

PROPOSED KAPITI COAST DISTRICT PLAN

CHAPTER 7- RURAL ENVIRONMENT

Date: Thursday 25th July, 2013

Venue: Nikau Meeting Room, Council Offices, Rimu Road, Paraparaumu

Topic: **Rural Environment**

Present: Emily Thomson: KCDC
Bryce Holmes: Land Matters Ltd (#411)
Stuart Pritchard: Individual (#604)
Barry Mansell: Individual (#380, FS059)
Tim Mansell: Individual (#380, FS059)

ISSUES DISCUSSED

- Concern that the PDP rules are generally focussed on stopping things from happening. The Council should want to create opportunities, including providing employment for people to give people a future.

2. Forestry

- Concern that the rules are restrictive for forestry and this is a problem as Forestry can supply fuel for homes, which can assist with enabling off grid housing.
- Concern about the ability to undertake replanting of trees after harvesting. Concern that there seems to be implications for a large harvest. Response that there are effects as a result of harvesting which are best assessed prior to planting. These include erosion and sediment effects, as well as traffic effects and the suitability of roads.
- Concern that the PDP does not acknowledge that when a forest is harvested there will be a mess, but the effects are temporary and a necessary part of a productive activity. Seek that there be certainty for “permitted activities” related to harvesting in the rules. Seek that the Proposed District Plan includes an explicit non notification clause for forestry harvesting which requires resource consent.

3. Subdivisions

- Concern that the proposed rules do not enable a cluster of 5 or more homes that can run efficiently (potentially off grid) with materials and resources they are using. Response; Incentives concept, bio diversity, etc in energy efficiency rule.

- Concern about the requirement for 10% of priority areas for restoration to be planted as part of subdivision.
- Concern that it is unclear what the differences are between the rural zones. Response: that the difference generally relates to the amount of subdivision that you can undertake in that area.
- Concern at uncertainty of subdivision rules, controlled activity versus restricted discretionary activity. Response: that subdivision was made a restricted discretionary activity because most subdivisions once applied for in rural areas were discretionary under the operative plan and this approach would be clearer for everyone.
- Concern about how the rules work for properties which have 2 or more zones on them. Response: that the primary difference between rural zones is in the subdivision density. Being in multiple zones should not cause any consent category changes.
- Concern that the PDP rules are not consistent with the resource consent conditions for subdivisions in Anlaby Way and Tasman Lakes and the PDP would seem to require further resource consents for development on these properties which was intended to be covered by the resource consent conditions. Seek that the rules take account of existing consent notices on title which already address matters such as building sites, curtilage, access and servicing, vegetation removal etc.

4. River Corridor

- Submitter concerned that Council has shown parts of the River Corridor weaving in and out of land that they own next to Otaki River and this affects any subdivision of that land. Who defines the river corridor area? Response that the Regional Council provided this information.

5. Dominant Ridgelines

- Seek built form to a maximum of 4.5 metres above the top of dominant ridgelines. Response that it is 3 metres as it currently stands in the operative District Plan so unlikely to be increased to 4.5m. Can look at other ways to achieve this e.g. rooflines, earthworks etc. can revise to be clear that it is desirable for a house to drop down the hill even if that involves more earthworks.
- Seek ease of use of plan and definitions / explanatory such as “dominant”.
- Site Specific Ridgeline changes are sought Response to email these requests to Council for consideration and the maps will then be amended if required. Where a specific ridgeline has been referred to in a submission they will be inspected by a Council Officer.

Action Points

Action Point 1: Consider looking at using the forestry “Code of Practice” at rule level. Key items to check; how earthworks (skid sites) and traffic issues are to be managed.

Action Point 3: Consider amending rules relating to development near dominant ridgelines back to 3 metres as it currently stands in the operative District Plan.

Action Point 5: In regard to ridgelines, submitters to email their “site specific” request to Council and the maps will be amended if required.

Signatures: