

BEFORE Kapiti Coast District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

And

In the matter of Proposed Kapiti Coast District Plan
Chapter 6 Working Environment

Date 29 August 2016

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY PAUL DENTON ON BEHALF OF THE SUBMISSION MADE BY GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Introduction

My name is Paul Anthony Denton. I am employed by the Wellington Regional Council as a senior policy advisor. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Science from the University of Canterbury and Master of Environmental Studies from the University of Melbourne. I have been employed in planning roles in central government and local government for over 20 years. I have been employed by Wellington Regional Council as a policy adviser since 2000, in regional plan implementation and regional plan development.

I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert in resource management planning are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, and where my evidence relies on evidence provided by others this is expressly referenced.

1. Scope of evidence and Greater Wellington Regional Council's submission

- 1.1 The following evidence relates to submissions from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) made on 01 March and 02 April, 2013 on the Proposed Kāpiti Coast District Plan (PDP).
- 1.2 GWRC's submission assessed the PDP for consistency with the then proposed but now operative Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (2013)

(the RPS). The assessment focussed on how the PDP fits within the regional policy framework for the management of the coastal environment and whether the framework has been adequately addressed through the PDP process.

1.3 The purpose of this evidence is to provide responses to the recommendations in the Officer's Report and to highlight outstanding areas of concern.

1.4 My evidence today will:

- (a) outline the policy and strategic context of this evidence,
- (b) summarise GWRC's submission,
- (c) respond to the Officer's Report recommendations on the matters covered in GWRC's submission, and
- (d) request decisions on the PDP.

2. Policy and strategic context

2.1 The RPS is a regional document that identifies significant resource management issues within the region and sets out the objectives, policies, and methods to achieve the integrated management of natural and physical resources for the Wellington region.

2.2 The RPS sets out objectives and policies that provide local authorities with direction and guidance on resource management issues that must be given effect to when making changes to district and regional plans (in accordance with section 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA)) (policies 1-34). The RPS also provides direction on policies that must be considered as part of resource consent application (policies 35-60).

2.3 GWRC is particularly interested in how the PDP will support and contribute to achieving the integrated management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region.

2.4 The RPS was made operative on 24 April 2013.

3. Summary of submission

3.1 GWRC made submissions largely in support of the provisions in Chapter 6 – Working Environment of the PDP, with minor amendments.

4. Response to the Officer's report recommendations

4.1 Policy 6.2, 6.18. and 6.20

4.2 GWRC supported these policies in the PDP. The policies aim to ensure a suitable supply of industrial land, well connected to transport networks and with appropriate provision to provide for commercial and industrial developments while maintaining the integrity of regional and sub-regional centres and aligns with the policy direction in the RPS. The need to provide

adequate industry/commercial land has been further highlighted in discussions around the proposed NPS for Urban development capacity.

4.3 The S42A report notes the support for these policies but recommends that the submission point can only be accepted in part as there are changes recommended to be made to the policies. Clauses (e) and (f) are deleted from policy 6.2 and Policy 6.18 is deleted to avoid duplication and improve clarity of interpretation as the matters are dealt with in other chapters.

4.4 I accept the argument that the intent of the PDP in these matters has not been changed by these deletions and therefore accept the proposed changes to the policies.

4.5 Policy 6.27 and 6.28

4.6 GWRC supported these two policies in the PDP and this support is accepted in the S42A report and the further submission against are rejected.

4.7 I support the recommendation and ask that the recommendation be accepted.

4.8 6.1.2 District Centre Zones and Standards

4.9 GWRC considered that the permitted activity standard for the ‘discharge of airborne contaminants’ should include ‘smoke’ along with dust and offensive and objectionable odour to be consistent with the RPS.

4.10 I note that the submission has been accepted in the S42A report and the permitted activity standard in 6A.1.3 now reads

4.11 ‘The activity shall not cause offensive or objectionable odour, dust or smoke at or beyond the boundary of the property on which it is occurring.’

4.12 I support the recommended rewording of the standard and ask that the changes be accepted.

4.13 Storm water management

4.13.1 GWRC sought that ‘storm water management’ be included as a matter of control or discretion for subdivision activities that are either controlled or restricted discretionary activities.

4.13.2 I note that subdivision and development in the zones in Chapter 6 must also meet the relevant rules/standards in other chapters – and this includes the rules/standards related to storm water management in Chapter 11. The Kapiti Coast District Council Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012 (Principles and Requirements) consider storm water and are already a matter of control or discretion in that chapter.

4.13.3 The S42A report has added explanatory text to highlight the requirements to consider the district wide rules and standards and recommends that the GWRC submission is therefore accepted in part.

4.13.4 I accept this recommendation and ask that the changes be accepted in the decision version.

5. Decisions requested

5.1.1 I request that KCDC notes GWRC's support where it is given for the recommendations related to Chapter 6 – Working Environment.

5.1.2 I ask that the amendments sought by GWRC as outlined in this evidence are accepted and included in the decision.

Paul Denton

August 2016