propose a new wording as set out above which instead introduces a non-compulsory element of “supporting landowners to enhance the health of those ecosystems.” This encourages statutory bodies, iwi and landowners alike to work together on enhancing the biodiversity values of all ecosystems not just those that need protection because of their significant values. This is more effective long term at improving biodiversity gains.

3.6 The Submitters **oppose clause (d) of Objective 2.2 as it is not a function for which the District Council has responsibility**. Paragraph 12 of the explanation even acknowledges this, where it states that, *“maintaining and enhancing ecosystems in waterbodies is a Regional Council function, the District Council is responsible for managing land use which ultimately affects water quantity and quality.* Clauses (a), (b) and (c) of Objective 2.2 should be sufficient to give effect to the provisions under the sections 6, 7 and 8 of the RMA in terms of enhancing the mauri of waterbodies.

4.0 OBJECTIVE 2.5 – NATURAL HAZARDS

4.1 Some of the Submitters opposed Objective 2.5 on the basis that the policies and rules did not adequately assess the risk to people and property. We consider the issue raised in the submissions is best addressed during the Chapter 9 hearings on Natural Hazards as recommended by the author of the s.42A report.

5.0 OBJECTIVE 2.6 RURAL PRODUCTIVITY

5.1 The wording of this objective as set out in the SEV and reworded by the recommendations of the S42A report is as follows:

“To sustain the ~~primary~~ productive potential of land in the District, including:

- a) retaining ~~highly versatile soils and specialised soils for~~ land which is suitable for a range of productive activities;*
- b) achieving added economic and social value derived from primary production ~~activity~~ activities through on-site ancillary processing and marketing;*

- c) *achieving priority importance of activities that utilise the productive potential of land in the rural environment; and*
- d) *avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the efficient operation of existing primary production activities from sensitive activities establishing on adjoining sites.*

While ensuring, that natural systems and processes are protected [safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems by] avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

5.2 Submitters opposed Objective 2.6 on the basis that it does not allow for people in the rural community to fairly choose how they use land. More often than not the per hectare price of land will determine the productivity of it, or not. The closer a district is to a city the higher the price of land. The higher the price of land the greater the need for that land to be more productive as is the case on the Kapiti Coast's rural land. Either rural land is used intensively for high productivity or, as is more often the case, purchased for the life-style. It is not likely to be both.

Kāpiti Coast District Council and in particular the Proposed District Plan should be more realistic about its expectation of rural land on the Kāpiti Coast. We are a peri-urban area where rural land values are high and increasing. Demand for rural lifestyles are also increasing. The use of rural lifestyle blocks may not achieve "*priority importance of activities that utilise the productive potential of land...*"

This Objective should be about acknowledging and supporting land use in the rural zone/environment as farmers and landowners see fit within in the ambit of environmental legislation. It is all very well to acknowledge the District's unique physical and geographic characteristics but to then state in a District Plan that certain areas provide "*excellent growing conditions for specialised crops including grapes and olives...*" is almost making up stories in the hope that farmers adopt the idea and start growing grapes and olives. I don't know of any productive vineyards or olive groves in the north of the District.

Some of the statements made in the explanation regarding globalisation of the world's food supply are also concerning. In paragraph 4 of the explanation it makes the claim that, "*globalisation has also resulted in the world's food supply (including transport) moving away from a local supply/consumption model, to a system based on economic efficiencies, often at the expense of higher energy consumption...*" We all know that Fonterra is a global co-operative that relies on its farmer shareholders to supply its milk solids. It hasn't moved away from a local supply model at all.

The explanation and therefore Objective 2.6 seems to heading in the direction of being 'anti-globalisation', anti-rural lifestyle blocks while at the same time being "pro" the local food movement when none should be disregarded. All should be considered acceptable systems if that is what a farmer/landowners decides to become involved in. While the local food movement is great for small businesses and those rural providers who are involved, globalisation should not be the anti-focus of a District Plan. Globalisation and/or specialisation are simply systems based on efficiencies. The statement noted above that globalisation is "at the expense of higher energy consumption" may not even be relevant if without globalisation we were not able to feed the population of the world.

- 5.3 Secondly Objective 2.6 takes a policy direction that primary productivity should not be afforded priority within the rural zone. This is because of the decision to apply an “environmental bottomline” approach as opposed to an “overall judgement” approach. This is indicative by the use of the words, “safeguarding life supporting capacity of air, water soil and ecosystems...”

Whereas an ‘overall judgement’ approach, which is what our submitters are seeking, allows a policy direction where the ‘avoidance of adverse effects’ is one of a number of relevant factors to be considered.

There are other objectives that are required to adopt an “environmental bottomline” policy approach, such as in the coastal environment and in respect of significant indigenous biodiversity values. These objectives will still remain relevant to land use in the rural zone, and that it is beyond the legislative framework requirements to apply such a punitive policy to all rural land use as proposed under Objective 2.6.

