



Minutes

of the

Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel

Date 16 - 18 September 2014
Venue Council Chamber
515 Mackay Street
Thames

16 September 2014

Present

M Farnsworth (Chairperson) T Fox
I Munro

In Attendance

Name	Item(s)
Peter French (Deputy Mayor)	All
Leigh Robcke (District Plan Manager)	All
Bruce Baker (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Kirsten Williamson (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Faith O'Sullivan-Babe (Contract Planner)	All
Lisa Madgwick (District Plan Co ordinator)	All

Glenn Leach (Mayor)
Sam Napia (Manager, Governance, Planning and Strategy)
David Hammond (Chief Executive)

Meeting Commenced 09:07

Adjournments and Absences

Adjournment	Start	Finish	Reason
Chairperson	09:16	09:46	Morning Tea
Chairperson	12:00	13:00	Lunch
Chairperson	16:00		Adjourned to 18/09/2014

18 September 2014

Present

M Farnsworth (Chairperson) T Fox
I Munro

In Attendance

Name	Item(s)
Leigh Robcke (District Plan Manager)	All
Bruce Baker (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Kirsten Williamson (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Faith O'Sullivan-Babe (Contract Planner)	All
Lisa Madgwick (District Plan Co ordinator)	All

Meeting Commenced 09:30

Adjournments and Absences

Adjournment	Start	Finish	Reason
Chairman	12:00	13:00	Lunch

Table of Contents

Item	Business	Page No.
1	Conduct of Hearing	4
1.1	Apologies	4
1.2	Conflict of Interest	4
2	Strategy and Policy Development	5
2.1	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Whole of Plan	5
2.2	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5	5
2.3	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Significant Trees	5
2.4	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay, Airfield Zone	6
2.5	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 18 Transport Policies	6
2.6	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 39 Transport and Section 55 Road Zone Rules	6
2.7	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Forestry	7
2.8	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Military Training, Noise, Festivals and Events	7

1 Conduct of Hearing

1.1 Apologies

All members were present.

1.2 Conflict of Interest

The Chairperson invited notice from members of:

1. Any interests that may create a conflict with their role as an elected member relating to the minutes item(s) for the meeting; and
2. Any interests in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest as provided for in the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968.

The following interests were declared:

Mark Farnsworth Genetically Modified Organisms

Moved/Seconded By: Munro/Fox

2 Strategy and Policy Development

2.1 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Whole of Plan

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Whole of Plan

2.2 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 1 - Background and How to Use the Plan
- Section 2 - Statutory Acknowledgements
- Section 4 - Information Requirements for Resource Consents
- Section 5 - Cross-Boundary Matters

2.3 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Significant Trees

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 11 - Significant Trees
- Section 35 - Significant Trees
- Appendix 3 - Significant Tree Schedule

2.4 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay, Airfield Zone

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 28 - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay
- Section 40 - Airfield Zone

2.5 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 18 Transport Policies

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 18 - Transport

2.6 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 39 Transport and Section 55 Road Zone Rules

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 39 - Transport Rules
- Section 55 - Road Zone Rules

2.7 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Forestry

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following topic of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Forestry

2.8 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Military Training, Noise, Festivals and Events

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following topics of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Military Training
- Noise
- Festivals, events

2 Suggested Resolution(s)

That the Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the reports - Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 35, 28, 40, 18, 39, 55 and Appendix 3,
2. Confirms that it has considered all submissions and further submissions made to the Proposed District Plan on the section/matter being considered.
3. Receives and considers any additional information or evidence tabled at the hearings by submitters.
4. Makes interim recommended decisions in regards to the matters raised in the submissions and further submissions received, and notes its reasons for the decisions.
5. Instructs staff to make changes arising from decisions made relating to the Proposed District Plan and take a recommended Decisions version of the Proposed District Plan to Council in 2015.

Moved/Seconded By: Mark Farnsworth/Ian Munro

General Discussion

- Introduction from Chairperson.
- Introduction from District Plan Manager. Section 42A report prepared by staff. Anticipate the tables with recommendations – make interim decisions. 10,000 submission points to deliberate on. Andrew Wharton is not available this block of hearings, his reports will be addressed by other members of the team.

Mr Neville Cameron (Submitter 33) – Further Submission not accepted

Key discussion points

- Read the EDS submission, and would like the Panel to reconsider.
- Panel advised they would move through every point of the EDS submission. Planning matters to address. Not accepting the further submission as covered in primary submission.

Primary submission

- Background item to submission is 28 years ago built white edifice on Coastal Zone.
- Mayor at time said not being able to build white on coast and set about building one
- Coastal Overlay - instrument of oppression. No reason to subject coastal landowners to more restrictions.
- Seems to be a desire to over-regulate ratepayers.
- House colours - limiting onerous and oppressive. Unusual colours. Not a matter for District Plan.
- Coastal Overlay - make nicer for those outside rather than those on the property. Ratepayers more important. Cost to owners and ability to do things.
- Minor dwellings - denied to anyone living in the Coastal Zone. Why limit the amount that people can use their property.
- B&B important in the economy of the Peninsula. One or two B&B establishments. Good source of income.
- Most ratepayers live within 1km of the Coast. Coastal overlay includes all of Coromandel town. Request simplify, and remove Coastal Overlay. Request remove rural overlay – majority of land is owned by Govt. Smallholders are not having rights to cut vegetation. Existing Plan is fine, doesn't need Coastal or Rural overlay.
- This Council is regarded as much improved, user-friendly and need to maintain that. Additional hoops is not improving relationship between ratepayers.
- Colour palette not a problem, useage from energy, white houses more effective for heat restoration etc. Need more insulation etc if have to paint it a different colour. White doesn't heat up as much. Proposed overlay, plant police force, inspecting plants in the Coastal Area which is wrong.
- Very good for the economy having people stay in B&B's.

The Hearings Panel agreed to not accept the Further Submission of Mr Cameron.

