

MINUTES

TITLE: Environment and Planning Subcommittee
DATE: Monday, 23 May 2005
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Masonic Lodge, Inglis Street, Motueka

PRESENT: Cr M J Higgins (Chair), Crs S G Bryant and E C Wilkins

IN ATTENDANCE: Manager Consents (J S Hodson), Planning Consultant (G Russell), Resource Scientist, Rivers and Coast (E L Verstappen), Administration Officer (B D Moore).

1. K VALENTINE, 453 MAIN ROAD, RIWAKA- APPLICATION RM040807

1.1 Proposal

The applicant sought consent to subdivide 5,627 square metres of residential land located at 453 Main Road, Riwaka. The legal description of the land is Pt Lot 4 DP 1267 (CT NL 9A/126). The applicant sought to subdivide the subject land into five fee simple allotments, with a right-of-way to provide access off State Highway 60. Consent was sought to reduce (from 25 metres) the building setback required for Lots 2, 3 and 4 between rural and residential use on the eastern boundary to 3 metres. In addition, consent was sought to reduce the minimum allotment width for Lots 2, 3 and 4 to below the 30 metres required between the Rural Zone boundary and the farthest boundary of the allotment. The proposed lot sizes are as follows:

- a) Lot 1 of 620 square metres;
- b) Lot 2 of 660 square metres;
- c) Lot 3 of 910 square metres;
- d) Lot 4 of 705 square metres;
- e) Lot 5 of 1,210 square metres.

1.2 Presentation of Application

Ms C M Owen, solicitor, represented the applicant, Mr K Valentine, at the hearing and tabled and read a submission. She said that the application is a discretionary activity but after pegging the western boundary of the site nearest Lots 1, 2 and 3 DP 1287. It is clear that Rule 16.3.3(h) can be complied with, as there will be 34 metres between the Rural Zone boundary and the farthest boundary of the allotment. The boundary of the A L Fry Ltd orchard has fruit trees within 8 metres of proposed Lot 4 but is separated by a shelter belt. The applicant sought that a rural emanations easement should be agreed to by A L Fry Ltd.

The evidence suggested that an additional five dwellings will not make the footpath along Main Road, Riwaka any more dangerous than it already is. The land is currently zoned Residential and although it may not suit neighbours to lose their semi-rural outlook, the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan has already identified that residential development is suitable use for this land. The applicant proposed to create a berm on the true left bank of the drain on the subject property, 400 millimetres below ground level and about 11 metres wide. The control on the capacity of the drain is the size of the culvert downstream under School Road. The land where the proposed building sites for Lots 2, 3 and 4 is located has been raised by the deposit of spoil and is unlikely to flood. The applicant proposed that final floor levels can be set at the standard reduced level of 8.7 metres in terms of the Council datum. At present the land is about RL 8.2 metres.

The evidence stated that the adverse effect directly arising from the proposed development is not measurable in terms of an increase in incidence or threat of flooding to neighbouring properties. Nothing about this development will increase the frequency of flooding or its depth. The land had been filled by Tasman District Council when the site was owned by a previous owner. The open drain is a natural flow path and will in times of heavy rainfall be filled with water. Ms Owen asked the hearing panel to reject the recommendation in the staff report and not reduce the number of lots, or require the drain to be realigned and a drain detention area to be created.

Civil engineer, Mr J McCartin, tabled and read evidence. He said that the proposed berm is designed to ensure that the ability on this site of the drainage system to convey overflow floodwaters emanating from well upstream is restored to the situation prior to the land being filled in 1990. The evidence included a typical cross-section of the proposed open drain and Mr McCartin explained how this would work to convey the stormwater disposal. He used aerial photographs of the 1976 flood to explain the potential effects of a heavy rain event on the subject site. He proposed that each of the five lots would have an individual soakpit for stormwater disposal. Mr McCartin recommended that the building final floor levels for each lot be set at a minimum level of RL 8.70 metres, which is 200 millimetres above the crown of the road on Main Road, Riwaka.

