

MINUTES

TITLE: Development Contributions Subcommittee
DATE: Wednesday 26 January 2011
TIME: 10.30 am
VENUE: Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond.

PRESENT: Crs S G Bryant and T E Norriss

IN ATTENDANCE: Consultant (J Hodson), Regulatory Services Manager
(A Humphries), Development Engineer (D Ley), Minute
Secretary (V M Gribble)

1 SEIFRIED WINERY – APPLICATION NO BC101180 – REPORT REP11-01-01

The hearing of an objection to Council's development contribution levies pursuant to Tasman District Council's Development Contribution Policy.

P Hilleard, Building Consent Solutions, was in attendance to present the application on behalf of the applicant, Seifried Winery.

Development Engineer, D Ley, spoke to his report contained in the agenda. He said the building is being extended by 50% but as part of the building work is enclosing existing structures and because this reduced the effective size increase he calculated that only 2 HUDs would be payable rather than 7. The application is deemed to be a building consent and part of growth through the region.

Mr Hilleard does not believe the test has been passed for development contributions. What is happening will not incur expense on Council as the business is static. The business is consolidating and the new bottling line is relocation of his present line. The business is building with the future in mind as at the present time and in the present economic climate it is a huge unknown.

Cr Norriss asked if Mr Hilleard supports the reduction of DCs from seven HUDs to two HUDs. He indicated that the preference would be to have none but 2 was better than 7.

Ms Hodson suggested that the panel look at the resource consent that was issued in 2009 (RM090377) and consult with Planner, J Andrew, if required.

Mr Ley said the consent gave dispensation for the 12 car parks.

This part of the meeting concluded at 10.53 am.

**Moved Crs Norriss/Bryant
EP11-01-01**

**THAT the Development Contribution Levies Delegated Committee resolves that the development contribution associated with BC101180 be reduced from seven roading HUDs to two roading HUDs.
CARRIED**

**2 GOLDEN BAY AIR – APPLICATION NO BC101064 – REPORT
REP11-01-02**

The meeting resumed at 1.15 pm.

The applicant was unable to attend the meeting and had advised by telephone that they were happy for the hearing to proceed. They forwarded an email explaining the effect of the application on Tasman District Council network infrastructure in support of their application.

The hearing of an objection to Council's development contribution levies pursuant to Tasman District Council's Development Contribution Policy.

Mr Ley spoke to his report contained in the agenda.

**Moved Crs Norriss/Bryant
EP11-01-02**

**THAT the Development Contribution Levies Delegated Committee resolves that the development contribution payable associated with BC101064, Golden Bay Air new hangar at Takaka Airfield be upheld.
CARRIED**

**3 TNL PROPERTIES LTD – APPLICATION NO BC100483 – REPORT
REP11-01-03**

The hearing of an objection to Council's development contribution levies pursuant to Tasman District Council's Development Contribution Policy.

Mr M Lile, Landmark Lile Ltd, Mr A Terris, Chairman of TNL Properties Ltd, and Mr P Murphy, Nationwide Project Manager for TNL Properties Ltd were in attendance. Mr Lile tabled and spoke to his submission in support of the total waiver of the stormwater contribution.

The truck wash is operated from harvesting water off of the roof into two storage tanks totalling 50,000 litres capacity. These tanks could be topped up from mains supply as required. Effluent from the truck wash will go to trade waste.

Development Engineer, D Ley spoke to his report which was included in the agenda. In response to comments made by TNL he indicated that he considered that there are works happening on Borck Creek which will benefit the TNL property. He also indicated that if TNL reduced the water pipe intake to 40 mm the HUDs would reduce to 4 HUDs.

He also reiterated that a 50% reduction in HUDs for stormwater had already been agreed by Council to acknowledge work carried out by TNL to improve stormwater quality prior to it entering Borck creek.

Cr Norriss asked what legally determines the difference between sealed or unsealed surfaces.

Mr Ley said "all weather surface" as specified in the Engineering Standards can be a gravel surface.

Mr Lile said in terms of \$1m (\$3m Total with 35% set aside for Growth) in LTCCP to pay for land purchase, look at TNL being one of 20 allotments in the subdivision and TNL being required to pay \$200,000 towards stormwater or even \$100,000 and if money is to go to land purchase then Council will collect \$1m from subdivision without going further. On pro rata basis, we believe that TNL is paying far more than it should for fair and reasonable contribution for land purchase for Borck Creek.

Mr Terris believes they have had a good chance to put case forward. He reiterated that TNL as a business has taken place in environment seriously. Believes it is more environmentally friendly to have the place sealed. TNL employs 370 people, of which 100 are based in this region and we want them to have a good clean, safe place to operate in. We are responsible citizens, and have not had a lot to do with Tasman District Council in the past. Want to put our points across and asked Council to reconsider. We are a good ratepayer to have in the region.

**Moved Crs Norriss/Bryant
EP11-01-03**

THAT the Development Contribution Levies Delegated Committee resolves that the development contribution associated with BC100483 (TNL Properties Ltd) be confirmed as follows:

- (a) **The development by TNL generates a demand for stormwater infrastructure.**
- (b) **This demand, in combination with other developments will lead to a need to widen Borck Creek for stormwater disposal.**
- (c) **Borck Creek (as upgraded) will provide a stormwater disposal network for Richmond South and Richmond West, including the TNL land.**
- (d) **It is appropriate that development that will generate a demand for upgraded stormwater infrastructure (in a cumulative sense) should pay a development contribution.**
- (e) **Council has already allowed a 50% reduction in stormwater contributions for mitigation work carried out by TNL to improve water quality discharging into the stormwater system.**

- (f) **A credit for one HUD equivalent should have been provided for in the original decision to take into account the development contributions paid at the time of subdivision (as per Clause 1.5 of the Development Contribution Policy). This reduces the equivalent HUDs from 36 to 35 and in turn reduces the development contributions for stormwater payable by TNL from \$104,868 to \$101,955.**

CARRIED

Date Confirmed:

Chair:

CONFIRMED MINUTES