

Te Tai o Poutini Plan Introductory Planning Statement Open Space Zones



Te Tai o Poutini
PLAN
A combined district plan for the West Coast

Introduction to the Open Space and Recreation Zones Topic

1. Tēnā koutou. My name is Lois Margaret Easton. I have been the principal planner during the period of development of Te Tai o Poutini Plan. I have been the lead planner for the open space zones topic. My credentials are outlined in the relevant s42A reports and I will not repeat these here.
2. This topic is one of the topics within Te Tai o Poutini Plan where this matter was not well addressed in the operative plans. None of the three Operative District Plans included any specific zoning for parks or open spaces, and these sites were generally zoned the same as the surrounding area. In the case of the reserves owned or managed by the district councils themselves, in Buller and Grey these were subject to Designations, but there were no specific management approaches put in place in Westland.
3. The National Planning Standards provide for three types of Open Space and Recreation Zones. All three zones have been used in Te Tai o Poutini Plan. When deciding on what zoning to use for an individual piece of land, the "base case" was to consider whether the Open Space Zone was appropriate in the first instance. This is the most generic of the three zones. Sportsfields and other active recreation sites were generally zoned Sports and Recreation Zone, and outside of the Department of Conservation lands, very few sites were zoned Natural Open Space Zone.
4. None of the three Councils have any strategic documents or plans for parks and open space to provide context for policy development for the Plan.
5. The Department of Conservation lands are largely zoned Open Space Zone although National Parks are zoned Natural Open Space Zone. This is because there was limited information available to the Councils to make zoning decisions on. As Department of Conservation operations are largely unaffected by zoning and district plan provisions, it was recognised that the zoning would mainly impact on concessionaires and third parties rather than the Department's activities.
6. In terms of the s42A Report I wish to provide some clarification around the relationship with the Minerals Extraction topic. Submissions on Policy OSZ – P14 and Rules NOSZ – R16, OSZ – R11, OSZ – R19 and OSZ – R22 have been addressed in the Mineral Extraction topic, not in this report. The Appendix 2 includes, for completeness, as requested by the Commissioners previously, all provisions relevant to the topic regardless of whether there are any amendments proposed. Policy OSZ – P14 and Rules NOSZ – R22, OSZ – R11, OSZ – R19 and OSZ – R22 are shown as per the notified version in the proposed Plan. I do not propose any amendments to that policy or rules and refer submitters and the commissioners to the Mineral Extraction topic for submissions and recommendations on any amendments to those provisions.
7. I now turn to the written evidence provided ahead of this hearing.
8. In relation to the evidence provided by KiwiRail in relation to setbacks from the railway corridor for buildings. While I discussed this topic in the Introduction and General Provisions report, I did not specifically consider it in that report in relation to the Open Space and Recreation Zones. My reservations about applying such a setback do not apply to the Open Space and Recreation Zones and I would be comfortable supporting a proposal to require a 4.5m setback in all three of these zones, as is sought by KiwiRail. I also am happy to support the proposal in the KiwiRail written evidence that where compliance with these setbacks is not achieved in the Sport and Open Space Recreation Zone, that this escalate to a Restricted Discretionary rather than Controlled Activity as is also sought by KiwiRail. This would be consistent with the approach taken in the other Open Space and Recreation Zones.
9. In relation to the evidence provided by Ms Pull and Poutini Ngāi Tahu I am comfortable with the proposed amendment to Policy -XXX as proposed by Ms Pull in relation to stewardship land. I agree the addition of a method as proposed is also a useful inclusion for the Plan in relation to this matter.
10. In relation to Energy, Infrastructure and Transport I support the amendment to the 'other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions' section of the Natural Open Space, Open Space and Sport and Active Recreation Zone overviews proposed in paragraph 64 of Ms Pull's evidence. I

agree this better represents the situation in relation to these activities than the wording I proposed in the s42A report.

11. At this point there are no other specific matters where I would alter my recommendations in relation to the s42A report.
12. Thank you