



STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee

FROM: Sonya Leusink-Sladen, Policy Planner

REFERENCE: L333

SUBJECT: **PROGRESS REPORT ON THE TAKAKA EAST GOLDEN BAY GROWTH PROJECT - REPORT EP06/11/13** - Report Prepared for 22 November 2006 Meeting

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update the Committee on progress of the Takaka - East Golden Bay growth project.

The report will focus on feedback from the Golden Bay Community on the Phase II, Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy, and present an outline of the next process steps.

2. BACKGROUND

The project team, Team Golden Bay¹, has taken the following steps so far:

- March 2005 – project initiated. The purpose of the project was to investigate the long term future for residential development in the Takaka Valley lowland area, from Tata Beach in the east to Rangihaeata in the west.
- July 2005 - “Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Urban Growth Issues and Options” paper was released (referred to as “Part I” consultation document). This paper articulated issues facing growth in the study area, and suggest possible options for the purpose of stimulating discussion. All Councillors received a copy of it.
- August to October 2005 – Phase I Consultation. A public meeting was held, and written feedback was encouraged. Copies of all written submissions were made available to Councillors in November 2005.
- November 2005 to April 2006 - Further information gathered. Following the first round of consultation, staff assessed the written feedback and worked towards completing the information requirements to take the project to the next stage. This involved gathering and incorporating new information into the project, including key work undertaken by Dr Iain Campbell relating to land productivity, “*Soils of the Lower Takaka Valley*” (released May 2006)

¹ Team Golden Bay comprises the Golden Bay Community Board members, ward Councillors, service centre staff, and Richmond based engineering and policy planning staff.

- July 2006 - "Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy: Phase II Community Discussion Paper" released. All information, especially written submissions from the community, was compiled and the second consultation document was drafted. This document took the next process step by articulating principles for growth.

The Phase II document was made available to the community and Councillors at the end of July 2006.

3. PHASE II CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

The purpose of the Phase II discussion document was to present possible principles for future growth in the study area, for discussion. These principles take an important step towards determining a new planning framework for the study area.

The principles were devised from feedback to the Phase I issues and options document, and from new information gathered. Consultation for the second phase consultation comprised: two public meetings held at Pohara and Takaka; stakeholder meetings (e.g. Golden Bay Futures); and, meetings with key individuals.

Written submissions were also called for. Due to a poor initial response, an extension of time was given (16 October 2006). A copy of written submissions is attached to this report.

The following summary of the submissions, both general and specific, is as was perceived and understood by the Policy Planner. Councillors are encouraged to read a copy of the written submissions attached to this document to gain a more complete view.

General

Generally there was a high level of support for the Phase II document and the principles contained within it. With a few exceptions relating to specific issues (see below), the principles were seen as "common sense" solutions to the main issues facing the Bay.

However, one of the key submitters Golden Bay Futures that represents a number of Golden Bay residents, felt that Council ought to be looking at all issues throughout the Bay, noting "*Comprehensive, integrated planning for the whole of Golden Bay remains our foremost priority*"

Team Golden Bay¹ recognises the importance of comprehensive, integrated planning. The extension of the process of inquiry to the West Golden Bay is on the work-programme to commence in the latter part of the 2006/2007 financial year.

A key objective for the first stage of this process will be to discuss issues and options with the local community across the whole area, from Patons Rock in the east, through Collingwood, and to Farewell Spit in the west. Some of the work already done in the Takaka area in articulating issues and determining planning options may be able to be applied to the western area, speeding up the process. Many of the same principles will be applicable to this area.

Specific

The following principles are directly quoted from the Phase II Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Strategic Growth Document (p17 & 18). A brief summary of feedback to each is provided.

	Phase II Principles (see p 17 & 18)	Summary of Feedback
1.	The community has indicated a preference for the use of a multiple area settlement approach, using the rural village concept. This is recommended as a basic approach for considering a range of location options.	This was generally supported. Questions were raised about what was meant by “rural villages”, the efficiency of them in providing services, and how cross-boundary effects would be managed at the periphery.
2.	Consolidation of all new development around existing developed areas is also a clear directive from the community No new area should be “opened up” without first accounting for potential development in areas that are already partly settled.	This was widely accepted.
3.	The creation and long-term maintenance of the greenbelts around or in between each rural village/township can help to provide separation between each and ensure the long-term maintenance of green space. This approach complements the rural village concept and the idea of consolidation of existing settlements.	This was widely accepted.
4.	Careful consideration of appropriate buffers between rural village areas and land being used for productive purposes. This is to minimise the potential for adverse cross-boundary effects. This issue needs to be considered at the time that particular locations undergo structure planning, prior to re-zoning.	This was widely accepted.
5.	Generally preventing new development from occurring where the soil is classified as Class A or Class B land. Some more work is required to determine the fate of land that is held in small titles in already	This was generally supported. Some landowner submitters expressed a desire to subdivide land that they deem uneconomic. Many submitters expressed a desire to

	Phase II Principles (see p 17 & 18)	Summary of Feedback
	partly settled locations such as Clifton and Motupipi.	prevent further development on high class soils regardless of land parcel size.
6.	<p>Limiting the extent of residential development along the coast. Limiting new development in coastal low-lying areas (at risk from sea-level rise).</p> <p>Development controls may need to be strengthened to prevent this from occurring.</p>	This was generally supported.
7.	<p>Further development inland from the coast or infill development where there is existing coastal development may be acceptable in some areas e.g. Rangihaeata.</p> <p>Some very low density, low visibility rural-residential development in discrete locations such as the Motupipi Hill headland may also be acceptable.</p>	<p>This was widely accepted.</p> <p>Many submitters expressed that the Pohara to Tata beach area has already reached (if not exceeded) its development maximum.</p>
8.	Preventing expansion of the existing Takaka urban limits. The land is flood-prone and located on Class A soils.	<p>This was generally accepted.</p> <p>Some commented on the ability of Council to uplift a residential zoning and return land to Rural 1.</p>
9.	<p>Review existing provision for the residential commercial and industrial development within the current Takaka township, particularly where development has not yet occurred.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for land development within the existing developed area, provided that minimum floor levels and flood sensitive building designs are used to a minimum 'flood size' standard.</p>	<p>There was no opposition to this principle.</p> <p>Some submitters questioned the need and/or urgency of addressing this. Others supported the need to consider commercial and industrial landuse as part of the process of looking at the future of settlement in the study area, and encouraging economic development and opportunity.</p>
10.	Provide for the opportunity for a new concentration of residential and possible commercial development in the south Takaka area (centred on Park Avenue) as an alternative to	<p>This was generally supported.</p> <p>There was a recognition that there would never be a perfect location given the basic requirements of; close</p>

	Phase II Principles (see p 17 & 18)	Summary of Feedback
	<p>continued expansion of the existing Takaka area (centred on Park Avenue) as an alternative to the continued expansion of the existing Takaka centre.</p> <p>Most of the land is classified as Class C in the Soils report. It is already partly settled, is flood free, is flat and relatively cost effective to service and it is in proximity to the existing Takaka township.</p>	<p>proximity to the existing Takaka township; flood hazard; and, avoiding development of Class A and B soils.</p> <p>However, some submitters expressed distrust of Council that the development of Park Avenue was a “done deal” and that Council was responding to developer pressures. Other submitters questioned the use of Class C land for residential development. No alternatives in lieu of this location were given that would also meet other basic requirements.</p>
11.	<p>Encourage an extensive green belt over the floodplain area between the Park Avenue development area and Takaka.</p> <p>Provide walkway/bridleway/cycleway connections between the two areas. Provide for an alternative multiuse access (road, cycleway etc) to Pohara from the new Park Avenue Area and to Takaka to alleviate pressures on State Highway 60.</p>	<p>Again, comments were made by some about the area being already selected and a “done deal”.</p> <p>In general terms however, the idea of appropriate multiple use links (road, walkway, cycleway) was largely accepted. Questions were raised about the economic feasibility of alternative road links to Pohara and Takaka.</p>
12.	<p>Review the existing patterns of development occurring in the Pohara to Tata Beach areas. Involve the local communities to ascertain both short term and long-term aspirations for this whole area.</p> <p>Use structure planning to manage and guide future development in the Pohara to Tata Beach areas. Address roading and access through and around the settlement area.</p>	<p>This was generally supported.</p> <p>There appeared to be a “damage is done” feeling amongst some submitters. Some submitters suggested that no further or more intensive development would be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>It was noted that Wainui Bay was not included in the study area, although acknowledged as not an area suitable for residential development in terms of coastal landscape values.</p>
13.	<p>Consider a long-term residential limit to the inland extent (hill-slope backdrop) of the development in the Pohara to Tata Beach Area.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
14.	<p>Review current zoning of Port Tarakohe industrial are (currently</p>	<p>There was no opposition to this idea. Cross-boundary conflict between</p>

	Phase II Principles (see p 17 & 18)	Summary of Feedback
	Industrial with a Rural 2 buffer. Consider other urban land use options including mixed use residential and/or commercial type activities as well as industrial for this land.	different uses was raised as an issue that should be carefully considered and appropriately addressed.
15.	Consider alternative approaches to the management of ongoing demand for coastal land. Re-consider low density approaches to land in close proximity to the coastal provide mixed density opportunities including higher density developments that use low impact design methods in already developed areas.	<p>Restrictions on further coastal development were widely accepted. However, at the same time, more intensive development in the future was not well supported.</p> <p>In the long term future this raises this issue of how Council will respond to on-going demands for land in proximity to the coast. In the short to medium term submitters noted that this is not likely to be an issue.</p>
16.	Determine appropriate long-term management of high value productive soils held in small titles adjoining Motupipi and Clifton. If some development is deemed appropriate and acceptable then determine the limits and intensity.	<p>Further development in these locations was not well supported, (with the exception of some affected landowners). Submitters expressed that they wished to see this land protected from any further development.</p> <p>In response to the idea of “un-economic” land parcels, it was suggested by some submitters that a range of land parcel sizes should be retained across the Bay, and that these locations would provide high quality land for people who wished to grow food for themselves, their families and local community in the future.</p>
17.	Determine network infrastructure servicing priorities for current and future potential settlement growth, including transportation, water wastewater and storm water management services.	This was widely accepted.
18.	Consider alternative approaches to the long term management of water resources both water supply and wastewater management) to ensure that development is both safe and	<p>There was no opposition to this principle.</p> <p>Questions were raised however, about what was intended with it. The</p>

	Phase II Principles (see p 17 & 18)	Summary of Feedback
	sustainable. Take into account the diverse range of cultural values held within the community particularly those of Iwi, Manawhenua Mohua.	principle was aimed at acknowledging that in the long term, environmentally sustainable and more self-sufficient water supply and wastewater disposal methods and solutions should be encouraged.
19.	Consider an appropriate long-term development strategy for the future of Rangihaeata, including prioritisation of wastewater management options, airfield cross-boundary issues, and timing and initiation of a structure planning exercise with local community.	This was generally accepted.
20.	Consider alternative locations for lifestyle development that is low density, will have minimal landscape impacts and is located on poor quality soils. As a component of this review, look closely at existing zonings and patterns of demand to determine the best long term approach to managing rural and coastal landscape values.	No submitters addressed this particular issue in any detail, in writing. Land productive values and visual amenity were noted in discussion as being critical considerations for any development.
2.1	Encourage the long-term protection of land that has particular heritage ecological cultural and/or spiritual values to both the local Iwi and the resident population of Golden Bay. This is particularly relevant to those coastal margins which are as yet largely undeveloped.	This was widely accepted.

4. NEXT STEPS

Further work and a relative timeline of planning initiatives were presented on pages 19 and 20 of the Phase II report. The purpose of this was to propose a way forward and indicate a prioritisation of things that need to be done.

Before steps are taken to tackle each initiative, Team Golden Bay¹ believes that it is important to articulate the principles - amended following consultation - as a new set of objectives and policies to the Tasman Resource Management Plan.

As a Plan Change, this will provide a clear context for subsequent amendments to the Plan that may arise from the more specific planning initiatives. A bit like a map, the new objectives and policies can give direction and guidance to future planning decisions. They will also contribute to other Council initiatives such as LTCCP processes.

Process steps

The likely process and timeline for this work is:

1. Initial scoping of objectives and policies for discussion with Team Golden Bay and key community group representatives e.g. Golden Bay Futures; Manawhenua ki mohua (December 2006 – January 2007);
2. Confirmation of key policy directions with Council e.g. location of alternative Takaka” growth area; protection of Class A & B Soils in the Clifton and Motupipi locations (February 2007);
3. Draft Plan Change released for more formal input with Golden Bay Community (February – April 2007).
4. Council adoption of proposed Plan Change for notification April 2007

All of this work will be undertaken with the guidance of Team Golden Bay¹ members with input from community stakeholder groups, landowners and individuals with an interest in the long-term future of the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay area.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee:

Receive this report.

Sonya Leusink-Sladen
Policy Planner