

# Western Bay of Plenty District Council

**Minutes of Meeting No. PP4 of the Policy and Planning Committee  
reconvened on 9 April 2014 in the Council Chamber, Barkes Corner, Tauranga  
Commencing at 9.00 am.**

## **Present**

G Merriman (Chairperson), Councillors K Gunn, P Mackay, K Marsh, M Murray-Benge, J Scrimgeour, D Thwaites, G Webber, M Williams and His Worship the Mayor R J Paterson

## **In Attendance**

S Hill (Group Manager Customer Services), P Martelli (Resource Management Manager), A Cloete (Policy Analyst Resource Management), and F Sweeney (District Secretary)

The meeting was reconvened in public excluded session.

## **Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Goudie and for lateness from Councillor Gunn. It was noted that as Councillor Matthews had not been present for the hearings she would not be participating in any further process for this Plan Change.

**Resolved:** Merriman/Williams

*THAT the apology for absence from Councillor Goudie and for lateness from Councillor Gunn be accepted.*

PP4.4                    **Planning Report 1 - Purpose of the Plan Change/Variation and Section 18 – Rural**

PP4.4.1                **Topic 1 – The need for Proposed Plan Change 46/Variation 2 and General Submission Points**

**Resolved:**            Merriman/Webber

*THAT Council proceed with hearings and decisions for Plan Change 46/Variation 2.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

### **Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
9	1	New Zealand Historic Places Trust
FS31	6	Poka, Donna
FS30	1	Blakely Pacific Limited
FS 27	1	Carrus Corporation Ltd
FS29	1	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS32	6	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai

### **Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
11	1, 4	Bay of Plenty Regional Council

### **Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
1	1	Duval, Bill
7, FS29	26, FS55, FS58,	TKC Holdings Ltd
8, FS 27	19, FS61,	Carrus Corporation Ltd
FS30	FS9,	Blakely Pacific Limited

### **Reason for Decision**

- 1 *Plan Change 46/Variation 2 gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and has had regard to the Proposed Regional Policy Statement and Variation 1.*
- 2 *Where matters have been settled by way of decision or consent order (although not yet made operative) these provisions have also been given effect to, as they are beyond change. One of the objectives of these documents is to give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010). Council has considered the development of the draft Regional Coastal Environment Plan, but recognises that the Regional Coastal Environment Plan document is currently only a resource, as it has not yet been notified.*
- 2 *With regard to Submitter 8 the differences between Plan Change 46/Variation 2 (as notified) and Plan Change 46/Variation 2 (as adopted by Council for notification) are editorial, which were allowed for in Council Resolution STP38.6.*
- 3 *With regard to Submitter 1 contact details are not included on District Plan maps.*

The Section 32 Report had been subject to legal scrutiny to check that it was robust, and it was noted that there was a further evaluation.

**Resolved:** Webber/Mackay

*That the Section 32 analysis be retained as notified.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>FS32</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>FS27</i>	<i>3, 5, 7, 9</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>6, 8, 10, 12</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>

**Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>FS32</i>	<i>3, 18</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>3, 17</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>

**Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Te Umuhapuku 3B Trust</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Taingahue Family Trust</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Rangiwaewa Marae Trust</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>1, 25</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS26</i>	<i>2, 9, 10, 11</i>	<i>Faulkner, Cathryn</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>

**Reason for Decision**

- 1. The Committee fully considered all of the issues and options that were presented to them and made amendments where appropriate*
- 2. The Section 32 analysis is based on the outcomes from detailed and robust research undertaken over the past 5 years by landowners and Tangata Whenua, the District Council, and the Regional Council.*
- 3. The Committee has produced a further evaluation under Section 32 that complements the planning reports to the Hearings Committee and the specific decisions of the Committee.*

PP4.4.3

**Topic 3 – Proposed changes to the Explanatory Statement and 18.1 Significant Issues**

**Resolved:** Murray-Benge/Mackay

- (1) *THAT the second to last sentence of the proposed addition to the Explanatory Statement (as notified) be amended to read as follow:*

*Council has adopted the Matakana Island Plan which addresses these significant issues in more detail to provide guidance for the future subdivision, use and development of the Island.*

- (2) *THAT the following wording be added to proposed paragraph (f):*

*(f) The pine forest landscape, as viewed from the Harbour, open coast and mainland is valued by both residents of the Island and the mainland, and visitors and as a production forest it will be subject to cyclical harvesting and associated visual changes.*

- (3) *THAT apart from the amendment included in 1 and 2 above, the proposed changes to the Explanatory Statement of the Rural Zone, as notified in Plan Change 46/Variation 2, be retained.*

- (4) *THAT 18.1 Significant Issues be amended to read as follows:*

*10. Matakana Island is a sensitive environment that needs to be planned for carefully. While the resource management issues relevant to Matakana Island also apply to other rural land, those of particular importance in the Matakana context include:*

- The potential for more intensive or large scale subdivision, use and development to adversely impact on archaeological, cultural, spiritual, ecological and landscape values.*
- The need and desire of Tangata Whenua to exercise rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga and to actively protect cultural values over their ancestral land, and to live on and develop their own land.*
- The threat of a multiplicity of natural hazards including coastal erosion, tsunami, liquefaction, inundation, and fire.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

Submission	Point Number	Name
------------	--------------	------

11, FS28	18, FS20	Bay of Plenty Regional Council
FS31	FS9, 11	Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust
FS32	FS11	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai
FS33	FS11, FS12	New Zealand Historic Places Trust

**Accepted in Part**

Submission	Point Number	Name
11	17	Bay of Plenty Regional Council
14	12, 13	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai
15	12, 13	Poka, Donna
16	13	Department of Conservation
FS27	FS39	Carrus Corporation Ltd
10	6	Blakely Pacific Ltd
FS29	FS36	TKC Holdings Ltd

**Rejected**

Submission	Point Number	Name
7, FS29	17, FS23, FS25, FS31, FS32, FS71, FS72, FS97, FS98, FS126, FS127, FS156	TKC Holdings Ltd
8, FS27	10, 12, FS25, FS34, FS35, FS74, FS75	Carrus Corporation Ltd
10, FS30	1, 2, FS11	Blakely Pacific Ltd
FS26	FS14	Cathryn Faulkner

**Reason for Decision**

1. The Explanatory Statement refers to the existing production forest and its value to the Island.
2. It is not the purpose of the Explanatory Statement or Significant Issues to balance various aspects of sustainable management on a title by title basis.
3. The additional wording to the second to last sentence of the Explanatory Statement is correct and comprehensive.
4. The additional wording sought by Submitter 11 for paragraph (f) of the Explanatory Statement is too specific and will result in a very long sentence.
5. The additional wording included in paragraph (f) acknowledges that the forested sand barrier is mainly a production forest and subject to visual changes as a result of the cyclical harvesting.
6. Significant Issue 10 and the proposed changes to it are supported by the preceding research.

**Section 18 – Rural****Resolved:** Webber/Williams

- (1) *THAT Objective 10 be retained as notified.*
- (2) *THAT Policy 16 be amended to read as follows:*
16. *In addition to policies relating to the rural land resource, subdivision, use and development of land on Matakana Island shall recognise and provide for the following matters:*
- (a) *Cultural, spiritual and archaeological values, including the need and desire of Maori to live on, develop and otherwise maintain a strong relationship with their ancestral land.*
  - (b) *Maintenance and enhancement of natural coastal character, natural features, ecology and landscapes, indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, and historic heritage.*
  - (c) *The need to ensure that large-scale or more intensive subdivision, land use and development proposals do not compromise future options for the comprehensive planning and development of the Island.*
  - (d) *Legal access to the ocean beach, Panepane and sites of cultural significance for at least the local community and landowners.*
  - (e) *Sustainability of existing social infrastructure and the cultural and social well-being of the Matakana Island community.*
  - (f) *Sustainable economic development that contributes to the economic well-being of the Matakana Island community.*
  - (g) *Development that is of a scale and nature that will complement the lifestyle (including self-sufficiency) of the Matakana Island community.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>14, FS9</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>FS10</i>	<i>Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangī Iwi</i>

		<i>Trust</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>Bay of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>FS33</i>	<i>FS3</i>	<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>

**Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>FS27</i>	<i>FS76</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>FS73</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>FS14</i>	<i>Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust</i>

**Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>Bay of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>18, 19, FS26, FS27, FS34, FS35, FS73, FS74, FS128, FS157, FS158</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8, FS27</i>	<i>14, 19, FS37, FS26, FS27, FS38, FS77</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>10, FS30</i>	<i>4, 5, FS18</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Ltd</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS26</i>	<i>FS6, FS12, FS15</i>	<i>Faulkner, Cathryn</i>

**Reason for Decisions**

- 1. The objectives and policies of the District Plan should not promote subdivision, land use and development on land that has a significant natural, cultural, or social environment, or which is exposed to significant natural hazards.*
- 2. It is more appropriate to ensure that the existing transportation links between the mainland and the Island are maintained and enhanced by including provisions in 18.5 Matters of Discretion, and not within the Policies as sought by Submitter 11.*
- 3. The cultural and spiritual significance of Matakana Island is highlighted in specialist studies, the Hapu Management Plan, and acknowledged by the Environment Court. It is therefore important that the objectives and policies of District Plan acknowledge this significance.*

PP4.4.5

**Topic 5 – The provision for dwellings (and the scale thereof) – Submission points that relate to the development of dwellings in the Activity Lists, excluding proposed 18.6 Prohibited Activities (therefore 18.3.1 Permitted Activities, 18.3.2 Controlled Activities, 18.3.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, 18.3.4 Discretionary Activities and 18.3.5 Non-Complying Activities)**

It was noted that the Committee's decisions in relation to these activities would be further elaborated in the Section 32aa statement. It was noted that the Rural Contractor Depot activity was defined under the District Plan and included a requirement to live on site.

**Resolved:** His Worship the Mayor/Webber

- (1) *THAT Rule 18.3.1(d) be amended as follows to allow one dwelling per lot on the entire Island as a Permitted Activity:*
  - (d) *One dwelling per lot,*
- (2) *THAT Rule 18.3.1(s) be amended as follows to allow Rural Contractor Depots on the forested sand barrier outside a dwelling cluster:*
  - (s) *Rural Contractors Depots, excluding within a dwelling cluster on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.*
- (3) *THAT Rule 18.3.3(f) be amended to read as follows:*
  - (f) *Dwellings and associated subdivision in addition to 18.3.1(d) on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier subject to compliance with the activity performance standards contained in Rules 18.4.1(d) and 18.4.2(i).*
- (4) *THAT the wording in 18.3.4(s) be amended to read as follows:*
  - (s) *Subdivision dwellings and development associated with the clustering of dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier that fails to comply with the activity performance standards listed in 18.4, provided that in respect of rule 18.3.6 an overall density of one dwelling per 40ha is not exceeded.*
- (5) *THAT the following be added to 18.3.5 Non-Complying Activities to enable subdivision under 18.4.2(b) General Farming Lots:*
  - (g) *Subdivision and development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier that is not associated with the clustering of dwellings subject to performance standards in 18.4.2(b).*
- (6) *THAT apart from the amendments included (1) to (5) above, the Activity Lists included in 18.3.1, 18.3.2, 18.3.3, 18.3.4 and 18.3.5 be retained as notified.*

(7) *THAT the following consequential amendments be made to the explanatory statement, significant issues and policies to support the rule change above:*

(7)(a) *Explanatory Statement: Add the following to the list of significant values as point (g).*

(g) *The unbuilt nature of the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.*

(7)(b) *Explanatory Statement: Add the following sentence to the second paragraph:*

*This seeks to confine the built form on the forested sand barrier to be clustered instead of the traditional pepper potting based on subdivision lot size.*

(7)(c) *Significant Issues: Add the following bullet point under Significant Issue 10:*

- *The subdivision of large blocks into multiple 40ha lots and the pepper potting of dwellings on these lots.*

(7)(d) *Policies: Add the following under Policy 16:*

(h) *Provide for the establishment of additional dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier in a clustered form only.*

(i) *Manage subdivision, land use and development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier under the rural provisions of the Plan to avoid fragmentation of existing titles*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

***Accepted***

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>11, FS28</i>	<i>22, FS22, FS48, FS12,</i>	<i>Bay of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>17, 18, FS12</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15, FS31</i>	<i>16, 17, 18, FS12</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>16, 18</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS33</i>	<i>FS5</i>	<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>
<i>8</i>	<i>16, 17</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>

***Accepted in part***

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>15, 16, 19</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS33</i>	<i>FS8</i>	<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>

FS26	13	Faulkner, Cathryn
<b>Rejected</b>		
<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
7, FS29	2, 22, FS53, FS75, FS75, FS100, FS129, FS131, FS159, FS164	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS27	FS30, FS54, FS78	Carrus Corporation Ltd
10	21	Blakely Pacific Ltd
25	1	Peter Axelrad

### **Reasons for Decision**

1. *Changes to enable dwellings on multiple owned Maori land have been reviewed with the District Plan – First Review and are supported by the Hapu Management Plan. As a result, no changes were proposed through Plan Change 46/Variation 2.*
2. *There is a significant difference between the look, feel, land use and ownership between the forested sand barrier and the farmland portion of the Island. Although one dwelling per lot is allowed on the forested sand barrier, it is not the intention to encourage the subdivision of large blocks into multiple 40ha blocks. To promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the forested sand barrier, dwellings and associated subdivision should be clustered in appropriate areas and should not be scattered throughout the forested sand barrier.*
3. *The changes will enable limited subdivision on the forested sand barrier under the General Farming Lots rules, including activities that have a genuine locational need.*
4. *The clustering of dwellings is more complicated than a standard subdivision in the Rural Zone and as a result cannot be a Controlled Activity, as sought by some submitters.*
5. *Complex cultural and social issues are mainly intangible and therefore best practice development and associated subdivision outcomes cannot be promoted through specific activity performance standards. These issues have to be addressed through innovative solutions that address the matters listed in Sections 6 and 7 of the RMA. With Proposed Plan Change 46/Variation 2, Council would like to encourage innovative development best practice. If the clustering of dwellings was to be a Permitted or Controlled Activity, Council would not be able to encourage the developer to work with the development constraints of the Island, such as the location of the cluster.*
6. *Considering the purpose of the RMA, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement, the District Plan must not promote the subdivision of existing small*

*landholdings on the forested sand barrier, or the development of a second dwelling on these landholdings.*

PP4.4.6

**Topic 5 – The provision for dwellings (and the scale thereof) – Submission Points that Relate to 18.6 – Prohibited Activities**

**Resolved:** Webber/Murray-Benge

1. *THAT, the wording in 18.3.6(a) be amended to read as follows:*
  - (a) *Residential development and subdivision that exceeds a density of one dwelling per 40ha on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.*
2. *THAT rule 18.3.6(b) be amended to read as follows:*
  - (b) *Minor dwellings on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.*
3. *THAT apart from amendment in 1 and 2 above, the proposed 18.3.6 Prohibited Activities be retained as notified.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>11, FS28</i>	<i>23, FS36</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>FS33</i>	<i>FS7, FS10</i>	<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>

**Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>

**Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Te Umuhapuku 3B Trust</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Taingahue Family Trust</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Rangiwaea Marae Trust</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Tauwhao Te Ngare Trust</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>24, FS7, FS9, FS11, FS13, FS49, FS77, FS105, FS134,</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8, FS27</i>	<i>18, FS4, FS6, FS8, FS10, FS49, FS77, FS105, FS134</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>10</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>
<i>FS26</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>Faulkner, Cathryn</i>

**Reasons for Decision**

1. *The need for this Plan Change/Variation is driven by pressure from developers that would like to undertake residential development of a scale and nature that is outside the provisions of the operative District Plan, Regional Policy Statement and the sub-regional growth strategy (SmartGrowth).*
2. *Prohibited Activities are a legitimate "tool" included in the RMA "toolbox" to ensure comprehensive development. Council believes that proposed Rule 18.3.6 Prohibited Activities:*
  - (a) *Provides certainty. As a result, significant time, resources and money will not be spent on resource consents, and appeals in the Environment Court by affected parties.*
  - (b) *Gives effect to Part 2 of the RMA, the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, and ensures that such development is in accordance with SmartGrowth, the sub-regional comprehensive development plan.*
  - (c) *Takes the Hapu Management Plan into account.*
  - (d) *Incorporates the outcomes from various specialist studies undertaken over the past 5 years.*
  - (e) *Does not affect existing entitlements.*
3. *Not allowing any new dwellings on the forested sand barrier, as sought by submitters 3, 4, 5 and 6, will impact on the existing planning entitlements of those lots and cannot be supported because through the provision of appropriate rules the "status quo" can be given effect to.*
4. *The request from the Regional Council to refer to subdivision and development, and not only development (as notified) will provide more clarity.*

PP4.4.7

**Topic 5 – The provision for dwellings (and the scale thereof) – Submission points that relate to the Activity Performance Standards for the clustering, of dwellings and subdivision**

**Resolved:** Webber/Mackay

1. *THAT 18.4.1(d) be amended to read as follows:*
  - (d) *Standards for clustering of dwellings or lots on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier*
    - (i) *Dwelling or Lot entitlements: one dwelling or lot for every 40ha of the combined total area of all existing lots on which the application is based.*

- (ii) *Yards:*
- *within the cluster - Minimum of 10m*
  - *along the outer boundary of the cluster - Minimum of 30m*
- (iii) *Minimum number of dwellings or lots per cluster:*  
10
- (iv) *The layout of the cluster or multiple clusters shall not be of a linear nature.*
- (v) *The reflectivity of all roofs of all buildings, excluding solar panels, shall be no greater than 25% (as per the British Standard BS5252 Reflectance Value).*
- (vi) *Transferring of development rights:*  
*To achieve the clustering of dwellings or lots, a dwelling or subdivision entitlement may be transferred from one existing title (the donor lot) to another existing title (the recipient lot) at a rate of one entitlement per 40ha of land within the "donor" lot.*
- An Encumbrance shall be registered against the title of the donor lot or balanced land to record the transfer of entitlements to:*
- (a) *ensure that the allotment cannot be used for further subdivision or additional dwellings in future.*
  - (b) *record the balance number of lots or dwellings still to be transferred (if necessary).*
- (vii) *Development within the cluster shall be in accordance with a Design and Development Plan approved in conjunction with the granting of a resource consent under rule 18.3.3(f). The Design and Development Plan shall, as a minimum, address the matters included in rule 18.5.8.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>FS13</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>11, FS28</i>	<i>24, 25, FS37, FS38</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>FS33</i>	<i>FS11, FS6, FS14</i>	<i>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</i>

FS27	FS88, FS89, FS90, FS91,	Carrus Corporation Ltd
FS29	FS107, FS111, FS136, FS140	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS30	FS16, FS17	Blakely Pacific Limited

**Accepted in part**

Submission	Point Number	Name
14, FS32	21, 25	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai
15	21, 25	Poka, Donna
FS31	FS13	Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust
FS33	FS11	New Zealand Historic Places Trust
10, FS30	20, 22, FS12,	Blakely Pacific Limited
7, FS29	21, FS54, FS57, FS81	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS27	FS29, FS53, FS55, FS81	Carrus Corporation Ltd

**Rejected**

Submission	Point Number	Name
7, FS29	21, 23, FS48, FS50, FS51, FS78	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS27	FS31, FS57, FS58, FS82	Carrus Corporation Ltd
10	24, 25	Blakely Pacific Limited
14	22, 26	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai
15	22, 26	Poka, Donna

**Reasons for Decision**

1. *The proposed Activity Performance Standards are not too rigid and over-prescriptive but are deemed appropriate for what is considered to be a sensitive environment. In conjunction with the proposed matters of discretion, a well balanced approach is proposed to provide certainty and flexibility while protecting the significant values of the Island.*
2. *It is believed that with an innovative and integrated design, development and management approach, a density of no more than 1 dwelling / 40 ha is a well balanced outcome that enables the protection of the significant values of the forested sand barrier and the fulfilment of development desires from the landowners.*
3. *Some of the submitters sought that the minimum number of dwellings in a cluster be reduced from 20 to 10 and the Committee accepted that on the basis that it gives more flexibility to the market to determine the cluster size (maximum or minimum). Notwithstanding we believe that anything less than 10 is not considered a cluster in the context of future development allowed for on the forested sand barrier. The*

*concentration of dwellings into clusters of more than 10 dwellings will enable the protection of the social, cultural, natural and landscape values of the remaining portion of the forested sand barrier more successfully.*

4. *The proposed roof reflectivity standards will reduce the visibility of the clusters from surrounding areas.*

PP4.4.8

**Topic 5 – The provision for dwellings (and the scale thereof) – Submission points on Restricted Discretionary Assessment Criteria for the Clustering of Dwellings**

**Resolved:** Webber/Merriman

- (1) *THAT the matters of discretion included in 18.5.8 and 18.5.9 (as notified) be combined into a new 18.5.8 that reads as follow:*

***18.5.8 Assessment Criteria for Restricted Discretionary Activities on Matakana Island, including the clustering of dwellings or lots on the forested sand barrier***

*Council shall restrict its discretion to the following:*

- (a) *The matters referred to in Objective 10 and Policy 16.*
- (b) *The location of the cluster of dwellings or lots on the forested sand barrier.*
- (c) *The sustainability of water, wastewater, electricity, telecommunication and solid waste removal provisions.*
- (d) *The provision of safe and legal access for landowners and the effect on the existing access rights of surrounding landowners.*
- (e) *The impact of development (including earthworks) on the natural environment, landscape, cultural and archaeological values.*
- (f) *Avoidance or minimisation of the risk to life and damage to property from natural hazards.*
- (g) *The social and cultural impact on the existing Island community.*

- (h) *How existing areas of ecological value will be enhanced and maintained.*
- (i) *How the introduction of pest plants and animals will be minimised and managed.*
- (j) *The impact on the existing rural character and amenity values of Matakana Island as viewed from within the Island, the mainland, open coast and the Harbour.*
- (k) *How the development will co-exist with the production forestry operations.*
- (l) *The provision of convenient access for the existing Island community to the open coast, Panepane and sites of cultural significance.*
- (m) *Roading ownership, construction and on-going maintenance.*
- (n) *Potential for conflict with existing and foreseeable activities in the area. In justifying any location where potential for conflict and other adverse effects arise, consideration should be made of possible alternative locations and the need to be in the specific area chosen.*
- (o) *Traffic Generation*
- *Impact on roading including traffic safety;*
  - *Access;*
  - *Effect on amenity.*
- (p) *Scale of the activity including number of people and how this affects the existing character and amenity values.*

(2) *THAT proposed 18.5.9 be deleted.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>10</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>
<i>14</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>FS27</i>	<i>FS60</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS28</i>	<i>FS43</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>

**Accepted In Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
-------------------	---------------------	-------------

11	27	Bay Of Plenty Regional Council
FS27	FS84	Carrus Corporation Ltd
FS29	FS80	TKC Holdings Ltd
FS30	FS14	Blakely Pacific Limited

**Rejected**

Submission	Point Number	Name
FS29	FS113, FS142	TKC Holdings Ltd

**Reasons for the Decision**

1. *Provision of public access should be done on a project by project basis to ensure that project related costs and effects are managed and budgeted for.*
2. *Inappropriate public access can have a significant effect on the existing forestry operations and the sensitive environment of the forested sand barrier.*
3. *Combining 18.5.8 and 18.5.9 makes the Plan more user-friendly.*

PP4.4.9

**Topic 6 – Other Land Use Activities****Resolved:** His Worship the Mayor Paterson/Mackay

1. *THAT the following assessment criteria be included in Rule 18.5.8:*
  - 18.5.8 (n) *Potential for conflict with existing and foreseeable activities in the area. In justifying any location where potential for conflict and other adverse effects arise, consideration should be made of possible alternative locations and the need to be in the specific area chosen.*
  - 18.5.8 (o) *Traffic Generation*
    - *Impact on roading including traffic safety;*
    - *Access;*
    - *Effect on amenity.*
  - 18.5.8 (p) *Scale of the activity including number of people and how this affects the existing character and amenity values.*
2. *THAT the following be included in rule 18.3.5 Non-Complying Activity to enable subdivision on the forested sand barrier that is not associated with the clustering of dwellings:*
  - (g) *Subdivision and development on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier that is not associated with the*

*clustering of dwellings subject to performance standards in 18.4.2(b).*

3. *THAT the following consequential amendment be made to 18.4.2(b) General farming lots:*

*(b) General farming lots*

4. *Delete 18.4.1(f)(iv) to enable the development of accommodation facilities within a cluster as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.*
5. *THAT rule 18.3.1(s) be amended as follows to enable a Rural Contractors Depot outside a cluster on the forested sand barrier:*

### **18.3.1 Permitted Activities**

*(s) Rural Contractors Depots, excluding within a dwelling cluster on the Matakana Island forested sand barrier.*

6. *Apart from the changes in 1 to 5 above, the provisions in 18.3, 18.4 and 18.5 that relates to activities other than the clustering of dwellings, be retained as notified.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

#### **Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
14	27	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
15	27	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
16	18	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
FS28	FS39	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>

#### **Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
11	26	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
8, FS27	15, FS59	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>

#### **Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
FS29	FS33, FS52, FS79, FS112, FS141, FS161	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
FS27	FS36, FS83,	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
10, FS30	3,26, FS13	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>

#### **Reasons for Decision**

1. *Rural contractor's depots will be allowed as a Permitted Activity on the forested sand barrier, excluding within a dwelling cluster where the dwellings are relatively close to each other*

*and as a result may impact on the tranquil lifestyle, natural environment and landscape.*

2. *The construction of minor dwellings will increase the potential number of people on the forested sand barrier significantly. This will impact on the objective to "balance" population numbers between the forested sand barrier and the farm lands. The potential population increase will also impact on the natural, cultural, social and landscape values of the forested sand barrier.*
3. *The proposed changes will enable subdivision on the forested sand barrier under the general farming lots rule, provided that it is not associated with the pepper potting of dwellings.*
4. *Proposed assessment criteria 18.5.8(j), (k) and (l) will contribute to minimising the effects on the existing production forest and potential land use activities, such as a dwelling cluster.*
5. *It is appropriate to provide for flexibility by allowing for accommodation facilities within a cluster. The proposed amendment will provide more flexibility regarding location.*
6. *Proposed assessment criteria 18.5.8(j), (k) and (l) will contribute to minimising the effects on the existing production forest and potential land use activities, such as a dwelling cluster.*

#### PP4.5 **Planning Report 2 – Natural Environment**

The Committee considered a report from the Policy Analyst Resource Management dated 6 March 2014 as circulated in the agenda.

#### PP4.5.1 **Topic 1: Updating the District Plan Maps and Appendix 1 - Schedule of Identified Significant Ecological Features**

**Resolved:** Webber/Murray-Benge

1. *THAT the wording in the Explanatory Statement of Section 5 regarding 'existing use rights' (8<sup>th</sup> paragraph) be replaced with the following paragraph:*

*Existing use rights apply. These include farm management and the management of other land currently used for production forestry, woodlots, and quarries.*

2. *The District Plan definition of Production Forestry be amended to include the wording 'replanting of trees', reading as follows;*

*“Production Forestry” means the management of land for commercial wood production including the extraction of timber therefrom and the replanting of trees but does not include the milling or processing of timber.*

- The three additional sites included in the submission of the Department of Conservation be included on the District Plan Maps and Appendix 1 as Significant Ecological Features.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

#### **Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>FS3</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>FS30</i>	<i>FS2</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Ltd</i>
<i>FS28</i>	<i>FS2, FS3, FS47, FS45</i>	<i>Bay of Plenty Regional Council</i>

#### **Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>7, 8,</i>	<i>Bay of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>15,</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>4, FS2, FS15</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>FS2, FS16</i>	<i>Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangī Iwi Trust</i>

#### **Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Taikato, Easton</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>4, 5, FS61, FS62, FS90, FS118, FS150, FS163</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8, FS27</i>	<i>FS12, FS13, FS64, FS65,</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>10, FS30</i>	<i>FS6, FS5</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Ltd</i>
<i>24</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Federated Farmers NZ (Inc)</i>

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- Various specialist studies have shown that the proposed Significant Ecological Features are of high value and need to be preserved.*
- The proposed changes will make it clear that, as an existing use right, production forestry can continue within identified Significant Ecological Features.*
- The three additional areas of ecological significance, included in the submission of Submitter 16 were identified prior to 2011, and overlooked during the Plan Change notification process.*

PP4.5.2 **Topic 2: Amendments to the Activity Lists and Matters of Discretion**

**Resolved:** Thwaites/Williams

*Amended 5.6.2 to read:*

***Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities – Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria***

*In considering an application for a Discretionary Activity or a Non-Complying Activity, Council shall consider:*

- (a) The Relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan.*
- (b) The matters listed in 5.6.1, 18.5.8.*

The following submissions are therefore:

***Accepted***

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
13	1	Western Bay of Plenty District Council
FS28	FS5, FS15, FS25, FS40	Bay of Plenty Regional Council

***Accepted in Part***

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
11	5, 6	Bay of Plenty Regional Council
16	3, 5 & 6	Department of Conservation
14	1, 3	Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai
15	1, 3	Poka, Donna

***Rejected***

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
8, FS 27	7, FS41, FS18, FS15, FS44, FS85, FS94,	Carrus Corporation Ltd
10	8, 11	Blakely Pacific Limited
7, FS29	7, 10, FS20, FS38, FS18, FS41, FS59, FS83, FS87, FS115, FS146, FS60, FS89, FS117, FS148, FS149	TKC Holdings Ltd
24	1	Federated Farmers
FS26	FS1	Faulkner, Cathryn

***Reasons for Decision***

*The proposed changes to Sections 5.4 and 5.6 will:*

- 1. Give effect to the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.*

2. *Take the Hapu Management plan into account.*
3. *Give a clear indication that the Significant Ecological Features on Matakana Island are very important.*
4. *Will not impact on the existing production forestry operations.*

PP4.6 **Planning Report 3 – Landscape Section**

The Committee considered a report from the Policy Analyst Resource Management dated 6 March 2014 as circulated in the agenda.

PP4.6.1 **Topic 1: General, District Plan Maps and Appendix 2**

**Resolved:** Merriman/Mackay

1. *The proposed changes to Appendix 2 of the District Plan be retained as notified.*
2. *Outstanding Landscape Features S25 – Matakana Open Coast and S9 and S9a – Matakana Island Landscape Management Area be amended as per the attached District Plan Maps.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>11, FS28</i>	<i>15, 16, FS13, FS18, FS19, FS29, FS30,</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>FS27</i>	<i>FS2</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>FS5</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>FS30</i>	<i>FS3</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>

**Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>11, FS5, FS7</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>FS5, FS7</i>	<i>Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust</i>

**Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>Taikato, Easton</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>11, FS22, FS24, FS44, FS45, FS69, FS70, FS96, FS125, FS155,</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8, FS27</i>	<i>9, 11, FS 19, FS20, FS45, FS48, FS72,</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>

	<i>FS73,</i>	
<i>10</i>	<i>15, 16</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>
<i>FS26</i>	<i>FS3</i>	<i>Faulkner, Cathryn</i>

### ***Reasons for Decision***

- 1. The proposed changes will incorporate the outcomes from research undertaken over the past 5 years by both the Regional Council and Western Bay of Plenty District Council.*
- 2. The proposed changes to S25 are as per the outcomes from the Environment Court appeals process on the Natural Character Areas of Matakana Island.*
- 3. The proposed changes will give effect to the Regional Policy Statement and NZCPS, and takes the Hapu Management Plan into account.*
- 4. The overlay distance of 50m from MHWS along the Harbour will be the same as for the rest of the District.*

PP4.6.2

### **Topic 2: Amendments to 6.4 Activity Lists and 6.6 Matters of Discretion**

**Resolved:** Webber/Williams

- 1. Add the following wording after production forestry in 6.4.3.1(e) and 6.4.3.2(e). (excluding Matakana Island)*
- 2. The following assessment criteria be added to 6.6.1.1:*

*6.6.1.1(e) Activities within the Matakana Island Open Coast (S25) where such activities will be visible from the adjoining beach, waterbody and mainland (including from Bowentown and Mauao),*
- 3. Proposed 6.6.2.1 be amended as follows:*

*6.6.2.1 - The matters listed in 6.6.1.3 and, 18.5.8 and the following matters shall be used as a guide for assessing Discretionary and Non Complying Activities:*

  - (a) relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan.*
  - (b) the vision, principles and implementation strategies included in the adopted Matakana Island Plan.*
- 4. Apart from the proposed changes in 3.7.1, 3.7.2 and 3.7.3, proposed 6.4 Activity Lists and 6.6 Matters of Discretion, be retained as notified.*

*The following submissions are therefore:*

**Accepted**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>FS46</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>10</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>
<i>11, FS28</i>	<i>9, 10, 11, 13, 14, FS9, FS10, FS17, FS28, FS31</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>14, FS32</i>	<i>5, 7, 8, 9, 10, FS16,</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>5, 7, 8, 9, 10</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>9, 10, 11</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS27</i>	<i>FS11, FS50, FS67,</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>FS31</i>	<i>FS8, FS17</i>	<i>Te Runanga O Ngai Te Rangi Iwi Trust</i>

**Accepted in Part**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>14</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Te Kuka, Nessie Hinetai</i>
<i>15</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Poka, Donna</i>
<i>16</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>
<i>FS29</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>

**Rejected**

<i>Submission</i>	<i>Point Number</i>	<i>Name</i>
<i>7, FS29</i>	<i>13, 14, 15, 16, FS21, FS39, FS47, FS49, FS64, FS65, FS66, FS67, FS68, FS91, FS92, FS93, FS119, FS120, FS121, FS122, FS123, FS124, FS151, FS152, FS153, FS154</i>	<i>TKC Holdings Ltd</i>
<i>8, FS27</i>	<i>8, FS21, FS22, FS23, FS24, FS42, FS51, FS52, FS68, FS69, FS70, FS72, FS95,</i>	<i>Carrus Corporation Ltd</i>
<i>10, FS30</i>	<i>9, 18, 19, FS10</i>	<i>Blakely Pacific Limited</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Bay Of Plenty Regional Council</i>
<i>FS26</i>	<i>FS16</i>	<i>Faulkner, Cathryn</i>

**Reasons for Decision**

- 1. Outstanding Landscape Feature overlay is an additional constraint that needs consideration. As a result activities within the overlay are normally more restrictive than activities outside the overlay.*
- 2. The significance of S25, S9 and S9a are acknowledged by the RPS and the Environment Court. Relaxing the proposed activity status and matters of discretion will result in unsuitable development within these areas.*

3. *The proposed amendments will provide more clarity dealing with a resource consent.*

*The provisions support the continuation of production forestry.*

PP4.7

## **Overview Statement – Decisions on Plan Change 46/Variation 2 – Matakana Island**

**Resolved:** Merriman/Gunn

*THAT the Committee adopts the following Overview Statement:*

### ***Decisions on Plan Change 46/Variation 2: Matakana Island Further Evaluation pursuant to RMA S32(2)(a) and S32AA Overview Statement from the Policy and Planning Committee***

*This statement is issued and should be read in context with all of the Committee's decisions regarding specific amendments to Plan Change 46/Variation 2 – Matakana Island Plan.*

*Matakana Island is seen as a special place in the Western Bay of Plenty: special in terms of physical, archaeological, cultural and historical, and the way in which all intertwine. Although physically close to the mainland it is relatively isolated as the only access is by boat. This has meant that the Island has been relatively untouched by development over the decades, with the main changes being the introduction of pastoral farming, pine plantation forestry, and latterly orcharding. The Island population is 255 and 94% tangata whenua (2013 Census).*

*Matakana Island also has a complex blend of ecological, landscape, and natural character associated with the coastal environment, including open coast and sheltered harbour. It is New Zealand's only "raised sand barrier island" and is a nationally significant geological site.*

*There are some who argue that these values add to the desirability of the Island and make it suitable for development that seeks to capitalise on such features. However it is the Committee's view that when all the above factors are taken together, the range of sensitivities points to needing to be very careful with planning for the future development of the Island. Whilst the various features and constraints are now mostly known, the cumulative impact of development on these is not. It is appropriate, therefore, to take a considered approach until any such impacts are fully understood. Monitoring of the level and type of development allowed by this Plan Change will allow consideration in the future as to whether further development may be acceptable or appropriate. The Island resource is finite and unique, with strong cultural values.*

*This Plan Change already represents the potential for substantial change to the current status quo, providing as it does for clustered residential development and the ability to establish accommodation facilities and places of assembly.*

*The Island is zoned rural, is not serviced with infrastructure, and is outside of the Urban Limits in the Regional Policy Statement. Aspirations of the landowners of the Island are somewhat polarised. Tangata whenua have had the longest association with the Island, tracing their ancestry back several centuries to when the Island was first settled, and regard themselves as kaitiaki (guardians) of the Island. The forested landowners also have aspirations, some of whom have had a long association with the Island, notably the Faulkner family who have had continuous land ownership since 1925, and were integral to the establishment of commercial forestry. Notwithstanding such association, it does not incur special rights to allow development over and above others, or at a scale at odds with other rural areas in the District. As a Committee we have to ensure that there is consistency with District Plan provisions not only within the Island, but within the wider Western Bay of Plenty District.*

*The notified Plan Change provided for clustered development of dwellings and the Committee has continued to support this concept. Clustering is considered to be a better solution to address the landscape and other concerns, rather than cutting the forested sand barrier up into 40ha lots each with their own separate dwelling. This clustering also gives additional flexibility to the landowners compared to what is allowed in the Rural Zone on the mainland. In addition the Committee heard from some submitters that there was still a need to allow some form of rural subdivision that also allowed a dwelling. The Committee sees value in that option and has provided for such flexibility, as long as it does not become the dominant form.*

*Much like the Environment Court did in the decision [2011] NZEnvC 354 (a successful appeal by Tangata Whenua against a subdivision application on the sand barrier arm of Matakana Island), this Council Hearings Committee found that there needed to be an integrated approach to the management of national, regional, and district level sites of significance on the Island, and that " the complex layering of those features including the landscape, natural and cultural values was a key consideration". The Court, too, found that such features "were of a significant order". Similarly, it found in its assessment that sites such as the sand barrier, "having significant natural features and a significant cultural component should not be compromised by successive applications for consent." In determining "what future uses should be provided on the island" the Court stated that this question "should be examined within the context of the constraints that there are on the island, and the cultural matters identified in a Cultural Impact Assessment and the Hapu Management Plan."*

*This does not mean that we have taken those findings of the Court on the subdivision application into account unquestioned in the decision-making on this Plan Change, but rather, that the Court's illumination of the complex landscape, natural and cultural values of the Island has served to underline that the Island has a significance greater than simply being rural land proximate to Tauranga with extensive coastal edges.*

*It is the cumulative effect of all of the reasons above that has led us to the decisions on the number and activity status of the lots able to be generated, and the criteria related to the clusters. There was much discussion about whether the activity status associated with exceeding the limit on the number of lots should be non-complying or prohibited. It was submitted by some that the Council should be confident in its District Plan with the non-complying activity status supported by appropriate objectives and policies. Conversely others submitted that if the Council is confident with the limit it has set, and therefore will not entertain any higher figure during the life of this Plan, it should be clear in that message to the community. A non-complying activity status will lead to ongoing applications with associated costs and uncertainty to the applicant, community, and Council. A prohibited activity status is therefore considered to be more efficient and transparent at this point, and to provide certainty for all in the particular circumstances of the Island. Overall, we consider it is the most appropriate tool available to address these concerns and meet the objectives of the Plan Change and the Rural Zone.*

PP4.8

### **Adoption of Plan Change 46 and Release of Decisions**

**Resolved:** Merriman/Gunn

*THAT Plan Change 46 – Matakana Island be adopted as amended by the decisions of the Committee and that the decisions be released publically no later than 28 April 2014.*

*THAT the Group Manager Customer Services be delegated authority to make editorial changes if required prior to notification.*

The Chairperson noted thanks to all for the effort that had been put into this process.

The meeting concluded at 12.10 pm.

PP4