- 5.4 The focus of Objective 2.6 should be on the “productive potential of land and other natural resources” It should also be broader and acknowledge the use of all natural resources in primary production (e.g. sunlight, wind, wood, water, metal, plants and animals etc).

We are seeking Objective 2.6 be rewritten as follows:

“To sustain the productive potential of land natural resources in the District, including through:

- a) ~~retaining land which is suitable for a range of primary production activities enabling a wide range of primary production activities~~***
- b) ~~Supporting achieving~~ added economic and social value from primary production activities through ancillary on-site processing and marketing;***
- c) ~~Achieving priority importance of activities that utilise the productive potential of the land in the rural environment; and~~***

c) ~~_____~~ 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.~~”

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the explanation should be deleted as they have no basis in a District Plan.

6.0 OBJECTIVE 2.9 – LANDSCAPES

- 6.1 With the changes made to this objective as recommended by the s42A report, most of the concerns the Submitters had, have been addressed. The Submitters acknowledge that protecting the outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development is a requirement the District Council has under section 6 of the RMA.
- 6.2 However, the Submitters and in particular Bellcamp Company Trust Ltd, Lutz Brothers Ltd, the Mansell Family, and Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc are **opposed to the inclusion of Special**

Amenity Landscapes (“SALs”) in any form in the PDP on the basis that they can not form part of the regulatory framework in the manner that the PDP has identified them. The Regional Policy Statement requires that they be provided for where those landscapes are highly valued and widely recognised by the community.

- 6.3 There are limited submissions from the wider community asking for inclusion of the Special Amenity Landscapes and Council has not successfully shown how these landscapes are “highly valued” and “widely recognised” by the community. Furthermore, many of the SAL’s were originally identified for a different purpose (being outstanding natural landscapes) and were simply re-labelled without any on-site assessment of them against the recommended criteria.

Council’s consultant landscape architects were not given a brief to consider whether the Special Amenity Landscapes they were identifying were ‘widely recognised’ by the community. Brad Combes of Isthmus Consultants during the pre-hearing meeting into low land coastal landscapes acknowledged this. The minutes record that, *“Brad Coombs noted that the 2012 Isthmus report recorded that the absence of community input **was not ideal** and that the report had been a technical assessment only.”*

- 6.4 The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment’s report “Managing Change in Paradise: sustainable Development in Per-Urban Areas” (2001) noted that, *“the High Court [in Arrigato] rightly emphasised the importance of policy statements and plans as legal documents [in terms of assessing landscapes], this places even greater obligations on local authorities to make sure these documents adequately reflect the community values and aspirations for the area. In order to do this, there is a need for a higher-level and longer-term visioning process [i.e. Council’s Long Term Council Community Planning Process]. This would set the framework for planning documents to enable communities to manage the expansion of human habitation consistent with that vision (pg16).”*

Yet the minutes of the pre-hearing meeting record that the consultation that was undertaken was patchy across the District, *“the Council team acknowledges that following notification of the PDP there has been greater consultation with hill country versus lowlands and coastal landowners.”* Even Department of Conservation staff at the pre-hearing meeting couldn’t confirm whether they agreed with the policy approach taken by the SEV for all of the areas they have statutory responsibility for. The minutes record that, *“Department of Conservation officers advised that it would need to consider the implications for SALs within the Coastal Environment when that line is fixed, as to whether it supported or opposed Council’s approach to SALs.”*

- 6.5 The author of the s42A report has noted that the issue of SALs will be considered at the Chapter 3 hearing and therefore she has not made a recommendation for or against them. Paragraph 449 of the s42A report notes that, *“there are a number of submissions seeking the removal of the SALs from the PDP maps and provisions which will be considered in the section 42A report for Chapter 3 – Natural Environment.”* The author goes on in paragraph 459 that, *“the submissions be accepted in part insofar as the objective should be amended to include “by avoiding, remedying or mitigating inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The section 42A report for the Natural Environment will also consider the inclusion of Special Amenity Landscapes.”*

6.6 This matter will be raised again at the hearings into Chapter 3 – Natural Environment and we will be seeking that SAL’s be **deleted from the PDP across the District and should not be referenced in Objective 2.9**. This is on the basis that there has been a distinct lack of broad community consultation and support for the SALs. There is also an acknowledgement from Council’s consultant landscape architects that their brief did not include a consideration of community values which is one of the criteria specified in the Regional Policy Statement. The PDP has therefore not met the criteria set out in the Regional Policy Statement for including SALs.

