

MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, FAIRLIE, ON WEDNESDAY 26 MARCH 2008 AT 9.00 AM

PRESENT:

Mayor John O'Neill (Chairman)	
Dave Pullen	Pukaki Ward
Leon O'Sullivan	Pukaki Ward
Evan Williams	Opuha Ward
Graham Smith	Opuha Ward (from 1.37 pm)
Graeme Page	Opuha Ward

IN ATTENDANCE:

Glen Innes (Chief Executive Officer)
 Craig Lyon (Manager – Planning and Regulations)
 Bernie Haar (Asset Manager) for parts of the meeting
 Sarah Bevin (Planning Officer)
 Rosemary Moran (Committee Clerk)

I APOLOGIES:

Resolved that apologies be received from Cr McDermott for his absence and from Cr Smith for lateness.

Evan Williams /D Pullen

Resolved that a meeting of the Hearing Panel be convened.

Evan Williams/Leon O'Sullivan

III REPORTS:

1. RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION RM060102, SUBDIVIDE RS32380, CLAYTON ROAD, FAIRLIE, THREE BEARS RUNNING LTD:

This report from the Consents and Policy Planner was accompanied by the proposed subdivision plan, the consent decision issued on 23 January 2008 and the notification of objection received from the applicant on 15 February 2008.

Resolved that the report be received.

Evan Williams/Dave Pullen

The Mayor welcomed Sue Hanham and Bruce Spiers who appeared for Three Bears Running Ltd, and Graham McDermott, a partner in the company. He outlined the process for the hearing and advised that the panel would make a site visit before making a decision.

Bruce Spiers presented his evidence which is attached to this record as Appendix A.

Cr Page:

Will the accessway ever become part of the Mackenzie District Council roading network?

Bruce Spiers:

If, in the future, the Mackenzie District Council and the affected parties deem it to be desirable – it is designed in such a way that it could be made public road.

Chief Executive Officer

The District Plan talks about matters that Mackenzie District Council has control over with regard to property access and talks about the standard of construction required, other than as required by Rule 7 b; those things would seem to me to give the Council the authority that you are disputing in your objection.

Sue Hanham

Our understanding is when the Plan refers to access it is access from a public road to an allotment. Our allotments have that access from private land being Access Lot 14, not Clayton or Monument Roads.

Cr Pullen

Shouldn't every one of the lots have part of Lot 14 in the titles?

Bruce Spiers

Each of the 13 lots has a 1/13th share in Lot 14.

Dave Pullen

What would happen in the future if Council decides to take over the private road?
What happens to the titles?

Bruce Spiers

I would suggest it would be taken over only when it is formed to your standards. All the titles would have to be changed to cancel the 1/13th portion – it would be a minor issue.

The Asset Manager

Commonly owned access lots seem to be a cheap, soft option to avoid surveyors having to put in individual strips. The Rights of Way legislation sorts out who owns what, but commonly owned accessways are becoming more widespread.

The applicant has agreed to the accessway being 15m wide which is the minimum width required in District Plan subdivision rules for a public road. So that triggers us into thinking this is the direction the applicant is moving, for the Council to be able to consider taking it over.

We have consistently required sealed frontages for rural residential lifestyle blocks. Why would we require Monument Road to be sealed as a dust mitigation measure and then allow Access Lot 14 to remain unsealed? It is 480 metres long - not a short track - and it has three straights ranging from 100 to 150 m metres in length. There is neither traffic control nor the ability manage traffic in terms of the law. There is no ability to keep speed down to a manageable level. It will undoubtedly become, regardless of any signs, a *rat run* and people will find out it is a short cut.

We are trying to make it safe for people to live on this commonly owned access lot and to safely get out onto Monument or Clayton Roads. There is no real way to stop other people from using it.

I am also concerned that we could end up with a narrow, potentially high speed traffic environment close to Lake Opuha which could be used by cyclists and walkers. That mix, along with vehicles towing boats, would be made worse by it being unsealed. We are not asking for a footpath but seeking to achieve a safe rural road that drains water properly. This is the time to make it work – not necessarily for the applicant but for the people who will live there in the future.

Cr Pullen

How is the road going to be maintained under private ownership?

Bruce Spiers

The parties would all sign up to an agreement, form a committee to gather levies and undertake maintenance.

The Mayor

Have you any concerns over dust?

