

Notice is hereby given that a Meeting of the Resource Management Committee will be held on:

**Date:** Friday, 26 June 2015  
**Time:** 10am  
**Meeting Room:** Council Chambers  
**Venue:** 15 Forth Street  
Invercargill

---

## **Resource Management Committee Agenda**

### **OPEN**

---

#### **MEMBERSHIP**

<b>Chairperson</b>	Paul Duffy
<b>Councillors</b>	Lyall Bailey
	Rodney Dobson
	John Douglas
	Julie Keast
	Gavin Macpherson

#### **IN ATTENDANCE**

<b>Manager Resource Management</b>	Simon Moran
<b>Committee Advisor</b>	Debbie Webster

Contact Telephone: 0800 732 732  
Postal Address: PO Box 903, Invercargill 9840  
Email: [emailsdc@southlanddc.govt.nz](mailto:emailsdc@southlanddc.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.southlanddc.govt.nz](http://www.southlanddc.govt.nz)

**Full agendas are available on Council's Website**  
**[www.southlanddc.govt.nz](http://www.southlanddc.govt.nz)**

## **Terms of Reference for the Resource Management Committee**

This committee is a committee of Southland District Council and has responsibility to:

- Monitor the consent process and make decisions on all notified hearings, excluding those being heard by a commissioner
  - Monitor non-notified consents and review decisions where objections are received.
  - Develop a District Plan, and/or District Plan changes, hear submissions on those and deliberate on those before making recommendations to Council
  - Participate in joint hearings
  - Decide on designations
-

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ITEM** **PAGE**

**PROCEDURAL**

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Leave of absence</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Public Forum</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Extraordinary/Urgent Items</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes</b>	<b>5</b>

**REPORTS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

<b>7.1</b>	<b>Potential Variations to Proposed District Plan 2012 - Implementation matters</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Potential Variation to the Proposed District Plan 2012 - Rural Settlement Areas</b>	<b>15</b>



---

**1 Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Cr Dobson.

**2 Leave of absence**

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

**3 Conflict of Interest**

Councillors are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a councillor and any private or other external interest they might have. It is also considered best practice for those members in the Executive Team attending the meeting to also signal any conflicts that they may have with an item before Council.

**4 Public Forum**

Notification to speak is required by 5pm at least two days before the meeting. Further information is available on [www.southlanddc.govt.nz](http://www.southlanddc.govt.nz) or phoning 0800 732 732.

**5 Extraordinary/Urgent Items**

To consider, and if thought fit, to pass a resolution to permit the Council to consider any further items which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded.

Such resolution is required to be made pursuant to Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the Chairperson must advise:

- (i) The reason why the item was not on the Agenda, and
- (ii) The reason why the discussion of this item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

- (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
- (ii) The presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) No resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

**6 Confirmation of Minutes**

6.1 Meeting minutes of Resource Management Committee, 12 June 2015

---

# Resource Management Committee

## OPEN MINUTES

---

---

Minutes of a meeting of Resource Management Committee held in the Council Chambers, 15 Forth Street, Invercargill on Friday, 12 June 2015 at 1.45 pm.

---

### PRESENT

<b>Chairperson</b>	Paul Duffy
<b>Councillors</b>	Lyall Bailey
	Rodney Dobson
	John Douglas
	Julie Keast
	Gavin Macpherson

### IN ATTENDANCE

Manager Resource Management Simon Moran and Committee Advisor Debbie Webster.

**1 Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Crs Dobson and Douglas.

Moved Cr Keast, seconded Cr Bailey **and resolved:**

**That the Resource Management Committee accept the apologies.**

**2 Leave of absence**

No requests for leave of absence had been received.

**3 Conflict of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

**4 Public Forum**

There was no Public Forum

**5 Extraordinary/Urgent Items**

There were no Extraordinary/Urgent items.