6.7 For the record the Submitters seek the wording of Objective 2.9 be amended as follows:

“To protect the District’s identified outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. ~~And maintain the landscape values of special amenity landscapes.~~

7.0 OBJECTIVE 2.11 - CHARACTER AND AMENITY VALUES

7.1 Objective 2.11 seeks to:

“To maintain and enhance the unique character of the District’s distinct communities so that residents and visitors enjoy:

- a) relaxed, unique and distinct village identities and predominantly low-density residential areas characterized by the presence of mature vegetation, a variety of built forms, the retention of landforms and unique community identities;*
- b) vibrant, lively town centres supported by higher density residential and mixed use areas;*
- c) neighbourhood centres, village communities and employment areas characterized by high levels of amenity, accessibility and convenience;*
- d) productive rural areas, characterized by openness, infrequent buildings, natural landforms, areas and corridors of indigenous vegetation, and primary production activities; and*
- e) well-managed interfaces between different types of land use environment (e.g. between living, working and rural areas) and between potentially conflicting land uses, to minimize adverse effects.”*

7.2 Section 7(c) of the RMA requires all persons exercising functions and powers under it to have “regard” to the “maintenance and enhancement of amenity values.” While the Submitters **opposed** Objective 2.11 the expectation was that Council had an obligation to give effect to its section 7 duties but that the PDP’s objective 2.11 focused on “protection” instead of “maintenance and enhancement” which went beyond the legislative framework.

Although the amended version of Objective 2.11 as recommended by the s42A report goes some way to address the Submitters concerns, there are still outstanding issues in the way that rural amenity is interpreted. In particular the use of the words, “*productive rural areas characterised by ... infrequent buildings...*” indicates that buildings in the rural zone cannot be clustered together as they frequently are.

The “infrequent buildings” is superfluous in this objective and that by referencing, “*openness, natural landforms, natural areas and corridors of indigenous vegetation and primary production*

activities” the objective acknowledges there will be less built form in the rural environment.

By including the term “infrequent buildings” there is the potential that the construction of buildings located close together which may be necessary for primary production activities may end up being contrary to this objective.

7.3 Clause (d) also refers to the rural environment being characterized by ‘*corridors of indigenous vegetation.*’ Again this is like the PDP writing a story in the hope that the rural environment will become like the environment it is describing when in fact most of the shelter belts in the rural zone are exotic species. There are very few corridors of indigenous vegetation – they typically occur along riparian margins and which are often out of sight of the general public. The use of the word “indigenous” should not be included in this context.

7.4 Clause (d) seems to be unbalanced in its description of rural activities. It describes open space which would be referring to pasture areas, it describes corridors of indigenous vegetation but it doesn’t describe production forestry for which there are large areas on the Coast; nor does it describe the many farmlets and rural lifestyle blocks which are often characterised by shelter belts and buildings clustered close together. Clause (d) needs to be more reflective of the rural community.

7.5 Clause (e), which seeks to manage the interfaces between different types of land use, conflicts with Objective 2.6 clause (e) which seeks to avoid sensitive activities being located close to an established primary production activity. What effects is clause (e) trying to minimize? The clause is applicable to such a wide range of areas and potential conflicting activities that it has become ineffective and unclear in its meaning. Instead, if required the clause should be included in those objectives that refer to living, rural and working areas (provision has already been made in Objectives 2.6(e) and Objective 2.16(e)). Clause (e) is superfluous to this Objective and should be deleted.

7.6 The Objective 2.11 should be reworded as follows:

“To maintain and enhance the unique character of the District’s distinct communities so that residents and visitors enjoy:

- a) ...***
- b)***
- c)***
- d) Productive rural areas, characterized by openness; ~~infrequent buildings~~ natural landforms and waterbodies areas; corridors and blocks of indigenous vegetation both exotic and indigenous, including shelter belts and production forests; and primary production activities.***
- e) ~~Well managed interfaces between different types of land use environment (e.g. between living, working and rural areas and between potentially conflicting land uses to minimize effects)~~***

7.7 The explanatory notes do not do justice to describing the rural communities of the Kāpiti Coast. Paragraph 13 identifies the major challenge for the District is in “*protecting this rural character*”

from pressures for urban expansion and rural lifestyle living.” I find this statement disturbing in that it seeks to “protect” against growth in the rural zone when this is not a statutory function under section 7(c) of the Act. Nor does it acknowledge the reason for the pressure for urban expansion is simply a response to a lack of available and suitably zoned urban land and/or rural residential land.

It is the purpose of the PDP to provide sufficient urban and rural residential land to meet the on-going needs for the region (not just for the Kāpiti Coast). This Objective in the District Plan needs to be flexible enough to allow for that growth while maintaining and enhancing amenity values. Those amenity values should be realistic enough to recognise that the primary growth in the rural zone is from rural lifestylers. Buildings located close together, shelterbelts, small forestry blocks and rural cottage industry typify those lifestyle blocks.

For the larger landholding, buildings will often be found located close together – along a road for instance or on a flat terrace. The presence or otherwise of buildings is not indicative of a rural area.

The explanatory note if it is to be kept should provide sufficient detail so as to describe the many and varied rural areas within the Kāpiti Coast. The explanation should not be a ‘wish list’ of a utopian rural paradise but accurately reflect its purpose and use.

8.0 OBJECTIVE 2.16 - ECONOMIC VITALITY

- 8.1 The Submitters opposed Objective 2.16 in its current form on the basis that it focuses mainly on urban opportunities at the expense of the rural environment. This issue has been fully addressed by the amended wording as put forward in the s42A report. We support the proposed wording of Objective 2.16 as recommended in the s42A report.

END E noho rā