Bruce Spiers

There will be dust but not large volumes. If Monument Road is sealed but the accessway is gravel the locals will probably not use it as a short cut when there are sealed roads round the triangle. We have proposed some traffic calming measures in terms of access lot 14 such as at entrances to gateways.

The Mayor

What are our liabilities in terms of traffic control on a private road?

Asset Manager

Council has no liability at all. However the nature of an event would dictate the outcome of traffic accidents, for example all traffic fatalities are investigated as if they are murders. I would strongly urge the applicant be very wary of minimising the standards that they want in that regard.

Bruce Spiers

The applicant is not raising objections to the proposed conditions so that standards can be minimised. Rather the point is that it is not Council's function to dictate the standards. If Council didn't require it to be sealed it is possible that it would be sealed because that might be the most cost effective thing to do.

The Chief Executive Officer reiterated that the applicant's argument in that respect was hard to accept given that control over accessways other than roads was clearly contemplated in the District Plan.

Cr Page

Would the owners of Lot 14 have the ability to exclude the public?

Bruce Spiers

Yes – by the use of gates, trespass notices etc.

The Mayor referred to the issue of fire fighting and Mr Spiers said that the conditions recommended in the Officer's report were accepted.

With regard to the objection to charges from the Asset Management Department for approval of engineering plans, the Asset Manager explained that the Council had to recover the costs of his involvement in any application.

Cr Page referred to the issue of fencing and the Manager – Planning and Regulations explained that it was felt the matter of solid fences should be addressed by way of a consent notice rather than as part of a covenant.

Mr Speirs said that the control was envisaged in terms of boundary fencing. He said there could be small areas within a lot where solid fencing was required, for example around a swimming pool.

The Manager – Planning and Regulations referred to the issue of telecommunications and noted that there was to be a presentation on the subject later in the meeting. He suggested that the Panel defer decisions on the objections until it had heard that presentation and visited the site.

The Mayor thanked the visitors who left the meeting at 10.17 am.

The hearing was adjourned at 10.17 am.

Resolved that the Planning Committee meeting be reconvened.

Leon O'Sullivan/Graeme Page

II MINUTES:

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 19 February 2008 including such parts as were taken with the public excluded be confirmed and adopted as the correct record of the meeting.

Evan Williams/Graeme Page

LATE ITEM:

LETTER FROM CHAPMAN TRIP:

Resolved that pursuant to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 the letter from Chapman Trip dated 25 March 2008 be considered.

Dave Pullen/Evan Williams

The reason the report was not included on the Agenda because it was not available in time. Consideration of the letter at this meeting is required to make the Planning Committee aware of the withdrawal of an application for resource consent RM070090.

The Mayor noted that Chapman Tripp acting for Coldwater Developments Ltd had advised that their clients had withdrawn the application for resource consent for the redevelopment and expansion of the Lake Tekapo Village Centre.

III REPORTS:

5. COLOUR PALETTES VS REFLECTIVITY VALUES:

This report from the Manager – Planning and Regulations advised Council of the positive and negative aspects of reflectivity values vs a colour palette. The report was accompanied by a Rural Building Appearance report from Landscape Architect Tina Batisite.

Resolved that the report be received.

Graeme Page/Leon O'Sullivan

The Manager – Planning and Regulations passed round examples of a colour palette and reflectivity values and reminded the members that recommendations regarding reflectivity values had been included in proposed Plan Change 13.

He suggested that the adoption of conditions relating to reflectivity would provide more robust guidance for applicants than colour palette guidelines which tended to be more restrictive.

In response to a concern about pressure on staff resources to administer reflectivity values issues, the Manager – Planning and Regulations advised that once staff had been trained the process would be straightforward.

The Mayor suggested that a decision to progress the issue be deferred to a future time.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.36 am for morning tea.

The Hearing Panel then visited the site of the Three Bears Running resource consent application.

The meeting was reconvened at 12.02 pm.

III REPORTS:

4. TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES:

The Manager – Planning and Regulations introduced Chris O'Connell, Vice Chair of the Telecommunications Users Association of New Zealand.

Mr O'Connell provided a presentation which included information on the background and history of telecommunications in New Zealand, Technologies, Trends and Strategies, Other Places, the Role of Local Government and Options.

At the end of his presentation when asked for his recommendations on a way forward, Mr O'Connell suggested that the Council:

- map the current telecommunications assets in the District (Telecom, Telstra, Meridian)
- Identify the area currently covered (by Telecom Farmside etc)

- Identify the main centres of high demand, e g schools, fire stations etc, and the areas across which Council required easier and cheaper services
- Convene a meeting and tell people what is available.

He recommended that:

- the issue be kept to the fore
- that contact be established with neighbours such as Ashburton, Timaru, Alpine Energy.
- if sufficient interest was generated it would be useful to contact Network Tasman which had 'been there and done that'.
- Keep talking to TUANZ

The meeting was adjourned at 1.05 pm for lunch and reconvened at 1.38 pm.

IX PUBLIC EXCLUDED:

Resolved that the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

1. RC Application RM060102, Three Bears Running Ltd

<u>General subject of each matter to be considered</u>	<u>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</u>	<u>Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</u>
RM 060102 Three Bears Running Ltd	The Right of Appeal Lies to the Tribunal	48(1)(d) That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings to which this paragraph applies.

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows: *Resource Consent Application RM 060102 Three Bears Running Ltd, section 48(2)(a) (i) A right of appeal lies to any Court or tribunal against the final decision of the local authority in these proceedings.*

Evan Williams/Graeme Page

The Panel continued in Open Meeting.

CONFIRMATION OF DECISION TAKEN WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED:

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION RM060102, SUBDIVIDE RS32380, CLAYTON ROAD, FAIRLIE, THREE BEARS RUNNING LTD:

Resolved that the following decision taken with the Public Excluded be confirmed:

That the objection relating to Condition (c) be rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (c) **The 166 metre length of Monument Road with which the development has frontage shall be sealed to a width of 5.6 metres and the appropriate advisory signs installed at the consent holder's expense, to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager, prior to the issue of a completion certificate under Section 224 of the Resource Management Act 1991.**

Reasons:

The Hearing Panel considered this condition necessary to mitigate the dust nuisance along the road frontage of Monument Road. The Hearing Panel undertook a site visit as part of the deliberations, during which time two vehicles travelled along Monument Road and the extent of the resulting dust nuisance was made apparent. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to seal the 166 metre frontage of Monument Road to ensure this dust nuisance is mitigated. This will also ensure a safe and efficient entrance and egress onto this road for vehicles.

2. The objection relating to Condition (d) is accepted in part and the condition amended as follows:

- (d) **The carriageway of access Lot 14 shall be formed and sealed to a minimum width of 5.6 metres for its entire length, excluding curves, where widening to an appropriate width to the Asset Manager's satisfaction is required.**

Reasons:

The Hearing Panel considered that the traffic movements along this access Lot 14 would be considerable and this warranted a sealed carriageway. The District Plan Subdivision Matters Council has control over are listed in Section 12 Rule 3. The Council has control over the standard of 'construction required for property access, other than as required by Rule 7.b'. Rule 7.b relates to new roading resulting from subdivisions. As the allotments created by this subdivision are all accessed from Lot 14, an access Lot, the Council is able to impose conditions on the standard of this access. During the hearing Section 106 (1) (c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 was brought to the attention of the hearing panel. The Section provides for Council to refuse subdivision consent in certain circumstances, including in instances where 'sufficient provision has not been made for legal and physical access to each allotment to be created by the subdivision'. Therefore it is appropriate to retain this condition in its entirety in order to ensure the safety and efficient functioning of this access Lot.

In addition, the Panel discussed the width required for both the access Lot 14 carriageway and the Monument Road carriageway. It was considered inconsistent to require a 6.5 metre width on access Lot 14, while requiring 5.6 metres on a public road. No decision on this minor consistency issue was made as part of the deliberations, however Council staff have assessed this matter further and consider reducing the access Lot 14 carriageway width to 5.6 metres is appropriate. The Hearing Panel members have been consulted in this matter and agree to this alteration.

3. The objection relating to Condition (e) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (e) **Traffic calming measures shall be installed on Lot 14 to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager so as to ensure traffic moving along this Lot travels at a speed no greater than 50 km/hr.**

Reasons:

As with the objection to condition (d), the Hearing Panel considered that the movements along the access Lot 14 would be considerable and therefore it was important to ensure the safety of both motorists and pedestrians moving along this Lot. The Hearing Panel considered the design of the subdivision itself, having access from both Clayton and Monument Roads, resulted in the possibility that non-residents may also utilise this access Lot as a short-cut. In addition, Council is not able to impose a speed restriction on this Lot, therefore the installation of traffic calming measures is an appropriate method of reducing traffic speeds along this Lot.

