

MINUTES

TITLE: Environment and Planning Subcommittee
DATE: Monday, 21 March 2005
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond.

PRESENT: Cr T B King (Chair), Crs E E Henry and E J Wilkins.

IN ATTENDANCE: Manager, Consents (J S Hodson), Development Engineer (D Ley), Administration Officer (B D Moore).

1. SANDY BAY PROPERTY LTD, KAITERITERI-SANDY BAY ROAD – APPLICATION No. RM040727

1.1 Proposal

The applicant sought consent to subdivide two existing titles NL 124/28 and NL 124/249, totalling 1.7882 hectares into five rural-residential allotments ranging in size from 1,965 square metres to 7,365 square metres. The applicant also sought to construct a 4 metre right-of-way with an average grade of 1:25 and to undertake the minimum amount of earthworks required to form the right-of-way and building platforms.

1.2 Late Submissions

Following questions to late submitter, Mrs R Jones, and the applicant's counsel, Ms C Owen, the Chairman directed that the late submissions would be accepted.

1.3 Presentation of Application

Ms C Owen presented opening submissions on behalf of the applicant. She described the sites as located on the seaward edge of the Kaiteriteri-Sandy Bay Road, past Kaiteriteri. The site does not have sea frontage but the nearest coast location is Ngaio Bay. She referred the hearing panel to Annex E provided with the application, which illustrated the local context and visual catchment.

The site is generally facing north, with a varied topography due to a series of gullies separating the land into one main spur and two smaller spurs. The streams and the gullies come together at the bottom of the gully below the adjacent road and flow into Ngaio Farm. At present the land is a steep, vegetation-covered allotment in two titles, containing mature pine trees and these trees cause seasonal icing on the road. The public road surrounds the site except for the boundary of Ngaio Tree Farms Ltd. Reticulated services are available within the adjoining road reserve and sewerage reticulation is available at the top of Sandy Bay Road.

Stormwater disposal problems in the past have caused this road to erode and slip. It will be necessary to remove mature pine trees from the site and this will cause some land disturbance. The right-of-way is proposed to be formed to 4 metres instead of 4.5 metres. The Council has completed recent road works in the vicinity of the site and the applicant is confident that adequate sight distance can be achieved for both entranceways proposed for the subdivision.

Mr K Mason, joint owner of the subject site, read a statement of evidence. He said that he is an architect and he provided illustrations of examples of dwellings that would be appropriate for this subdivision. Mr Mason said he wished to create five generously sized lots sitting among regenerating native plants and bush carefully contained and managed by limited building platforms. He said that the proposed conditions of consent and covenants will ensure that the proposed development will enhance the amenity of the area.

Mr R Wells, civil and structural engineer, read a statement of evidence in relation to development engineering matters, particularly site access, stormwater servicing, sewage effluent disposal and water supply. He said that there are only two practical access points to the property and the main accessway will be formed as a right-of-way. He referred to the plan tabled at the meeting and described the extent of cut and fill required for the right-of-way formation. He spoke about the importance of providing a reliable system of stormwater run-off and disposal. Mr Wells said that this was necessary to protect the erodible nature of the Separation Point Granite soils and a private water supply installation some distance downstream from this property.

It was proposed that the construction of private accesses be left to future owners to give some flexibility with the design and location of their private driveways to the covenanted building sites. The evidence listed some provisions for the control of stormwater run-off and measures to avoid contamination of the watercourse. A private pump station would be provided and maintained for the purpose of effluent disposal to the existing public sewer in Sandy Bay Road to Council's specifications.

Mr P C Denton, an engineering geologist, read a statement of evidence on the geotechnical issues related to the proposed development. His report had been provided with the application and he sought that the controls outlined within that report be adhered to, particularly minimising earthworks, appropriate design and construction of the roadside cuts and fills and special care with the removal of the pines and other vegetation. He said that the proposed building sites had been identified as described in the initial report. Some test cutting had been carried out to identify soil types and that the proposed building sites are on the more stable high ground and that the gullies had been avoided for building purposes.

Mr T F Carter, landscape architect, read a statement of evidence and referred to the proposed conditions of consent and landscape control mechanisms (including covenants) proposed to be applied as mitigation measures.

Mr M A Lile, resource management consultant, read a statement of evidence and described the extent of consultation which had been carried out in relation to the application. Mr Lile discussed the actual or potential environmental effects of the proposal. He advised that a parking platform was proposed for Lot 3. He said that the issue of cross-boundary on the boundary adjacent to the Ngaio Tree Farms property could be dealt with by use of a rural emanations easement. He said that the development of a comprehensive landscape plan is a proposed condition of consent. He said that the package of methods proposed have been carefully designed to achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Mr Lile did not agree with the staff recommendation to delete Lot 3 from the subdivision scheme plan.

1.4 Presentation of Submissions

Mr B Harvey spoke to his original written submission, saying that he sought only two building sites and titles. He wanted to restrict road access and improve and control drainage from the land. He suggested that all roading work be carried out at once and that tree felling should be done very carefully. Mr Harvey said that a maximum building height of 6.5 metres should be applied and not an average of 6.5 metres. Mr Harvey said that a programme for revegetation and regrowth should require a timeline to be applied. He spoke of his concerns about residents having to maintain the proposed sewerage scheme and referred to historical washouts of the road. He said that development work should be restricted seasonally and by hours, as the subject site is a natural amphitheatre. Mr Harvey conceded that a total of four lots would be the absolute minimum number acceptable to him. He said that kerb and channel should be formed on the southern side boundary of the subject site adjacent to the road and provided at the applicant's expense.

The submission from Ngaio Tree Farms Ltd was spoken to by Mr C Baigent. He said that Ngaio Tree Farms is the owner of land adjoining the subject site and that the rural emanations easement should apply to the entire common boundary and include both Lots 1 and 5. He said that the quality of the water supply on the Ngaio Tree Farms land needs to be preserved and that the applicant should provide adequate warning systems and holding tanks to avoid sediment contamination. He said that the land quality in this locality is poor and ground cover is necessary to avoid future land disturbance and contamination of groundwater.

Ms R A Jones was concerned that a grant of consent to this application could set a pattern for further future subdivision. She said that her main concern was the potential for contamination of the water supply, especially once the trees have gone from the subject site. She spoke about the instability of the road which occurs in storms and the occurrence of numerous slips. She was concerned about the potential for flooding of the private access road to Ngaio Bay.

1.5 Staff Reports

The Chairman noted the absence of the reporting Consent Planner, Mr M Morris.

The Development Engineer, Mr D Ley, spoke to his memorandum of 9 March 2005 contained within the agenda. He advised that Mr Morris express concern about the visual effects of a potential dwelling on proposed Lot 3. Mr Ley said that the applicant had not described how access to the public sewer system will occur. He was concerned about the potential for odour control, storage, maintenance contracts and the design of the proposed sewer system. Mr Ley said that silt traps would be needed within the stormwater control system and sought that the boundaries between lots not occur in the centreline of a creek. He suggested a restriction against further subdivision of the subject site and sought that all earthworks be done together, including the formation of driveways.

1.6 Right of Reply

Ms Owen responded on behalf of the applicant and addressed the matters of concern raised during the hearing. She said that the proposed conditions of consent were generally accepted by the applicant. However, Ms Owen said that there should not be a time lag between formation of access and building because of the risk of sedimentation of waterways occurring. She said that the applicant could relocate the boundary adjacent to the creek to suit Council requirements.

Ms Owen assured the hearing panel that expert input will provide the level of detail to avoid engineering problems. She said that although potentially affected landowners were consulted, the property owners east of the Ngaio Bay access road were not consulted. She agreed that proposed Lot 1 should also have a rural emanations easement.

Ms Owen said that work on site should not be limited or restricted to wintertime, as this is not an appropriate season for earthworks in this land type. She reminded the Subcommittee that the application has a permitted baseline of two lots.

1.7 Further Staff Report

Cr King directed that a written response would be sought from Consent Planner, Mr M Morris, especially regarding any potential change of attitude concerning proposed Lot 3 and the reply would be circulated to all parties.

Cr King adjourned the hearing at 2.45 pm.

Moved Crs King / Henry EP05/03/36

THAT the public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Sandy Bay Property Ltd

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to the matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

Subject	Reasons	Grounds
Sandy Bay Property Ltd	Consideration of a planning application.	A right of appeal lies to the Environment Court against the final decision of Council.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs Henry / King
EP05/03/37**

THAT for the purposes of discussing the application of Sandy Bay Property Ltd as an "In Committee" item, the Manager Consents be authorised to be in attendance as advisor.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs King / Henry
EP05/03/38**

THAT the public meeting be resumed and that the business transacted during the time the public was excluded adopted and that the following resolutions be confirmed in open meeting.

CARRIED

**2. SANDY BAY PROPERTY LTD, KAITERITERI-SANDY BAY ROAD – APPLICATION
No. RM040727**

**Moved Crs King / Henry
EP05/03/39**

THAT pursuant to Section 104B, 220 and 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Council grants consent to Sandy Bay Properties Ltd to subdivide NL 124/248 and NL 124/249 into five rural residential allotments with areas between 1965 m² and 7365 m² in area.

The consent is subject to the following conditions and granted for the following reasons.

CONDITIONS – SUBDIVISION:

1. Amended Plan.

The application plan shall be amended to ensure the creek is contained within the Proposed Lot 2 and 3 rather than the boundary being in the middle of the creek.

2. Development Impact Levies

The following development impact levy payments are to be made on three allotments in accordance with Section 16.5.2 and 16.5.5 of the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan.

Calculation of Development Impact Levy Payment (all GST inclusive)

Reserves and Community Services

A reserves and community services levy equivalent to 5.5% of the assessed market value of each of the three lots shall be payable. The valuation shall be based on the value of a 2,500 square metre notional building site within each lot. The valuation shall be by way of a special valuation undertaken by a registered valuer at the applicant's request and cost. The applicant is requested to forward a copy of the consent plan to the registered valuer when the valuation is requested. This valuation is to be forwarded to the Tasman District Council for calculation of the reserve fund contribution.

ADVICE NOTE

Council will not issue the Section 224(c) certificate in relation to this subdivision until all development contributions have been paid in accordance with Council's Development Contribution Policy under the Local Government Act 2002.

The Development Contributions Policy is found in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) and the amount to be paid will be in accordance with the requirements which are the amount to be paid and will be in accordance with the requirements that are current at the time the relevant development contribution is paid in full.

This consent will attract a development contribution on three allotments in respect of roading, wastewater and water.

3. Landscaping

A comprehensive landscaping plan is to be prepared by a suitably qualified consultant and submitted to Council for approval for prior to any works commencing on site. This landscaping plan is to provide for the long term protection of natural values on and adjoining the site, including existing wetland areas. The plan shall address the following matters:

- a) Monitoring, where necessary, control of willow, Japanese honeysuckle, jasmine, ginger, banana passionfruit, pampas grass, grey wattle and monbretia.
- b) Retention of the 5 to 10 metres wide buffer strip of existing stream side vegetation along the length of the stream.
- c) Establishment of native vegetation over all cut and fill batters and soil disposal areas and native revegetation of modified building platforms following house construction.
- d) A list of appropriate plant species native to the Kaiteriteri area that will be used in any plantings carried out.
- e) A management plan detailing how the pines will be removed from the site, and any environmental mitigation measures to ensure that the pines can be removed without adverse effects on the environment.

The landscaping plan shall including the revegetation plan for the area between the road reserve and the building sites, so as to provide at least a 10 metre wide vegetative buffer between the road and the building sites. It will also include the revegetation of the cuts and batters created as a result of the access works

The landscaping plans shall include details of mulching and soil preparation to ensure the long term survival of the plantings.

The landscape plan shall be in accordance with the David Sissons Landscape report dated 4 March 2004 and submitted with the application.

The landscaping plan shall be fully completed and plantings completed prior to signing of the Section 224 (c) certificate except as provided for below. This shall be confirmed in writing from a suitable qualified landscaping professional.

Note that if the landscaping in the area between the proposed building site for lot 3 and the building platform is not completed prior to Section 224, a bond pursuant to Section 222 may be acceptable to ensure the landscaping is completed after the building of the dwelling is completed.

4. Rights-of-Way

The rights-of-way A and B shall each have a minimum legal width of 6 metres and a minimum formation width of 4 metres.

The rights-of-way shall be constructed with kerb and channel on one side and concrete edge restraint on the other side, with adequate provision for drainage. This generally shall include sumps and sump connections to the stormwater system. The maximum gradient of the right-of way shall be 1:5.

Culverts shall be required at the gully crossings which shall be constructed in accordance with Tasman District Engineering Standards while also allowing for fish passage and not adversely affecting wetland values.

The right-of-way road intersection shall be constructed in accordance with Tasman District Engineering standards, with sight distances to the satisfaction of the Engineering Manager. Further off-site works may be required to improve sight distances.

Two mirrors to assist drivers turning right into the ROW and access to proposed Lot 3 shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Manager.

5. Accesses

A 3 metre wide sealed access shall be provided to each of the building sites (except Lot 3) with hard surfaced water tables to deal with storm water. The surface is to be sealed with a two-coat bitumen chip seal (Grade 4 bitumen chip seal and Grade 6 locking coat). The maximum gradient of the access shall be 1:5.

6. Sewer

Full sewer reticulation discharging to Council's gravity reticulated system via a sewage pump station shall be installed complete with any necessary manholes and a connection to each building site. This may include work outside the subdivision to connect to or upgrade existing systems and includes odour control systems, storage, maintenance contracts etc. The precise design of the connection to Council system shall be shown on the engineering plans to Council's approval.

7. Stormwater

Full stormwater reticulation shall be provided in accordance with Tasman District Engineering Standards with a stormwater connection provided to each building site.

A comprehensive stormwater management plan shall be provided from a suitably experienced engineer, detailing all stormwater flows on the site, including discharge from the six road culverts, discharge from the right-of-way formation and discharge from access to each of the building sites.

The stormwater management plan shall also outline the sediment mitigation measures in each of the gullies that have stormwater drainage. These measures shall be in place prior to the commencement of earthworks or any tree clearance.

The existing kerbing that adjoins Lot 4 shall be extended along past the frontage of Lot 3 so that it discharges into the creek between Lots 1 and 3. This is to provide a secondary flow path for the road drainage to ensure that is directed well away from the potential building sites.

The stormwater reticulation system to be designed with adequate mitigation measures in place so that all stormwater discharge from this subdivision complies with the permitted activity status for stormwater discharge under Section 36.4.2 of the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan and does not adversely affect downstream properties particularly in regard to sedimentation effects.

The final design of the stormwater reticulation and disposal system shall be to the satisfaction of the Tasman District Council Engineering Manager.

8. Telephone and Power

Live telephone and power connections shall be provided to the building site on each lot and all wiring shall be underground as per the requirements of Tasman District Council.

Confirmation of the above from the line operator and a copy of the certificate of compliance will be required prior to the release of the Section 224 Certificate.

9. Water

A water supply connection shall be provided to each building site and a Tasman District Council approved water meter shall be installed at the Toby for each lot. The water meter shall be either a Socam or Kent MSM Qn 1.5 Class C. The location and details of each meter must be recorded on the Tasman District Council's standard Water Meter Location form and submitted to the Tasman District Council for approval.

10. Engineering Plans

Engineering plans detailing all services and earthworks complete with calculations for roading and culvert design, and numbering, sanitary sewage and stormwater flows, the stormwater disposal report and all other works required under Conditions 2-9, are required to be submitted for approval prior to the commencement of any works. All engineering details are to be in accordance with the Council's Engineering Standards. All necessary fees for plan approval shall be payable.

A separate engineering plan for the parking platform for Lot 3 as proposed in the application shall be submitted for the approval of the Engineering Manager.

As-built plans detailing roading, water, sewerage and stormwater including exact locations of pipes, laterals, connections etc. complete with depths of sewer and stormwater connections shall be provided.

A sediment management plan shall be provided together with the engineering plans detailing management of earthworks during the construction phase and management of run-off in accordance with the land use consent for earthworks.

The Section 223 title plan shall not be submitted until the engineering plans have been approved by the Engineering Manager, so that easement areas can be accurately determined.

11. Commencement of Works and Inspection

The Engineering Department shall be contacted two working days prior to any engineering works. In addition, two working days notice shall be given to the Engineering Department Inspectors when soil density testing, pressure testing, beam testing or any other major testing is undertaken.

No works shall commence on-site (including preliminary earthworks) until the engineering plans as required under Condition 10 of this consent, have been approved by the Tasman District Engineering Manager.

12. Engineering Supervision

All work shall be constructed in strict accordance with the Council's Engineering Standards and are to be to the Engineering Manager's satisfaction.

The applicant shall engage a suitably qualified consultant (Registered Surveyor/Engineer) for advice and to supervise/test construction of the work. The completion certification pursuant to Section 224 of the Resource Management Act 1991 shall not be released by the Tasman District Council until a Certificate of Supervision signed by the Consultant is provided and all necessary fees have been paid.

13. Engineering Certification

- a) At the completion of works, a suitably experienced registered engineer or surveyor shall provide Council with written certification that the works have been constructed to the standards required.
- b) Certification that the building site identified on each new lot is suitable for the erection of a residential building shall be submitted from a registered engineer or geotechnical engineer experienced in the field of soils engineering (and more particularly land slope and foundation stability). The certificate shall define on each lot the area suitable for the erection of residential buildings.

- c) Where fill material has been placed on any part of the site, a certificate shall be provided by a suitably experienced Registered Engineer, certifying that the filling has been placed and compacted in accordance with NZS 4431:1989.

Any recommended conditions shall be incorporated into consent notices to be registered on the respective titles pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The consent notices will be prepared by the applicant and sent to Council for signing and approval.

14. Easements/Building sites/Covenant areas

Easements are to be created over any services located outside the boundaries of the lots that they serve as easements-in-gross to the Tasman District Council for Council reticulated services or appurtenant to the appropriate allotment.

Note that no easement is required for the sewer lines and pumping station which are not to be vested in Council.

The 10 m x 15 m building sites shall be accurately determined by survey and shown on the Section 223 plan.

The covenanted bush and wetland areas shall also be shown on the Section 223 plan.

A "rural emanations" easement shall be created pertaining to Lot 1 and 5 in favour of the adjoining land containing pine trees owned by Ngaio Tree Farms Ltd.

15. Consent Notices

The following consent notices are to be prepared by the applicant and submitted to Council for approval:

- a) All buildings on the lots shall within the specified building sites as shown on DP (to be allocated).

Dispensation of no more than 2 metres outside the specified building sites may be allowed subject to conformation from a suitably qualified geotechnical engineer in regard to foundation stability.

- b) The maximum building coverage of all buildings on each lot shall no more than 200 square metres per lot.

- c) All building shall be no higher than 6.5 metres on average above natural ground level.

- d) Those lots containing wetland areas shall have protective covenant imposed protecting the wetlands.

- e) The area of land outside the building sites shall be managed to retain the predominant cover of native vegetation.

- f) That prior to the construction of any dwelling, a sediment management plan be provided showing silt control measures to prevent any sediment entering a water course and the revegetation of any exposed batters.

- g) Any earthworks shall be limited to the earthworks associated with construction of buildings on the specified building site.
- h) The conditions in Appendix G of the application, that are not covered above.
- i) Any recommended conditions relating to the engineering reports under Condition 13 of the subdivision consent RM040727.
- j) The parking platform for Lot 3 shall be constructed in accordance with the approved engineering plan prior to the occupation of the dwelling on Lot 3.

DECISION - LAND USE (EARTHWORKS):

THAT pursuant to Section 104 and 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991, Council grants consent to Sandy Bay Properties Ltd to carry out earthworks in association with the subdivision approved on Lots 29 and 30 DP 5026 Certificates of Title NL 124/248 and NL 124/249.

CONDITIONS:

1. Construction Earthworks

a) Placement of Spoil

No spoil shall be placed in any watercourse, or where it may move or wash into a watercourse or onto adjoining land.

b) Discharge of Sediments During or as a Result of Construction Works

- i) All construction areas shall have adequate sedimentation mitigation or control measures to ensure that no stormwater discharge has a suspended solid level exceeding 100 grams per cubic metre of water and in compliance with the discharge standards under Section 36.2.4 of the Proposed Tasman Management Plan. A sediment management plan shall be provided at the engineering plan stage. The plan shall be to the approval of the Tasman District Engineering Manager.
- ii) All sedimentation mitigation or control measures shall be maintained by the consent holder for as long as there is a potential for sediment movement (resulting from earthworks) to affect off-site areas or natural water.
- iii) The applicant should consult with the Council's Monitoring Officer (Land Disturbance) on the most appropriate mitigation measures prior to the submission of the engineering plans for earthworks. A copy of the approved earthworks plans shall be provided to the Council's Monitoring Officer (Land Disturbance) to allow for monitoring of the earthworks. All monitoring costs shall be borne by the applicant.

c) **Supervision**

All earthworks (including stormwater control) shall be planned and supervised under the direction of a registered engineer experienced in large scale earthworks and soils engineering.

d) **Monitoring**

The applicant shall advise in writing the Council's Co-ordinator, Compliance Monitoring and provide a copy of the approved engineering plans (earthworks) prior to the commencement of any earthworks on the site. Regular monthly (or as required) inspections by the Council's monitoring officer will be carried out to check compliance with these conditions of consent. All costs of monitoring and any subsequent remedial works shall be paid for by the applicant.

e) **Archaeological Report**

If any items of archaeological or historical significance are disturbed during construction or earthworks then works shall stop immediately and an archaeological survey shall be carried out by a suitably competent person. The local tangata whenua and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust shall be consulted. Any recommended remedial/restoration works shall be complied with. All costs shall be borne by the applicant.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION (BOTH SUBDIVISION AND LANDUSE):

1. The land is zoned Rural 2 under the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan. The minimum lot size for a controlled activity subdivision is 50 hectares according to Rule 16.3.8(b), thus the application would be deemed to be a discretionary activity, as it does not comply with this rule.

The application has been considered pursuant to Part 2 and Section 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

2. It is understood that there are no references to either the zoning of the land or the relevant subdivision objectives, policies and rules of the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan and therefore in accordance with Section 19 of the Amendment Act, no weight is given to the Transitional Plan.
3. The Committee noted that the application had received nine submissions; three in support, four in opposition and two raising issues.

The concerns raised were:

- Potential adverse effects on water quality used for drinking
- Ability of forestry activities to continue on adjacent land
- Increase in illegal access over private land
- Noise and loss of amenity for businesses involved in tourism
- Instability of land
- Adverse effects on special character and amenity of the area
- Servicing of more house
- Precedent of allowing substandard Rural 2 subdivision
- Potential effects on wetlands and freshwater ecosystems

4. The Committee carefully considered these concerns. The Committee considered that the area was more of a rural residential character, with strong amenity values associated with its coastal location and that the subdivision for five lots was carefully planned and not out of character with the area. It was considered that the building site locations and the proposed landscaping were important factors in ensuring there would be a very limited impact on the amenity values of the area. The Committee endorsed the limitations put forward by the applicant in terms of height and location and finishes of dwellings plus the suite of consent notice items designed to integrate the dwellings into the natural landscape and mitigate visual and other effects. It is noted that there will be additional matters covered by private covenants.
5. The Committee notes that the applicant has offered to complete all the landscaping prior to Section 224 approval except for the area between the Lot 3 building site and the parking platform proposed for Lot 3. Instead, they are offering a bond to ensure this landscaping strip is completed after the parking platform is built, which they also wish to be after the Section 224 certificate. The Committee has considered this matter and has concluded that it is reasonable to allow this limited amount of landscaping on Lot 3 to be bonded to ensure completion after the subdivision. In addition it is considered reasonable to allow for the parking platform on Lot 3 to be constructed after the Section 224 approval provided that the engineering plans for it are approved and a consent notice on the title requires the completion of the platform as per the approved plans prior to the occupation of the dwelling on Lot 3. This provides for access for the dwelling construction which may otherwise be complicated by the platform but ensures the platform is constructed as proposed so that traffic safety issues are adequately dealt with.
6. The Committee was satisfied that the landscaping concept as described by the applicant was an important integral aspect of the success of the subdivision in amenity terms. The protection of wetland areas and the planting and on-going enhancement of native vegetation on the land was considered to be very important to ensure a high standard of environmental outcome. The Committee noted the intention to remove the existing pine trees and noted that great care would be required to ensure existing regenerating native vegetation is not destroyed. The Committee was satisfied that allowing the subdivision would not lead to any significant effects in terms of the need to protect productive land values. The Committee accepts the offer made by the applicant to impose a "rural emanations" easement on Lot 1 and 5 to protect the interests of the adjoining land owner in terms of the on-going nature of the effects from the forestry activity.
7. It was considered that the utmost care needed to be taken regarding earthworks to mitigate potential adverse effects. This is the reason why it was considered appropriate for the accesses to all the building sites (except Lot 3) to be done by the consent holder prior to the issuing of the Section 224 certificate as the control and monitoring of earthworks and associated sedimentation protection measures can be better provided for at that time compared to the time of building consents for the individual dwellings.
8. The Committee was concerned about the traffic safety issue for cars travelling north and turning right into the sites and therefore considered that two mirrors would assist with this matter.

9. The Committee did not consider that it was necessary or reasonable to limit the timing of construction works which was a suggestion made by submitters.
10. The Committee considered that the availability of services was a significant advantage in favour of granting this application, in particular the availability of wastewater reticulation is vital to avoid potential adverse effects on the water quality and stability of the land. The Committee was satisfied that the increased storm water generated from this proposal could be managed in a manner which would not have any significant adverse effects downstream, particularly given the size of the catchment and the size of the increase associated with the proposal.
11. In summary, the Committee was satisfied that the application was consistent with the policies and objectives of the Proposed Plan and was also consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and that the visual and physical effects could be effectively mitigated by the comprehensive suite of conditions.

CARRIED

Confirmed:

Chair: