

Pauatahanui Residents Association

Minutes of the Management Committee meeting held at **325 Grays Road** on **Thursday 21st February 2013**

1. **Apologies** : Ken McAdam
2. **Present:** John Mazerier [Chair], Nicky Chapman Alan Gray [Secretary], Diane Strugnell [Treasurer], Anna Dellow, & Rob Foley.
3. **Minutes:** The minutes of the previous meeting of Thursday 6 December 2012. Were approved. Moved Diane; seconded Nicky.
4. **Business arising from the minutes.**

4.1 Water & sewage (&Gas!) reticulation for the Village: The following are the conclusions of a paper on the "Pauatahanui sewage scheme update" PCC Officers presented to Council on 14 February 2013:

- The scheme is progressing well and is on track for construction starting next summer. Consultation with property owners at the end of last year resulted in a mostly positive response. The project budget has been revisited as a result of Councils adopting of the preferred options in September 2012, and contingencies increased to provide for a cautious approach, resulting in the budget increase from \$1.351 million to \$1.627 million.
- Council officers are in the process of engaging consultants. Approval is needed to bring forward some funding (\$80,000) into the current financial year so that the consultants can start detailed design work as soon as possible. The consultants will also review the current budgets based on greater certainty around the scheme.
- In February 2013 the consultants will carry out a survey of each property. Detailed design will be carried out during the winter, and construction is expected to start at the end of this year (2013).

The increase in the cost of this project is concerning to PRA.

4.2 Moonshine Road – Flood washout repair: concrete blocks have been placed on site but are not yet in position to prevent further washout in a flood. At least the work appears to have started after many months of delay.

4.3 Winstones application for a clean landfill on Haywards Hill- Jo and Paul Macready of the Highway 58 group who are concerned about this landfill project attended this part of the meeting. Winstone's application for resource consents has been submitted to Greater Wellington Regional Council, Hutt City Council and Porirua City Council. They have applied to construct, operate and maintain a 13.78 hectare cleanfill with a total capacity of 1,750,000m³, which includes:

- the permanent diversion and piping of approximately 1,658m of un-named tributaries of the Pauatahanui Stream;
- discharges to land, water and air associated with the construction and operation of the cleanfill;
- bulk earthworks on Felix Road (paper road) to provide access to the cleanfill in an area identified as a General Recreation Activity area;
- road works on State Highway 58 (SH58);
- to operate, maintain and eventually close a cleanfill in a Rural Zone.

- The proposed cleanfill is to be developed in four stages and will take approximately 57 years + 6 months to reach capacity.
- The applicant has proposed an offset/compensation package which involves planting a 15m wide riparian margin, exclusion of stock of 1,510m of degraded perennial stream and 440m of degraded intermittent and headwater stream sections.

The "Highway 58 Group" have a number of concerns particularly regarding its impact and safety on the traffic using state Highway 58, the visual impact of the landfill because of its size and proximity to the highway and adjacent housing, the adverse effects of noise and dust, and the diversion and sedimentation, possibly including toxins, of waterways which are part of the headwaters of the Pauatahanui Stream discharging into the inlet.

After discussion it was agreed that the PRA would submit on the project with particular emphasis on the potential effects on traffic using this major arterial route. Submissions close on 6 March 2013. The application to Porirua City Council may be viewed on their website.

4.4 Transmission line land rights: An update on this subject was published in the December PRA minutes. It was submitted to Council for their verification but no reply was received before the minutes were distributed [at Xmas]. An addendum containing Council's suggestions to the text is attached at the end of these minutes. It does not in any way change the content of the previous text but makes the wording more precise. Council has achieved a significant change in attitude by Transpower who have backed off their original draconian proposals. PRA approves of Council's revision of the network utilities plan and will make a submission accordingly. Submissions close on 8 March 2013.

4.5 Website for PRA. Work continues on developing this website as time allows.

4.6 Accounts: [00] Account = \$905-67 & [01] History Account = \$6,621-48 on 21/02/2013.

4.7 Pauatahanui Village Planning Programme. The Village Planning Programme includes 11 city villages & has a budget of \$100,000 of operating funds and \$500,000 of capital funds every year.

The programme is staffed with one full time programme manager and a part time communications advisor & other Council resources are used as necessary.

