#### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLAN CHANGE COMMITTEE HELD IN MEETING ROOM MAHITAHI, CIVIC HOUSE, TRAFALGAR STREET, NELSON ON FRIDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2009 COMMENCING AT 10.45AM

- PRESENT: Councillor R Reese (Chairperson), Councillors A Boswijk, M Cotton, and D Shaw
- IN ATTENDANCE: R Johnson (Divisional Manager, Planning and Consents), M Workman (Manager Environmental Policy), R Peterson (Policy Planner), P Rawson (Senior Policy Planner), A James (Transport Manager), P Ruffell (Utilities Manager) and R N Palmer (Administration Adviser)

#### **1.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 3 SEPTEMBER 2009**

Document number 823770.

Resolved

#### <u>THAT</u> the minutes of a meeting of the Plan Change Committee, held on Thursday, 3 September 2009, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

#### Shaw/Reese

**Carried** 

### 2.0 NELSON SOUTH DRAFT PLAN CHANGE 18

Document number 830800, agenda pages 4-23 refer.

The Senior Policy Planner (Peter Rawson) explained the background to the proposed change and outlined the reasons for the proposal, being to rationalise the residential development which was proceeding on an ad hoc resource consent basis.

Mr Rawson also explained that another reason for the proposed change was to address the standard of subdivision which was presently being undertaken within the southern part of the City as without a change there would be no opportunity to introduce any good urban design features.

The Transport Engineer (Andrew James) explained that in his opinion the effects of re-zoning all four Nelson City areas (C D E and F as shown on Attachment 2 to the report – Structure Plan Map) in conjunction with the land to be re-zoned within the Tasman District on the southern side of Champion Road, without a connection through Hill Street North would put serious pressures on the roundabout at the junction of Champion Road and Salisbury Road and also increase pressure on the roundabouts leading to State Highway 6.

It was noted that at this stage the proposal was only to re-zone areas C and D, however, Mr James explained that even this additional residential area, together with that which the Tasman District Council was proposing to rezone, would likely necessitate traffic lights being installed at that intersection 3 to 5 years before they would otherwise be needed.

He explained that with this increase in traffic the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) would need to carry out an assessment of the affects on State Highway 6, and at this stage there was no provision for it to fund such a study within its 3 year plan.

He suggested that in parallel with the plan change, the Council should be looking to allocate funding to undertake a traffic study to show how the effects on the various roads and intersections could be mitigated and TDC should be approached to help fund this.

The Committee noted that it was proposed that the Tasman District Council would proceed with the change to introduce the additional residential zoning south of Champion Road in parallel with Nelson City Council so that the issues could be dealt with at one time.

The Utilities Manager (Phil Ruffell) outlined the situation regarding servicing of the areas under discussion, explaining that there was no issue with water which was presently sourced from Tasman, and generally the same could be said in respect of waste water, notwithstanding that there were some issues which needed to be addressed in relation to Area D.

He also pointed out that Saxton Creek had some limitations in relation to stormwater disposal and the existing subdividers were using a number of detention practices to overcome this.

He explained that if the Plan change proceeded then the services overlay would ensure that developers would provide infrastructure appropriate to the shortcomings of the area.

It was accepted that the Plan change would remove the existing underlying Rural zoning and thus some of the uncertainty as to future use of the area.

The meeting discussed whether or not, having regard to the possible future zoning of areas E and F, on the northern side of Saxton Creek, there should be some serious consideration given to designating an extension of Hill Street through to Suffolk Road, notwithstanding that the landowner had previously indicated resistance to this connection.

The Committee discussed the priorities for the Council in relation to urban development and whether it was appropriate at this stage to consider this as an area for future residential development, particularly as the change was basically a tidy up and rationalisation of the development which had already occurred.

The Committee generally agreed that it would be appropriate to review the overall roading and infrastructure issues within the southern part of the city before addressing the zoning of the wider area, and in this regard it would be appropriate to have more discussion with the Raine family as to the likely future development. It was generally agreed that while it was important to address the wider issues in due course the present proposal was to rationalise an existing situation and to make provision for a more appropriate development regime, and on this basis it seemed appropriate not to defer it.

Resolved

#### <u>THAT</u> the Committee confirm that the Nelson South draft Plan Change 18 shall make provision for:

- The re-zoning of Areas C and D only to residential, as shown in Attachment 1 to Report number 830800;
- Non-residential activities within the residential zone through the existing non-residential provisions to enable commercial/retail activity;
- A Services overlay over Areas C and D;
- Amending the riparian and coastal margin overlay to provide for an esplanade reserve on the western arm of Saxton Creek;

<u>AND THAT</u> the staff write to iwi, landowners and other interested parties explaining the revised proposal;

<u>AND THAT</u> the comments on the final change be referred back to a subsequent meeting of the Plan Change Committee.

<u>Cotton/Boswijk</u>

**Carried** 

## 3.0 ENNER GLYNN/UPPER BROOK VALLEY STRUCTURE PLAN – PLAN CHANGE 17

Report number 834262, agenda pages 24-84 refer.

: Jane Hilson (Consultant Planner assisting on the proposed change) entered the meeting.

The Policy Planner (Reuben Peterson) presented the report explaining that there were a number of issues which had been raised by interested parties relating to the proposal, these were:

# i) The extent of the Proposed Residential zoning

Mr Peterson drew the Committee's attention to the plan of possible zonings prepared for the Higgins family by Davis Ogilvy, advising that although the area at the bottom end of Enner Glynn Road was accepted, the proposed residential zoning along Enner Glynn Road and parallel to the proposed road number 2 were not supported as they either impacted on the character of the valley floor, gave rise to geo-technical concerns, or raised issues regarding the efficiency of servicing the area. The Committee noted the total of three areas (shown on discussion Map 2 page 34 of the agenda) which it was suggested should be re-zoned Residential and agreed to their inclusion.

### ii) Proposed Roads

Mr Peterson drew the Committee's attention to the proposed roading pattern shown on Discussion Map 3,( page 35 of the agenda) advising that the policies would support the indicative roading pattern to ensure that the roads were constructed logically as development proceeded.

He also advised that although concerns had been expressed regarding proposed road 3 where it passed through the Higgins property, a review of this had been undertaken by Staig & Smith, which illustrated that the road was a logical and practical route, under the proposed new roading standards.

Mr Peterson advised that the Simpson family did not support a road shown over their property connecting the Brook Valley to Bishopdale. The Transport Engineer (Andrew James) stated that this road link would be desirable in the future to allow people an alternative route which avoided having to cross the Inner City when heading south.

The need for a road connection between Marsden and Enner Glynn was discussed. Mr Peterson explained that the road would be a goal for the medium term and that development from the Marsden side provide for the road up to the saddle area.

Mr Peterson also drew the Committee's attention to the proposal to remove the road extension of Enner Glynn Road as shown on discussion map 3.

The Committee understood that the indicative roads would be shown on the structure plan for the area which would be part of the Nelson Resource Management Plan, and therefore the plan to be followed when development was proposed within the area.

#### iii) Extent of the Rural Zone

It was noted that the Rural Zone pattern would remain substantially as currently shown, except where previously proposed areas of residential zoning are recommended to be removed and replaced with rural smallholdings high density zoning.

#### iv) Walkways

It was noted that the walkways were intended to also be available for cycles and therefore the wording within the change would ensure that this was clear.

The Committee noted that the walkway proposed through the Simpsons' farm would be opposed and therefore there needed to be some good reasons to retain it, accepting that it was unlikely to be achieved within the medium term, or an alternative location provided off the farm.

Mr Peterson was requested to pursue this issue further.

Mr Peterson advised the Committee of the Kelly family opposition to the proposed walkway across their land, and explained that as there was a viable alternative on Council owned land that the position of the walkway should be changed.

# v) Bio-diversity Corridors

It was noted that the bio-diversity corridors generally followed existing valleys which were in vegetation.

The meeting discussed whether it would be appropriate to indicate corridor links to the Brook Sanctuary or from the Brook to the Grampians.

Also noted was the need to show a corridor connecting in the area of the Brook saddle.

# vi) Riparian Overlays

It was noted that the riparian overlay on the Kelly farm was specifically there to provide for a walkway to the bush area at the head of the valley. It was accepted that it would be more transparent to delete the overlay and specifically indicate the route as a walkway, rather than using the riparian provisions of the Plan for this purpose.

## vii) Landscape Overlay

The Committee noted that the recommendation was that the extent of the landscape overlay on the Kelly farm be reduced from what was presently in the draft Plan change proposal.

## viii) Viability of the Plan Change in Total

The Committee discussed the viability of the change, noting the importance of the structure plan and the roading connections and walkways, agreeing that while there was no pressure on for the development of the area the change provided an opportunity to provide a clear outline of what the future development of the area should look like.

It would also ensure connectivity of zoning, servicing and movement with the recently notified Marsden Valley area Plan Change 13, and it allowed for rezoning of the properties that were not part of Plan Change 13 but now had zoning which was inconsistent with that notified.

Resolved

# <u>THAT</u> the Committee

*i)* receive the comments of the landowners consulted on the preliminary proposals for plan change 17

- *ii)* Having had regard to these comments, confirm the proposals for the Enner Glynn/Upper Brook Valley for:
  - a) The zoning, and
  - b) The structure plan
- *iii)* Instruct staff to prepare an amended draft proposal for further landowner and stakeholder consultation;

<u>AND THAT</u> the revised amended draft proposal, together with any further landowner or stakeholder comments be referred to the Plan Change Committee for consideration.

<u>Boswijk/Shaw</u>

**Carried** 

Carried

### 4.0 PLAN CHANGE 15 - HERITAGE

Report number 847232, agenda pages 85-164 refer.

Resolved

<u>THAT</u> plan change 15-Heritage (as Attachment 1 to Document 847232) be recommended to the Council for adoption for public notification for submission under clause 5 part 1 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991.

#### Boswijk/Shaw

It was noted that the information contained within the change would in due course be made public as a community resource.

## 5.0 IWI INVENTORY PROJECT – VERBAL UPDATE

Peter Rawson provided a brief verbal update on the Iwi Inventory Project and tabled copies of the Conclusion and Appendix of the draft Nelson Iwi Heritage Inventory Project report prepared by Ursula Passl, the consultant to the project.

The meeting closed at 2.25pm.

CONFIRMED AS A CORRECT RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

 CHAIRPERSON

\_ DATE