- 4. The objection relating to Condition (f) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:**

- (f) **Culvert construction and water tabling on access Lot 14 shall be to the Asset Manager's satisfaction.**

Reasons:

To ensure efficient functioning of Lot 14, including stormwater management, requires the appropriate culvert and water tabling installations. The Panel considered that requiring the construction of these to the Asset Manager's satisfaction ensured these facilities are constructed to the correct standard, in accordance with the contours of the Lot.

- 5. The objection relating to Condition (g) is accepted in part and the condition amended as follows:**

- (g) **The formed and sealed carriageway on access Lot 14 shall be marked with a centre line at the curves, to be installed and remarked annually at the consent holder's expense, to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager.**

Reasons:

The Panel considered it appropriate to mark the curved areas of the carriageway with a centreline as the marking will improve traffic safety on the Lot, and will complement the widening required at these curved sections. The Panel considered the straight sections of the carriageway had sufficient visibility and a centreline in these areas was not required.

- 6. The objection relating to Condition (h) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:**

- (h) **The entrance points on Clayton Road and Monument Road shall be a compulsory "Stop" point and the appropriate signage and markings shall be installed and maintained at the consent holder's expense, to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager.**

Reasons:

The Panel considered the installation of 'stop' signs at the entrance points on Clayton and Monument Roads as appropriate as this is another mechanism to ensure access Lot 14 is safe and functions efficiently. Council does not have control over the landscaping or building on the lots that have road frontage, and it is possible that development on these lots will result in obscured visibility at the intersections with access Lot 14 and Clayton and Monument Roads. Visibility in this environment is required to be a minimum of 150 metres at a point nine metres back from the carriageway.

7. The objection relating to Condition (i) is accepted in part, with an additional condition inserted and Condition (i) amended as follows:

- (i) The accessways to Lots 1, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 13 shall have a formed width of at least 4.0 metres and shall be constructed to comply with the Transportation rules and Standards of the District Plan and to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager, in particular sealing requirements, sight distances, culvert construction and water tabling, prior to the issue of a completion certificate under Section 224 of the Resource Management Act 1991.**
- (j) The accessway to this Lot shall have a formed width of at least 4.0 metres and shall be constructed to comply with the Transportation rules and Standards of the District Plan and to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager, in particular sealing requirements, sight distances, culvert construction and water tabling, prior to the commencement of building development on the Lot.**

This condition shall be the subject of a consent notice on the titles of Lots 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12 pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Note: Please note the addition of the above consent condition will require original conditions (j) - (ah) to be renumbered to (k) - (ai).

Reasons:

The Panel considered it appropriate that the accessways to Lots 1, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 13 be formed prior to approval pursuant to Section 224 of the Resource Management Act, due to the winding nature of access Lot 14 along the frontages of these Lots. This will ensure that the accessways to these Lots are positioned with appropriate regard to sight distance requirements in respect of these curved areas of access Lot 14. The remaining allotments will obtain access to Lot 14 along a straight section of this road and given the length of road frontage (between 60 and 84 metres length), it is appropriate to allow future allotment owners to decide the location of the accessway.

8. The objection relating to Condition (m) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (m) At the time a dwelling/building is erected on the Lot, domestic water and fire fighting storage is to be provided. A minimum of 20,000 litres shall be maintained at all times as a static fire fighting reserve within a 30,000 litre tank. Alternatively, an 11,000 litre fire fighting reserve is to be provided for each dwelling in association with a domestic sprinkler system installed to an approved standard. A fire fighting connection in accordance with Appendix B - SNZ PAS 4509:2003 is to be located**

within 90 metres of any proposed building on the site. Where pressure at the connection point/coupling is less than 100kPa (a suction source - see Appendix B, SNZ PAS 4509:2003 section B2), a 100mm Suction Coupling (Female) complying with NZS 4505, is to be provided. Where pressure at the connection point/coupling is greater than 100kPa (a flooded source - see Appendix B, SNZ PAS 4509:2003 section B3), a 70mm Instantaneous Coupling (Female) complying with NZS 4505, is to be provided. Flooded and suction sources must be capable of providing a flow rate of 25 litres/sec at the connection point/coupling. The reserve capacities and flow rates stipulated above are relevant only for single family dwellings. In the event that the proposed dwellings provide for more than single family occupation then the consent holder should consult with the NZFS as larger capacities and flow rates may be required.