Resource management consultant, Ms L Gibellini read a statement of planning evidence and provided a recent aerial photograph showing the level of residential development adjacent to the subject site. She noted that the adjoining properties to the west fronting onto the State Highway comprised standard residential development and the access strip serving the subject site passes between residential properties. The site adjoins the sports fields of Riwaka School and contains an established tree-lined boundary. A larger residential property is located to the north of the site that contains a dwelling adjoining this site and the Riwaka School boundary, along with some horticultural use within two glasshouses. To the south of the site are two larger residential sites in the same ownership, containing a dwelling and fruit trees.

The access for the adjoining residential lot is currently obtained informally from the access strip serving the site subject to this application, although this access is not legally formalised. The proposed subdivision lots will connect to the existing sewer main on this site. The evidence provided an assessment of environmental effects and said that the development is of a sufficiently low density residential character and entirely reflective of expectations of a residential environment. She discussed the proposed development setbacks and concluded that the effects will be no more than minor. The evidence concluded some proposed conditions of consent.

1.3 Presentation of Submissions

Mr K Andrews spoke for the Board of Trustees of Riwaka School. Mr Andrews read the written submission of 13 October 2004 from Riwaka School Board of Trustees with the amendment to building setback being 25 metres. He also added that there was a concern about the potential effects of the proposed soakpits on the school water bore source. Mr Andrews said that about 10-15 children pass the access to this site on a daily basis.

Mr T Bradley said that his main concern was the potential for the ditch to overflow and was concerned about Lots 2 and 3 DP 1267. He was concerned about the potential for the creek edge to fall in and that laterals for the sewer line may be disturbed.

Mr M King-Turner said that he spoke for the Taylor Family Trust, M Reid, J Turnock and E Semmen. He spoke of his background experience as the former Chairman of the Motueka Water User Association and Chairman of Fruitgrowers' Association and former Co-ordinator of the 1990 Riwaka Flood Relief Committee and Flood Clean Up Co-ordinator. He spoke of his concern about the potential for flooding of the drain and that extra water would be created by run-off from the proposed development. He was concerned about the future maintenance of the proposed berm and suggested that Council take over the mowing and maintenance of this berm area. He said rocks should be removed from the ditch, especially those near the culvert, which could cause blockages and flooding. He said that a drain had been filled in on the boundary of proposed Lot 4 near the Semmen orchard and that ponding occurs on that orchard site. He spoke about the potential effects of the traffic using the driveway causing noise and danger to the public and said the visibility on the south side was poor.

Mr King-Turner said that the proposed access drive should be a road vested in Council and be formed to appropriate public road standards. He said that the proposed subdivision should be only a three lot subdivision, with public road access. He said the Taylor Family Trust is concerned about erosion of the bank of the drain, as the drain floods in major rain events. Mr King-Turner said that the efficiency of the drain is affected by the amount of flow down the Little Sydney Stream and the high water-table in winter.

Mr T Fry spoke to the submission of A L Fry Ltd. In response to a question from Cr Higgins, Mr T Fry said that A L Fry Ltd would accept the proposed rural emanations easement. He spoke about the need to carry out orchard spraying between about 7.00 am to 8.00 am and the potential noise effect on future residents. He said that the neighbouring drain had been filled in during January 2005 this created problems. He said he wanted the stormwater issues rectified. Mr Fry said that orchard trees are located 8 metres from the corner peg adjacent to the subject site.

1.4 Staff Reports

Consultant Planner, Mr G Russell, spoke to his report contained within the agenda and noted that Transit New Zealand had provided affected party approval pursuant to Section 94 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and had advised that the proposal will not adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of State Highway 60 in this vicinity. Mr Russell commented about the environmental effects, including the flooding and stormwater issue and the proposed reduced setbacks. He said that given the photographic evidence on the 1976 flood event and the written submissions by local residents he concluded that the site is subject to natural hazards. Mr Russell said that these potential environmental effects are more than minor and that he recommended consent subject to the application being amended to three lots instead of five lots and with the recommended conditions imposed. Appended to this report was a suggested set of consent conditions, based on a three lot development.