Council is proposing some adjustments to the programme-

- To set priorities in April May for the forthcoming financial year to allow earlier completion of projects. It will also allow more time for Council and communities to agree on priorities.
- Currently each Village program has something happening every year. Council is interested in greater priority to communities based on relative need. This includes more intensive staff support to areas that are struggling to gain or maintain the benefits the village program for their communities.
- Councillors have requested a stronger leadership role in the village program & suggest appointing a Councillor as a lead person for each village with a Council staff person as the primary support.
- Council wants to limit the number of new villages or communities joining the program as it is exceeding staff capacity to provide them with support
- Council suggests that the City Centre project be treated as a village in the village program.
- Council is considering implementing some form of neighborhood matching fund to finance new projects. This could include communities supplying for grants from other funding bodies.

In the Pauatahanui Village area, the Village Program has worked extremely well thanks to the cooperation between residents and Council staff. This has allowed the Village to make up for many years of relative neglect, but given the size of the village its needs are limited, and the majority of the work has been achieved except for the 2 major projects, water and sewerage, and the completion of the Inlet Pathway to the Village, both of which are treated as separate projects outside the Village Program by Council. While involvement by Councillors is always welcome, PRA would not like to see any reduction in access to the skills and knowledge provided by Council staff when it is needed. Their input in the early stages of any community project is essential, before finance and politics enter the fray. Providing matching funds from the

community is a problematic issue, most residents would consider that they currently do so in the rates they pay. If the project is basically a Council responsibility, then matching funds should not be required or become a habit. If the project has a 'nice to have' element to it then community fundraising could be reasonable, but there needs to be some definition of where and when this obligation on the community begins and ends and where it belongs on Councils plate. The perception of the village planning program was that it diverted some small amount of funds away from the City Centre to develop local communities to show something more tangible for their rates. This has been remarkably successful and in most areas seems to have led to a more contented populace. To include the City Centre in the Village Program reverses this and seems unwise given that it has no significant resident population and has all the appearances of a cost shifting exercise. Currently the Village programme represents less than 1% of PCC's annual budget. Councils ambitions for the City Centre could soon eat a big hole in that.

4.8 Emergency action plan for Pauatahanui? The Porirua Emergency Management Office [presumably part of Porirua City Council] has established a Welfare Operational Team which meets regularly to plan emergency services for potential crises in the local community. It is a difficult subject to apply to a rural & self-sufficient community such as Pauatahanui. Pukerua bay has developed a template appropriate to their community & this will be circulated for the next meeting to see what can be adapted to Pauatahanui.

4.9 Landscape Management Strategy: Porirua City Council is adopting a Proposed Landscape Management Strategy for the rural area and is now calling for submissions. This is a strategy for protecting and managing important landscapes and guiding future land use and development in the rural area. It will help the Council to manage the impact of future land use in the rural area as farming and forestry give way to rural lifestyle use and development. The strategy proposes making it easier to continue farming and forestry, whilst protecting the most highly valued aspects of the landscape for future enjoyment, as well as encouraging landscape enhancement through appropriate types of rural subdivision and development. Council officers have consulted extensively with local large landholders in the rural area to deal with the many concerns they have about this project. The current plan mostly has their approval and Council plans to release it for public discussion. At this stage PRA supports the proposal thus far, although it should be titled a rural landscape plan, as it does not address the issue of urban landscapes. Submissions close on Friday 1 March 2013. Details are available on the Council website.

4.10 History Project. Sharon Evans from the Pauatahanui History Group attended the meeting to discuss proposals for the printing of the history book which is now well advanced-

- The production of the book is on time and within budget.
- Planning for a launch has begun.
- PHG will soon begin developing a marketing and sales plan, building on the 250 expressions of interest we already have.
- The website <www.pauatahanuihistorybook.co.nz> has a pre-order form, which doesn't involve payment now.
- Details for handling the revenue from sales are being developed
- Accountants advice has been sought on dealing with any GST component of sales.
- Once the editing & preparation for printing has been completed, a new contract will be needed with the Publishing Manager for the actual printing.
- Any profit from the book would accrue to PRA
- The History Group would like to see the profit used for specific projects compatible with the PRA's constitution.
- An addendum to the present MOU between the history group & PRA will be drafted for the next meeting to cover these issues.

- The Committee approved one more PRA member from the History Group to have 'view only' online access to the PRA bank account to assist with electronic book sales.

4.11 Membership of the committee. The Committee unanimously accepted a proposal from the Chair to appoint Erica Nicholls as a co-opted member of the Committee.

4.12 Possible ashes wall for the Pauatahanui Public Burial Ground. At a recent meeting of the Management Committee for the Burial Ground there was a discussion of the possibility of erecting an ashes wall, with a view to raising money by selling the niches. There was a view that such a structure would look out of place, given the older style of many of the graves and headstones & there was also some doubt as to whether the Burial Ground's legal status as a closed cemetery would allow this type of addition. An ashes wall is already present at the St. Albans Church burial ground right next door.

The PRA Management Committee recognises the need for Council to economise, but erecting an ashes wall as a fund raising venture is not appropriate for this heritage site. The secretary will discuss it with Council.

5.0 Correspondence:

5.1 Inward

Various PCC committee & other papers including:

GWRC has developed a biodiversity portal "*Where the wild things are*". The website is <http://www.wrs.govt.nz/where-the-wild-things-are/> There is a 'home' page which contains the google map with links to all 50 sites of interest, with photos and PDF's.

City Centre Revitalisation - E-Newsletter Dec 2012

E-mail from Geoff Marshall PCC giving an update on repairs to Moonshine Road. [20/12/2012].

December *Update* newsletter for Charities from the Charities Commission.

Minutes of the Welfare Operational Team Meeting – 28th November 2012– at Porirua Emergency Management Office [14/01/2013]

Invitation to participate in a Massey University MBA study into the value of community grants to New Zealand from the Lion Foundation. [14/01/2013]

Results of a national survey looking at- "What exactly is a Residents Association?" by a Victoria University researcher Dr Jarrod Coburn. [17/01/2013]

Porirua City District Plan - Public consultation on draft Proposed Network Utilities Plan Change [22/01/2013]

Department of Internal Affairs - Update newsletter for charities - Jan/Feb 2013 [05/02/2013]

NEW TOOLS *for Local Government* FREE *seminar with* David Engwicht. PCC. Thursday, February 21 2.20 pm – 4.30 pm Te Rauparaha Arena 17 Parumoana Street [05/02/2013]

Invitation from PCC to Village Planning Programme bus-tour Monday March 4 (evening) [07/02/2013]

Request for Registration Update Required for Lottery Grants Board[12/02/2013].

Report on Manager's Meeting for the Public Burial Ground [19/02/2013]

5.2 Outward:

Audit documents forwarded to the Lion Foundation as a requirement of their grant [06/02/2013]

6.0 Date of next Management Committee meeting-Thursday 21st March at 7.30 pm.

John Mazenier.

Chair. PRA

Addendum:

Transmission Line Land Rights-As discussed above the following amended text replaces that in the December minutes-

The local working group established by Council to consider Transpower's proposal for extensive buffer zones over private land for its electricity network, met with Council Officers & Transpower representatives on 7 December.

It became apparent that a lot of work had gone on behind the scenes, in particular PCC staff had held meetings with their counterparts in Wellington City Council, Lower Hutt City Council, and Upper Hutt City Council, to forge a combined response to Transpower's proposals and it included negotiations with Transpower.

The following is from the draft position paper Council had prepared.

-The document recognises Council's responsibility to both Transpower and landowners

-The draft position paper has looked to recognise and provide for:

- **A basic electricity transmission Yard within which sensitive activities and buildings, including building additions, would be actively controlled and managed.**
- **An electricity transmission Corridor, within which any subdivision activity would be controlled and managed to ensure that this activity, and any potential future development activity, did not compromise the maintenance and operation of the transmission line.**

Electricity Transmission Yard:

The electricity transmission Yard recognises a basic **set back yard** 12 m from the centre line of the transmission lines or from the edge of the pylons.

Within this **Yard**:

1. **Sensitive Activities:** Any buildings used for sensitive activities will be **non-complying**. Sensitive activities are defined as residential buildings, schools and hospitals.
2. **Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures:**
 - Additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures over 2.5m in height and/or more than 10m² in area or
 - New buildings and structures over 2.5m in height and/or more than 10m² in area **will be restricted discretionary activities**.

A restricted discretionary activity means **that a resource consent would be required for such a building/s or building addition work/s. Such a consent application would not need to be publicly notified. Transpower would however be notified as an affected party.**

To the best of PCC's existing knowledge any existing buildings within the city that may currently fall within this Yard Such buildings are most likely to be farm buildings e.g. hay sheds, implement sheds.

Council has **suggested in its draft position paper for restricted discretionary activities** restricting its discretion to the following matters when considering an application for resource consent **within the yard**:

- 1] Any risk to the structural integrity of the transmission line;
- 2] Any effects on the ability of the transmission line owner to operate, maintain and/or upgrade the Electricity Transmission Network;
- 3] The proximity of buildings and structures to electrical hazards;
- 4] Operational risks relating to health or public safety, and the risk of property damage;
- 5] The siting of buildings in relation to transmission lines
- 6] Amenity and integration of land use activities; and
- 7] Any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects.

3. **Any other activity, not covered above, would be allowed by the District Plan, but would also need to** comply with NZECP34:2001. **Council has suggested including an advice note in its District Plan to alert plan users to this requirement.**

Electricity Transmission Corridor:

An electricity transmission corridor extends beyond the electricity transmission yard, but is only considered at the time of any subdivision.

The electricity corridor extends 32m for 110kV transmission lines & 37m for 220kV transmission lines, **from** either side of the centre line of the electricity transmission line (forming a total electricity corridor width of 64 & 74 metres wide respectively).

Council's only concern **within** this Corridor is with **managing** subdivision activities **and** ensuring that:

- the subdivision plans do not **inappropriately** restrict Transpower's access to the electricity lines for maintenance **and servicing purposes** and
- any subdivision lots **are able to identify and** can provide for an **appropriate** building site that is not within the **Electricity Transmission Yard**.

Subdivision of land which is within an Electricity Transmission **Corridor** is proposed to be a **restricted discretionary activity**.

Subdivisions will be subject to other relevant consent requirements under the District Plan but where this is also within the transmission Corridor, Transpower will be notified as an affected party.

For subdivision within the electricity corridor Council would have regard to, in addition to the matters that it would otherwise normally consider, the following -

- 1] The extent to which the design, construction and layout of the subdivision (including landscaping) allows for buildings to be located outside of the Electricity Transmission Yard to ensure adverse effects on and from the Electricity Transmission Network and on public health and safety are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated;
- 2]The provision for the on-going operation, maintenance and planned upgrade of Electricity Transmission Lines;
- 3]The risk to the structural integrity of the Electricity Transmission Network;
- 4]The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development will minimise the risk of injury and/or property damage from such lines;
- 5]The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development will minimise the potential reverse sensitivity on and amenity and nuisance effects of the transmission asset; and

It will be the responsibility of the land owner to coordinate with Transpower on any subdivision within the Corridor and to ensure that the subdivision complies with the NZECP34 regulations.

Transpower wanted to add earthworks to **the list of activities to be controlled and managed by the District Plan** , as they **were** concerned about earthworks that might compromise the

stability of a pylon or that earth might be piled up that could reduce the safe clearance distance between the lines and the ground.

Council **currently believes** that earthworks are reasonably covered under its District Plan already, **and that specific technical requirements / restrictions /performance standards for earthworks in proximity to transmission tower structures are covered under NZECP 34.**

The Working Group thinks it can probably live with all this.

It confirms the essential requirement that Council will not be responsible for policing the Governments NZECP34 regulations which will remain the responsibility of the land owner consulting directly with Transpower.

Council's concern is with:

- **managing** buildings populated by people that are close (within the Yard) to the transmission lines, and
- **ensuring that reasonable and practical access to the transmission line network is not compromised by inappropriate subdivision activity**
- **ensuring that future subdivision activity near transmission lines provide practical building sites that are outside of the electricity transmission yard.**

It seems unlikely, although not impossible, that somebody could wish to build a residence within the **Yard**.

Within the **corridor** it will be for Council to ensure that, for new subdivisions, building platforms do not encroach on the **Yard**, and do not limit Transpower's access to the line. Council does not want to accept responsibility for administering or policing NZECP34.

There are still some concerns, such as compensation for reduced value of the land which is a national issue with Transpower and not one Council would get involved in.

Reverse sensitivity is an issue that seems mainly to apply to heavily populated buildings such as schools, hospitals etc. There will probably be ongoing urban issues, as well as rural ones, such as orchards under lines having to build supportive frames etc. which do not fit the requirements for the **yard**.

There seems to be have been a significant shift by Transpower to accommodate public concerns, and Council has stayed staunch in notifying landowners about NZECP34 but not accepting responsibility for policing it.

Council is putting out a draft paper on the issue for public consultation in late January 2013, and submissions will close in late February/early March.

They hope to be able to notify it as a plan change by mid-2013.