Ben Grubb (Submitter 568) – Further Submission not accepted

Key discussion points

- Had two further submissions that were not accepted.
- Submission on 803 (Ian Michael Wernham).
- Opposed all points of the submission.
- Planning Map 24c – Overlays and Zone – Property at 9 and 41 are an integral and important part of Te Karo Bay. Should have same overlays as the rest of Te Karo Bay. Severe environmental damage if subdivision proceeded. Rural zoning is the appropriate zoning. Stream originates in 9 and flows through 41. Oppose Point 1.
- Point 2 – Section 9.1.1 – LA4 study was one part of the Landscape Assessment. Findings of LA4 by itself is irrelevant.

- Point 3 – S29 R3, Oppose all of a) to g)
- Point 4 – Biodiversity. No knowledge of EW report of 2000.
- Point 5 – Significant trees, overlooked, neither support or opposes that.
- Point 6 – R23, two dwellings per lot, do not support established outside of developed settlement
- Point 7 – neither support/oppose
- Point 8 – Oppose
- Point 9 – Homestay/farmstay accommodation – oppose
- Point 10 – Map 24D – Coastal living zone should be zoned rural. Support
- Point 11 – Map 29B – overlooked, neither support or oppose.

Kaimarama Trust – not read, not accepting Further Submission.

Forestry

- Wilding pines. Te Karo Bay property. Outstanding natural features. Spread throughout TCDC area. Damage well documented in Landscape studies.
- District Plan needs a considered background statement, clear objectives and policies. Need robust rules.

Part 8 – Zone Rules

- Afforestation Rule 11 #1 – add prior to afforestation, plan by suitably qualified forester for removal of wilding pines. Trees on road reserves be removed, felling to avoid native damage, felling to remove pines at 8 years. May require independent review at the forest owners expense.
- There could be more employment to District to remove wilding pines.
- Impose some form of tax on all forestry owners and you clean up on your area. Cost is minimal.

Kim Coppersmith – Pauanui Residents and Ratepayers Association (Submitter 353)

Committee member

Key discussion points

- Congratulate the DP team on the Plan.
- Want a footer with part number and section.

Future Coastal Protection Line

- Oppose, detrimental.
- Current line which was assumed was adequate. Can't be ignored but line goes through some of the houses on Pauanui Beach. Line not the right way to recognise it.

Part IV Overlay 29.3 – Ind Vegetation

- Support in part, oppose doesn't allow Property owners any allowance for removal of vegetation. Current Operative Plan allows for 5m³ – should be retained. 500 yr old Kanuka has other protection, 4 or 500 hectares, wants to clear for firewood, not significant value. It's saying go and buy your firewood, when you've tatty scrubby stuff that can be used for firewood.
- New property owner, can't clear fell. 5m³ seems a reasonable amount.
- Consent cost of you exceeded 5m³ - controlled activity \$900 standard deposit
- To buy 1m³ of manuka is about \$150.00

Zone Rules – Part VIII

- Visitor Accommodation – 6 tariff paid visitors. Oppose – the ability to enforce it and the cost of the enforcement. Council trying to support Economic Development and tourism within the area, this opposes that. Tourist do not necessarily want to stay in a Motel. Detrimental to Economic Development in this area. Not enforceable.
- Concerns that people might not want a holiday home in the District if they need a resource consent for it.
- Discussion was had regarding the amount of holidaymakers staying at baches. 35 people at a bach is not unusual. Amenity effects, complaints from people who live next door.

Part VIII – Commercial Zone

- Part 4 – dwelling in Commercial Zone, balcony or patio. Patio designed to receive two hours of sunlight on the 21 June every year. Who's going to monitor that? Agree with protecting Amenity Values.

Pauanui Specific Activities – 44.5

- Specific to Pauanui – Comprehensive Residential Development – not less than 2000m² – want to see it retained. Minimum lot size to Pauanui 600m² – want to see that retained.

Zone Rules 53.4

- A playground generally exceeds the noise levels allowed.
- Mechanical flying fox exceeds the 2 decibel level.

Section 54.8

- Part N – Side yard fence – max of 1.2m when adjoins walkway or rec area. Doesn't allow people privacy.
- If you had a 2m fence in Pauanui it is changing the character of the place. Turning from an urban area to sub-urban.

S 56.4 – Festival/event in rural area

- Permitted act standard should be amended from 24hours to 72 hours. Rural area is appropriate for overnight visitors. Encourages Economic Development. Not necessarily bad behaviour. Can be benign.

57.4 – Zone Rules

- Silt and sediment from earthworks – applicable to any other zoning rules? Specific to rural lifestyle? Un-necessary and in-consistent.

Part V – 26.7 – Community Halls

- Council owned community halls to be raised from 15 decibels to 20 decibels.

Schedule 3 3.3A – Sig Trees

- Want Sequoia tree to be added. Significant tree and a significant landmark. STEM baseline means that pohutukawas are not included as they are not tall.
- Mount Ave tree – historical magnificent tree but not included due to height.

Airfield - Height and Noise restrictions

- The submitter is supporting the 12m amenity yard.
- Changed their mind from original to further submission as they represent the ratepayers in Pauanui, and they are opposed to changing the rules.
- Huge grey area around this section of Plan. Different to CAA enforcement. Current Operative Plan places 1 in 5 from Boundary of airfield.

- TCDC put valve cuts within the airfield. Discrepancy within how reference things. Current AIP shows airfield width at 54m – runway strip boundary. Development is already done. Google map – **Attachment A**.
- Plan should retain existing runway strip extent shown on map 29N.
- Current houses would be disadvantaged by relaxation of the rules. Airfield protected. Some houses have had to 'dig-in' to remain in that existing height rule. Would like to see the current Operative Plan retained.

Mike and Sandra Morrison (Submitter 92)

Along with Mike Slater – 19 Oceanair Drive, Pauanui

Attachment B

Key discussion points

- Council maintained 1 in 5 to observe current amenity levels. CAA have relaxed that rule. Area Managers and staff and CAA all support the 1 in 5 rule. Full resource consent to build beyond that. PDP this rule has been dropped. Unfair to current residents. Six residents who have formed submissions and the Community Board want Council to reconsider the 1 in 5 rule.
- Would like to have the 3 properties that infringe the 1 in 5 rule partitioned off and would want the rest of properties to abide. No two storied properties etc.
- Want to retain 1 in 5 rule from airfield boundary fence, not from the runway strip
- Every property on the northern side - have a notation on LIMS, 1 in 5 has to be maintained.