The Fire Service connection point/coupling must be located so that it is not compromised in the event of a fire.

The connection point/coupling shall have a hardstand area adjacent to it that is suitable for parking a fire service appliance. The hardstand area shall be located in the centre of a clear working space with a minimum width of 4.5 metres. Pavements or roadways providing access to the hardstand area must have a minimum formed width as required by the Mackenzie District Plan Transportation rules and standards for rural roads. The roadway shall be trafficable in all weathers and be capable of withstanding a laden weight of up to 25 tonnes with an axle load of 8.2 tonnes or have a load bearing capacity of no less than the public roadway serving the property, whichever is the lower. Access shall be maintained at all times to the hardstand area.

Underground tanks or tanks that are partially buried (provided the top of the tank is no more than 1 metre above ground) may be accessed by an opening in the top of the tank whereby couplings are not required. A hardstand area adjacent to the tank is required in order to allow a fire service appliance to park on it and access to the hardstand area must be provided as above.

Fire fighting water supply may be provided by means other than the above if the written approval of the New Zealand Fire Service is obtained for the proposed method.

The fire fighting water supply tank and/or the sprinkler system shall be installed prior to the occupation of the building.

This condition shall be the subject of a consent notice on the title of Lots 1-13 pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Reasons:

The objection to this consent condition was withdrawn at the Hearing.

9. The objection relating to Condition (p) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (p) The consent holder shall supply to the Council, prior to the issuing of the Section 224 certificate, either a certificate of compliance or a resource consent providing for the discharge of stormwater to ground from roofs and hardstand areas within Lots 1 - 13.

Reasons:

The Panel considered it appropriate that this condition be retained as no written confirmation from Environment Canterbury had been provided by the applicant with regards to the compliance or otherwise of stormwater disposal for this development. This development is subject to the Regional Council's requirements relating to discharge and it is appropriate to ensure compliance prior to the issue of a Section 224 certificate.

10. The objection relating to Condition (q) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (q) Lots 1 - 13 shall each be provided with the ability to connect to a telecommunications and electrical supply network at the boundary of the net area of the allotment.**

Reasons:

The Panel recognises that alternative telecommunications technologies are developing; however the technology remains secondary to physical 'landline' technology. No detail of the standard of alternative telephone servicing available in the subdivision location was supplied as part of the original application or the objection information. The Council has consulted with TUANZ in regards technological developments in this area. TUANZ consider that in a modern society fibre optic facilities are the appropriate option, and any alternative supplies should be essentially viewed as a 'last resort'.

11. The objection relating to Condition (u) is rejected and the condition remains as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (u) The minimum floor level for any habitable residential building to be erected on the Lot shall be 150mm above flood waters with a 0.2% probability of occurring in any one year (i.e. a 500 year return period flood).**

This condition shall be the subject of a consent notice on the titles of Lots 1-13 pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Reasons:

This is a standard condition imposed on all allotments created on land located within an area recognised as being at risk of flooding. This condition requires the provision of a site specific flood hazard assessment report prior to the commencement of building work on the allotments. The report supplied as part of the subdivision application is generalised across the development site and does not provide information on the particular floor height requirements for each allotment created. The Panel considered this condition was appropriate in accordance with the recognised flood hazard present across the development site.

12. The objection relating to Condition (v) is accepted in part and the condition amended as follows:

- (v) The swale shall be clearly identified on a plan to be submitted to Council for approval pursuant to Section 223 of the Resource Management Act 1991.**

Reasons:

The Panel noted the applicants comments regarding the restrictions of the Landonline drawing programme used to draw up survey plans. It is accepted that a supplementary plan, attached to the survey plan, which shows the extent of the swale on the site, is acceptable.

13. The objection relating to Condition (z) is accepted and the condition amended as follows (as suggested by the applicant):

- (z) **Buildings erected on the Lot shall consist of a single level dwelling and usual appurtenances for the occupation of one family unit. There shall be no further subdivision by any means – either in fee-simple, under the Unit Titles Act, or by way of cross-lease or other similar device unless the land is rezoned to specifically allow for more intensive subdivision or development.**

This condition shall be the subject of a consent notice on the title of Lots 1-13 pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Reasons:

This condition was originally proposed by the applicant as a covenant on the resulting titles. The Council consulted with the applicant prior to issuing the decision and it was agreed to impose this design control as a consent notice and not as a covenant. The Panel considered the addition of “*unless the land is rezoned to specifically allow for more intensive subdivision or development*” provided flexibility in regards any possible future zoning of this site.

