

NOTICE OF MEETING

MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD

I hereby give notice that an Ordinary Meeting of the Massey Community Board will be held on:-

DATE: **Wednesday, 5 March 2003** **TIME:** **7.30 pm**

VENUE: **Civic Centre, 6 Waipareira Avenue, Lincoln, Waitakere City**

to consider the business as set out herein and to take any necessary action connected therewith.



3 March 2003

Ngareta Delamere
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Telephone (09) 836 8000 extn 8552

MEMBERSHIP:

Mr	RF	Jessopp (Chairperson)
Mrs	DJ	Webster (Deputy Chairperson)
Mr	MFP	Chan, JP
Mr	WW	Flaunty, JP
Mr	JA	Good
Cr	OE	Hoskin, MNZM, JP
Cr	GE	Nash, JP
Ms	KG	Perri
Cr	GW	Russell

(Quorum 5 members)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

(The reports and recommendations contained in all agendas are reports and recommendations only and are not to be construed, in any way, as Council policy until adopted.)

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,
WAITAKERE CITY, ON WEDNESDAY, 5 MARCH 2003,
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>		<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1	APOLOGIES	1
2	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
3	PUBLIC FORUM	1
4	URGENT BUSINESS	2
5	CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT	2
6	COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT	3
7	ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION - HIGHER SALARIES COMMISSION DETERMINATION	4
8	REPORT OF THE APPROVED NON NOTIFIED APPLICATION HEBRON TRUST / MASSEY COMMUNITY CHURCH FOR RELOCATED PORTACOM BUILDING AT 115 ROYAL ROAD, MASSEY	5
9	NOTICES OF MOTION	10
10	BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS	11

**AGENDA FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD
TO BE HELD IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, 6 WAIPAREIRA AVENUE, LINCOLN,
WAITAKERE CITY, ON WEDNESDAY, 5 MARCH 2003,
COMMENCING AT 7.30 PM.**

1 APOLOGIES



2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Ordinary - 5 February 2003

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Massey Community Board held on Wednesday, 5 February 2003, as circulated, be taken as read and now be confirmed.



3 PUBLIC FORUM

For guidance of Community Board Members, the Council's Standing Orders have the following provisions in regard to Public Forum.

- (i) Members of the public wishing to address the Board in Public Forum shall furnish their names to the Chairperson at the beginning of the meeting; and
- (ii) the Chairperson shall determine the order of speakers, and allow five minutes for speaking time.
- (iii) Questions by members are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides that no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of any specific item of business not on the agenda except to refer the items to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. Therefore, no decision may be made on matters raised in Public Forum. However, written reports on matters raised may be requested from the Chief Executive.



4 URGENT BUSINESS

Section 46A(7) and (7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides that where an item of business is not on the agenda, it may only be dealt with at the meeting if:

- (i) the item is a minor matter; and
- (ii) the Chairperson has explained at the beginning of the meeting (when open to the public) that the item will be raised for discussion, why the item is not on the agenda, and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting; and
- (iii) the Board resolves to deal with the item.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer the item to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

NOTE: Urgent Business need not be dealt with now and may be delayed until later in the meeting.



5 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

This month for me has been a hectic month from a family point of view. With my mother in and out of hospital, it has been a case of Doctor Bob to the rescue. Certainly something I can do without. However, mum has survived in spite of my ministrations. Or is that because of?

There is no doubt in my mind that our hospital service is brilliant and the people there are so caring, they deserve all the support we can give. The only problem seems to be getting into hospital in the first place. Once your in, you are very well looked after.

As mentioned to Jean, Peter and Garry the Waitakere City Police Liaison Meeting organised by Kitch Cuthbert has nothing to do with the Police Liaison Meeting with the Henderson police. I have at this pint in time no information regarding the latter.

The Waitakere City Police Liaison Meeting on 18 February 2003 discussed vandalism on the belisha post and disc at the corner of Triangle Road and Waimumu Road. Alan Hopkins is to look into this.

I had a request from a member of the public and Jane Livingstone of the Massey Community House, requesting a pedestrian crossing outside of their building.

It has been suggested that an underused pedestrian crossing can be more dangerous than a refuge island. In the meantime I am told a report will be prepared to advise us of this situation.

On 13 February 2003 a ceremony was performed at the top end of the Upper Harbour Bridge celebrating the start of work on a new over bridge to link in with the planned upper harbour expressway/motorway For the first time I actually saw a plan of the entire route seeing how it will link in with the present road system and the planned development of the area. Although we were told that a great deal of work is going on building and improving the road system in Auckland, Six years still seems a horrendous amount of time our community will have to struggle along Upper Harbour Drive.

The talking point at present is the Higher Salaries Commission report and how Council plan to implement it. It has certainly made people very vocal, unfortunately it's introduction has been a bit divisive too. More of this I thin at our next meeting.





RECOMMENDATION

That the Chairperson's Report be received.

Robert Jessopp
CHAIRPERSON



6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S REPORT

REPORTS PENDING			
Subject	Date Requested	Report Due	Reporting Officer
Thai Buddhist Trust - Consent Requirement	November 2002 6/2003	2 April 2003	Colin Diprose  836 8000 Ext 8618
Westpark Marina - Parking Issues	April 2002	7 May 2003	Ross McLeod  836 8000 Ext 8675
Woodford Avenue / Access to Waitakere Hospital from Buscombe Avenue, and the bus stop on Lincoln Road outside the Hospital	December 2002	2 April 2003	Alan Hopkinson  836 8000 Ext 8742
The Retention of the Hose Drums Tower Herald Island	December 2002	2 April 2003	Roger Wilson  836 8000 Ext 8086

RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

Report prepared by: Ngareta Delamere, Committee Secretary.



7 **ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION - HIGHER SALARIES COMMISSION DETERMINATION**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide to the Massey Community Board a copy of the report to Council on 26 February 2003, advise the Board of the Council's recommendation to the Higher Salaries Commission and invite the Community Board to respond as requested by the Higher Salaries Commission.

ISSUES

The Higher Salaries Commission has requested the Council to consider and resolve whether to continue with the present conditions of remuneration and expenses until the date of the next local body elections or adopt the new remuneration and expenses basis to be determined by the Higher Salaries Commission to come into effect from 1 July 2003. The Council decision will be notified to you immediately after the Council's meeting on 26 February.

If the Council opts to adopt the new remuneration it is required to recommend to the Higher Salaries Commission a process and scale of payments. This includes recommended salaries for the Community Boards.

A1-A53

The report to the Council is attached at pages A1 to A53.

The Council has held two Workshops to discuss this matter. The Community Boards have also had a combined Workshop to discuss this matter. The deliberations from the Community Board Workshop were advised to the Council at the time of its second Workshop.

CONCLUSION

The Council will make its decision at its meeting on 26 February 2003 and will notify the Board of its decision. The Board is required to advise the Higher Salaries Commission whether it agrees with the Council's decision with respect to the recommendation on salaries for this Board. The Higher Salaries Commission also require to know whether the Board's decision is unanimous or with dissent. If with dissent, the Higher Salaries Commission requires details of the dissent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That the Board resolve either:
 - a. to agree with the Council's recommendation; or
 - b. to disagree with the Council's recommendation and provide details of that disagreement.

Note: A vote must be taken on whatever resolution is put to determine whether it is unanimous or not. All dissenting votes are to be recorded with details of the dissent to advise the Higher Salaries Commission.

Report prepared by: Darryl Griffin, Manager: Democracy and Support Services.



8 **REPORT OF THE APPROVED NON NOTIFIED APPLICATION HEBRON TRUST / MASSEY COMMUNITY CHURCH FOR RELOCATED PORTACOM BUILDING AT 115 ROYAL ROAD, MASSEY**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

At the Community Board meeting 5 February 2003 the following resolution was passed:

“That a report be brought back to the Massey Community Board on the relocatable building that has been placed on the property of the Massey Community Church - Hebron Trust, 115 Royal Road, Massey.”

54/2003

Information provided for the Community Board at their request on the background to this application.

BACKGROUND

Hebron Trust made application for a Discretionary Activity resource consent for relocation of a porta-com building as an extension to the Massey Community Church in May of 2002. Due to delays by the applicant in the satisfaction of further information requests made by Council in May 2002 in relation to this application and satisfied by the applicant in January 2003, land use consent was not granted until 18 February 2003.

In the interim the Trust moved the subject building onto the site without planning or building consent in December 2002.

Neighbours situated on the northern boundary of the Church site objected strongly to the placement of the building without the appropriate consents; and raised concerns over the potential impact on their amenity given the placement of the new building in the car park opposite their common boundary. They requested to be considered as affected parties in relation to the application.

Correspondence from neighbours was passed to the reporting planner for consideration in her report on the planning application. Neighbour concerns as expressed within their correspondence and through discussions with Council field services officer Kim McLeod dealing with the issue could be summarised as:

- *The new building does not blend in with the existing building;*
- *The building is of a low cost material;*
- *Building materials will cause glare;*
- *The building ruins the view and will affect property values;*
- *As the building is closer to the residential boundaries, existing problems with noise will be exacerbated;*
- *There will be a lack of privacy with the building so close to the residential boundaries;*
- *Security lighting will cause sleep disturbances;*
- *The extension of the Church facilities will increase the parking problems being experienced at the moment, where people are already parking on the road; and*
- *The Church has shown itself to not comply with Council rules by not complying with conditions from the original consent and by moving the building on prematurely.*

A54-A71

The reporting planner addressed these issues within the context of her report in the following manner, as attached at pages A54 to A71.

STATUTORY CONTEXT

Consideration of applications for Discretionary Activity resource consent must pass two statutory tests.

1. Public Notification

The first pursuant to sections 93 and 94 of the Resource Management Act 1991 addresses whether the application can be considered without the need for public notification inviting comment from affected persons and giving them rights of appeal if they are unhappy with the outcome of Council's decision on the matter. The test for a Discretionary Activity (pursuant to Section 94(2) (a) & (b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 is in two parts.

- (a) Council must be satisfied that adverse effects associated with the proposed development are no more than minor.

The reporting planner concluded on page 10 of the report;

"The adverse effects on the environment of the activity for which consent is sought would be no more than de minimis as discussed in section 5.2.1 to 5.2.12 of this report. In particular, the proposed building addition will be largely located within a paved area on the site, will be small in scale and situated adjacent to the main auditorium, away from the adjoining site boundaries, to ensure that any adverse effects on dominance and visual amenity would be considered to be no more than de minimis. The proposal would not increase the site intensity beyond what has been previously consented to, including the number of persons and associated parking demand for the existing activities on the site. In addition, the relocation / forming and marking out of the on-site parking spaces will ensure that parking is adequately accommodated on the site. The adoption of appropriate mitigation measures during construction will ensure that any adverse effects on soil/ existing landform as a result of the proposed activity would be minimal. Furthermore, the implementation of the proposed landscape planting and fencing would ensure that the proposal would not detract from the visual amenity and surrounding neighbourhood character."

- (b) Written consent is received from every person the Council is satisfied may be adversely affected by the proposed development.

The reporting planner concluded that the proposed development also met this test. The issues raised by the neighbours were addressed within the body of the report and were summarised within section 5.3 on pages 9 & 10 of the report reproduced below.

" 5.3 Section 94(2) (b) - Adversely Affected Persons

Whilst adjacent neighbours have raised issues regarding the development there are no persons considered to be adversely affected by the proposed activity for the reasons stated in section 4.4 and sections 5.2.1 to 5.2.12 above.

In summary issues raised by adjacent property owners have been addressed within this report in the following manner.

1. The new building does not blend in with the existing building;
2. The building is of a low cost material;
3. Building materials will cause glare;
4. The building ruins the view and will affect property values;

Comment: Councils landscape advisor considers that with the provision of appropriate landscaping the development will fit within the landscape without undue effect on visual amenity, views or glare. (See Sections 4.4, 5.2.10 & 5.2.12)

5. As the building is closer to the residential boundaries, existing problems with noise will be exacerbated;
6. There will be a lack of privacy with the building so close to the residential boundaries;
7. Security lighting will cause sleep disturbances;

Comment: No security lighting is proposed on the addition. The number of vehicles parking close to the residential boundary will be reduced and thereby reduce vehicle related disturbance. Whilst the addition is located closer to the northern boundary no change in intensity of the use of the site will occur and the proposed development is oriented southwards away from the relevant northern boundary. The addition is for office and meeting room use; not part of the main auditorium. (See Sections 4.4, 5.2.4, 5.2.10 & 5.2.12)

8. The extension of the Church facilities will increase the parking problems being experienced at the moment, where people are already parking on the road;

Comment: Council's traffic engineering advisor considers that the existing and proposed onsite parking make satisfactory provision for the activity and will not increase adverse effects on the safety of the local road network. (See Section 5.2.9)

9. The Church has shown itself to not comply with Council rules by not complying with conditions from the original consent and by moving the building on prematurely.

Comment: Not considered to be a relevant environmental consideration in relation to this application. Council can ensure compliance with any proposed conditions related to the development."

A54-A64

The reporting planner concluded that the proposed development met both of these tests and that the proposal could therefore be considered without the need for public notification, as attached at pages A54 to A64 - 1-11 for the full Section 94 report.)

2. Decision on the Substantive Application

Having recommended that the application need not be notified the reporting planner addressed the second statutory test; whether or not the application should be granted; pursuant to Section 104 & 105 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

This decision must address the relevant matters contained within section 104(1)(a)-(i) of the Act. The matters considered to be relevant to this application and addressed within the planners report were:

- (a) Any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity.
- (d) The relevant objectives rules and other provisions of the Proposed District Plan.
 - (i) Any other matters the Council considers relevant.

Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.

The reporting planner concluded that:

*"Pursuant to Sections 104, 105 and 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991, being satisfied that no body or person is adversely affected, it is recommended that **consent be granted** to the application by Hebron Trust (as more accurately defined in Sections 3 and 4 of this report) at 115 Royal Road, to locate a 86.4m² prefabricated building on a residential zoned site to be used as part of the existing church facilities, with associated parking and earthworks, for the following reasons:*

- (i) The proposal has been considered in terms of the relevant assessment criteria and is considered to create no more than de minimis adverse effects on the environment. In particular the proposal includes mitigation measures, including proposed planting and sediment control devices.*
- (ii) The non-residential activity is considered to be consistent with the relevant assessment criteria for discretionary activities, and in particular the proposed addition would be small in scale, located a sufficient distance from adjoining residential boundaries, and would replace an existing paved area on the site, so as not to detract from the visual amenity of the rural landscape and neighbourhood character.*
- (iii) The number of people on the site is not proposed to increase beyond the previously required maximums, and the parking generation is not anticipated to increase beyond what is currently existing on-site.*
- (iv) The proposal would not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Transitional and Proposed District Plans."*

A54-A71

Attached at pages A54 to A71.

Having fully considered the report and supporting information including letters from local residents and undertaken a site visit the report was signed off by the Team Leader Resource consents under delegated authority in accordance with the reporting planner's recommendation for approval on 18 February 03.

ISSUES

The principal environmental issues associated with the development identified by the reporting planner related to:

- Additional storm water run - off collected from the roof of the new building; (section 5.2.1, 9.2.1a);
- Visual amenity associated with the design and placement of the building; (section 4.4, 5.2.10, 5.2.12, 9.2.1b.);
- Additional noise generated by use of the building; (sections 5.2.4, 9.2.1b);
- Traffic safety related to displacement of parking from the car park on which the building has been placed to on the road. (sections 5.2.9, 9.2.1 b);
- Siltation and Sedimentation associated with run off from earthworks associated with creation of new car parks to replace those occupied by the new building. (sections 5.2.1, 5.2.3 & 9.2.1a);
- Cumulative effects associated with this additional development in combination with other non-residential activities associated with this and other churches established in the area (section 5.2.12).

The reporting planner has researched each issue; sought the advice of appropriate experts where necessary; applied relevant district plan objectives policies and rules and produced sound arguments in support of the recommendation to proceed without public notification and for approval of the substantive application. (Refer sections of the report quoted in brackets above.)

Neighbour concerns associated with the development have been identified and addressed within the report to the extent to which they can be directly attributed to the proposed development and to the extent to which they fall within the range of environmental issues Council is able to address under the Resource Management Act 1991.

In recognition of neighbour concerns associated with the development the Manager Resource consents has undertaken to meet with local residents to:

1. Circulate a copy of the resource consent when it becomes available; and to
2. Meet with them to discuss with their wider concerns with the Massey Community Church and to assist them in achieving a satisfactory resolution of these wider issues.

A72

As attached at page A72.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the Council have acted appropriately in the assessment and approval of the application by Hebron Trust for the extension to the Massey Community Church and, within the constraints of the Resource Management Act, have considered the concerns of the local residents as expressed in the letters of complaint received by Council.

In closing it should be remembered that the extension to the Church building will not result in an increased intensity of use of the site. Church attendance has been limited to a maximum of 300 persons by a previous consent and has not been altered as a result of the new building.

RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

Report prepared by: Graeme McCarrison, Manager: Resource Consents.



9 NOTICES OF MOTION

Pursuant to Standing Order 28.1 the following Notice of Motion has been received from Community Board member Peter Chan.


MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD 5TH MARCH
NOTICE OF MOTION

THAT IT BE A RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL
" THAT THE DECISION OF COUNCIL TO
REDUCE THE REMUNERATION OF THE MASSEY
& NEW LYNN COMMUNITY BOARD MEMBERS
AT THE COUNCIL MEETING ON 26TH FEBRUARY
2003 BE DEFERRED TO THE NEXT TRIENNIAL
LOCAL BODY ELECTIONS IN OCTOBER 2004 "

Signed:


PETER CHAN

Seconded:


WASSER
COMMUNITY
RESERVE
PHOTOGRAPHY

Received 27/2/03
N. Delaune



10 BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS

Provision has been made on this agenda for Board Members should they so wish to submit a report on their activities during the month in regard to matters within the scope and delegations of the Board. However, to comply with the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, no decision may be made on matters raised in Board Members' reports.

MASSEY COMMUNITY BOARD APPOINTMENTS

OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS	APPOINTMENT
Auckland Region Community Boards' Association Executive Committee	Andrew Good
Keep Waitakere Beautiful Committee	Peter Chan
Massey Citizens Advice Bureau	Peter Chan
Massey Community House Committee	Karen Perri
Massey Leisure Centre Community Liaison Group	Jean Webster
Police Liaison Committee	Cr Russell Peter Chan Jean Webster
Ranui Action Plan Project	Cr Nash
Ranui Community Centre Committee	Cr Nash
Te Rangi Hiroa Working Party	Karen Perri Andrew Good
Henderson Creek Reserve Management Plan	Cr Hoskin
Harbourview People's Park Working Party	Andrew Good
Moire Road Community Hall	Cr Nash
Safe Waitakere	Bob Jessopp
COUNCIL COMMITTEES	
Hearings Committee	Jean Webster Karen Perri
Community Sports Fund Allocation Subcommittee	Warren Flaunty
WORKING GROUPS	
Wai Care Programme	Peter Chan
Project Twin Streams	Bob Jessopp