**6 Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved Cr Bailey, seconded Cr Keast **and resolved:**  
**That the Meeting minutes of Resource Management Committee, 27 March 2015 be confirmed subject to the following change that Cr Duffy was noted as an apology.**

**Reports for Resolution**

**7.1 Minutes Southland District Council Resource Management Hearing South Catlins Charitable Trust (SCCT) 2 February 2015**

**Record No: R/15/6/9560**

Moved Cr Keast, seconded Cr Macpherson **and resolved:**

**That the Resource Management Committee confirms the minutes dated 2 February 2015 as a true and correct record and**

- a) **Receives the report titled “Minutes Southland District Council Resource Management Hearing South Catlins Charitable Trust (SCCT) 2 February 2015 ” dated 2 June 2015.**
- b) **Determines that this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) **Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**

**.2 Minutes of a Resource Management Hearing for The Around The Mountain Cycle Trail held 2 - 5 February 2015**

**Record No: R/15/6/9573**

Moved Cr Bailey, seconded Cr Keast **and resolved:**

**That the Resource Management Committee confirms the minutes dated 2 - 5 February 2015 as a true and correct record and**

- a) Receives the report titled “Minutes of a Resource Management Hearing for The Around The Mountain Cycle Trail held 2 - 5 February 2015” dated 2 June 2015.**
- b) Determines that this matter or decision be recognised not as significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**

**7.3 Unconfirmed minutes Resource Management Hearing AG and GJ Whyte Land Use Consent Submission Friday 13 March 2015 OPEN**

**Record No: R/15/6/9578**

Moved Cr Keast, seconded Cr Bailey **and resolved:**

**That the Resource Management Committee confirms the minutes dated as a true and correct record and**

- a) Receives the report titled “Unconfirmed minutes Resource Management Hearing AG and GJ Whyte Land Use Consent Submission Friday 13 March 2015 OPEN” dated 4 June 2015.**
- b) Determines that this matter or decision be recognised not as significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**



**Reports for Recommendation**

**8.1 Report to Resource Management Committee - Hearing Glencoe Quarries Limited - Land Use Consent. 9.30am Friday 12 June 2015.**

**Record No: R/15/6/9594**

Moved Cr Keast, seconded Cr Bailey and resolved:

**That the Resource Management Committee:**

- a) **Receives the report titled "Report to Resource Management Committee - Hearing Glencoe Quarries Limited - Land Use Consent. 9.30am Friday 12 June 2015." dated 2 June 2015.**
- b) **Determines that this matter or decision be recognised as significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) **Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**

The meeting closed at 1.55 pm

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT  
RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE RESOURCE  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON

**DATE:**.....

**CHAIRPERSON:**.....



## Potential Variations to Proposed District Plan 2012 - Implementation matters

**Record No:** R/15/5/8828

**Author:** Courtney Ellison, Senior Resource Management Planner - Policy

**Approved by:** Bruce Halligan, GM - Environment and Community

☐ Decision

☒ Recommendation

☐ Information

### Purpose

- 1 The purpose of this report is to outline some potential changes to be made to the Proposed District Plan, in particular around some implementation matters which have arisen since the plan has had legal effect and been implemented by the Resource Management team.

### Executive Summary

- 2 With the implementation of the Proposed District Plan, some potential improvements that could be made to the plan have been identified.
- 3 To make the changes suggested in this report, a variation would have to be undertaken in accordance with the process outlined in the Resource Management Act 1991. This process includes public notification with two opportunities for the public to make submissions, and holding hearings for the submitters to speak on their submission.

### Recommendation

**That the Resource Management Committee:**

- a) **Receives the report titled "Potential Variations to Proposed District Plan 2012 - Implementation matters" dated 19 June 2015.**
- b) **Determines that this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) **Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**
- d) **Endorse staff continuing with the preparation of a draft variation to the Proposed District Plan.**

## Content

### Background

- 4 With some parts of the Proposed Plan now having legal effect, some implementation issues have arisen. Some small changes could be made to the plan to improve the clarity and efficiency of the rules in achieving the outcomes intended with the plan.
- 5 The potential amendments that could be made include changes to:
  - The Urban and Fiordland/Rakiura Zone rules around earthworks affecting sites listed in the historic heritage schedule, to align with the resolution agreed with Heritage New Zealand as part of their appeal on the associated Rural Zone provisions.
  - The definitions, in particular the definition of property, and other associated definitions to assist in the interpretation of the Rural Zone dwellings rule, the definition of farmers' markets, distribution lines and networks, and adding a definition for notional boundaries in relation to the noise provisions.
  - The formatting and rewording of the Industrial Zone rules for consistency with the other similar clauses in the plan.
  - The signage rules to clarify interpretation, the relationship between the different aspects of the rule and to provide more practical criteria. For example, sandwich boards come in standard sizes which all exceed the limitations Council has in the plan, therefore any sandwich board would technically require a resource consent, which was not the intention of the plan.
  - The Fiordland/Rakiura Zone rules to clarify the cascade of rules, and what activity status applies when certain criteria of the permitted or controlled activities cannot be met.
  - The General Urban Standards to remove standards where consent would be required anyway to avoid confusion around the activity status that applies, and clarify what height recession plane rules apply within the Commercial Precincts.
  - The planning maps to illustrate wastewater treatment facilities in a consistent manner.
  - The provisions relating to 'other buildings' in the Rural Zone, in particular how above ground effluent tanks are provided for.

### Issues

- 6 As outlined in the introduction of this report, those aspects of the Proposed District Plan that have not been appealed now have legal effect and therefore the rules and interpretation of the plan is now being applied. This has highlighted some areas where the plan could benefit from some improvements.

### Factors to Consider

#### Legal and Statutory Requirements

- 7 Any changes to the District Plan will be required to follow the variation process as outlined in the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). This process includes assessing the benefits and costs of the changes through a Section 32 report, public notification of the changes, submissions and hearings, with the final decisions of the Council being subject to appeal.

### Community Views

- 8 Community views would be sought through the formal consultation process outlined in the First Schedule of the RMA. This includes two opportunities for making submissions, and the opportunity for submitters to speak on the content of their submissions at a hearing.

### Costs and Funding

- 9 There are costs associated with undertaking a variation, including staff time, consultation costs, printing/distribution of documents, public notices and hearings. The work would be undertaken within current District Plan budgets.

### Policy Implications

- 10 The District Plan should always be reviewed to ensure it meets the requirements of the community and is achieving its intended outcomes. This proposed variation is intended to continue to ensure the District Plan is clear and easy to use.

## Analysis

### Options Considered

- 11 Council has the following options:
- Option 1: Retain the current provisions
  - Option 2: Proceed with a variation to make changes to the plan which further clarify how the plan is to be interpreted.
- 12 Each of these options is explored further below.

### Analysis of Options

#### Option 1

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No plan change/variation would be required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Any uncertainty that there is currently with the provisions of the plan will continue, and there will be a reliance on informal internal procedures to ensure consistency amongst the planners</li></ul>

#### Option 2

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More certainty and consistency in the implementation of the District Plan</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• None</li></ul>

### Assessment of Significance

- 13 It is not considered that these potential changes to the Proposed District Plan are significant in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy because they are only intended to improve the clarity of the District Plan provisions.

## Recommended Option

- 14 It is recommended that Option 1 is endorsed and that a draft variation is prepared to address those issues outlined in this report.

## Next Steps

- 15 If the Resource Management Committee recommends the variation be progressed, this recommendation will be taken to Council for approval to start the variation process.
- 16 If Council approves of a variation being undertaken the process would be as follows:
- Develop a draft variation and undertake the Section 32 cost benefit analysis.
  - Report to RMC with the draft variation and Section 32 report, seeking a recommendation to Council to approve the variation for public notification in accordance with the Resource Management Act (RMA).
  - Report to Council seeking approval to notify the variation in accordance with the RMA.
  - Publicly notify the variation for submissions.
  - Summarise submissions received.
  - Publicly notify the Summary of Submissions, for further submissions.
  - Staff prepare Section 42 Recommending Reports for the hearings.
  - Hearings.
  - Hearing panel to make and release decisions, which are then subject to appeal.
- 17 The Committee will note that another report has also been prepared for this meeting outlining another variation which could be progressed in relation to the Rural Settlement Areas. If the Committee endorsed both variations proceeding, they could be notified together to reduce costs and staff time associated with the public notification and submission process.

## Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

## Potential Variation to the Proposed District Plan 2012 - Rural Settlement Areas

**Record No:** R/15/6/10262  
**Author:** Courtney Ellison, Senior Resource Management Planner - Policy  
**Approved by:** Bruce Halligan, GM - Environment and Community

☐ Decision ☒ Recommendation ☐ Information

### Purpose

- 1 The purpose of this report is to outline a potential change to be made to the Proposed District Plan, to create a new 'Rural Settlement Area' providing for townships that are currently within the Rural Zone.

### Executive Summary

- 2 Decisions on the Proposed Southland District Plan 2012 were released in October 2014 and identified that a future piece of work was required to address how townships such as Orepuki which are currently zoned Rural could be better provided for.
- 3 The new plan imposes some constraints for these townships in terms of setbacks from other dwellings and some boundaries as well as other activities in the Rural Zone. It is suggested that a variation could be progressed to establish a Rural Settlement Area overlay for the Rural Zone to provide for townships such as Orepuki.
- 4 Matters that would need to be considered include the boundaries of any settlement areas, effluent disposal, servicing, setbacks from other dwellings or property boundaries, hazards, and provision for the continuation of rural activities.
- 5 The different options available to the Resource Management Committee are outlined in this report along with the process that would need to be followed, including requirements under the Resource Management Act (RMA), should a variation be progressed.

## Recommendation

That the Resource Management Committee:

- a) **Receives the report titled “Potential Variation to the Proposed District Plan 2012 - Rural Settlement Areas” dated 16 June 2015.**
- b) **Determines that this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**
- c) **Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**
- d) **Recommends to Council the scoping and drafting of a variation to the Proposed District Plan to create a new Rural Settlement Area for Orepuki**

## Content

### Background

- 6 The review of the Southland District Plan has recently been undertaken, and aside from a few provisions that have been appealed, the Proposed District Plan 2012 is largely operative. The Proposed District Plan retained the Rural zoning over a number of townships such as Orepuki, Athol, Fortrose, Garston, Gorge Road etc. but the rules associated with building a dwelling in the Rural Zone have changed. In particular the ability to construct one dwelling per certificate of title is now subject to the other criteria being met including the need to provide a 150 metre separation between dwellings. There are also other potential constraints, for example in Orepuki, the part of the township to the west of State Highway 99 is also covered by the Visual Amenity overlay which imposes additional criteria relating to setbacks from roads and building materials. This has raised the potential need for a change to be made to those rules to better provide for the ability for new dwellings to be constructed in these townships, thereby assisting the future consolidation and growth of these settlements.
- 7 A potential zoning change for Orepuki and Athol has been discussed since 2006, where a report was presented to Community Boards (CBs) and the Resource Management Committee investigating a potential plan change to make some townships an Urban Resource Area. While the CBs endorsed a plan change going ahead, a plan change was not progressed for Orepuki as it was considered there was sufficient provision of vacant land to meet the community needs until 2026, there was a lack of demonstrated demand, the undesirability of urban sprawl along the coast and the impact this would have on the visual landscape. Work was also undertaken in 2008 for a potential plan change in Athol but this plan change was not progressed as a change in the Community Development Area (CDA) membership resulted in a loss of support for such a change.



- 8 Brian McGrath, on behalf of the Orepuki CDA Subcommittee lodged a submission on the Proposed District Plan requesting a more permissive regime, and greater provision for the development of existing rural residential settlement areas. The Hearing Committee's decision was to retain the general approach of the Proposed District Plan as notified, but recognised that a specific piece of work was required to look at how rural residential areas such as Orepuki could be better provided for within the plan, to facilitate the future growth of these areas around the existing settlements.
- 9 The following townships in the Rural Zone could be considered as part of a Rural Settlement Area variation to the Plan: Orepuki, Athol, Dipton, Drummond, Fortrose, Garston, Gorge Road, Limehills/Centre Bush, Thornbury, Waikawa, Woodlands and Curio Bay.

## Issues

### Settlement Area Boundaries

- 10 Attached are a series of aerial maps showing the current configuration of the townships which could be subject to a Rural Settlement overlay. Boundaries of any overlay would be established through consultation with those communities.

### Effluent Disposal

- 11 One of the potential constraints on development is the ability for each site to adequately dispose of wastewater on-site. Reports have been prepared by Environmental Consultant Veena Boon, which considers what the potential constraints are in Orepuki and Athol, and what wastewater requirements there might be. The report for Athol in particular identifies a number of limitations on disposing of wastewater on-site including the potential for potable water contamination, flooding risks, and the rapidly draining soil category.
- 12 For other towns which might be covered by a Rural Settlement overlay, no assessment of the on-site wastewater requirements and capabilities has been undertaken to date. This is further work that would need to be undertaken should Council decide to progress with scoping a variation for those other townships.
- 13 Effluent disposal is required to be disposed of in accordance with the New Zealand Standard 1547:2012 "On-site Domestic Wastewater Management". Environment Southland also requires a 50 metre setback from potable water abstraction points. Environment Southland records confirm there are two potable water abstraction points in Orepuki, and numerous points within Athol. These will therefore need to be considered as part of any development proposals.

### Servicing (Power and Telephone)

- 14 A further matter to be considered is that currently the provision of services such as power and telephone are not required for land use applications (eg to build a dwelling on an existing title), however it is expected that they will be provided for all new allotments created through a subdivision. It is not anticipated that this current practice would change with this proposed variation, however potential purchasers of existing sections would need to be cautious of this, and therefore it may be prudent to note the uncertainty about power and telephone connections on the relevant property files so that it is clear if a Land Information Memorandum is requested by a potential purchaser in the future.

Other Development Constraints

- 15 Under the Proposed District Plan there are a number of new setbacks which apply to dwellings in the Rural Zone. The setbacks/provisions of particular relevance to these Rural townships are:
- 150 metres from another dwelling in separate ownership (or consented dwelling or building platform)
  - 4.5 metres from the boundary of any other road (other than a State Highway where the speed limit is greater than 80km/hr)
  - Within the Visual Amenity Landscape overlay, 20 metres from the boundary of any formed road, and 4.5 metres from the boundary of any unformed road
  - Building platforms and access not to be on the seaward side of the Coastal Hazard Line.

As part of a variation, some of these setbacks could be removed or reduced, however consideration would still need to be given to matters such as the coastal hazards, and the impact on the landscape.

Hazards

- 16 While the flooding overlay is not currently referred to in the permitted activity criteria for dwellings in the Rural Zone, the risk of flooding in these townships will need to be considered as part of the variation, as several of the identified townships are currently covered by the flooding hazard overlay in the Proposed District Plan Maps.
- 17 For some of the settlements, such as Orepuki, potential for future coastal movement, and the proximity of development to the coast is another important matter to be considered. There is the potential for further coastal movement inland to adversely affect residential development and dwellings approved under the Building Act are expected to have a 50 year durability. A Coastal Hazard Line is shown on the Proposed District Plan maps and needs to be considered for those sections close to the coast.

Rural Activities

- 18 The Orepuki CDA, at its meeting on 12 May 2015, raised the matter of how dwellings would be affected by surrounding rural activities. For most of the rural type activities, there are already setbacks within the permitted activity rules which would minimise the effect of those activities on the township. For example, intensive farm buildings, gravel extraction and cleanfills have setbacks from dwellings or property boundaries that would prevent them from locating within or near to the proposed township boundaries without requiring consent.
- 19 At the informal meeting with members of the Athol CDA Subcommittee, it was discussed that it may wish to continue grazing animals within the township boundaries. As the Rural Settlement Area would only be an overlay of the Rural Zone, the permitted activity for farming would still apply.

**Factors to Consider**

**Legal and Statutory Requirements**

- 20 Any changes to the District Plan will be required to follow the variation process as outlined in the RMA 1991. This process includes assessing the benefits and costs of the changes

through a Section 32 Report, public notification of the changes, submissions and hearings, with the final decisions of the Council being subject to appeal.

### **Community Views**

- 21 Staff have met with members of the Orepuki CDA Subcommittee, and attended its meeting on 12 May 2015 to discuss the issues that would need to be considered as part of any plan change.
- 22 Staff also met with some members of the Athol CDA Subcommittee in August 2013 to discuss their interest in progressing a plan change again. Discussions at that meeting indicated there was interest in creating a rural village type zoning but that there would need to be adequate opportunity for community engagement and input. As there was no urgency in progressing this, the work was put on hold while the Proposed District Plan work was progressed.
- 23 Should a variation be progressed, staff would continue to seek input from CDA members of the relevant townships as any changes are developed. The views of the community would be sought through key stakeholder consultation prior to any variation being notified, and they would again have an opportunity to provide feedback through the formal process under the RMA.

### **Costs and Funding**

- 24 There are costs associated with undertaking a variation, including staff time, consultation costs, printing/distribution of documents, public notices, and hearings. There may also be the need to engage external experts such as a landscape architect to review the rules in relation to the Visual Amenity Landscape in some of the townships, and an environmental consultant to look at wastewater requirements for those towns that have not yet been investigated. The work would be undertaken within current District Plan budgets.

### **Policy Implications**

- 25 As outlined in the introduction of this report, the decisions on the Proposed District Plan identified further work to be undertaken in relation to rural settlements. It was also identified in the Resource Management Activity Profile for the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 that the regulatory framework for rural townships was an area likely to need to be addressed in the next few years.
- 26 It is also likely that any amendments to the District Plan would result in less restrictive plan rules for these areas than there are at present.

## **Analysis**

### **Options Considered**

- 27 With regard to the establishment of rural settlements, Council has the following options:
  - Option 1: Retain the current plan approach, with the Rural Zone provisions continuing to apply across all rural settlements.
  - Option 2: Proceed with a variation to provide for Orepuki only as a Rural Settlement Area and develop specific rules for that area. This option does not preclude Council from deciding to progress plan changes in the future for other rural townships.

- Option 3: Proceed with a variation to establish Rural Settlement Areas with associated rules, for two or more of the following townships: Orepuki, Athol, Dipton, Drummond, Fortrose, Garston, Gorge Road, Limehills/Centre Bush, Thornbury, Waikawa, Woodlands and Curio Bay.

## Analysis of Options

### Option 1 – Retain the Status Quo

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further work or costs would be incurred with regard to any variation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent would be required for every dwelling in Orepuki, and several other similar townships resulting in unnecessary costs and delays.</li> <li>Development would be ad-hoc with no incentive for development to be clustered around existing settlements.</li> </ul>

### Option 2 – Proceed with a variation for Orepuki

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A variation can be prepared specifically addressing matters relevant to Orepuki.</li> <li>Less restrictive rules making some types of development easier.</li> <li>This would facilitate consolidation and growth of the Orepuki township around its existing core, rather than the potential for residential development to occur in more isolated locations further from the town as has occurred in the recent past.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other similar townships in the District, such as Athol etc will continue to require resource consent.</li> <li>There may be a perception of inequity amongst townships to progress such a change only in one township.</li> </ul>

### Option 3 – Proceed with a variation for two or more of the Rural townships

<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A proactive and consistent approach across the District would be implemented.</li> <li>Costs and resources, including staff time would be minimised by only going through the process once, rather than for each township.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process may be delayed somewhat, as further background work is undertaken for those townships that have not previously been investigated.</li> </ul>

## Assessment of Significance

- 28 It is not considered that these potential changes to the Proposed District Plan are significant in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy because they are looking to address additional restrictions that have already been imposed through the Proposed District Plan. The proposed changes will also be subject to a public consultation process under the

RMA, giving the communities and anyone else who wishes to express a view the opportunities to have their say and affect the overall outcome of the variation.

## Recommended Option

- 29 It is recommended Council proceed with Option 2, a variation to address implementation issues, and provide for Rural Settlement Areas with associated rules for Orepuki. Following a variation for the Orepuki township, Council could consider extending those Rural Settlement rules to any other townships in the District where there was a demand for such changes.

## Next Steps

- 30 If the Resource Management Committee recommends the variation be progressed, this recommendation will be taken to Council for approval to start the variation process.
- 31 If Council approves of a variation being undertaken the process would be as follows:
- Develop a draft variation in consultation with the Orepuki CDA Subcommittee (and other relevant CDAs or CBs) and undertake the Section 32 cost benefit analysis
  - Report to Resource Management Committee with the draft variation and Section 32 report, seeking a recommendation to Council to approve the variation for public notification in accordance with the RMA
  - Report to Council seeking approval to notify the variation in accordance with the RMA
  - Publicly notify the variation for submissions
  - Summarise submissions received
  - Publicly notify the Summary of Submissions, for further submissions
  - Staff prepare Section 42 recommending reports for the hearings
  - Hearings
  - Hearing panel to make and release decisions, which are then subject to appeal.

## Attachments

- A Rural Settlement Maps [View](#)



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Athol





Dipton



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Drummond





Fortrose



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Garston





Gorge Road



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Limehills/Centre Bush





Orepuki



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Thornbury





Waikawa



Item 7.2 Attachment A



Woodlands