

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

TO THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE
COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

Cr R A Budd (Chairperson)

Cr T K Burke	Cr A G Neill
Cr A S Carroll	Cr M E Oldfield
Cr E H Cunningham	Cr J F Slee
Cr R H M Johnston	Cr N J Wagner
Cr R M Kirk	Cr J M Waters
Cr R I R Little	Cr W E Woods
Cr A R McKay	

A meeting of the Committee will be held on
Wednesday, 14 March 2007 at 11.00 a.m.

VENUE: Council Chamber
First Floor
Pegasus Building
Environment Canterbury
58 Kilmore Street
CHRISTCHURCH

BUSINESS: As per Order Paper attached

Dr Bryan Jenkins
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE TAKEN
AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY COUNCIL**

58 Kilmore Street,
PO Box 345,
Christchurch,
Telephone: (03) 365-3828,
Fax: (03) 365-3194
Website: www.ecan.govt.nz



COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS

Except as below, a statement of compliance and a completed decision checklist is required for any agenda item on a council committee or the council recommending that a decision be made. This will be the responsibility of the person signing off the agenda item.

The compliance statement and checklist will not be used for:

- Recommendations that information be received or that the Council make a decision.
- Decisions taken under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Biosecurity Act 1993 in relation to resource consents, decisions required when following the procedures set out in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, other permissions, submissions on plans, or references to the Environment Court.
- Decisions taken to proceed with enforcement procedures under various primary or secondary legislation or regulations, including procedures under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, and Environment Canterbury Bylaws.
- Administrative and personnel decisions that are entirely internal to Environment Canterbury.
- Other decisions where the procedures to be followed are set out in Legislation.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The council committee (or the council) must formally certify that:

- (a) It is satisfied that it has sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being and the effects on community outcomes, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- (b) It is satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

INFORMATION CHECKLIST

(a)	A Statement of the Proposed Decision
(b)	A Statement of the Objective of the Proposed Decision and the Issue or Problem being addressed
(c)	A list of all reasonably practicable options, (including doing nothing).
(d)	For each option in (c): An evaluation of the Benefits and Costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
(e)	For each option in (c): A statement of the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner.
(f)	For each option in (c): A statement of the Impact, if any, on Environment Canterbury's capacity to undertake its statutory responsibilities
(g)	If the Proposed Decision is a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, a statement of how Maori values have been taken into account
(h)	A Statement of significant inconsistencies, if any, with any Existing Policy, Plan or Legislation arising from the Proposed Decision.
(i)	A statement how the views and preferences of affected or interested persons have been given adequate consideration during the definition of the problem or issue, the objective, the assessment of options and the development of the proposed decision, including the particular contribution of Maori to the decision-making process.

Notes:

The significance of proposals and decisions determines how much time, money and effort is put into exploring and evaluating options and obtaining the views of affected and interested parties. The significance of proposals and decisions is determined through reference to criteria contained in the policy on significance.

The policy on significance together with Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the Council's requirements in relation to decisions. Some decisions can only be made through the Long-Term Council Community Plan, or after the Special Consultative Procedures set out in the Act have been used, (refer to the policy on significance and the Act).

All decisions of Environment Canterbury are subject to the decision-making requirements of section 76 of the Act unless inconsistent with specific requirements of other legislation.

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
ORDER PAPER

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 14 FEBRUARY 2007
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

MATTER FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

5. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE REGIONAL COASTAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN

6. NOTICES OF MOTION
7. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
8. QUESTIONS
9. NEXT MEETING – 16 APRIL 2007

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 14 FEBRUARY 2007 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR,
PEGASUS BUILDING, 58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH
FROM 11.00 A.M.

CONTENTS

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 11 October 2006
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

MATTER FOR COUNCIL DECISION

5. CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT REVIEW
6. NOTICES OF MOTION
7. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
8. QUESTIONS
9. NEXT MEETING 14 March 2007

PRESENT

Crs R A Budd (Chair), T K Burke, A S Carroll, E H Cunningham, R H M Johnston, R M Kirk, R I R Little, A R McKay, A G Neill, M E Oldfield, J F Slee, J M Waters (from 11.06am) and W E Woods.

MANAGEMENT AND STAFF PRESENT

B R Jenkins (Chief Executive), J D Talbot (Director Policy and Planning), R Ball (Coasts, Biodiversity and Pests Policy Manager), A Willis (Senior Policy Analyst), F Stewart (Senior Policy Analyst) and L M McDonald (Administration Officer).

Jeff Page (Consultant)

1. **APOLOGY**

Cr N J Wagner.
2. **MINUTES OF MEETING – 11 October 2006**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of a meeting held 11 October 2006 be taken as read and confirmed as a correct record of proceedings, and be adopted.

Cr Kirk/Cr Slee

3. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

There were no deputations or petitions.

MATTER FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

5. REVIEW OF THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

Cr Budd introduced this item and explained that this was the opportunity to assess the policy papers attached to the agenda to ensure that enough options were included before the papers go out to the community. The debate on the detail will occur later in the process.

Cr Waters arrived at 11.06 am.

Andrew Willis spoke to a powerpoint presentation (notes tabled) that described the review process and highlighted the issues that were identified in the reports attached to the agenda.

Referring to attachment 1 on the agenda, (a flow diagram of the of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) review process) Richard Ball explained the draft papers had been developed by staff at Environment Canterbury, with Territorial Authorities staff and some stakeholders. It is now at the stage when they can be elevated to the political level for policy direction.

A request was made for Councillors to be invited to meetings with Territorial Authorities to discuss the draft policy papers.

It was suggested that Portfolio Committees are a good mechanism to enable Councillors to work through policy documents with staff.

NATURAL HAZARDS

The Committee considered the options described in the report Natural Hazards (Attachment 2) and the following comments were made:

- Support for Option A (the status quo) as there was a lot of good policy in the existing CRPS and this should be retained.
- The issue of central government funding for investment in flood protection.
- The need to address earthquake risk proactively and develop strong linkages with the districts.
- Affordability of hazard measures (Option D).
- The CRPS should provide a regional policy on climate change rather than provide guidance.

Cr Little proposed a motion to include Option A for community discussion, this was seconded by Cr McKay. Cr Little explained that he did not want to see the good existing policy lost through the review process. Richard Ball confirmed that the review process would build on the existing policies that were effective.

Cr Budd obtained the approval of the mover and seconder to reword the motion to state recognition that there are elements of the current policy that are effective, but that the status quo would not be used as an option in the review of the current CRPS.

RECOMMENDED

- (a) ***That, while there are elements of the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which are effective, it has been shown that improvements to the CPRS can be achieved. Option A therefore cannot be supported in the review analysis of the natural hazards provisions. In addition stakeholders do not support Option A.***
- (b) ***Proceed with Options B, C, D and explore E for natural hazards provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, noting that Option B be amended to replace "Give guidance on climate change" to "Provide regional policy on climate change".***

Cr McKay/Cr Little

SETTLEMENT AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Jeff Page spoke to Attachment 3, with the powerpoint presentation. He explained that with regard to chapter 7 (Soils and Land Use) that while the legislation had changed, soil conservation can still be addressed through other Council functions. Valuable work was done on versatile soils in 2004 and some more options can be developed from that work.

The following comments were made:

- Potential ramifications for Territorial Authorities from versatile soil policies.
- Linkage/relationship with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS).
- Settlement policy should also include subdivision policy, particularly on productive land

The meeting adjourned for lunch between 12.30 and 1.15pm, Cr Cunningham left at this time

The Committee returned to the consideration of Attachment 3:

- It was requested that the definition of versatile soils be redefined as land use has changed since the current classifications were developed.
- Consider a buffer zone between urban areas and versatile soils.
- New issues to be considered for inclusion in the CRPS include:
 - transmission lines;
 - water storage sites; and
 - windfarms.

RECOMMENDED

That the process for review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions for settlement and the built environment, transport and versatile soil proceed as follows:

- (a) ***Retain, but combine, the settlement and built environment and transport provisions.***
- (b) ***Review the specificity of current settlement and built environment and transport provisions in order to provide greater certainty and direction.***

- (c) ***Where appropriate in the current settlement and built environment and transport provisions, include greater guidance and direction in the implementation methods.***
- (d) ***Remove those provisions demonstrated to be ineffective and that do not assist in the resolution of resource management issues with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.***
- (e) ***Broaden the settlement and built environment provisions to focus adverse effects of dispersed development outside of urban areas that are of significance within the region.***
- (f) ***Include consideration of versatile soils as part of Chapter 12, (Settlement and Built Environment), and delete it from Chapter 7 (Soils and Land Use).***

Cr Little/Cr Burke

LANDSCAPE

Andrew Willis presented Attachment 4 (Natural Features and Landscape Settlement and the Built Environment). The following comments were made:

- Within Option C there were range of options, some which could be interpreted as mutually exclusive rather than on a continuum. The way is it currently presented could be confusing.
- The subjective nature of assessing landscape values and the difference between regional and local significance.
- The need to avoid duplication of the work already done by the Territorial Authorities on landscape.
- The role of the Department of Conservation, and other stakeholders.

Cr Cunningham returned at 2.35pm.

The Committee then considered the recommendation of proceeding with Option C. Some Councillors expressed concern at the scope of option C4 as it could cut across work already done by the Territorial Authorities. There was also support for retaining it as an option at this stage for discussion purposes.

Proposed Cr Little, seconded Cr Johnston

That the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement proceed with options C1, C2 & C3 for the natural features and landscape provisions.

This motion was LOST 6/7 on a show of hands.

RECOMMENDED

That the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement proceed with options C1, C2, C3 & C4, for the purpose of exploring options of where responsibilities lie with regard to natural features and landscape responsibilities between the Territorial Authorities and the Regional Council.

Cr Budd/Cr Burke

The Committee then considered the recommendations on page 9 of the agenda, which were taken separately.

RECOMMENDED

That the Council approve for consultation the policy options recommended for the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement: Natural Hazards.

Cr Budd/Cr Waters

Cr Oldfield requested that his vote against this recommendation be recorded.

RECOMMENDED

That the Council approve for consultation the policy options recommended for the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement: Settlement and the Built Environment, Transport and Versatile Soils.

Cr Budd/Cr Waters

RECOMMENDED

That the Council approve for consultation the policy options recommended for the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement: Natural Features and Landscape.

Cr Budd/Cr Waters

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no notices of motion.

7. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS

There was no extraordinary and urgent business.

8. QUESTIONS

Nil.

9. NEXT MEETING – 14 March 2007

The meeting closed 3.14pm.

CONFIRMED

DATE _____ CHAIRPERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO: 5	SUBJECT MATTER: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE REGIONAL COASTAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN
REPORT: Regional Planning Committee	DATE OF MEETING: 14 March 2007
FILE REFERENCES:	PORTFOLIO: Coastal PROJECT: Coastal Plan OUTPUT: Plan Change
REPORT BY: David Gregory Senior Resource Management Planner	ENDORSED BY: John Talbot Director Policy and Planning

PURPOSE

To consider an option for revisions to the intended scope of Changes to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan (RCEP) for consultation.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED

Proposed Changes to the RCEP - Scoping Report, December 2006.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 7 December 2006, Council confirmed the recommendations set out in a Scoping Report regarding proposed Changes to the RCEP. The particular recommendations that this report deal with are:

1. To require existing swing moorings outside Designated Swing Mooring Areas (DSMA) to apply for consent to occupy; and
2. To require occupation existing boatsheds outside Designated Boatshed Areas (DBA) to apply for consent to occupy; and
3. To make a range of existing occupations in the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) Permitted Activities.

CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCOPING REPORT

In considering point 3 above, staff believe that consideration could be given to making occupation by all legally established existing structures a permitted activity, subject to conditions, such that they do not represent a navigational hazard and that they provide a map and description of the occupation.

If all existing occupations are made Permitted Activities, as set out in (3) above, then this could incorporate existing swing moorings and boatsheds regardless of their position. This will not be in line with the recommendations of the Scoping Report. However, it is considered that requiring consent to occupy from pre-RMA boatsheds and swing moorings that exist outside designated areas will not achieve any environmental benefit and will impose a burden, both on Consents staff and on the applicants.

PROPOSAL

That the basis for consultation for the Plan Change (3) above should include an option that all existing *lawfully established structures, including* boatsheds and swing moorings outside designated areas, as permitted activities. The effect of this is that those lawfully established occupations existing at the time the Plan Change becomes operative will not be required to apply for consent to occupy the CMA. They will however have to comply with any permitted activity conditions. New applications for boatsheds and moorings outside the designated areas will be required to apply for consent.

OPTIONS

The Committee may choose to remain with the recommendations contained in the December 2006 Scoping Report. If, however, the Committee believes that making all existing occupations a permitted activity is a valid option, consultation based on the recommendations contained in the 2006 report may be misleading.

VIEWS OF AFFECTED PARTIES

The purpose of this is to obtain approval to consult on this option prior to seeking views of external parties. The views of affected parties will be reported to Council following consultation.

RECOMMENDATION

That consultation during the preparation of the Proposed Change to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan include an option that all structures, including boatsheds and swing moorings existing outside designated areas, lawfully occupying the Coastal Marine Area on the date the plan change becomes operative, be included as permitted activities.