Black and White photo (A) referenced. Current plans rules haven't stopped plans being delivered.

Mervyn Trebes (Submitter 1140)

Attachment C

Key discussion points

- Moteilier from Whitianga. Concerned with noise in the area. New Plan is going to be noisier.
- They run a motel. Love events. Brings people to the town.
- Asking that there must be a reasonable time – 10pm people have to be able to go to sleep. Must be responsible and mitigate their noise effects.
- Electronically amplified noise 10pm – 7am in pedestrian core zone for special events.
- Have to be able to sleep. PDP for Pedestrian Core Zone of 70db does not allow that. Attenuation from outside to inside 10-15dB, looking at 40dB inside. Page 6 of original submission, bedrooms and habitable rooms would like table.
- Whangamata hall – accommodation provider having battle with the hall. Hall was built, it is old, no sound proofing. Council has to sort this issue out. May have to cost Council.
- Discussion was had relating to standard residential zone, the limits the submitter is proposing are higher than limits in the residential zone.
- Discussion was had regarding Pedestrian Core zone – mixed use, comp residential dwelling above ground floor are permitted and how that should be dealt with. Refit the house part sound-proofing material?

Simon Ritchie (Submitter 538)

Key discussion points

Festivals and Events – Rural Zone

- Long periods of amplified music can cause distress. Wants to tighten up controls.
- Current District Plan - no effective controls in Rural Zone. PDP introduced some controls, but not far enough. Staff report (appendix 2), suggesting introducing more

controls in the Rural Zone. Prefer to see permitted activity events lasting less than 24hr and less than 250 people.

- Local residents are the most affected by festivals and events, they should have a say whether they take place. The Proposed District Plan has gone some way towards this in appendix 2, local community in the assessment criteria in the restricted discretionary matter and must consider views of the local community.

Communications – Attachment D

- Whatever the District Plan says, enforcement is going to be an issue.
- Ad hoc festivals – no one but organisers know about it. Local residents are kept in the dark. January 2014 event – started at 5.30 on Friday afternoon, finished at 5am on Sunday. Numerous complaints, noise control officers attended. Noise levels never abated. Ad hoc will become more common. Once these festivals start, very difficult to stop.
- Contravening the District Plan – non-compliant festivals with no resource consent, not allowed to have festivals on this property.
- Staff commented that you can get an abatement notice for excessive noise. It takes time to get issued, to get someone on sight is difficult. Can seize equipment if excessive noise.

Trevor Barrett (Submitter 713)

Attachment E

- Map 29M needs to be changed as the position of the airstrip is in the wrong location.
- Other submitters want it measured from the airfield boundary, however this submitter wants a 12m yard as it removes the issues of 1:4 or 1:5
- Visual amenity and amenity equality should not affect building a second story.

John Isdale (Submitter 910)

- Importance of gold mining to the whole country.
- Inherited late Fathers information.
- The submitter has made no submissions, but made further submissions. His personal views and are not Heritage NZ views.

Transport – paper road

- Want people to be able to use those roads. TCDC District maps that go into DoC land, TCDC maps still have paper roads that are still not on other internet providers eg google. Paper roads in DoC estate do they still come under the District Plan.

Arthur Hinds – Mercury Bay Forest and Bird (Submitter 781)

Attachment F

- Agrees that erosion on farms can occur. Large siltation problems, same amount of rainfall but short bursts. Very steep country not specifically in Whangapoua, floods and creates issues.

Karl Baldwin on behalf of Ernslaw One and Rayonier (Submitter 855)

James Sinclair – Ernslaw One, taking over from Richard Hagill

Attachment G

- The Panel asked the submitter what his view of the Section 32 report was, had it adequately validated the forestry rules, he had reviewed it and then prepared the submission

- Initial thoughts in preparation of submission. Most related to details rather than objectives and policies of framework. KTB was supportive of what S32A report set out and how was prepared in relation to forestry.
- Ernslaw audit the Whangapoua forest annually as well as the Regional Council. The conditions are well looked at. Two audits per year to ensure we are meeting the conditions.
- The Panel asked what Rayonier and Ernslaw One thought of how to control wilding pines? The industry controls in areas where there is evidence that the wildings are coming from forestry that Ernslaw owns. Need to be a broader plan to identify where the wildings are coming from, maybe not specifically just forestry.
- When harvesting forestry, all adjacent neighbours are notified by the forestry company.

Thursday 18 September

Commenced 9.30am.

Graeme Ready on behalf of Coromandel Property Owners Alliance Incorporated (Submission 1357)

along with Gloria Ready, Christine and Bruce Vickerman and Sue Edens
Attachment H

Key discussion points

- HNZ 531.11 not suggesting Heritage New Zealand doesn't have some role to play in the general process. Objects to specific words 'functions or authorities'? Not a gatekeeper of resource consent functions. Look to Council? Can HNZ be put into the bundle as partners or stakeholders?
- HNZ 531.12 Cost? Council is thinking about costs to ratepayers, maybe mitigating those costs? Suggest as above (HNZ 531.11).
- HNZ 531.14 Perhaps misinterpreted. Making people aware of what is on the ground and reduces the cost to you. The use of the word 'public' is a wider general audience; 'public' is the offensive word? Text suggested is not correct. Don't like the word 'public' agree with the rest.

Forestry

- EDS 320.32 Land inventory sheets. Publically available? Could be a regional council function

Part II – Overlay Issues – Section 6 Biodiversity

- Grubb 568.44 Scenario: How to remove brown Kiwi to relocate if harvesting. Kiwi turning up around houses at north-end of Coro, not property owner responsibility to protect wandering birds. Land use is forestry, really the property owners' responsibility?
- Discussion was had on the frequency of harvesting trees. Only do ½ catchment at a time so that wildlife can move between the areas.

Part VI – Section 32 – Landscape and Natural Character

- RNZFB 780.9 Page 218 Point 43 – Staff are considering.
- FEDFR 935.18 Changing the activity status, not saying no. Non-complying has to pass two gateway test that the effects not more than minor, or not contrary to Objectives, Policies and Rules in the District Plan.
- Large forestry companies and smaller farming forestry blocks. Extent of outstanding landscape on Peninsula. Cost of resource consent requirements at a non-complying level.

- Non-complying sends picture that you can't do it. Hard threshold to get over.
- Discussion was had regarding Outstanding Natural Landscapes and how they apply to working production landscape, what range of activities can be taken? Referenced Nelson case of the red mesh. Everything needs to be treated fairly.
- The Panel commented that the King Salmon rules will apply and that they would expect clear justification as to why something is outstanding.

Part VIII – Section 56

- 568.6 Rules 11.4 Undue duplication between Regional and Council. Spirit of simplification.
- The Panel complimented the submitter on their Section 42 as they found it succinct and easy to follow.

Lloyd Morris (Submitter 747)

Attachment I – Pauanui Airfield

Key discussion points

- Discussion was had regarding the proposed 1:5. Southern side is amenity value only. Southern side hard up against the airfield set up for 'hangar homes'. Footprint to get a hangar, you need a 14m box.

Patricia Hishon (Submitter 24)

Attachment J

- Osage Orange Tree - The Panel recommended that protection from vehicle parking should be an Annual Plan matter and that this information should go to the Mercury Bay Community Board.
- Heritage Item – Mercury Bay Heritage Item 217
Most relevant name for the home is the Homestead Hahei

Maggie Johnson (Submitter 439)

- Talking about the Whole Plan.
- Preserving the Coromandel as a beautiful progressive place, but that honours the values that make it unique and special to NZers.
- Tendency to let outsiders govern.
- The submitter found it difficult to speak in 10 minutes on a Plan.
- The submitter felt she had a great deal of trouble having her submission publically notified and feels her submission wasn't summarised correctly.
- The Plan is not accessible to people who are concerned about things. Can't find what you are wanting to comment on and get blocked on what you're trying to express. Computer literacy is an issue. Total obfuscation in un-readability.
- Takes exception to the rule hierarchy.
- Blueprint has totally gone out the window.
- Mining is a travesty.
- Just trying to find out about subdivision and the rating. Doesn't apply to the annual draft plan either, where does it sit?
- Council is distancing itself from the people. Not preserving Kopu Bridge or Coromandel Harbour. Need community input and communication.
- Restore community wellbeings, which seem to be going out the window.
- It's about usefulness for us, when I want to make a decision on my subdivision Cannot make sense of it, how to get at the bones for what I want to learn about my property. Council is saying don't waiver around 'up here'.
- Thoroughness not glib slogans. Equally consider everyone points of view. Do the honourable thing for the rights of the people.

- General frustration - that I don't feel that I have any voice in this process. Not on community consultation.
- Staff commented there were over 40 workshops on the Draft Plan in the Community in 2012. 26,000 properties on the Coromandel, once Decisions are made on the Plan, will be able to use the E-Plan.
- Council staff don't know the Plan themselves. Very hard to discuss. Totally frustrating to go into those little details, that's why I started with the cosmic viewpoint of trust, sharing, responsibility then we don't need to be angry with each other. If we can trust that people are making the right decision.

Tabled Documents

Tabled Document L – Keith Vernon (Submitter 182)

Accepted as further submission. Received on time by Council. No further action required.

Tabled Document M – New Zealand Transport Agency (Submitter 787)

The Chair will draft a letter to go to NZTA.

Tabled Document N – KiwiRail (Submitter 130)

- Staff comment – TCDC don't have an operational line. Agree it's an issue when an operational line, we would look at a Plan Change or Variation to accommodate the provisions if required. Rang the submitters as there is no rail line.
- The line is still designated. No plan to do anything about it. Existing use rights apply. Surprised we'd received such a submission as had no indication of a line in the District.

Tabled Document O – McDonalds Restaurant Submitter 792

Tabled Document P – Bunnings Limited submitter 121

- Rewording of criteria 7 – information requirement. When is an ITA required, when and to what extent?

Tabled Document Q – National Trading Company Submitter 706

Tabled Document R – New Zealand Defence Force Submitter 400

Tabled Document S – Keith Vernon Submitter 182

- Number of loopholes the submitter has seen, noise limits apply – direct staff to look into. Para 4 not correct?
- Amendments to festivals/events have been done, now written into festivals/events rules to find out. RMA for excessive noise. Hopefully a reasonable approach. Amplified noise only.
- Frequency controls have gone, hours have been re-drafted.
- Whole load of problems with frequency as an activity. How would we know it's happened? How to monitor and enforce? Up to a certain threshold to accommodate small community activities.
- Para 6 – acceptable if noise is within limits. Wants frequency control on basis of excessive noise. Hours have been set around permitted standard. Each zone slightly different. What zone, what is generally acceptable noise? Extended hours on Fri/Sat, Sun-Thurs quiet at night, depending on zoning. Contentious activity.

Tabled Document T – Robert Ngapo Submitter 554

Sally Millar – Federated Farmers (935)

Attachment K

Along with Sue Edens and John Sanford (past president)

Apologies from Kevin Roberts

Key discussion points

- **Planning experience** – law degree from Waikato University and Business Administration from Massey. Been in the Planning/Policy space since 1997.
- Discussion was had on the King Salmon case and it will be interesting to see how it is to be applied.
- Going to come back to the question: is production land an Outstanding Natural Landscape in King Salmon and how that plays out. If it's not Outstanding Natural Landscapes, this removes Federated Farmers submission.
- If production is Outstanding Natural Landscape – should be able to have economic benefit. Ability to make a living out of the land needs to continue.
- Identified as outstanding as production landscape. Point in time, stopping that land from being production landscape. Scale, tensions in making that decisions. Like that because it is a farming landscape. Landscape cannot be a point in time.
- Areas that want to put into forestry are small lots. Usually marginal areas not suitable for pastoral farming.
- Life supporting capacity doesn't capture economic resource it is. Trying to find the balance. Looking at negative aspects of land use impacting on the water.
- No landscape is static.
- GMO's are adequately dealt with at National level - not a District Plan matter

Meeting Closed at 14:28

The minutes from each hearing are only a record of what was heard and discussed at that hearing. The Panel will not be making any recommended decisions to the Council until all the hearings are completed and all submissions and evidence are considered.

The foregoing Minutes were certified as being a true and correct record of the meeting of the Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel held on 16-18 September 2014.

Chairperson



Date 20 November 2014

18 September 2014

Present

M Farnsworth (Chairperson) T Fox
I Munro

In Attendance

Name	Item(s)
Leigh Robcke (District Plan Manager)	All
Bruce Baker (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Kirsten Williamson (Senior Policy Planner)	All
Faith O'Sullivan-Babe (Contract Planner)	All
Lisa Madgwick (District Plan Co ordinator)	All

Meeting Commenced 09:30

Adjournments and Absences

Adjournment	Start	Finish	Reason
Chairman	12:00	13:00	Lunch

Table of Contents

Item	Business	Page No.
1	Conduct of Hearing	4
1.1	Apologies	4
1.2	Conflict of Interest	4
2	Strategy and Policy Development	5
2.1	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Whole of Plan	5
2.2	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5	5
2.3	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Significant Trees	5
2.4	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay, Airfield Zone	6
2.5	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 18 Transport Policies	6
2.6	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 39 Transport and Section 55 Road Zone Rules	6
2.7	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Forestry	7
2.8	Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Military Training, Noise, Festivals and Events	7

1 Conduct of Hearing

1.1 Apologies

All members were present.

1.2 Conflict of Interest

The Chairperson invited notice from members of:

1. Any interests that may create a conflict with their role as an elected member relating to the minutes item(s) for the meeting; and
2. Any interests in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest as provided for in the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968.

The following interests were declared:

Mark Farnsworth Genetically Modified Organisms

Moved/Seconded By: Munro/Fox

2 Strategy and Policy Development

2.1 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Whole of Plan

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Whole of Plan

2.2 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 1 - Background and How to Use the Plan
- Section 2 - Statutory Acknowledgements
- Section 4 - Information Requirements for Resource Consents
- Section 5 - Cross-Boundary Matters

2.3 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Significant Trees

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 11 - Significant Trees
- Section 35 - Significant Trees
- Appendix 3 - Significant Tree Schedule

2.4 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay, Airfield Zone

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 28 - Airfield Height and Noise Overlay
- Section 40 - Airfield Zone

2.5 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 18 Transport Policies

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 18 - Transport

2.6 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Section 39 Transport and Section 55 Road Zone Rules

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following sections of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Section 39 - Transport Rules
- Section 55 - Road Zone Rules

2.7 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Forestry

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following topic of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Forestry

2.8 Proposed District Plan Hearings - 16-18 September 2014 - Section 42A Report - Military Training, Noise, Festivals and Events

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Hearings Panel to assist in making recommended decisions in respect of submissions and furthers submissions received on the following topics of the Proposed District Plan 2013:

- Military Training
- Noise
- Festivals, events

2 Suggested Resolution(s)

That the Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the reports - Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 35, 28, 40, 18, 39, 55 and Appendix 3,
2. Confirms that it has considered all submissions and further submissions made to the Proposed District Plan on the section/matter being considered.
3. Receives and considers any additional information or evidence tabled at the hearings by submitters.
4. Makes interim recommended decisions in regards to the matters raised in the submissions and further submissions received, and notes its reasons for the decisions.
5. Instructs staff to make changes arising from decisions made relating to the Proposed District Plan and take a recommended Decisions version of the Proposed District Plan to Council in 2015.

Moved/Seconded By: Mark Farnsworth/Ian Munro

General Discussion

- Introduction from Chairperson.
- Introduction from District Plan Manager. Section 42A report prepared by staff. Anticipate the tables with recommendations – make interim decisions. 10,000 submission points to deliberate on. Andrew Wharton is not available this block of hearings, his reports will be addressed by other members of the team.

Mr Neville Cameron (Submitter 33) – Further Submission not accepted

Key discussion points

- Read the EDS submission, and would like the Panel to reconsider.
- Panel advised they would move through every point of the EDS submission. Planning matters to address. Not accepting the further submission as covered in primary submission.

Primary submission

- Background item to submission is 28 years ago built white edifice on Coastal Zone.
- Mayor at time said not being able to build white on coast and set about building one
- Coastal Overlay - instrument of oppression. No reason to subject coastal landowners to more restrictions.
- Seems to be a desire to over-regulate ratepayers.
- House colours - limiting onerous and oppressive. Unusual colours. Not a matter for District Plan.
- Coastal Overlay - make nicer for those outside rather than those on the property. Ratepayers more important. Cost to owners and ability to do things.
- Minor dwellings - denied to anyone living in the Coastal Zone. Why limit the amount that people can use their property.
- B&B important in the economy of the Peninsula. One or two B&B establishments. Good source of income.
- Most ratepayers live within 1km of the Coast. Coastal overlay includes all of Coromandel town. Request simplify, and remove Coastal Overlay. Request remove rural overlay – majority of land is owned by Govt. Smallholders are not having rights to cut vegetation. Existing Plan is fine, doesn't need Coastal or Rural overlay.
- This Council is regarded as much improved, user-friendly and need to maintain that. Additional hoops is not improving relationship between ratepayers.
- Colour palette not a problem, useage from energy, white houses more effective for heat restoration etc. Need more insulation etc if have to paint it a different colour. White doesn't heat up as much. Proposed overlay, plant police force, inspecting plants in the Coastal Area which is wrong.
- Very good for the economy having people stay in B&B's.

The Hearings Panel agreed to not accept the Further Submission of Mr Cameron.

Ben Grubb (Submitter 568) – Further Submission not accepted

Key discussion points

- Had two further submissions that were not accepted.
- Submission on 803 (Ian Michael Wernham).
- Opposed all points of the submission.
- Planning Map 24c – Overlays and Zone – Property at 9 and 41 are an integral and important part of Te Karo Bay. Should have same overlays as the rest of Te Karo Bay. Severe environmental damage if subdivision proceeded. Rural zoning is the appropriate zoning. Stream originates in 9 and flows through 41. Oppose Point 1.
- Point 2 – Section 9.1.1 – LA4 study was one part of the Landscape Assessment. Findings of LA4 by itself is irrelevant.

- Point 3 – S29 R3, Oppose all of a) to g)
- Point 4 – Biodiversity. No knowledge of EW report of 2000.
- Point 5 – Significant trees, overlooked, neither support or opposes that.
- Point 6 – R23, two dwellings per lot, do not support established outside of developed settlement
- Point 7 – neither support/oppose
- Point 8 – Oppose
- Point 9 – Homestay/farmstay accommodation – oppose
- Point 10 – Map 24D – Coastal living zone should be zoned rural. Support
- Point 11 – Map 29B – overlooked, neither support or oppose.

Kaimarama Trust – not read, not accepting Further Submission.

Forestry

- Wilding pines. Te Karo Bay property. Outstanding natural features. Spread throughout TCDC area. Damage well documented in Landscape studies.
- District Plan needs a considered background statement, clear objectives and policies. Need robust rules.

Part 8 – Zone Rules

- Afforestation Rule 11 #1 – add prior to afforestation, plan by suitably qualified forester for removal of wilding pines. Trees on road reserves be removed, felling to avoid native damage, felling to remove pines at 8 years. May require independent review at the forest owners expense.
- There could be more employment to District to remove wilding pines.
- Impose some form of tax on all forestry owners and you clean up on your area. Cost is minimal.

Kim Coppersmith – Pauanui Residents and Ratepayers Association (Submitter 353)

Committee member

Key discussion points

- Congratulate the DP team on the Plan.
- Want a footer with part number and section.

Future Coastal Protection Line

- Oppose, detrimental.
- Current line which was assumed was adequate. Can't be ignored but line goes through some of the houses on Pauanui Beach. Line not the right way to recognise it.

Part IV Overlay 29.3 – Ind Vegetation

- Support in part, oppose doesn't allow Property owners any allowance for removal of vegetation. Current Operative Plan allows for 5m³ – should be retained. 500 yr old Kanuka has other protection, 4 or 500 hectares, wants to clear for firewood, not significant value. It's saying go and buy your firewood, when you've tatty scrubby stuff that can be used for firewood.
- New property owner, can't clear fell. 5m³ seems a reasonable amount.
- Consent cost of you exceeded 5m³ - controlled activity \$900 standard deposit
- To buy 1m³ of manuka is about \$150.00

Zone Rules – Part VIII

- Visitor Accommodation – 6 tariff paid visitors. Oppose – the ability to enforce it and the cost of the enforcement. Council trying to support Economic Development and tourism within the area, this opposes that. Tourist do not necessarily want to stay in a Motel. Detrimental to Economic Development in this area. Not enforceable.
- Concerns that people might not want a holiday home in the District if they need a resource consent for it.
- Discussion was had regarding the amount of holidaymakers staying at baches. 35 people at a bach is not unusual. Amenity effects, complaints from people who live next door.

Part VIII – Commercial Zone

- Part 4 – dwelling in Commercial Zone, balcony or patio. Patio designed to receive two hours of sunlight on the 21 June every year. Who's going to monitor that? Agree with protecting Amenity Values.

Pauanui Specific Activities – 44.5

- Specific to Pauanui – Comprehensive Residential Development – not less than 2000m² – want to see it retained. Minimum lot size to Pauanui 600m² – want to see that retained.

Zone Rules 53.4

- A playground generally exceeds the noise levels allowed.
- Mechanical flying fox exceeds the 2 decibel level.

Section 54.8

- Part N – Side yard fence – max of 1.2m when adjoins walkway or rec area. Doesn't allow people privacy.
- If you had a 2m fence in Pauanui it is changing the character of the place. Turning from an urban area to sub-urban.

S 56.4 – Festival/event in rural area

- Permitted act standard should be amended from 24hours to 72 hours. Rural area is appropriate for overnight visitors. Encourages Economic Development. Not necessarily bad behaviour. Can be benign.

57.4 – Zone Rules

- Silt and sediment from earthworks – applicable to any other zoning rules? Specific to rural lifestyle? Un-necessary and in-consistent.

Part V – 26.7 – Community Halls

- Council owned community halls to be raised from 15 decibels to 20 decibels.

Schedule 3 3.3A – Sig Trees

- Want Sequoia tree to be added. Significant tree and a significant landmark. STEM baseline means that pohutukawas are not included as they are not tall.
- Mount Ave tree – historical magnificent tree but not included due to height.

Airfield - Height and Noise restrictions

- The submitter is supporting the 12m amenity yard.
- Changed their mind from original to further submission as they represent the ratepayers in Pauanui, and they are opposed to changing the rules.
- Huge grey area around this section of Plan. Different to CAA enforcement. Current Operative Plan places 1 in 5 from Boundary of airfield.

- TCDC put valve cuts within the airfield. Discrepancy within how reference things. Current AIP shows airfield width at 54m – runway strip boundary. Development is already done. Google map – **Attachment A**.
- Plan should retain existing runway strip extent shown on map 29N.
- Current houses would be disadvantaged by relaxation of the rules. Airfield protected. Some houses have had to 'dig-in' to remain in that existing height rule. Would like to see the current Operative Plan retained.

Mike and Sandra Morrison (Submitter 92)

Along with Mike Slater – 19 Oceanair Drive, Pauanui

Attachment B

Key discussion points

- Council maintained 1 in 5 to observe current amenity levels. CAA have relaxed that rule. Area Managers and staff and CAA all support the 1 in 5 rule. Full resource consent to build beyond that. PDP this rule has been dropped. Unfair to current residents. Six residents who have formed submissions and the Community Board want Council to reconsider the 1 in 5 rule.
- Would like to have the 3 properties that infringe the 1 in 5 rule partitioned off and would want the rest of properties to abide. No two storied properties etc.
- Want to retain 1 in 5 rule from airfield boundary fence, not from the runway strip
- Every property on the northern side - have a notation on LIMS, 1 in 5 has to be maintained.

Black and White photo (A) referenced. Current plans rules haven't stopped plans being delivered.

Mervyn Trebes (Submitter 1140)

Attachment C

Key discussion points

- Moteilier from Whitianga. Concerned with noise in the area. New Plan is going to be noisier.
- They run a motel. Love events. Brings people to the town.
- Asking that there must be a reasonable time – 10pm people have to be able to go to sleep. Must be responsible and mitigate their noise effects.
- Electronically amplified noise 10pm – 7am in pedestrian core zone for special events.
- Have to be able to sleep. PDP for Pedestrian Core Zone of 70db does not allow that. Attenuation from outside to inside 10-15dB, looking at 40dB inside. Page 6 of original submission, bedrooms and habitable rooms would like table.
- Whangamata hall – accommodation provider having battle with the hall. Hall was built, it is old, no sound proofing. Council has to sort this issue out. May have to cost Council.
- Discussion was had relating to standard residential zone, the limits the submitter is proposing are higher than limits in the residential zone.
- Discussion was had regarding Pedestrian Core zone – mixed use, comp residential dwelling above ground floor are permitted and how that should be dealt with. Refit the house part sound-proofing material?

Simon Ritchie (Submitter 538)

Key discussion points

Festivals and Events – Rural Zone

- Long periods of amplified music can cause distress. Wants to tighten up controls.
- Current District Plan - no effective controls in Rural Zone. PDP introduced some controls, but not far enough. Staff report (appendix 2), suggesting introducing more

controls in the Rural Zone. Prefer to see permitted activity events lasting less than 24hr and less than 250 people.

- Local residents are the most affected by festivals and events, they should have a say whether they take place. The Proposed District Plan has gone some way towards this in appendix 2, local community in the assessment criteria in the restricted discretionary matter and must consider views of the local community.

Communications – Attachment D

- Whatever the District Plan says, enforcement is going to be an issue.
- Ad hoc festivals – no one but organisers know about it. Local residents are kept in the dark. January 2014 event – started at 5.30 on Friday afternoon, finished at 5am on Sunday. Numerous complaints, noise control officers attended. Noise levels never abated. Ad hoc will become more common. Once these festivals start, very difficult to stop.
- Contravening the District Plan – non-compliant festivals with no resource consent, not allowed to have festivals on this property.
- Staff commented that you can get an abatement notice for excessive noise. It takes time to get issued, to get someone on sight is difficult. Can seize equipment if excessive noise.

Trevor Barrett (Submitter 713)

Attachment E

- Map 29M needs to be changed as the position of the airstrip is in the wrong location.
- Other submitters want it measured from the airfield boundary, however this submitter wants a 12m yard as it removes the issues of 1:4 or 1:5
- Visual amenity and amenity equality should not affect building a second story.

John Isdale (Submitter 910)

- Importance of gold mining to the whole country.
- Inherited late Fathers information.
- The submitter has made no submissions, but made further submissions. His personal views and are not Heritage NZ views.

Transport – paper road

- Want people to be able to use those roads. TCDC District maps that go into DoC land, TCDC maps still have paper roads that are still not on other internet providers eg google. Paper roads in DoC estate do they still come under the District Plan.

Arthur Hinds – Mercury Bay Forest and Bird (Submitter 781)

Attachment F

- Agrees that erosion on farms can occur. Large siltation problems, same amount of rainfall but short bursts. Very steep country not specifically in Whangapoua, floods and creates issues.

Karl Baldwin on behalf of Ernslaw One and Rayonier (Submitter 855)

James Sinclair – Ernslaw One, taking over from Richard Hagill

Attachment G

- The Panel asked the submitter what his view of the Section 32 report was, had it adequately validated the forestry rules, he had reviewed it and then prepared the submission

- Initial thoughts in preparation of submission. Most related to details rather than objectives and policies of framework. KTB was supportive of what S32A report set out and how was prepared in relation to forestry.
- Ernslaw audit the Whangapoua forest annually as well as the Regional Council. The conditions are well looked at. Two audits per year to ensure we are meeting the conditions.
- The Panel asked what Rayonier and Ernslaw One thought of how to control wilding pines? The industry controls in areas where there is evidence that the wildings are coming from forestry that Ernslaw owns. Need to be a broader plan to identify where the wildings are coming from, maybe not specifically just forestry.
- When harvesting forestry, all adjacent neighbours are notified by the forestry company.

Thursday 18 September

Commenced 9.30am.

Graeme Ready on behalf of Coromandel Property Owners Alliance Incorporated (Submission 1357)

along with Gloria Ready, Christine and Bruce Vickerman and Sue Edens
Attachment H

Key discussion points

- HNZ 531.11 not suggesting Heritage New Zealand doesn't have some role to play in the general process. Objects to specific words 'functions or authorities'? Not a gatekeeper of resource consent functions. Look to Council? Can HNZ be put into the bundle as partners or stakeholders?
- HNZ 531.12 Cost? Council is thinking about costs to ratepayers, maybe mitigating those costs? Suggest as above (HNZ 531.11).
- HNZ 531.14 Perhaps misinterpreted. Making people aware of what is on the ground and reduces the cost to you. The use of the word 'public' is a wider general audience; 'public' is the offensive word? Text suggested is not correct. Don't like the word 'public' agree with the rest.

Forestry

- EDS 320.32 Land inventory sheets. Publically available? Could be a regional council function

Part II – Overlay Issues – Section 6 Biodiversity

- Grubb 568.44 Scenario: How to remove brown Kiwi to relocate if harvesting. Kiwi turning up around houses at north-end of Coro, not property owner responsibility to protect wandering birds. Land use is forestry, really the property owners' responsibility?
- Discussion was had on the frequency of harvesting trees. Only do ½ catchment at a time so that wildlife can move between the areas.

Part VI – Section 32 – Landscape and Natural Character

- RNZFB 780.9 Page 218 Point 43 – Staff are considering.
- FEDFR 935.18 Changing the activity status, not saying no. Non-complying has to pass two gateway test that the effects not more than minor, or not contrary to Objectives, Policies and Rules in the District Plan.
- Large forestry companies and smaller farming forestry blocks. Extent of outstanding landscape on Peninsula. Cost of resource consent requirements at a non-complying level.

- Non-complying sends picture that you can't do it. Hard threshold to get over.
- Discussion was had regarding Outstanding Natural Landscapes and how they apply to working production landscape, what range of activities can be taken? Referenced Nelson case of the red mesh. Everything needs to be treated fairly.
- The Panel commented that the King Salmon rules will apply and that they would expect clear justification as to why something is outstanding.

Part VIII – Section 56

- 568.6 Rules 11.4 Undue duplication between Regional and Council. Spirit of simplification.
- The Panel complimented the submitter on their Section 42 as they found it succinct and easy to follow.

Lloyd Morris (Submitter 747)

Attachment I – Pauanui Airfield

Key discussion points

- Discussion was had regarding the proposed 1:5. Southern side is amenity value only. Southern side hard up against the airfield set up for 'hangar homes'. Footprint to get a hangar, you need a 14m box.

Patricia Hishon (Submitter 24)

Attachment J

- Osage Orange Tree - The Panel recommended that protection from vehicle parking should be an Annual Plan matter and that this information should go to the Mercury Bay Community Board.
- Heritage Item – Mercury Bay Heritage Item 217
Most relevant name for the home is the Homestead Hahei

Maggie Johnson (Submitter 439)

- Talking about the Whole Plan.
- Preserving the Coromandel as a beautiful progressive place, but that honours the values that make it unique and special to NZers.
- Tendency to let outsiders govern.
- The submitter found it difficult to speak in 10 minutes on a Plan.
- The submitter felt she had a great deal of trouble having her submission publically notified and feels her submission wasn't summarised correctly.
- The Plan is not accessible to people who are concerned about things. Can't find what you are wanting to comment on and get blocked on what you're trying to express. Computer literacy is an issue. Total obfuscation in un-readability.
- Takes exception to the rule hierarchy.
- Blueprint has totally gone out the window.
- Mining is a travesty.
- Just trying to find out about subdivision and the rating. Doesn't apply to the annual draft plan either, where does it sit?
- Council is distancing itself from the people. Not preserving Kopu Bridge or Coromandel Harbour. Need community input and communication.
- Restore community wellbeings, which seem to be going out the window.
- It's about usefulness for us, when I want to make a decision on my subdivision Cannot make sense of it, how to get at the bones for what I want to learn about my property. Council is saying don't waiver around 'up here'.
- Thoroughness not glib slogans. Equally consider everyone points of view. Do the honourable thing for the rights of the people.

- General frustration - that I don't feel that I have any voice in this process. Not on community consultation.
- Staff commented there were over 40 workshops on the Draft Plan in the Community in 2012. 26,000 properties on the Coromandel, once Decisions are made on the Plan, will be able to use the E-Plan.
- Council staff don't know the Plan themselves. Very hard to discuss. Totally frustrating to go into those little details, that's why I started with the cosmic viewpoint of trust, sharing, responsibility then we don't need to be angry with each other. If we can trust that people are making the right decision.

Tabled Documents

Tabled Document L – Keith Vernon (Submitter 182)

Accepted as further submission. Received on time by Council. No further action required.

Tabled Document M – New Zealand Transport Agency (Submitter 787)

The Chair will draft a letter to go to NZTA.

Tabled Document N – KiwiRail (Submitter 130)

- Staff comment – TCDC don't have an operational line. Agree it's an issue when an operational line, we would look at a Plan Change or Variation to accommodate the provisions if required. Rang the submitters as there is no rail line.
- The line is still designated. No plan to do anything about it. Existing use rights apply. Surprised we'd received such a submission as had no indication of a line in the District.

Tabled Document O – McDonalds Restaurant Submitter 792

Tabled Document P – Bunnings Limited submitter 121

- Rewording of criteria 7 – information requirement. When is an ITA required, when and to what extent?

Tabled Document Q – National Trading Company Submitter 706

Tabled Document R – New Zealand Defence Force Submitter 400

Tabled Document S – Keith Vernon Submitter 182

- Number of loopholes the submitter has seen, noise limits apply – direct staff to look into. Para 4 not correct?
- Amendments to festivals/events have been done, now written into festivals/events rules to find out. RMA for excessive noise. Hopefully a reasonable approach. Amplified noise only.
- Frequency controls have gone, hours have been re-drafted.
- Whole load of problems with frequency as an activity. How would we know it's happened? How to monitor and enforce? Up to a certain threshold to accommodate small community activities.
- Para 6 – acceptable if noise is within limits. Wants frequency control on basis of excessive noise. Hours have been set around permitted standard. Each zone slightly different. What zone, what is generally acceptable noise? Extended hours on Fri/Sat, Sun-Thurs quiet at night, depending on zoning. Contentious activity.

Tabled Document T – Robert Ngapo Submitter 554

Sally Millar – Federated Farmers (935)

Attachment K

Along with Sue Edens and John Sanford (past president)

Apologies from Kevin Roberts

Key discussion points

- **Planning experience** – law degree from Waikato University and Business Administration from Massey. Been in the Planning/Policy space since 1997.
- Discussion was had on the King Salmon case and it will be interesting to see how it is to be applied.
- Going to come back to the question: is production land an Outstanding Natural Landscape in King Salmon and how that plays out. If it's not Outstanding Natural Landscapes, this removes Federated Farmers submission.
- If production is Outstanding Natural Landscape – should be able to have economic benefit. Ability to make a living out of the land needs to continue.
- Identified as outstanding as production landscape. Point in time, stopping that land from being production landscape. Scale, tensions in making that decisions. Like that because it is a farming landscape. Landscape cannot be a point in time.
- Areas that want to put into forestry are small lots. Usually marginal areas not suitable for pastoral farming.
- Life supporting capacity doesn't capture economic resource it is. Trying to find the balance. Looking at negative aspects of land use impacting on the water.
- No landscape is static.
- GMO's are adequately dealt with at National level - not a District Plan matter

Meeting Closed at 14:28

The minutes from each hearing are only a record of what was heard and discussed at that hearing. The Panel will not be making any recommended decisions to the Council until all the hearings are completed and all submissions and evidence are considered.

The foregoing Minutes were certified as being a true and correct record of the meeting of the Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel held on 16-18 September 2014.

Chairperson



Date 20 November 2014