14. The objection relating to Condition (ac) is accepted and the condition amended as follows:

- (ac) **There shall be no boundary fence or boundary screen erected on the Lot of corrugated iron, metal sheeting or timber palings.**

This condition shall be the subject of a consent notice on the title of Lots 1-13 pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Reasons:

This condition was originally proposed by the applicant as a covenant on the resulting titles. The Council consulted with the applicant prior to issuing the decision and it was agreed to impose this design control as a consent notice and not as a covenant. The Panel considered that clarifying the consent notice to refer specifically to boundary fencing only, was appropriate.

15. The objections relating to Condition (ad), (ae), (af) and (ag) are rejected and the conditions remain as written on the original consent granted 23 January 2008 as follows:

- (ad) That prior to seeking survey plan approval, the consent holder shall submit engineering plans and specifications of all construction and layout details of the right of way and all servicing for approval by the Asset Manager.**
- (ae) The Mackenzie District Council engineering department shall review and approve the engineering drawings, specifications and calculations prior to any physical works commencing. An engineering fee of the greater of:**
 - \$200 or
 - 2% (including GST) of the estimated value of the physical works**is payable when the plans and specifications are submitted for approval.**
- (af) When the authorised Council officer is satisfied that the design meets the engineering requirements the applicant will be notified that the design has been approved. The engineering plans, specifications and other documents shall be endorsed accordingly.**
- (ag) Work shall not commence on site unless resource consent has been issued and engineering design has been approved.**

Reasons:

These conditions are placed on the consent to ensure any physical works carried out as part of the subdivision, are constructed and completed to the satisfaction of the Asset Manager, and the conditions allow for recovery of the Asset Manager's costs in assessing the work on the site. With regard to this subdivision consent, the conditions relate to the works required by the roading and access and servicing conditions of this consent, which require assessment by the Asset Manager. The Panel considered it appropriate to retain these conditions in full to ensure the works required as part of the development were carried out to the required standard.

Evan Williams Dave Pullen

The meeting of the Planning Committee was reconvened.

III REPORTS (Continued):

3. REQUEST FOR A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR A SIGN TO BE ERECTED ADJACENT TO LAKE PUKAKI, TO BE HEARD BY AN INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER SIR EDMOND HILLARY CENTRE:

This report from the Manager – Planning and Regulations referred to a request for the resource consent application for a sign to be erected adjacent to Lake Pukaki, to be heard by an Independent Commissioner.

The report was accompanied by an email from the applicant dated 19 March 2008 and a copy of Section X *Making Good Decisions*.

Resolved that the report be received.

Leon O'Sullivan /Evan Williams

Resolved that the Council delegates its power to an Independent Commissioner, pursuant to Section 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991, to hear the application from Aoraki Mt Cook Alpine Village Limited for resource consent for a sign to be erected adjacent to Lake Pukaki.

Leon O'Sullivan /Evan Williams

Cr Pullen voted against the motion.

6. HARD STAND AREAS:

This report from the Manager – Planning and Regulations provided information on a suggested Plan Change to increase the coverage of hard stand areas in the residential areas of the Mackenzie District.

Resolved that the report be received.

Dave Pullen/Graeme Page

Resolved that a draft plan change dealing with hard stand areas and an accompanying Section 32 report be prepared for consideration at the Council meeting on 15 April 2008.

Dave Pullen/Leon O'Sullivan

LATE ITEM:

Resolved that pursuant to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the report from Patricia Harte of Davie Lovell Smith dated 25 March 2008 be considered.

Dave Pullen/Evan Williams

The reason the report was not included on the Agenda because it was not available in time. Consideration of the report at this meeting is required to enable concerns regarding the impacts of the provisions of Plan Change 13 on land in and around Twizel to be considered.

TWIZEL AND PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 13:

The Committee considered the report from Patricia Harte.

Resolved:

1. That the report be received.
2. That a timetable for the completion of the Twizel rezoning project be prepared and presented to the Council for approval.

Graham Smith /Graeme Page

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE
MAYOR DECLARED THE MEETING CLOSED
AT 3.30 PM**

CHAIRMAN:

DATE: _____