Resource Scientist, Rivers and Coast, Mr E Verstappen, spoke to his report of 12 May 2005 contained within the agenda about the flooding and stormwater impacts on the proposed subdivision. He said there is nothing that can be done to curb flooding in a major flood event and that although the land had been raised since the 1976 flood, he still did not know if the land would be subject to flooding. He said that however the Council could require the applicant to raise the proposed house floor levels 500 millimetres above the crown of the road. Mr Verstappen said that improvements in the drain will help the stormwater flow and that some on-site stormwater detention should occur, such as a decent detention pond in the proposed swale. He said this would deal with the stormwater but not flooding. He said that soakpit benefits are not known and that a road within the berm adjacent to the drain is not appropriate.

1.5 Acceptance of Late Submission

**Moved Crs Higgins / Wilkins
EP05/05/11**

**THAT the late submission from R Dysart be accepted.
CARRIED**

1.6 Right of Reply

Ms Owen responded for the applicant and advised that there is no access easement over the subject property to any other property. She said that the applicant was not aware of any pesticide residue situation existing in the land within the property. Ms Owen acknowledged the submission from Mr King-Turner, saying that there is no requirement for vesting the proposed access road in Council for a five lot subdivision. She said that the drain adjacent to the neighbouring orchard had been blocked off recently during on-site work and that the applicant volunteered to install a sump and grate to rectify this situation. Ms Owen said that the applicant had provided an expert witness to demonstrate that floor levels could be provided above flood levels. She explained that the provision of stormwater soakage is a permitted activity. She said that evidence had not been presented at the hearing to demonstrate why there should be only three lots within the subdivision instead of five lots as applied for.

The hearing panel reserved its decision at 3.15 pm.

**Moved Crs Higgins / Wilkins
EP05/05/12**

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

K Valentine

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 |
|----------------|--|--|
| K Valentine | Consideration of a planning application. | A right of appeal lies to the Environment Court against the final decision of Council. |

CARRIED

**Moved Crs Higgins / Bryant
EP05/05/13**

THAT for the purposes of discussing the application of K Valentine as an "In Committee" item, the Manager Consents be authorised to be in attendance as advisor.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs Bryant / Higgins
EP05/05/14**

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

CARRIED

2. K VALENTINE, 453 MAIN ROAD, RIWAKA- APPLICATION RM040807

**Moved Crs Higgins / Bryant
EP05/05/15**

DECISION – SUBDIVSION:

THAT pursuant to Section 104 and 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Council GRANTS consent to K Valentine to subdivide Part Lot 4 DP 1267 into five allotments served by right of way "A".

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

CONDITIONS - SUBDIVISION:

1. Right-of-Way

The right-of-way A shall have a minimum legal width of 6 metres and a minimum formation width of 5 metres.

The right-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 surface is to be sealed with a two-coat bitumen chip seal (Grade 4 bitumen chip seal and Grade 6 locking coat).

2. Sewer

Full sewer reticulation shall be provided discharging to Council's wastewater reticulated system and a connection to each allotment.

The existing sewer connection(s) serving adjoining properties shall be identified and protected.

Note: Laying stones in the creek bed will achieve this protection.

3. Stormwater

Full stormwater reticulation shall be provided in accordance with Tasman District Engineering Standards with a stormwater connection provided to each allotment. All lots shall drain stormwater into the existing drain.

A comprehensive stormwater management plan shall be provided from a suitably experienced Charter Professional Engineer, detailing all storm water flows from the site, including overland flows from the adjoining properties, those being Lot 1 DP 13969, Lot 1 DP 6437, Lot 6 DP 2833 and Lot 2 DP 5984 and what mitigation measures have been provided to mitigate any adverse effects on the adjoining properties.

The plan shall also detail any flooding mitigation measures relating to flood hazard on the property and the proposed upgrading works to the drainage ditch running through the property. This plan shall show a "berm" area of 11 metres in width excavated to 400 mm depth containing the existing drain.

Secondary flow paths shall be provided along the right-of-way formation with the finished ground level of each allotments at least 500 mm above the right-of-way formation.

The stormwater reticulation system to be designed with adequate mitigation measures in place so that stormwater discharge from this subdivision does not adversely affect downstream properties.

It appears that fill on Lot 4 obstructs natural runoff from adjoining properties to the east, therefore the consent holder shall provide a piped reticulation system to connect to the open drain on the west of the site.

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

All the stormwater and flooding mitigation works shall be fully completed prior to the approval of the Section 224(c) certificate.

4. Telephone and Power

Live telephone and power connections shall be provided to the bulk of 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.

5. Water

A water supply connection shall be provided to each allotment 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.

6. Engineering Plans

Engineering plans detailing all services and earthworks complete with calculations for roading design, and numbering, sanitary sewage and stormwater flows, the stormwater disposal report and all other works required by this consent, 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 by the applicant.

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

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.

7. 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 until the engineering plans as required under Condition 8 of this consent, have been approved by the Tasman District Engineering Manager.

8. 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 (Chartered Professional Engineer / Surveyor) 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.

9. 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 a building site identified on each new lot is suitable for the erection of a residential building shall be submitted from a Chartered Professional 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. The certification shall be in accordance with Section 11 Appendix B of the Tasman District Engineering Standards.
- c) Where fill material has been placed on any part of the site, a certificate shall be provided by a suitably experienced Chartered Professional 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.

10. Easements

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

A drainage easement shall be provided over the drainage ditch and associated detention area ("berm") appurtenant to the five allotments. The easement document for this drainage shall clearly state the easement holders obligations to maintain the ditch and detention area ("berm") and prevent any weed infestation or regrowth or sedimentation that might reduce the efficiency of the drain. Maintenance obligations shall relate to the land owner(s) of the area concerned.

11. Consent Notices

The following consent notices are to be prepared by the applicant and submitted to Council for approval. All associated costs shall be at the consent holder's expense.

- a) Any building used for habitable purposes on Lot 4 shall be at least 17 metres from the corner boundary common with Lot 1 DP 6437.
- b) Any building on Lots 1 to 5 used for habitable purposes shall have a minimum finished floor level of RL 8.80 metres above mean sea level or 300 mm above the crown of the State Highway at the entrance of subdivision, whichever is the higher.
- c) The area of land within the drainage ditch and detention area ('berm') being Easement XX shall be managed to retain the flood detention capacity and be kept in low grassed state.
- d) Any recommended conditions relating to the engineering reports under Condition 9 of the subdivision consent RM040807 regarding soil conditions or foundation requirements.
- e) 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.
- f) That a rural emanation easement (as volunteered by the applicant) be created in favour of AL Fry Limited, Lot 1 DP 6437.

12. Development Impact Levies

The following development impact levy payments are to be made on four 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 4 lots shall be payable. 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 two allotments in respect of roading, wastewater and water.

DECISION – LANDUSE:

THAT pursuant to Section 104 and 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Council GRANTS consent to K Valentine to construct a dwelling on each of Lot 2,3 and 4 within the required 25 metre setback.

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

CONDITIONS - LANDUSE:

Term of Consent

1. The consent to construct a dwelling on each of Lot 2, 3 and 4 commences on the date of deposit of the survey plan of subdivision RM040807.
2. The consent shall lapse five years from the date of issue of the Section 224 certificate for RM040807.

Setback from Rural Zoned Land

3. Any building used for habitable purposes on Lot 4 shall be at least 17 metres from the corner boundary common with Lot 1 DP 6437 as shown on the consent plan attached.
4. Any building on Lots 2, 3 and 4 shall be a minimum of 3 metres from the eastern boundary being the common boundary with the Riwaka School.

Minimum Floor Level

5. Any habitable buildings on Lots 2, 3 and 4 of the subdivision RM040807 shall have a minimum finished floor level of RL 8.8 metres above mean sea level or 300 mm above the crown of the State Highway at the entrance of the subdivision, whichever is the higher.

ADVICE NOTES:

- a) This consent does not authorise any non-compliance with the requirements for dwellings in the Residential Zone other than the setback rule as provided for in the above condition. All other requirements shall be met unless another resource consent is approved for any proposed non-compliance.
- b) The requirement for a minimum finished floor level of RL 8.8 will also be applicable to any habitable building on Lots 1 and 5 of RM040807 and this requirement will be part of the building consent.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION: (Subdivision and Land Use Together)

1. The land is zoned Residential under the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). The application is a discretionary activity under the Tasman Resource Management Plan as it does not comply with the size factor required for residential lots adjoining the rural zone. The subject land is within the residential area of Riwaka and adjoins the Riwaka Primary School to the east. In addition, consent is sought for the construction of dwellings on proposed Lots 2, 3 and 4 within the required 25 metre setback from land zoned Rural. This part of the application is considered as a restricted discretionary activity.
2. It is understood that there are no references to the Residential zone subdivision or relevant residential zone 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 application has been considered subject to Part 2 of the Act i.e. the purpose and principles of sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and Section 104 which requires the Committee to have regard to:
 - a) any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity
 - b) the relevant provisions of:
 - Regional Policy Statement
 - Plan or Proposed Plan
 - Any other matter considered relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application.
4. The Committee noted that nine submissions in opposition had been received in relation to the application. One submission was late but was allowed by the Committee to be received. In summary the issues raised by the submissions were:
 - Concerns about the existing drain on the property, whether it would have to be shifted and the need for a retaining wall,
 - Concerns about reverse sensitivity between the school and residential development close to the boundary,
 - Flood hazard and limited capacity of stormwater systems
 - Traffic safety issues associated with the right of way entrance to the State Highway for pedestrians
 - Potential reverse sensitivity associated with the existing orchard and close houses e.g noise, spray drift causing complaints.

5. Regarding the issue of the proximity of the land to the adjoining rural land, the Committee considered that the purpose of the 25 metre setback rule was to provide adequate separation from rural activities and residential ones to avoid cross boundary effects. Therefore, in terms of the school, enforcing this 25 metre setback rule was not considered to be appropriate as the possibility of “rural” activities occurring on the land seemed very remote. The Committee considered that a 3 metre setback would be appropriate. However, in terms of the setback from the corner boundary common with the Fry Orchard land, the Committee considered that a 17 metre setback would be appropriate. The reason for the reduction from the 25 metres is that there is existing shelter vegetation along the boundary and the orchard trees are set back approximately 8 metres from the boundary.

In addition the Committee noted that the owner of the Fry Orchard would accept the rural emanation easement being created if the development was approved. This condition has been imposed. The Committee noted that there was no rule in the residential zone which required a setback from other residential land even if that land was used for orchard purposes (such as the cherries to the south) and therefore they were unable to impose a setback requirement in relation to that land. On balance, the Committee considered that the subdivision for five lots was able to be approved as applied for.

6. The Committee carefully considered the concerns raised about the potential impact of flooding on the future occupants of the subdivision. It was stated that the land had been raised since the last major flood event in the area. Information available indicated that if the finished floor levels of the dwellings was set at RL 8.8 (100 mm higher than the height volunteered by the applicant) that this would adequately mitigate the flood hazard. The additional height is a precautionary approach and also allows for added height of the crown of the road through resealing over time. The Committee considered that the additional 100 mm in height is appropriate to allow for the height of foundations. The Committee considered that in the case of development of land affected by a potential flood hazard, that a conservative approach is important to protect future occupants. Other measures which were seen as appropriate were the enhancement of the existing drain by the creation and maintenance of an 11 metre wide “berm” area adjacent to the drain, as volunteered by the applicant, to mitigate the effects of additional stormwater from the development and the design of the right of way to act as a secondary flow path.

The Committee also considered that it was appropriate to deal with the matter of drainage from adjoining land to the south east and that stormwater from the proposed development would be best managed by way of piped reticulation direct to the existing drain rather than via on-site soak pits.

7. The Committee noted the provisions of Section 106 of the Resource Management Act 1991, which provided for subdivisions to be declined if the land or any structure on the land would be likely to suffer material damage by flooding or inundation. The Committee considered that based on the evidence presented, that if the minimum floor level was imposed, there would be no likelihood of material damage being suffered by the dwellings.

8. The Committee considered the concerns raised regarding traffic safety but they were satisfied that provided the access and right of way were designed and constructed in accordance with the Council's engineering standards, there would be any significant traffic or pedestrian hazard created. The location of the right of way entrance was appropriate in terms of sight distances. The Committee noted that Transit NZ had provided written approval.
9. The Committee was satisfied that the land could be serviced but that it was important to ensure the existing sewer connections to adjoining land were protected .
10. In summary, the Committee considered that the proposal was consistent with the objectives and policies of the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan and the Resource Management Act 1991 and subject to the conditions imposed, the effects on the environment will be no more than minor.

CARRIED

Confirmed:

Chair: