

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE AMBERLEY TOWN PLAN COMMITTEE, HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, AMBERLEY ON TUESDAY 3 APRIL 2007 AT 6.30 P.M.,

PRESENT

Mrs J McKendry (Chairperson), Cr A Smart, Mr J Hibbard, Mr G Cooper

APOLOGIES:

Mayor Jackson, Cr M Malthus, Cr Russell Black

THAT THE APOLIGIES BE ACCEPTED.

Chairperson / Smart

CARRIED

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr P Clifford (Chief Executive Officer), Mr A Parrish (Policy Planner), Ms L Weastell (Consultant Planner).

BUSINESS:

1. LOCATION OF ZONES

Three papers were tabled, Mrs Weastell described that there were three documents.

- 1) Discussion Paper
- 2) List of Submitters and other people who have approached Council
- 3) Summary of Submissions

Cr Smart questioned if the Ward Committee could be included in the discussions that were publicly excluded, particularly if the decisions made by this Committee deviated a long way from the original wish of the Ward Committee?

Mr Clifford stated that he would have no problem as long as the items discussed tonight did not leave the meeting until after the Committee had determined to release the detail back into the public domain. Mr Clifford also added that if the Ward Committee are informed then the general public need to be informed also.

Cr Smart stated that he thinks that the Ward Committee still think that they should be involved in the process. Mr Clifford stated that Council formed the Amberley Town Plan Committee and therefore this Committee could draw in any other group it wants to. Mrs Weastell stated that the Ward Committee did not follow the process laid out in the RMA. Therefore the Ward Committee through the Concept Plan Process should have made recommendations to

Council. Cr Smart stated that it would only be an issue if this Committee did not come to the same decisions as the Ward Committee

Mrs Weastell handed out that the various maps

Cr Smart questioned why the Greys road industrial site was not shown on the maps. It did go out for consultation and people submitted on it. Mrs Weastell stated that it was difficult to find a PDF copy of a map that shows the Greys Road industrial site, the map shown is the only PDF copy that is currently available.

Mrs Weastell ran through the list of submitters and people who have engaged Council. It was pointed out by various members of the Committee that a second supermarket on the site of the recycling centre was by no means a final outcome. At this point in time the land that the recycling centre was on was not up for sale and if it was put on the market there was no guarantee who the final buyer would be.

Cr Smart stated that the large number of people wanting to develop land suggested that there would be a large number of submissions.

Mrs Weastell then stated that the Committee last week had agreed to options 2 and 4, Geographical constraints and people suggesting a suitable zoning for particular land. The purpose of this meeting was to decide on the areas where Council would suggest that new land is zoned.

Mrs Weastell then ran through her discussion paper.

2. COMPACT TOWN SHAPE AND CONSOLIDATED DEVELOPMENT

Mrs Weastell asked if the Committee would like to encourage a compact town with consolidated development. It was noted that this would result in infrastructural efficiencies. Cr Smart asked why we need to have consolidated development, why could people not build outwards?

Mrs Weastell stated that you could build outwards but any new development needed to adjoin a currently developed area. Mrs Weastell showed on the zoning maps how this may work in the south eastern corner of the town between the Teviot's and State Highway One. Mrs McKendry stated that Mark Harrison did not want to pay for access to his land. It was agreed that a compact town with consolidated development was a good option.

3. LOCATION OF RESIDENTIAL 1A

Mrs Weastell asked if the Committee wished to follow Graham Densem's Landscape advice and ensure that residential 1a should be near the town centre.

Cr Smart then produced some photographs, which showed a 380m² section. Cr Smart was concerned that this section had so little room that even the single tree on the site had to be cut down. Mrs Weastell stated that the minimum section size did not preclude larger sections.

Mrs Weastell stated that she wanted to know the Committee wanted a policy of containment in the town centre.

Mr Cooper stated that it did seem sensible to make the town centre high density. Mrs McKendry stated that the original concept plan wanted the strip down state highway one was supposed to be commercial.

Mrs Weastell stated that from a planning perspective it did not matter where high density goes but from a landscape perspective, it needs to go near the town centre. Cr Smart suggested that there was no need to drop down to residential 1a. Just have residential. Mrs Weastell asked about the people who want small sections.

4. RETAIN AMBERLEY'S RURAL OUTLOOKS

Mrs Weastell asked if the Committee wanted to protect views of natural areas such as Mount Grey, the Three Sisters etc

Cr Smart asked if you wanted to protect the views to Amberley downs to the north of the township. Cr Smart said that the best place to build in Amberley is on these downs because you get the views. it was a golden opportunity in his view to develop a Fendalton type suburb in Amberley.

However, any policy allowing development on the downs should be written in such a way that will not suggest that building should continue all the way up the hill. Mrs McKendry suggested that we should ask this question when the draft plan is released for consultation, i.e. how far up and in what point in time?

5. ELONGATING THE TOWN ALONG STATE HIGHWAY ONE

Mrs Weastell asked if the plan should encourage development at either end of the town and extend outside the 100km/h zone. There was unanimous agreement that this was not a good idea and that the town should be encouraged to expand in an east west direction.

6. DEVELOPMENT ON THE KOWAI RIVER FLOOD PLAIN

Mrs Weastell asked if the Plan should seek to avoid development on the Kowai flood plane? Cr Smart asked if this would be consistent with other decisions, in particular the development on the Kowai Downs?

Mrs McKendry stated that there needed to be stopbanks and flood protection. Mrs Weastell reassured the group that they would be constant. In addition, it was only a draft plan and it could be changed. There was general agreement by the Committee that development along the flood plane should be avoided.

7. MINIMISE THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENT ABUTTING THE MSITL OR SH1

Mrs Weastell asked if development beside the state highway should be planned in such a way that the negative effects are minimised. For example the noise could be minimised by bunding and planting. There was unanimous approval to this suggestion. Mr Cooper stated that often the most effective way was to have a bund, then a fence and then trees.

8. INFRASTRUCTURAL SERVICES

Mrs Weastell stated that there were two options, the Committee could choose to either allocate infrastructure on a first come first serve basis or identify priority areas for development. Priority areas have an advantage because it allows for compact town development, for example, there are only about 50 lots under the present sewerage system and it would not be efficient for these to be on the outskirts of town. However, the negative effect of allocating areas is that they may not be developed immediately and then the investment in infrastructure is tied up with no return on this investment.

Mrs Weastell stated that the LTCCP was planning for 425 new lots over the next 20 years but Council was planning to zone land for 1175 new lots. This was almost three times as much as what was planned for in the LTCCP.

Mr Clifford stated that the LTCCP could change, and the planning in that document was not cast in stone. Mr Clifford also stated that currently infrastructural capacity was allocated on a first come first serve basis

Mrs Weastell stated that the people who already had residential zonings should be provided supply first if Council chose to allocate preferential zonings. Cr Smart suggested that first come first serve was the best option and there was unanimous approval by the rest of the Committee.

Mrs Weastell stated that the plan needed to say where and how much infrastructure was needed. Council could choose to zone as much land as they wanted but not allow all of this to be developed immediately. Mrs Weastell stated that when the infrastructural upgrades have occurred it would just be a matter of a Council resolution to signal that now the infrastructure was available and the land could be developed.

9. LOCATION OF ZONES

9.1. Douglas Road / Markham Street

Mrs Weastell suggested that the residentially zoned land in Douglas Road should stay residential. Business zone could be used for the rest of the land. There was some discussion about the property at the end of Markham and Douglas Road. The Committee suggested that this property may be better as light industrial. Mrs Weastell suggested that only two zones are needed, a place where people can go and a place that is noisy and smelly.

General approval by members of the Committee to leave the current zoning as it is.

9.2. Courage Road

Mrs Weastell stated that Mr Parker was concerned about the zoning on the South side of Douglas Road. Mr Parker did not want the zone changing to industrial. The Ward Committee wanted an industrial area there and maybe some business. Cr Smart stated that the people at the Ward Committee wanted to develop the land behind.

Mr Clifford stated that there could be a strip of residential at the front to block out the industrial zone. Mr Clifford stated that in this area there where people that have invested heavily in developing their residential sections. Mrs Weastell stated that Livingston Property Valuers did a valuation on the land and that this showed that the value increased, but under the current District Plan residential development is permitted in the business zone, however the proposed new rules would exclude residential development from the Business Zone.

Mrs McKendry left the meeting at 8.41

Agreement that the first lot (the western most lot) should be business and the second and third lots should be residential.

9.3. Courage Road East of Ravensdown

Mrs Weastell asked if the Committee wanted to change the zone from residential to rural lifestyle. Cr Smart stated that he was concerned that the names residential 1 and 2 were confusing; Cr Smart wished to change the name residential 2 to urban lifestyle.

Mrs Weastell stated that there could not be huge amounts of additional subdivision on many of these lots since they already have large houses and gardens. Cr Smart asked why can't it be left how it is currently? Mrs Weastell stated that it was not consistent with the Seavale plan change.

The Committee agreed that it should be changed to residential 2

9.4. North West rural lifestyle area

Mrs Weastell asked if the large block on the north east side of town beside the railway lines should remain rural lifestyle. The Committee agreed unanimously

that Residential 2 was the preferred zoning for this area. There needs to be a lot of amenity work bunding etc to stop the noise from the railway lines. Mr Cooper stated that he did not want this area to extend further. Cr Smart suggested that this area was prone to flooding.

9.5. State Highway East Side

Mr Weastell asked if the Committee would like to rezone the land fronting land in front of State Highway One from Courage road to Amberley Beach Road Business. The Committee unanimously agreed to this suggestion

9.6. Courage Road and Pound Street

Mrs Weastell asked the Committee what the zoning should be for this land. Cr Smart stated that Council owns all the land. Mr Cooper stated that it should all be zoned business. Strong agreement with Mr Cooper by other members of the Committee that it should all be zoned Business. Mrs Weastell suggested that the Committee should ask the landowner. Cr Smart stated that the core town centre should be placed between Pound Street and Amberley Beach Road.

9.7. Pound Street to Amberley Beach Road

Mrs Weastell asked the Committee what the zoning should be for this land. Cr Smart stated that this area should be changed to business. Cr Smart stated that if the supermarket does not go ahead there would be some very unhappy people in Amberley. Mr Hibbard stated that it is almost guaranteed that a supermarket will be developed here.

Mr Clifford stated that the Committee would be wise to keep its options open. Mr Cooper stated that the Committee needs to ensure that the supermarket can develop. Cr Smart stated that it would be sensible to give all people who want the opportunity to develop this land the option. Mr Hibbard stated that this area should be business. There was general support from the Committee to make this are business.

9.8. Seavale

Mr Cooper asked if the Seavale land has bearing on the plan change process. Mrs Weastell stated that the Committee and Council could also look at a different process. Cr Smart stated that the Seavale land was a different process and should not be discussed by this Committee. Cr Smart suggested that Seavale could come back in 2022 and then be subdivided. The Committee decided that the west half should be Residential 1 and residential 2 on the east half. However, this was dependent on when the covenant was lifted.

Mrs Weastell stated that rules could be developed so that retirement complexes could be positioned in the business zone. There would not need to be a minimum lot size.

There was some discussion on the purpose of the 10% variance. Mrs Weastell stated that from a planning perspective there would be no problem removing the 10% variance. Mr Cooper agreed that the 10% variance could be removed.

Mrs Weastell stated that you would not need a minimum lot size for business. Mrs Weastell stated that rules could be developed in the business zone you could put a retirement zone.

Cr Smart stated that there should not be any residential 1a. Mrs Weastell reminded the Committee that Amberley was a retirement town and with the growth in the viticulture industry and tourism sector there may be more workers on minimum wage or other low paid work. Mrs Weastell stated that there was a need for 400m² sections for these groups.

Mrs Weastell also reminded the Committee that when the plan change comes into effect then existing sections will also have an ability to develop 350m² sections. Cr Smart said he had not realised this. Mrs Weastell stated that the Committee or Council could come back and look at the northern part of Seavale. Cr Smart stated that there were adverse effects in the north part of the Seavale land where the industrial land and the Seavale land would one day join.

Mrs Weastell suggested that one way to ensure that small sections are developed but are appropriate for the community is that developments wanting smaller sections would need a comprehensive development plan. Council could then state that approval would only be given if a number of conditions were met, for example, no internal fencing. Mrs Weastell stated that if you have an average of 600 then you will get 600m² sections.

9.9. South of Seadown and the Teviots

Mrs Weastell recommended a mix of residential 1 and 2. Has the option of flipping Teviot proposal around with 800m² near the state highway and 2000m² near the Teviots

Cr Smart suggested that the best thing was to have residential 2 that extended all the way from Seavale curl round Mr McClelland's land and be that size all the way to State Highway 1. Cr Smart stated that the Teviots has set a precedent.

There was much discussion as to the roading access through the Teviots to Mr Harrison's Land. Cr Smart stated that he would like to see it residential 2 but change the minimum size to 1500m². Mr Cooper stated that there was a need for more residential 1.

Mr Clifford and Ms Weastell suggested that the more intensive housing near State Highway 1 was important because it would provide an incentive for development because the profit margins are much higher on smaller sections.

Cr Smart stated that Council had already received submissions from people in Teviodale Place, these people did not want to look out onto smaller lots. Mrs Weastell stated that we needed to provide development options.

Cr Smart stated that at best Mr McClelland's could be deferred residential 1. But even then, this would be going against the Densem report in a number of ways.

Mr Cooper wanted to ensure that there were many options available.

9.10. Rural Lifestyle Land on the South of State Highway 1.

It was decided that this issue would be finalised at the next meeting

Mr Clifford stated that Mrs McKendry thought that the timeframe was creating bad decisions. Mr Hibbard stated that it was not so much the timeframe but the lack of time to make decisions. John asked if it would be possible to get papers on the night and essentially make the decision the following week.

Mr Clifford stated that it was important that the decisions were made well. Mr Cooper stated that there are not too many issues with delaying the timeline for another month.

Mrs Weastell stated that the meeting after Easter Tuesday would be very short notice. There was a need to discuss infrastructure, industrial land and reserves. After some discussion, it was decided that the meeting would be held on Tuesday 10 April 2007

Confirmed: _____ Date: _____