

MINUTES

TITLE: Environment and Planning Consents Subcommittee
DATE: Friday, 8 July 2005
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond.

PRESENT: Crs E M O'Regan (Chair), M J Higgins and T B King.

IN ATTENDANCE: Manager Consents (J Hodson), Consent Planner (P J Gibson), Development Engineer (D Ley) and Administration Officer (B D Moore).

1. HOPE COMMUNITY CENTRE TRUST, 114 RANZAU ROAD WEST, RICHMOND – APPLICATIONS RM041391 AND RM050151

1.1 Proposal

Hope Community Centre Trust sought subdivision consent to subdivide Lot 1 DP18344 (CTNL 12A/469) into two allotments (Lot 1 and Lot 2) and to amalgamate Lot 1 of 3.1575 hectare with Lot 2 DP 15359 (CTNL 12A/469) and proposed Lot 2 of 7 635 m² with Lot 1 DP 17913 (CTNL 12A/468).

The outcome will remain two Titles, with no additional titles created, as follows:

- i) The existing Church/Community Centre site will increase from 3,284 m² to 10,919 m²;
- ii) the existing Orchard site will decrease from 6.7114 hectare to 5.9479 hectare.

The Trust sought consent to extend the Church complex and carpark area. This includes an auditorium for 450 people, offices, meeting rooms, children's rooms, cafeteria, kitchen and a carpark for 190 spaces.

1.2 Presentation of Application

Mr F C Bacon, Resource Management Consultant presented evidence on the application and was accompanied at the Hearing by Mr D Irvine, representing the Trust.

The evidence tabled by Mr Bacon included an updated site plan showing all principle features of the proposed development. Tests had shown that the ex-orchard land is not contaminated. He demonstrated that the proposed development involves retaining the existing Church building and incorporating this into the proposed new complex. The completed complex will have a gross floor area of 1,900 m² in a single storey building.

Mr Bacon explained how the Complex will be serviced with water supply, stormwater and effluent disposal. The evidence listed the non-conforming matters as follows:

- i) Excess site coverage being 1,902 m² in lieu of 577 m²;
- ii) encroaching into front setback, existing building;
- iii) two vehicle entrances instead of one;
- iv) providing 191 car park spaces on site instead of 250;
- v) exceeding permitted building height by 1 metre, existing building;
- vi) request to waive Community Services and roading levies;
- vii) request for a 15 year consent period.

The evidence commented on the issues raised in opposing submissions. Maps were provided to show the rural and urban locations from which the Church congregation is derived from. The evidence stated that the Church congregation has grown by 13% in the last 12 months.

Mr Bacon sought that the Council waive the Reserves' levy as the proposed activity will have no adverse impact on the environment, particularly the infrastructure, reserves or community services of the District. Annexed to this evidence was a letter of 20 May 2005 from the Acting Principal, Ranzau School, writing in support of the proposed development.

A further submission on behalf of Hope Community Church, was attached to the applicant's evidence and the Senior Pastor, Mr D W Irvine, read the submission providing the background history of the Church on this site since 1913 and the development to date.

Mr Bacon also outlined the present community involvement including groups such as Ranzau School and the proposed future development. Mr Irvine said that the new facilities will enable the Hope Community Centre to adequately cater for the growing number of people attending Church, especially children and young families. He said that all cars will be able to be parked on site, so removing the danger of on-road parking.

The submission strongly emphasised the wider community good that this development will provide.

Mr R J O'Hara, a Senior Engineer of Tasman Consulting Engineers Limited, responded to Councillors' questions about the on site effluent disposal system. He explained a buffer tank would be used to smooth out the loading of the effluent flow.

1.3 Submissions

Mrs J E Ralston, an adjacent landowner and orchardist, made an opposing submission based on the continual fragmentation of rural land and potential effects of orchard spraying. She said that the complex is huge in context of the area and that the Church could be in a better place. She said that the Church parking area will restrict orchard operations on neighbouring land.

Mrs M Melis of 65 Ranzau Road opposed the proposal saying that the main reason was a concern for land fragmentation and a waste of productive land, for carparking. She said that the subject site is used for 75% of the time and was concerned about the proposed 15 year consent period.

The submitters, A R and J C Garguilo said they were neighbours of the Church site and were concerned about the proposed method of effluent disposal. They said that the extended carparking area needs to be chained off when not in use and the Church use should be restricted to 10.00 pm during the week and 11.00 pm on the weekend for youth groups and concerts.

Mrs S A Clark said that because of the amount of new information since she signed her consent to this application that she now wishes to withdraw that consent. She was concerned that the site plan indicated carparks would be next to the common boundary of the applicant's site and her neighbouring property and that an effluent disposal area was located around the boundary, which she said was quite close to her house. She was concerned about the potential for noise level and loud music and wanted a 10.00 pm restriction for noise to cease. In response to a question from Councillor O'Regan about a weekend midnight shut-off for noise for about 12 events per year, Mrs Clark indicated agreement.

A submission from Mrs H Rance of 26 Ranzau Road was read by Councillor O'Regan and the submitter sought upgrading of Ranzau Road and referred to accidents which had occurred involving traffic and horses. The submitter sought that a traffic management plan be put in place by the applicant, especially near the School and that a speed reduction or restriction be imposed, and that footpath improvements be required.

A submission from Nelson Marlborough Health Service, Public Health Service and written by Mr M Molloy was read by Councillor O'Regan and sought that domestic wastewater effluent be tertiary treated or at least treated to enable compliance with the requirements of Rule 36.1.5 for the discharge of domestic wastewaters in the special area. The submission sought a reserve area for treated effluent disposal and that the disposal area be signed and fenced off to prevent access by the public. The submissions said that there should be a condition of consent requiring the applicant property to connect to the reticulated sewer system when this becomes available.

1.4 Staff Reports

Consent Planner, Mr P Gibson, spoke of the positive effects of the proposal and the ability to provide for social and cultural needs to the development and use of this community facility. The planning report addressed key issues including:

- Amenity values and rural character;
- Cross boundary effects;
- Productive land value;
- Servicing methods;
- Contamination methods;
- Traffic matters;
- Duration of consent
- Financial contributions

The report discussed the assessment criteria regarding amenity values and rural character. Comments were made within the report regarding the existing lawful situation of site coverage and building height.

Development Engineer, Mr D Ley, tabled and read a further statement of evidence. He addressed the subjects of roading and carparking. Mr Ley noted that the applicant had not provided a reserve wastewater disposal area. The subject of water supply and access was also referred to in that report and some proposed conditions of consent were suggested.

Mr Gibson noted the applicant had volunteered a flow meter for wastewater discharge. Mr Gibson also referred to the proposed conditions of consent listed within his report. He said that a condition of consent should refer to the amended site plan tabled at the meeting by the applicant. He noted that this was in Appendix 1 of the applicant's submission and dated 5 July 2005 and titled "Sheet 2".

1.5 Right of Reply

Mr Bacon responded for the applicant and advised that the applicant had considered alternatives to this proposal but there was no mandatory need to consider alternatives. He said that the applicant is not required to provide a reserve effluent disposal area. He said that if necessary the applicant could arrange for effluent to be removed from the site. Mr Bacon said that the effluent disposal systems available, will continue to improve and that discharge consent will require renewal periodically.

Mr Bacon said that the applicant would comply with the required setback rules and that landscaping could also be used as a shelter belt. He said that the Playcentre is more than 30 metres away from the site boundaries and is sheltered by buildings. He said that the use of the carparks on the subject site, by Ranzau School, should not influence this issue and that School pupils cross the road under teacher supervision.

Mr Bacon said that the applicant accepted a proposed limitation concerning use and noise on the site for up to 10.00 pm on weekdays and Friday and Saturday to midnight, limited to 12 occasions per year. He said that the main carpark would be chained off to restrict unauthorised nightly use. He suggested that a management plan condition could be appropriate.

Mr R O'Hara, Engineer, spoke about the site plan and said that the 1 metre strips between carparks will also be used as an effluent disposal area. He said that the dose rate of discharge from the irrigated system is 15 mm's per day and that if necessary the receiving surface can be rehabilitated. This may involve new topsoil and dripline replacement.

Mr Bacon said in closing that it would be onerous to require the treatment of stormwater from the carpark area, but that a requirement for monitoring would be acceptable.

The Committee reserved its decision at 3.00 pm.

**Moved Crs O'Regan / King
EP05/07/05**

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

Hope Community Centre Trust

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
Hope Community Centre Trust	Consideration of a planning application.	A right of appeal lies to the Environment Court against the final decision of Council.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs King / Higgins
EP05/07/06**

THAT for the purposes of discussing the application of Hope Community Centre Trust as an "In Committee" item, the Manager Consents be authorised to be in attendance as advisor.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs O'Regan / King
EP05/07/07**

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. HOPE COMMUNITY CENTRE TRUST, 114 RANZAU ROAD WEST, RICHMOND – APPLICATIONS RM041391 AND RM050151

Moved Crs O'Regan / Higgins
EP05/07/08

DECISION - LAND USE (RM050151):

THAT pursuant to Sections 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991, Council GRANTS consent to Hope Community Centre Trust to extend and operate a church/community centre on Lot 2 of Proposed subdivision of Lot 1 DP 18344.

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

CONDITONS:

Land Use Activity

1. That the activity shall be carried out in general accordance with the application and associated further information, and the plans dated 5 July 2005, attached as **Appendix I** to this consent. Where a condition of consent is contrary to the application, the condition shall prevail.

Commencement and Duration of Consent

2. This land use consent shall not be given effect to (commence) until the certificate of title is issued for the amalgamated Lot 2 and Lot 1 DP 17913.

This land use consent shall lapse 15 years from the date the certificate of title is issued for the amalgamated Lot 2 and Lot 1 DP 17913, unless this land use consent has been given effect to, or an extension of time application pursuant to Section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991 has been granted by Council.

Maximum Building Height

3. The building shall not exceed the maximum height of 8.5 metres as shown on the elevation plans attached in **Appendix I** of this consent.

Maximum Site Coverage

4. The building coverage on the site shall not exceed 1902 m² as shown on the site/planting plan attached in **Appendix I** of this consent.

Front Setback

5. The building shall not be closer to the road boundary than is shown on the site/planting plan attached in **Appendix I** of this consent.

Parking

6. At the completion of construction of the building as shown on the site/planting plan attached as **Appendix I** to this consent, a total of 191 parking spaces shall be formed, sealed with a minimum of two coat chip seal, and clearly marked out on the ground with paint. These spaces shall be maintained on an ongoing basis.

Advice Note:

This condition shall ensure that there is sufficient parking provided on site while the complex is being developed and once it is fully completed.

Security of the Parking Area

7. The chains shall be established as shown on the site/planting plan dated 5 July 2005 attached as **Appendix I** of this consent, or in similar locations. These chains shall be drawn across and locked except when needed for large functions/services requiring those car parks to be available.

Advice Note:

This condition will discourage inappropriate use of the parking area while the facility is unattended.

Review of Condition 6 regarding parking

8. Pursuant to Section 128 of the Resource Management Act 1991, condition 6 specifying on-site parking spaces may be reviewed by Council 12 months after the date of commencement of this land use consent. The purpose of such a review shall be limited to:
 - i) deal with any adverse effect on the environment which is more than minor which may arise from the exercise of the consent regarding the number of parking spaces provided on the site that was not accurately foreseen at the time of granting of the consent, and is therefore more appropriate to deal with at this later stage; and/or
 - ii) require the consent holder to adopt the best practicable option to avoid or mitigate any more than minor adverse effects on the environment resulting from the number of parking spaces provided on the site.

Number of Persons

9. The number of persons on the site at any one time, excluding any people who have travelled in a vehicle parked on the Ranzau School site in order to attend the subject site, shall not exceed the number of parking spaces on the subject site multiplied by four (4).

Advice Note:

The applicant has agreed to this condition (letter from Bacon Planning Group received by Council 17 June 2005). Excluding any people who have parked on the Ranzau School site in order to attend the subject site from the one parking space per four people calculation recognises the long-standing shared parking agreement between the Ranzau School and the Hope Community Centre Trust. Please note that the Council is not responsible for administering the shared parking agreement between the Ranzau School and the Hope Community Centre Trust as this is a private agreement.

Hours of Operation

10. On-site activities shall cease no later than 10.00 pm Sunday to Thursday, and 11.00 pm Friday and Saturday.

In addition, the activities may extend to midnight on twelve occasions per calendar year.

Water Supply

11. That the site shall be provided with water storage of not less than 23,000 litres and whether the storage is provided by an above ground or an underground tank/s, each tank shall be fitted with an accessible 50 mm diameter Camlock coupling enable connection with firefighting equipment.

Advice Note:

This will ensure that there is a suitable connection for firefighting equipment.

12. Water supply shall be obtained from a maximum 15 millimetre diameter lateral.

Advice Note:

This will limit the volume of water which can be taken, avoiding adverse effects on the water supply and other properties.

Wastewater – Flow Meter

13. The Consent Holder shall install an appropriately installed and calibrated flow meter capable of measuring to an accuracy of plus or minus five percent.

Advice Note:

The above condition was volunteered by the applicant. Pursuant to Section 35 of the Act, the consent holder should keep records and should if so requested supply this information to the Council to illustrate compliance with the permitted activity requirements. The consent holder is advised that the weekly averaged wastewater flows should not exceed 2000 litres per day.

Advice Note:

The church/community centre may be required to connect to the Council reticulated sewer system in the future if the service is upgraded and becomes available.

Limit on Café and Any Other Commercial Activity

14. The café shown on the approved plans attached as **Appendix I** to this consent shall operate as an ancillary activity to the community facility and shall only be for the use of people visiting the site for reasons relating to community activity events. Further, the café shall not be advertised on any sign on the site as a destination in itself.

Advice Note:

This condition will ensure that the café is not used as a commercial venture unrelated to the Church and community facility use. This is necessary as the parking calculation and traffic assessment is not based on the café being a destination in its own right. That is, parking was calculated at the rate of a community activity rather than a commercial restaurant/café.

15. The site shall not be used for any other non-church related commercial/retail activity.

Financial Contributions

16. The Consent Holder shall, no later than the time of uplifting the Building Consent for the building work, pay a financial contribution to the Council. The amount of the financial contribution shall be assessed as a percentage of the value of the Building Consent component in accordance with the following table:

Financial Contribution – Building	
Component	Contribution
Building Consent (\$0 to \$50,000 value)	0%
Building Consent (\$50,001 to \$200,000 value)	0.5%
Building Consent (above \$200,001 value)	0.25%
Notes:	
1. The financial contribution is GST inclusive.	
2. The building consent value is GST exclusive.	
3. The contribution due on a building should be identified separately from other contributions set for any resource consent for an activity that includes buildings.	
4. The financial contribution shall be determined by taking the total estimated value of the work required for a building consent and applying each component identified in the table to that value and the contribution is the sum of the components.	

Note that if the building work is done in stages this requirement to pay a financial contribution shall apply at each stage.

Planting Plan

17. Planting shall be undertaken generally in accordance with the site/planting plan dated 5 July 2005, attached to this consent. This planting shall be planted within the first planting season following the commencement of the land use consent (that is, from the date the land use consent is begun to be given effect to). The planting shall be maintained and irrigated thereafter in general accordance with the abovementioned Plan.

LAND USE ADVICE NOTES

Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan

1. Any matters not referred to in this application for resource consent or are otherwise covered in the consent conditions must comply with the relevant provisions of the Tasman Resource Management Plan and the Resource Management Act 1991.

In particular, it is noted that:

- Further information provided to the application states that the PTRMP noise standard for the Rural 1 Zone will be met.

- Further information received on 30 May 2005 from Bacon Planning Group confirms that all relevant signage rules of the PTRMP will be met.

Other Council Requirements

2. The consent holder shall meet the requirements of Council with regard to all Building and Health Bylaws, Regulations and Acts.

Concurrent Resource Consents

3. This land use consent application was made in conjunction with subdivision consent application RM041391.

Monitoring

4. That all actual and reasonable costs incurred by this Council in monitoring, enforcement and administration of this consent should be met by the consent holder.

Archaeological

5. If in the course of any earthworks for the subdivision, any artifacts, taonga, or koiwi are unearthed, then all earthworks in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be suspended and contact made immediately with local iwi and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for the establishment of a protocol for removal of the findings.

Wastewater

6. The Consent Holder is advised that any discharge of domestic wastewater at the site should meet the relevant permitted activity requirements of the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan or resource consent shall be obtained if these criteria cannot be met. Compliance with the New Zealand Standard for On-Site Wastewater Management is recommended.

Stormwater

7. The Consent Holder is advised that any discharge of stormwater at the site should meet the relevant permitted activity requirements of the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan or resource consent should be obtained if these criteria cannot be met. The installation of stormwater treatment devices may be necessary to treat stormwater prior to its discharge from site to meet the permitted standards.

Development Contributions

8. Unless otherwise agreed with the Tasman District Council Development Contributions Committee the consent holder should pay the required Development Contribution in respect of the following services prior to uplifting the section 224(c) certificate.

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 current at the time the relevant development contribution is paid in full. This consent will attract a development contribution in respect of roading only.

Transit New Zealand Comment

9. Transit New Zealand have viewed the applications and advise as follows, *“Whilst Transit New Zealand does not have any specific concerns with this development, we did feel that there was some merit in “flagging” our intention to install a yellow no-stopping line along the south west shoulder of State Highway 6 turning into Ranzau Road at a future date. As this development will increase the number of left turning manoeuvres onto Ranzau Road, it is important this area is protected over the long-term for movements of this nature.”*

DECISION - SUBDIVISION (RM041391):

That pursuant to Sections 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991, Council GRANTS consent to Hope Community Centre Trust to subdivide Lot 1 DP 18344 (CT NL12A/469) into two allotments (Lot 1 and Lot 2) and to amalgamate proposed Lot 1 of 3.1575 hectares with Lot 2 DP 15359 (CT NL12A/469) and proposed Lot 2 of 7635 m² with Lot 1 DP 17913 (CT NL12A/468).

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

CONDITIONS- SUBDIVISION:

General Accordance

1. That the development be in general accordance with the subdivision plan attached to this consent, and the information submitted with the application, as amended by the further information received. Where a condition of consent is contrary to the application, the condition shall prevail.

Amalgamation

2. Lot 1 hereon shall be amalgamated with Lot 2 DP 15359 (CT NL12A/469) and one certificate of title issue. Lot 2 hereon shall be amalgamated with Lot 1 DP 17913 (CT NL12A/468) and one certificate of title issue.

Land Information New Zealand Reference Number: 296217.

Vehicle Crossings

3. The two proposed vehicle crossings onto Lot 2 shall be formed to the standard specified in Schedule 16.2C: Rural Intersection and Access Design (Diagram 1) of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (attached as **Appendix B**). Each of the two crossings shall be 6 metres wide.

Advice Note:

The vehicle crossing serving proposed Lot 1 (to be amalgamated with the orchard) is considered to be suitable at present for the purposes of this condition.

Remove Existing Crossing

4. The existing vehicle crossing serving Lot 1 DP 17913 (the existing Church site) shall be removed and the road berm reinstated.

Engineering Certification

5. 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. Certification that a site has been identified on the new community activity allotment suitable for a building shall be submitted from a registered engineer or geotechnical engineer experienced in the field of soils engineering.

SUBDIVISION ADVICE NOTES:

Tasman Resource Management Plan

1. Any matters not referred to in this application for resource consent or are otherwise covered in the consent conditions must comply with the relevant provisions of the Tasman Resource Management Plan and the Resource Management Act 1991.

Other Council Requirements

2. The consent holder shall meet the requirements of Council with regard to all Building and Health Bylaws, Regulations and Acts.

