



STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee

FROM: Steve Markham, Policy Manager, Deborah Hewett, Rose Biss, Neil Jackson, Policy Planners

REFERENCE: R420

SUBJECT: **BRIEFING REPORT NEW AND POSSIBLE RESOURCE POLICY PROJECTS - EP07/12/04** - Report Prepared for 13 December 2007 Meeting

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides a briefing on the objectives, and likely scope and process for a number of resource policy planning projects and recommends commencement under current budget and resourcing of some of these projects.

2. BACKGROUND

In November the Committee considered the updated resource policy programme and considered briefly a number of projects set out in the programme as priority 1 and 3. These were:

- Golden Bay west strategic planning – priority 1
- Waimea estuary and catchments integrated management strategy – priority 1
- Strategic development planning for Tasman Bay townships such as Brightwater, Wakefield and Tasman – all priority 3.

This discussion was in the context of the large number of active projects in the programme. The constraints on resourcing, largely staff time, were noted, and the Committee directed a briefing report on these projects and the resourcing implications of their commencement alongside current projects.

None of these projects have been resolved by the Committee to formally commence, although initial investigations have been carried out in order to scope the size, content and likely process. The first two projects listed were recommended to the present committee for commencement by the last term of Council.

The following sections of this report provide a general briefing on these projects, with an assessment of resource capabilities of the Resource Policy section in delivering on any of the projects.

3. GOLDEN BAY WEST STRATEGIC PLANNING

Background

This project has been in the Resource Policy programme to commence once the first leg of the strategic resource management review for Takaka – eastern Golden Bay was sufficiently advanced. Both the eastern Bay urban settlement-focussed project

and the proposed western Bay project have been recognised as essential to address settlement and rural resource issues last examined by the Council over 10 years ago with the formulation of the TRMP. The Takaka – eastern Bay project commenced in 2005, recognising that Golden Bay needed a strategic review through two linked projects.

Proposed Study Area

The study area encompasses land in Golden Bay northwest from Rangihaeata to Farewell Spit, and land along the west coast to Kahurangi Point.

Objectives

The project objectives are:

- Establish a community vision and principles for the future development of western Golden Bay
- Identify qualities and attributes that the western Golden Bay community values and seeks to look after for present and future generations.
- Review significant resource management issues and identify options for addressing those issues as part of the Tasman Resource Management Plan
- Inform Council planning processes and plans of other issues arising from community consultation including the Long Term Council Community Plan, Engineering Infrastructure and Community Services Activity Management Plans

The strategic planning work will also be used to:

- inform and guide future development and land use change.
- raise community awareness and understanding about issues that affect the area and values of the area
- assist land owners by providing available information on issues and values, and information sources

Strategic Issues

A brief desktop exercise of planning issues relevant to Golden Bay West has been undertaken using available information from a range of studies and dialogue with the Golden Bay Community Board, Council Staff, and Manuwhenua Ki Mohua.

It is acknowledged that for some matters there is a paucity of information and for others it is timely to update information to reflect current trends and projections and to consider their implications alongside the community vision. It is anticipated that the Golden Bay West community, through a community consultation exercise in conjunction with the community board and key stakeholders will inform the issues. There are links between identified issues for the study area and current project workstreams. The western Golden Bay work will inform these issues.

The current workstreams relevant to western Golden Bay are two sets of Environment Court appeals on Council decisions on the Tasman Resource Management Plan. These are coastal landscape character and historic heritage. Aquaculture management is also subject to litigation processes and government decision-making on law. In addition, the rural policy review project due to commence

in early 2008 will review rural land use issues and inform options for management and protection of productive land, rural character and amenity values among other matters across the District. There are important programme management drivers for allowing the Golden Bay West project to commence, to enable these current workstreams to be efficiently advanced, and so economise on process steps overall.

The following are identified strategic issues for the study area:

Settlement patterns – managing future growth of coastal and rural settlements

Coastal settlements within the Bay have been subject to development pressures, subdivision and built form that has not always respected coastal character and environmental limitations. The relationship between settlement pattern and many of the issues raised in this report are closely aligned and require an integrated approach to achieve development that respects the environment and community aspirations.

Factors that may affect the extent and rate of future growth in settlements include:

- Infrastructure barriers
- Access limitations (private roads, State Highway access)
- The regional and local economy
- The level of population growth, housing demand and housing affordability
- Fuel prices (affecting the costs of commuting)
- Local employment opportunities and their seasonal nature (tourism, aquaculture, farming)
- Subdivision provisions
- Private plan change requests

Patons Rock Proposed Private Plan Change Request

A briefing of a community-based proposal for a private plan change or Council variation was presented to this Committee on 15 November 2007 by Simon Hedley for the Patons Rock Beach Society Inc. The work has been made available to Council. The proposal seeks among other things, to remove the present deferred residential zoning behind Patons Rock and limit the nature and extent of any form of future residential settlement beyond the current settlement boundary. Its objective is to reduce the risks from future ad-hoc subdivision and development which has the potential to compromise the character and values of the Patons Rock area. It provides an integrated structure plan approach to expansion and development of the settlement, and it addresses a number of issues specific to planning for growth of the settlement. It adopts the Tasman District Coastal Landscape Character Assessment findings, and principles from the eastern Golden Bay work.

Within the context of the western Golden Bay work the focus of the private Patons Rock proposal is localised and at a structure plan level rather than strategic in nature. The proposal could be pursued as a private plan change request following operative status of TRMP Part II in 2008, or incorporated in a Council change flowing from the Golden Bay west project. The Society seeks an immediate adoption of the proposal as a variation by Council to avoid development regarded as inappropriate. The staff view is that the risks of this arising do not outweigh the costs of intervening in the wider strategic planning for Golden Bay west that would be incurred, as resources would be diverted. As well, a planning framework across the key issues in the study area is an important context needed and which would be compromised.

Managing risks of coastal hazards: tsunami, coastal inundation, erosion, river flooding

Potential inundation areas in a 100 year stormsurge/tsunami scenario pose threats around much of the coast throughout western Golden Bay.

High erosion hazard risk areas (>0.5m/year long term average) also pose threats in more localised pockets along the coast. Pakawau is an example where coastal erosion is having a significant effect on sea wall structures. In Milnthorpe/Parapara the present zoning is considered to be too close to erodable land. While in other localities such as north of Waikato and the northern side of Ruataniwha Inlet roading is too close to the coast and subject to erosion, sea level rise and storm surge events.

The Aorere floodplain is also subject to flood risks from the Aorere River.

Managing infrastructure service provision in settlements

Water: Many of the coastal settlements do not have access to suitable groundwater and their water source is through rainwater or surface water (streams and creeks) which are unreliable sources of water. Pakawau (including Totara Avenue and Waikato Inlet), Parapara (except groundwater), Patons Rock, and Puponga all have poor water quality. Compliance with DWSNZ 2000 is an issue and an inadequate water capacity for fire-fighting.

Wastewater: On-site wastewater disposal systems for Parapara, Patons Rock, Tukuruua are considered to be of poor standard. As townships increase in size or monitoring shows adverse effects of contaminants from septic tank discharges on drinking water and/or coastal environments then appropriate solutions for disposal will need to be addressed.

Stormwater: Other than Collingwood and Patons Rock no other settlements have infrastructure networks for managing stormwater and associated contaminants.

Roading: The arterial state highway is a key road network providing direct access to coastal settlements. Access to some settlements is not considered safe and there is insufficient road width for cycling making these road users vulnerable.

Providing access to rivers and the coast

There are few Council reserves and limited coastal access opportunities in a number of settlements for example Tukuruua and Milnthorpe. Options may exist to relocate paper roads on private land to provide access to key localities that is less intrusive to private landowners.

Recognition and protection of landscape character

Changes to coastal and rural character and landscape qualities, particularly in coastal locations, through subdivision, built development and land use changes can have detrimental effects on those values in the absence of comprehensive policy provisions.

The Tasman District Coast Landscape Character Assessment (Boffa 1995) identified the Golden Bay Coastal Character Area (Farewell Spit to Separation Point) as the most threatened of the District's landscapes due to its location, and landscape qualities considered attractive for further and rapid development.

The North West Coast Character Area (Cape Farewell to Kahurangi Point) has also been identified as having low ability to accommodate or absorb change and development, and while isolated, it is vulnerable to subdivision and development.

Rural land in western Golden Bay generally comprises larger land areas which could be subdivided resulting in small land parcels that have the potential to change the rural and coastal landscape.

The characteristics and qualities of landscapes and natural features most important to the local community needs to be further tested and considered alongside the expert advice prepared for the Council by Frank Boffa in 2005 (limited to coastal landscapes). Options for protection of important landscape values also needs to be explored with the community and landowners as a basis for formulation of appropriate policy provision and to better inform decision-making.

The ability of the landscape to absorb change is likely to be a key factor in the consideration of options and policy provisions for settlement planning, built development and other land use activities.

Recognition and protection of heritage areas

The coastal area is important for Maori cultural values. Development pressures and more intensive land use in coastal settlements poses a risk of damage to and loss of archaeological sites and cultural knowledge. This is particularly prevalent where settlements are on the threshold of more intensive land use such as Pakawau. The heritage precincts of Taimata, Te Rae and Parapara are important as they are likely to contain undisturbed archaeological evidence.

Consultation with Manawhenua Ki Mohua will be important in establishing cultural heritage values for this part of Golden Bay.

Management of aquaculture development

Implementation of aquaculture management areas, and strategic planning for land and infrastructure for this development, particularly onshore processing plants, wharf facilities, distribution infrastructures, waste disposal, and equipment supply and storage, are important. The requirements for this industry and associated economic and labour market impact for Golden Bay are unclear but may be significant. It could be timely to touch base with the industry sector to gauge future intentions.

There are sensitivities between marine and land use activities for example shell fish harvesting in the Ruataniwha Estuary and bay is sensitive to faecal bacterial runoff from within the Aorere dairy catchment.

Protecting productive land from built development and fragmentation

Land fragmentation arising through successive subdivision of land parcels into smaller parcels can have an effect on productive use of rural land through:

- Increased land values
- Cross boundary effects
- Reduction in economies of scale of productive units
- Direct loss of land for productive activities

There appears to have been relatively little change in productive land uses between 1996 - 2001. The pattern of rural subdivision and houses in the Golden Bay rural area (Golden Bay Ward) from 1996-2003 showed a dispersed and high increase in the rate of subdivision. Updated information is required to confirm the trend.

The North West coast has been subject to ownership changes and some pressure for subdivision. The high level of rates has been identified as a potential driver for land use change in a direction less appropriate to the location and subdivision into smaller titles to maintain economic viability.

In the Aorere catchment it appears that dairy farming is undergoing significant change with consolidation of farms into larger land holdings and increasing stock units. Issues around the viability of farming activities are however arising through:

- Labour shortages, debt levels and increasing costs
- Lack of skilled and reliable staff
- industry compliance requirements

Impacts of affordable housing on labour supply could be a factor affecting labour.

Protection of significant indigenous vegetation sites and management of riparian areas

A separate process for identifying areas of significant indigenous vegetation is in train with landowners being approached to participate on a voluntary basis and receive a report on the ecological values of their indigenous areas with the possibility of assistance from a landowner's assistance package.

The lowland natural ecosystems in Golden Bay have suffered the greatest losses of biodiversity since pakeha settlement. The most threatened locations are coastal dunes, flats and estuarine margins, lowland wetlands, riparian ecosystems, forest and shrubland, and frost flat communities.

Threats to ecosystems and biodiversity values arise from land use activities, including vegetation clearance, browsing, wetland drainage and invasion by weeds and pests animals, and also just the increasing presence of people and domestic animals. The intactness of biodiversity values can also be threatened from subdivision of land into smaller parcels. The impact is not only on the vegetation but on the range of native animals, particularly native birds and insects that utilise these areas for food, shelter and nesting.

Process

- Research and investigation of key issues and possible options, working closely with the Golden Bay Community Board, key staff, and specialist consultants to better understand opportunities and constraints in each issue. This work will integrate land use and infrastructure services considerations.

- Development of Issues and Options Paper, with defined issues and body of supporting information compiled. Articulation of opportunities and constraints. Establish key options available for settlement development, landscape character protection, and other key issues.
- Community Consultation: 'Issues and Options' paper used as basis for consultation within the Western Bay and north west coast communities. Summary of feedback reported to Council.
- Policy paper on possible and preferred option/s Work closely with Golden Bay Community Board to identify direction/s for progress. Establish preferred option/s for key issues. Incorporate S 32 analysis. Put to Committee.
- Prepare TRMP changes and Infrastructure services development proposals Develop draft TRMP change(s) and infrastructure services plans for routing through committees and budgetary processes for adoption, consultation and implementing.

Outputs

Proposed outputs include:

- Research Paper identifying issues for community consultation
- Issue and Options Paper
- Consultation Summary Report
- Variation(s) to the TRMP to address significant resource management issues.

There is an important ongoing link between this project, and the Takaka-Eastern Golden Bay work, and the rural policy review work yet to commence, on matters relating to the rural environment that form a backdrop to the settlement issues. These include landscape character and land productive values and their retention in the rural land surrounding all settlements, This link will mean integrated outputs will have to result across these three projects.

It is anticipated that decisions arising from the project would be implemented through a range of tools including the TRMP, annual plan, LTCCP, activity management plans, and other strategies by the Council. Implementation for some outcomes may require input from external agencies, especially where the Council is not a key provider or regulator of the service.

It is the staff view that this project has some important drivers for its high priority, and that it should commence immediately. The professional resourcing in the Resource Policy team currently allows staff time for this to happen so that other current projects requiring the same people can continue at an efficient pace of progression.

4. WAIMEA ESTUARY AND CATCHMENTS INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Background

In 2002, Council produced a discussion paper on three coastal management issues:

- Waimea Inlet
- Abel Tasman National Park coastline
- Activities that disturb foreshore and seabed.

Public submissions were received and partially analysed, but the work was overtaken by other priorities. In 2006, Waimea estuary was discussed at a meeting involving DoC, Council staff, and interest groups. There was a call for an overall “management strategy” for Waimea Inlet. However, that was a label for a concept, rather than a developed proposition. In 2007 the concept of an integrated management strategy for the estuary and contributing catchments was included in the Resource Policy programme with the Committee requesting a briefing.

Council’s coastal Tasman area work that introduced the Rural 3 Zone, and the Richmond West work have drawn attention to the natural and recreational significance of the estuary. It presents constraints to development in adjacent areas, but also offers opportunities for its values to be integrated as features of development.

The Waimea estuary is the District’s largest estuary; with extensive intertidal areas and barrier islands including Moturoa (Rabbit) and Rough Island. The major contributing catchment is the Waimea catchment, with many minor coastal catchments to the west to Mapua, and east to Tahunanui beach. The estuary is Richmond’s and Stoke’s front yard. The intertidal areas and margins support habitats for bird life of at least national significance.

Proposal

The proposal is to review the state of Waimea estuary, its role as a major geographic feature of the District, and the pressures on its natural and recreational values. Following this, an assessment of the management regime for the estuary would identify any different or additional management measures necessary to deal more effectively with issues, including opportunities for enhancement and risks to values. The work would pick up from matters raised in response to the three coastal issues discussion paper, the Rural 3 zone and its subsequent implementation, and from the Richmond West work. Catchment inputs and land use in contributing catchments would need review.

Besides Council the Department of Conservation and Nelson City Council are key agencies with interests and knowledge of the estuary, and Nelson City territory covers the eastern part of the estuary waters and contributing urban catchments. In addition there are community interest groups and iwi with stakes in many of the issues. Integration across issues and stakeholders is a necessary aspect of this proposal. This shared stake suggests a collaborative process would be important.

Process

The work proposed is:

- A review of existing information about the inlet: the state of the water body, seabed, the habitat conditions of its intertidal area and immediate margins, and activities in catchments affecting the estuary.
- A review of relevant submissions already held by Council.
- One or more meetings with interested parties to share knowledge and clarify issues and actions.

At that point, a report back to the Council and the other key agencies would cover:

- Are there significant uncertainties in information about the estuary?
- Are there significant inadequacies in present management provisions for the estuary, its margins, and the catchments affecting it?
- Options for addressing any deficiencies.

Those options include whether further work is required by Council in any of its statutory roles; or whether there are matters that could be appropriately managed in a non-statutory way by a cooperative of interested parties (or an organisation such as the Tasman Environmental Trust).

Unless or until this project commences, it is premature to map out a likely process, given the fact of other agency interests, and need to explore opportunities for developing the process, including obtaining funding for specific inquiries such as Envirolink for a science stocktake tailored to the situation.

The staff view is that this project could proceed cautiously, under currently budgeted staff time, with some strategic investigation, preliminary stakeholder engagement, and clarification of external funding for stocktaking of natural systems information and uncertainties. At an early stage, reporting on process and effort required would help in confirming the scope and best value for the work.

5. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING FOR TASMAN BAY TOWNSHIPS OF BRIGHTWATER, WAKEFIELD AND TASMAN

Background

Strategic development planning for townships in Tasman Bay including Brightwater, Wakefield and Tasman has like Golden Bay, been waiting since the first formulation of settlement policy under the RMA for these areas in the TRMP. The programme has included projects for each of these small urban areas for some years. Each township has its own set of strategic growth issues to be resolved for its future development. While Brightwater and Wakefield are serviced for water and wastewater Tasman is a small township that has been limited in its growth by poor drainage conditions and a lack of reticulated services. The strategic development planning work for each township is outlined as a separate project, with likely issues, and a likely standard process.

5.1 Brightwater

Issues

The issues identified for Brightwater in the Tasman Resource Management Plan in 1996 were:

- Recognition of flood hazard on the lowlying land adjacent to rivers
- The need to limit urban expansion on land of high productive value
- Adverse amenity effects from dispersed pattern of industrial activities in Brightwater and need for better separation and management of effects (*current wording dates from 1999*)
- Adequate open space and walkways

It is timely to review these issues and identify any further issues.

Rate of Growth in Brightwater

In the ten year period 1996 - 2006 Brightwater's population has increased from 1239 to 1791, an increase of 44 per cent. This equates to a 4.4 percent annual growth rate which can be compared with 3.2 per cent growth in Richmond. Brightwater is one of the rapid growth areas in the District with an average of 20 new dwelling consents per annum issued over the same ten year period. The residential growth has been matched by several significant industrial developments particularly in the Factory Road area. There has been little commercial development however.

The medium growth rate projection for the population in Brightwater to 2026 is 2520 persons.

Flood Risk

Brightwater is located near the confluence of the Wairoa and Waiti Rivers. While there have been no major floods affecting Brightwater since 1996, flooding remains a major risk to the township. Some residential rezoning has proceeded in the last ten years on to land in the northwest of Brightwater that requires flood mitigation measures. One seven hectare parcel of residential land remains to be developed in this area.

In Lord Rutherford Rd south some works have been undertaken to mitigate flooding from the Pitfure Stream.

Location of Industrial Development

Some progress has been made in consolidating industrial development on the southeast of Brightwater away from the town centre and residential development to mitigate the effects of traffic and noise. However there is some risk from flooding from the Wairoa River in the locality which may need to be mitigated.

The large Rural Industrial zone at Eves Valley in Waimea West remains largely underutilised.

Recreational Opportunities

Land for an additional playing field is being negotiated at Lord Rutherford Park. An informal walking and cycle track developed recently along the margin of the Wairoa and Waiti Rivers could be further enhanced to encourage Brightwater's sense of identity as a riverside place.

Infrastructure Services

Water: - The township's water storage reservoir on Watertank Hill is being upgraded to provide increased storage but any further development on the hills above the level of the reservoir will be difficult.

Wastewater: - Upgrading is proposed in the Long Term Council Community Plan 2006. Included in the major capital works programme is a trunk main upgrade for Brightwater to Richmond. The \$8 million project is expected to occur in three stages over the next 10 years.

Stormwater: - It is proposed to upgrade Jeffries Creek and construct detention storage although the latter project is now in doubt.

Roading: - Two Brightwater road reconstruction projects were deferred in the 2006 LTCCP. These were:

- Factory Road
- River Terrace Road

Brightwater streetscaping project was also deferred from the 10 year programme in the LTCCP.

Heritage Character

In recent years various owners of the many listed heritage buildings in Brightwater have taken advantage of the Council's heritage grants scheme to upgrade their buildings (that add to the appearance and character of the township). Some heritage buildings remain unprotected.

Future Issues for Brightwater

- Sustainably managing stormwater runoff from increasing hillside development
- The extent of residential development on Watertank Hill on the south west of the Brightwater Bypass needs to be decided.
- The future of industrial development on the floodplain versus further development at Eves Valley Rural Industrial Zone.
- Further enhancement of the heritage character of the town
- Travel demand management including improvement of public transport to Richmond and Nelson.

5.2 Wakefield

Issues

Some of the issues identified for Wakefield in the TRMP in 1996 have now been resolved and one of these is the completion of remediation of the contaminated Brookside sawmill site in Bird Lane. The cross boundary issues between industrial and residential activities and flooding at the northern end of Wakefield have been largely resolved by retaining a rural buffer area.

Some issues are not yet resolved; one is the poor access between Lord Auckland Rd and the Bowling Club with all traffic from the north side of Wakefield utilising Martin Avenue to access State Highway 6. A more connected network is desirable.

Rate of Growth in Wakefield

In the period 1996 – 2006 Wakefield's population increased from 1419 to 1875, an increase of 32 per cent (or 3.2 % per annum) which is the same growth rate as occurred in Richmond. The average number of new dwelling consents for Wakefield issued over that period is 21 per annum.

The medium growth rate projection for the population in Wakefield to 2026 is 2200 persons.

Industrial Land

The Industrial zone in Bird Lane still has the Chemical Hazard Area overlay on it despite the site's having been remediated. This may be impeding development opportunities. However the flood risk also needs to be evaluated as the land is very close to the Waiti River.

Infrastructure Services

Water supply: - This is proposed to be augmented with increased storage in the low and high level reservoirs.

Wastewater: - The replacement of the Wakefield to Brightwater trunk main is a project that was deferred in the LTCCP in 2006.

Stormwater: – there are no major stormwater projects planned in the Wakefield area.

Roading: – There are five projects listed for Wakefield in the LTCCP 2006. These are Eighty Eight Valley Rd reconstruction to the Rural Residential area at Totara View Rd; replacement of the Pigeon Valley Bridge; and seal extensions at Bridge Valley, Gibbs Valley and Eighty Eight Valley. In contrast there are 13 roading projects in the coastal Tasman area. It is noted that four other Wakefield roading reconstruction projects were deferred beyond the 10 year forecast in the LTCCP 2006. These were:

- Edward Street Pitfure Road to Church
- Bird Lane
- Pitfure Road
- 88 Valley Road

Future Issues for Wakefield

Some emerging issues are:

- Future growth direction needs to be established
- Future development in the Wakefield south Rural Residential zone requires an indicative roading plan to avoid an inadequate and inefficient roading pattern in Wakefield south
- Roding plan at Wakefield north needs to be completed
- Ensuring there is sufficient land available for local employment opportunities
- Travel demand management including improvement in public transport to Richmond and Nelson

5.3 Tasman

Issues

Tasman is a small village in the coastal Tasman area bordering the southern end of the Moutere estuary. Its development future has been in part assessed through the CTA development review from 2001 to 2005 which led to Variation 32 and the infrastructure services programme of water supply via the coastal pipeline, and road upgrading, with CTA reticulated wastewater being abandoned in this process. While Variation 32 did not amend the urban zoning for Tasman, the few submission decisions made committed Council to a strategic development review of the village, with a focus on infrastructure upgrading following some vision of its development potential. This need was highlighted in resolving an appeal request to rezone a small site on the southern boundary of Tasman from commercial and industrial to residential

Issues

The issues in the TRMP for Tasman (current to the commencement of the CTASDR in 2000) are:

- Wastewater management effects in an unreticulated location with high groundwater** level and no reticulated water supply.
- Maintaining urban limits in relation to surrounding land of high productive value, and the present SH 60.

The following are future issues for Tasman.

Infrastructure

Wastewater, stormwater and water supply need a fundamental review in relation to the present village and any expansion. Acute flooding issues from rural stormwater are in need of resolution. This is a LTCCP capital programming issue.

Growth options

The functional future of Tasman as an urban area needs consideration in relation to its connections with Motueka, Mapua-Ruby Bay, and development in the surrounding Rural 3 Zone and other rural or rural residential zoned land. The need for urban density residential and commercial service development expansion is related to the spatial expansion options available. The SH 60 Ruby Bay Bypass will provide some structural boundary to the north, and the relationship with the present highway will change. The use of surrounding Rural 3 zoned land for production and rural residential development is another context. The low-lying eastern part of Tasman vulnerable to sea level rise, is another.

5.4 Process for township strategic development planning

The likely process for each of these township projects follows broadly the steps for the Golden Bay strategic planning work, namely:

- Research and investigation of key issues and possible options, integrating land use and infrastructure services considerations
- Development of Issues and Options Paper
- Community Consultation
- Policy paper on possible and preferred option(s)

- Structure plan preparation to support both TRMP changes and services programme design and timing
- Plan changes and services upgrading.

The staff view on these three projects is that the drivers for the projects support a priority 2 status for Brightwater and Wakefield. When these projects are to be proceeded with, it is considered efficient to progress them on a common timeframe, as there are common issues and crossover implications, where residential and business land issues are concerned. The Tasman project has drivers, but of a lesser relative priority.

6. RESOURCE POLICY AND OTHER COUNCIL CAPACITIES FOR NEW PROJECTS

The advice in relation to the projects addressed in the report is that Golden Bay West, Waimea Estuary, and Wakefield could and should commence alongside existing projects. However, there are tradeoffs and risks in capacity terms. The commencement of the Brightwater and Wakefield strategic development planning projects could be brought forward to 2008. However, the projected capacity of the policy planning team who are able to be involved in any of the strategic land development planning projects is such that through 2008 and beyond, the rate of progress for all these new projects would also be sensitive to the demands of current commitments, and also to the risk of significant numbers of private plan change requests being received after operative status of Part II TRMP in early 2008.

In addition, substantial effort is currently required for all urban development projects from key staff in Engineering Services Department, and staff involvement from Community Services Department. This is so demanding that the limit on capacity for taking on new projects lies within Asset Engineering sooner than in Resource Policy. This is growing in its acuteness with the rollout of Richmond projects and corporate strategic projects (ESP review, stormwater management review).

Furthermore, all the staff team members across all these departments will be involved in some way with the programmed review of the LTCCP commencing beginning of 2008. This may impact on all policy workstreams in ways that are not yet clear.

7. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee:

1. **Agree** to the commencement of the Golden Bay West Strategic planning project and the Waimea Estuary project at a rate consistent with ongoing commitments with current projects, and subject to any additional funding needs for 2008/09 being provided in the 2008/09 annual plan.
2. **Agree** to review the situation by 30 June 2008 to establish the commencement of the Brightwater and Wakefield Development projects at a point after that time.

Steve Markham
Policy Manager