Concurrent Resource Consents

3. This subdivision consent application was made in conjunction with land use consent application RM050151.

Archaeological

4. If in the course of any earthworks for the development, any artifacts, taonga, or koiwi are unearthed, then all earthworks in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be suspended and contact made immediately with local iwi and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for the establishment of a protocol for removal of the findings.

Wastewater

5. The Consent Holder is advised that any discharge of domestic wastewater at the site should meet the relevant permitted activity requirements of the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan or resource consent shall be obtained if these criteria cannot be met. Compliance with the New Zealand Standard for On-Site Wastewater Management ASNZS 1547:2000 is recommended.

Stormwater

6. The Consent Holder is advised that any discharge of stormwater at the site should meet the relevant permitted activity requirements of the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan or resource consent should be obtained if these criteria cannot be met. The installation of stormwater treatment devices may be necessary to treat stormwater prior to its discharge from site to meet the permitted standards.

Development Contributions

7. Unless otherwise agreed with the Tasman District Council Development Contributions Committee the consent holder shall pay the required Development Contribution in respect of the following services prior to uplifting the section 224(c) certificate.

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 power to withhold a section 224(c) certificate is provided under section 208 of 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 current at the time the relevant development contribution is paid in full. This consent will attract a development contribution in respect of roading only.

Financial Contributions

8. As the subdivision is for a boundary adjustment which will not result in an additional title, under the PTRMP no financial contributions are required on the subdivision. However, they may still be applicable on the land use proposal.

Engineering Plans

9. Council's Development Engineer confirms that no engineering plans are required for this development.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION - SUBDIVISION AND LAND USE:

1. The land is zoned Rural 1 in the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan. The extension to the existing church/community centre proposed is a restricted discretionary activity under the Proposed Plan as it falls within the definition of "community activities". The subdivision application is a discretionary activity under the Proposed Plan and the Transitional Plan. Due to the progress of the Proposed Plan through the statutory process the provisions of the Transitional Plan are not considered relevant as there are no relevant references to the relevant rules of the Proposed Plan. The application has been considered pursuant to Part 2 and Sections 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
2. Part 2 of the Act, i.e. the purpose and principles of sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and Section 104 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.

3. The existing church (established in 1913) is located across the road from Ranzau School. The site is flat and the soil type is Class 1. The land which will be transferred to the church is currently mostly planted orchard trees (apples). The surrounding area is characterised mainly by various farming and horticultural and orchard operations, scattered dwellings, rural industrial activities and other community uses and has a reasonably well developed character for a rural area. The area is located within the Special Domestic Wastewater Disposal Area and the Aquifer Protection Area.
4. The Committee noted that nine submissions were received. There were three in support, five in opposition and one neutral. The main issues of concern in relation to this application were:
 - Use of Rural 1 zoned land for non-productive use, particularly land within the Waimea East Irrigation Scheme area,
 - Fragmentation and loss of rural land
 - Potential reverse sensitivity issues with legitimate rural land uses being restricted in the future
 - Large scale of the building being out of keeping with the low intensity of the area, adverse visual effects of proposed fence
 - Churches should combine the use of facilities to avoid wasted resources
 - Commercial elements of the proposal eg café and crèche
 - Applicant should pay appropriate financial and development contributions
 - Adverse traffic effects associated with the use of complex including conflicts with school associated traffic and pedestrians, impact other users of Ranzau Road including horse riders, cyclists and drivers and pedestrians, noise from vehicles using the parking area unsupervised at night,
 - Insufficient on-site parking proposed
 - Noise effects from functions held at the Centre
 - Potential problems with on-site waste water disposal including degree of treatment and availability of reserve disposal area
 - Lack of consultation with neighbourhood
5. The Committee carefully considered the concerns of submitters in terms of the matters that the Council discretion was restricted to;
 - Amenity values and rural character
 - Cross boundary effects
 - Productive land value
 - Servicing issues
 - Contamination
 - Traffic matters
 - Duration of consent
 - Financial contributions

6. The Committee considered the matters pertaining to amenity and rural character effects and agreed with the advice provided by Council's planner, that the effects of the extension of the church building would have no more than a minor effect. Weight was given to the permitted baseline in that it was accepted that a much larger glass house could be constructed as a permitted activity which would have a greater effect on visual amenity. The proposed extension complied with the rules in relation to height, set backs from boundaries and signage. The proposed materials being timber and stone will blend in with the surrounding environment. It was also considered very relevant that this is an extension of an established land use which has had a presence at this location for a long time and thus can be distinguished from a new non-productive use coming into the area.
7. In terms of cross-boundary effects, the Committee did not consider that any new or increased effects would arise as a result of the extensions. The landscaping, placing of the building extension in relation to the boundaries, limit on hours and management of the carparking area would mitigate potential effects.
8. The Committee accepted that the application would result in the loss of a small amount of productive land, but balancing this with the benefits that the extension would provide to the wider community, the loss was considered acceptable. The fact that the church was existing in this location also had weight in terms of the loss of productive land. The Committee was aware of the community concern regarding precedent and the risk of cumulative loss of productive land to non-productive uses. However, it was agreed that community facilities such as this were not a significant driver in this process, compared to residential development. It was noted that the Committee had no ability to suggest the various church groups share facilities and also noted that this location is between Brightwater and Richmond which are both fast growing communities. The Committee considered that this expanded facility would provide a positive benefit for those communities.
9. The Committee was satisfied that the issue of waste water disposal would be adequately managed. It was recognised that this was a sensitive area and this would be taken into account in the design and construction of the system. It was noted that the applicant had volunteered to install a flow meter to ensure compliance with the permitted activity rule in terms of quantity of waste water. The applicant was aware of the issues of the limited area of land for disposal and that other methods of dealing with the wastewater would have to be turned to if the on-site disposal method was compromised in the future. The provision of potable water was considered to have been satisfactorily dealt with as was storm water management. The Committee noted that test results indicated that the soil had not been contaminated with pesticides.
10. The issues of traffic effects, provision of car parking and access were carefully considered. The Committee noted the agreement between the Ranzau School and the Hope Community Centre Trust in relation to school car parking being able to be accessed by users of the Centre at times when over flow parking would be needed. The Committee found that the provision of car parking to be acceptable. It was accepted that the centre was multi purpose and that the likelihood of all facilities being in full use at the same time was remote. The Committee considered that there would be little likelihood of car parking having an adverse effect on Ranzau Road. It was acknowledged that there would be an increase in the level of traffic on Ranzau Road, but it was considered that the road network was adequate to absorb the increase without giving rise to any unsafe levels. The proposal includes two two-way vehicle accesses onto the site but given the layout it is considered that this will assist with efficient traffic flows and will not create a hazard.

11. The Committee was satisfied that the Centre should be given an extended period of 15 years to complete the project which was substantial.
12. The Committee did not agree with the view posed by the applicant in relation to the request for a waiver of financial contributions. The amount taken by Council is based on the value of the building project and the Committee was told that all community facilities have paid the contribution in the past. The Council takes the contribution consistently for all building work over \$50,000 in value as this is seen as a fair and reasonable as a method of funding the provision of community services required as a result of regional growth. It is very difficult to demonstrate an increase in demand associated with any one particular project but it is accepted that the method is fair and there is a need to be consistent. The Committee examined the criteria for the waiving of contributions and did not consider that this project satisfied any of those criteria.
13. The Committee was satisfied that the proposed private school was not contrary to the objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan in terms of site amenity effects, rural character and amenity and land transport effects, particularly in recognition of the conditions imposed on the consent.
14. The Committee considered the issue of the financial contributions and noted that the application was submitted prior to 1 July 2004 which is when the Council's Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) was operative. Therefore it is clear that the application has to be assessed under the rules of the Tasman Resource Management Plan in relation to financial contributions.
15. In summary the Committee considered that the proposed extension to the Hope Community Church should be granted as it was considered that it would have no more than a minor adverse effect on the environment. It was further considered that the proposal in this location, was consistent with the policies and objectives of the relevant planning documents.

CARRIED

Confirmed:

Chair: