~~~~~~

Legal Case-notes July 2022

Feedback Please! Any Feedback? Drop us a note!

We would appreciate comments and suggestions from members on content, format or information about cases that might be of interest to members as not all cases may have been reported in "Your Environment".

The Case-book Editor Roger Low can be contacted through the Survey & Spatial NZ National Office, or by e-mail, Roger Low<rlow@lowcom.co.nz>

~~~~~~

Summaries of cases from Thomson Reuter's "Your Environment".

This month we report on seven court decisions covering diverse situations associated with subdivision, development and land use activities from around the country;

- An unsuccessful application to the Court of Appeal to bring a second appeal concerning subdivision of land in the Queenstown area;
- An appeal to the High Court relating to proposed residential development that would place a residential dwelling within the National Grid Yard, 12 metres either side of existing Transpower high tension power lines;
- The decision on costs arising from a direct referral to the Environment Court for consent subdivide and develop land at Halswell, Christchurch for residential and commercial activities;
- The resolution by means of court-assisted mediation of an appeal over financial and other conditions imposed by Napier City Council on a consent for a staged subdivision and development at Meeanee, Napier;
- A jurisdictional appeal about the subtle distinctions between residential activities and those associated with residential activities. A cautionary tale from Whakatane about the problems caused by over-complex rules and laws;
- Another appeal provoked by the intricacies of district plan detail, construction and definitions, this case involved provisions in PC20 to Auckland Council's unitary plan;
- Settlement by consent of an appeal against grant of consent to develop a 52-bedroom hotel at Glenorchy.

~~~~~~

Log-in and download these summaries, earlier case summaries and other news items at: https://www.surveyors.org.nz/Article?Action=View&Article_id=23

CASE NOTES JULY 2022:

~~~~~~

Brial v Queenstown Lakes District Council - [2022] NZCA 206

Keywords: Court of Appeal; leave to appeal; resource consent; district plan proposed; amenity values; subdivision

This application for leave to bring a second appeal concerned a proposed subdivision of land that appeared to conflict with a new policy regarding minimum site areas. Queenstown Lakes District Council ("the council") had granted resource consent to a couple known as the Blacklers to subdivide approximately 8 ha of land into two lots of approximately 4 ha each.

The property was located in an area recognised by both the operative district plan ("ODP") and proposed district plan ("PDP") as having landscape and visual amenity values. The appellants, who were neighbours on an adjoining property, unsuccessfully appealed the council's decision in the Environment Court ("EC") (see *Todd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2020] NZEnvC 205). A further appeal to the High Court ("HC") was also dismissed (see *Brial v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2021] NZHC 3609). A key argument of the appellants before the HC involved new policy 24.2.1.1 of the PDP ("the New Policy"), which required that "an 80 ha minimum net site area be maintained" in the relevant zone. The appellants had argued that the EC had failed to construe the New Policy correctly in accordance with prevailing authority in *Environmental Defence Society Inc v The New Zealand King Salmon Co Ltd* [2014] NZSC 38, [2014] NZSC 38 and failed to recognise the New Policy's primacy as an environmental "bottom line". This was rejected by the HC. The appellants now sought a second appeal.

The Court reviewed the applicable laws on second appeals, summarising that it could only grant leave if satisfied that the second appeal involved a question of law that was "capable of bona fide and serious argument" and "a matter of general or public importance". The Court then considered the appellants' claim that the New Policy was an environmental "bottom line" and that consent should have been refused because the subdivision would not comply with the New Policy's requirement that "an 80 ha minimum net site area be maintained". The Court noted it was common ground that the proposal required consent as a discretionary activity under the ODP. The Court said that "[a] discretionary activity is by definition one that may be granted consent". Despite this, the Court noted that the EC had carried out an analysis of the proposal which emphasised that it would hypothetically have *non-complying* activity status under the PDP. The EC had therefore approached the question by applying s 104D (restrictions for non-complying activities), even though that section did not formally apply. The EC had said the subdivision would struggle to meet the threshold test in s 104D(1)(b) because it would be "contrary to the objectives and policies" of the PDP, but concluded that it met the alternative threshold test in s 104D(1)(a) because the adverse effects were "minor". The Court was satisfied that the EC had, in reaching that conclusion as part of its "non-complying activity" analysis, undertaken "a comprehensive assessment of the environmental effects".

That assessment was also relevant to the EC's consideration of s 104 (requirements when considering consent applications), which required consideration of "any actual and potential effects on the environment" (s 104(1)(a)). The Court was also satisfied with how the EC had had regard to "any relevant provisions of … a plan or proposed plan" as required by s 104(1)(b)(vi). While the EC had found that the proposal was in conflict with the New Policy, it had concluded this conflict was not significant. It had said that while the subdivision of 8 ha of land into two 4 ha lots "inherently cannot accord" with the New Policy, that did not "condemn" it and the proposal was still capable of being consented. The Court was also satisfied that the EC's conclusions that the proposal was in accordance with other relevant objectives and policies (such as the objective of maintaining or enhancing "landscape character and visual amenity values") were "reached reasonably based on the evidence" and not susceptible to appeal on a question of law.

The Court concluded that the 80 ha minimum lot size in the New Policy was not a "bottom line" that must have led to the refusal of consent. It said this was not a seriously arguable proposition of law because subdivisions like the one proposed were not prohibited. It said, "if a council does not exercise its powers to prohibit activities, there is always the possibility that a particular proposal may merit consent when considered against the relevant statutory criteria" and that was essentially what the EC had found. The Court also saw no analogy in this resource consent application to the circumstances in *King Salmon*, which examined "bottom lines" in the "completely different" context of a council's obligation to give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement in a plan change.

The Court also rejected the claim that the EC had overlooked an existing consent that limited the whole property to just one dwelling. The Blacklers had applied to cancel this as part of their proposal to the council. However, due to COVID-19 pressures, the EC had specifically focused only on community-level issues as part of an interim decision, and decided to defer examination of effects on direct neighbours to a later hearing. The Court said that to the extent that cancelling the existing consent might directly impact the appellant neighbours, that would be considered in future proceedings.

The application for leave to appeal was declined. The applicants were to pay the interested parties' costs for a standard application on a band A basis and usual disbursements.

Decision Date 24 May 2022 - Your Environment 6 June 2022

(The interim decision of the Environment Court which is subject of this appeal is identified as Todd v QLDC [2020] NZEnvC 205. See previous reports in Newslink case-notes in March 2021 and April 2022- RHL.)

~~~~~~

Karmarkar v Auckland Council _ [2022] NZHC 1119

Keywords: High Court; declaration

This was an appeal from an Environment Court decision to strike out an application for a declaration on the basis it was frivolous or vexatious. M Karmarkar ("K") owned a property in Auckland, which he sought to develop with the addition of two further residential dwellings. He had been advised that the dwellings would fall within the "National Grid Yard" ("NGY"), a corridor 12 metres either side of existing Transpower power lines. After consulting Transpower, Transpower advised him that it would not support his proposal because it would not support housing development within the NGY. K then modified his proposal to remove any proposed construction from the NGY, and he successfully obtained consent to construct one dwelling. K now wished to construct a further dwelling, this time within the NGY.

Pre-empting opposition from Transpower, K applied to the Environment Court for a "declaration" under s 310 of the RMA 1991 that would give "approval" to the construction of the dwelling. The Environment Court struck out the application under s 279(4) on the basis it was frivolous or vexatious, it disclosed no reasonable or relevant case, and/or it would be an abuse of court process to allow it to continue. It said this was a situation where resource consent was required to be obtained from a council and where a requiring authority (Transpower) had a designation over the property, and the application for declaration not only lacked clarity but was an attempt to subvert these processes (see *Karmakar v Auckland Council* [2022] NZEnvC 23).

In these appeal proceedings the Court said that, like the Environment Court, it had trouble understanding the nature of the declaration K sought. It also could not discern the basis upon which K believed the Environment Court had erred in law. The Court concluded that, quite clearly, s 310(a) to (g) and even (h) were not wide enough to give the Environment Court jurisdiction to make the order sought. Accordingly, there had been no error of law. The appeal was dismissed. Although Auckland Council had been named as respondent, it had not taken part in proceedings and accordingly there was no issue as to costs.

Decision Date 20 May 2022 - Your Environment 7 June 2022

Woolworths New Zealand Ltd v Christchurch City Council - [2022] NZEnvC 79

Keywords: costs; trade competitor; resource consent

This matter concerned several disputes about costs in relation to a consent application that had been directly referred to the Court. In 2021 the Court granted consent to Woolworths New Zealand Ltd ("Woolworths") for a mixed residential and commercial development at Halswell (*see Woolworths New Zealand Ltd v Christchurch City Council* [2021] NZEnvC 133). The application had come before the Court via a direct referral process whereby Woolworths had made a request to the Christchurch City Council ("the council") under s 87D of the RMA 1991 for the application to be determined by the Court, which the council had granted. The council had then prepared a report, as required by s 87F, containing an assessment of the proposal. As well as preparing that report in order to assist the Court, the council had also, when the matter was then being determined, requested that the Court decline consent unless certain changes were made to Woolworths' proposal.

These proceedings involved a number of costs claims by and against various parties. First, the council sought a costs award against Woolworths to recover some of its costs of preparing the s 87F report. It argued it had merely been fulfilling its obligation to assist the Court and had not advocated for any particular outcome when preparing the report. It argued it was only later, when asked by the Court, that it advocated for the consent to be declined unless amendments were made. Second, Woolworths in turn made its own applications for costs against both the council and another party, Spreydon Lodge Ltd ("Spreydon"), a s 274
~~~~~~

party that had opposed Woolworths' application. Woolworths argued that an award should be made against the council because: its actions in pursuing amendments to Woolworths' application were unsubstantiated by evidence; the council's position was unreasonable because the parties had already made significant refinements; and the council had failed in its duty to provide reasonable assistance to the Court as required by s 87F. Woolworths sought costs against Spreydon on the grounds Spreydon was a trade competitor and had deliberately breached the provisions of the RMA 1991 that proscribe the involvement of a trade competitor by pursuing arguments that were related to the effects of trade competition. It also claimed Spreydon had been "steadfast" in its opposition, refusing to refine its position or suggest amendments that would address its concerns.

Regarding the costs claim by the council, the Court agreed that the council was "for the most part" addressing the Court on matters raised in the s 87F report, for the purpose of providing assistance. Although the Court did not agree with all the opinions in the report, that of itself did not mean that the council had stepped outside of its role to an extent that amounted to a neglect of duty. However, the Court also agreed with Woolworths that the part of the council's case that involved opposing elements of the proposal and requesting amendments was "ill-thought-out" and without justification. In this respect the council had been "blameworthy" and had departed from the role it was required to take. The Court noted that the council had already made significant discounts to its actual costs in its costs application. The Court said this was appropriate and that it would have applied this discount had the council not done so. It therefore granted the council's request for costs of approximately $155,000 against Woolworths. For the same reasons that a discount had already been factored in, it dismissed Woolworths' counter claim for costs against the council (which had only been approximately $61,000).

Regarding Woolworths' claim against Spreydon, the Court agreed that Spreydon was not entitled to the benefit of the starting presumption in s 285 that costs should not be awarded against a s 274 party. Spreydon had argued that the presumption could only be rebutted in exceptional circumstances, but the Court held that "the involvement of a trade competitor whose case (or even part thereof) has been found to transgress s 308B, is sufficient to rebut the presumption against an award of costs to a s 274 party". The Court highlighted the "strong proscription" in the RMA 1991 against the involvement of trade competitors motivated by anti-competitive imperatives. It noted that Spreydon had not complied with the requirement to declare whether it was a trade competitor by denying that status throughout proceedings, and its opposition was so wholly without merit that the Court questioned whether Spreydon would have opposed any aspect at all had it not been in competition with Woolworths. The Court acknowledged that it was not easy to say whether some aspects of the proposal opposed by Spreydon violated s 308B, but said "the court cannot neatly unbundle that part of the case that is said to be untainted by trade competition … The majority, if not all of the issues raised by Spreydon, were inter-related". It also found that Spreydon should pay 50 per cent of the Crown's costs otherwise payable by Woolworths.

Woolworths was ordered to pay the council $155,174. Woolworths' own application against the council was declined. Woolworths was awarded costs of $285,581 against Spreydon, plus 50 per cent of the Crown's costs otherwise payable by Woolworths.

Decision Date 16 May 2022 - Your Environment 10 June 2022

(See previous report in Newslink case-notes in November 2021- RHL.)

~~~~~~

Durham Property Investments Ltd v Napier City Council _ [2022] NZEnvC 77

Keywords: consent order; resource consent

This consent order concerned an appeal by Durham Property Investments Ltd, challenging the conditions imposed on a resource consent granted by Napier City Council for a residential subdivision and development. Following court-assisted mediation, the parties filed a joint memorandum setting out an agreement that would resolve the appeal in its entirety. The agreement covered aspects such as arrangements between the parties for the formation and funding of drainage and recreation reserves, and arrangements for road frontage upgrades. There were no s 274 parties to the appeal. The Court concluded that the parties had taken a nuanced and balanced approach, and the agreed amendments were the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Pursuant to s 279(1)(b) of the
~~~~~~

RMA 1991 the Court directed, by consent, that the conditions of consent were amended as agreed by the parties. There was no order as to costs.

Decision date 12 May 2022 Your Environment

~~~~~~

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa v Whakatāne District Council - [2022] NZHC 819

Keywords: High Court; appeal procedure; jurisdiction; residential; retirement housing

This appeal from a decision of the Environment Court ("EC") considered the meaning of "residential activity" in light of a jurisdictional bar in the RMA 1991 that temporarily restricted appeals on residential developments. In 2019, MMS GP Ltd applied to the Whakatāne District Council ("the council") for resource consent to develop land at Coastlands/Ōpihi. This included a proposal for an 8.8 ha retirement village known as the "Lifestyle and Retirement Precinct" ("the Precinct"). Independent commissioners for the council granted the consent, subject to conditions. One condition stated that Precinct activities could include: dwellings for retirees ("activity 1"); services and facilities for the care and benefit of the residents ("activity 2"); and activities pavilions and/or other recreational facilities or meeting places for use of the residents and their visitors ("activity 3"). The appellants, who represented tangata whenua in the district, opposed the Precinct development and appealed the council's decision to the EC. Their appeals focused on activities 2 and 3. However, the EC decided that it did not have jurisdiction to hear the appeals under s 120 of the RMA 1991, which set out the right of appeal against decisions on resource consents. The appellants then appealed that decision to this Court. In these proceedings, the Court had to determine whether the EC's interpretation of s 120 and related statutes was correct.

Because the application for consent was filed in 2019, a former version of s 120 – which was in force between 2017 and 2020 – applied to the appeals filed in the EC. At that time, s 120(1A)(c) provided that there was no right of appeal in respect of a decision to grant resource consent if the decision related to "a residential activity as defined in s 95A(6), unless the residential activity is a non-complying activity". It was common ground that if the consented activity was indeed a "residential activity", it was *not* non-complying. The key issue was therefore whether the consented activity constituted a "residential activity" in s 95A(6). That provision referred to activities that were "associated with" the construction or use of "dwelling houses", which the RMA 1991 in turn defined as not only a residence but also "any structure or outdoor living area that is accessory to, and used wholly or principally for the purposes of, the residence". During proceedings it was explained that this jurisdictional bar to appealing residential activities was in force between 2017 and 2020 as a response to a housing supply and affordability crisis.

The appellants had argued that while activity 1 was a residential activity, activities 2 and 3 went beyond being "associated with" dwelling houses, and nor did they constitute dwelling houses themselves because were they not "accessory to" or "for the purposes" of the residences. They pointed to the lack of detail about what services and facilities would actually be included in the proposed retirement village and suggested the EC should therefore be cautious about applying a jurisdictional bar, especially because the bar in s 120(1A) only applied if the decision related to residential activities and *"no other activities"*. They further argued that when s 120(1A) was enacted as a response to a housing crisis, a retirement village such as this was not the type of infrastructure contemplated by Parliament in creating this jurisdictional bar. However, the EC had disagreed and concluded that the consented activities, bundled together, constituted a "residential activity". Importantly, it found that the central purpose of the services and facilities in activity 2 was "for the residents". It acknowledged that the pavilions and other recreational facilities in activity 3 could potentially go beyond the care and benefit of the residents, but determined, taking a purposive approach, that the scope of this was not so great because use of the facilities would be limited to residents and their visitors.

The Court considered the EC's approach and found no fault in its interpretation. It said that because these activities were linked to residents, the purpose of the activities was "inextricably linked" to the definitions of "dwelling house" and "residential activity". It agreed with the EC that the lack of detail about the proposed services and facilities did not prevent a finding that the activities were residential; the EC had noted that zoning rules would not allow commercial activities on the site that were not linked to services for residents. The Court also
~~~~~~

disagreed with the appellants that a retirement village was not contemplated by s 120(1A), since retirement villages fundamentally house people and assist with issues of housing supply and affordability. Although the Court agreed that care must be taken when interpreting "ouster" clauses that act as jurisdictional bars, in this case the intention of Parliament to restrict appeals was clear and had to be respected. The EC was correct to conclude that the appellants had no right of appeal. The appeal was dismissed.

Decision date 26 April 2022 - Your Environment 13 May 2022

~~~~~~

Pipers Limited Partnership v Auckland Council _ [2022] NZEnvC 76

Keywords: district plan change; regional policy statement; rural; residential; retirement housing

These appeals concerned Plan Change 20 ("PC20"): Rural Activity Status to the Auckland Unitary Plan ("AUP"). PC20 was notified by Auckland Council ("the council") in 2019 in order to amend existing references to "residential" in specific rural policies and zone descriptions to "dwelling" or "dwellings". The council had been concerned that leaving the references to "residential" could give policy support to a range of larger-scale activities in the rural zones that had not been intended, such as retirement villages and integrated residential developments. It believed these existing references in the AUP were not consistent with higher-order directives in the Regional Policy Statement ("RPS") concerning urban growth and the rural environment. The proposed amendments were then confirmed by commissioners for the council. The appellants challenged these amendments, arguing they could inappropriately limit the range of residential activity when there was no planning basis for this limitation or any evidence of potential adverse effects. Because retirement villages and integrated residential developments were not included in the rural zone activity tables, they defaulted to "discretionary activity" status, and the appellants argued that there was therefore no need to amend policy wording because any effects of a proposed activity would be addressed by consent authorities when considering applications for resource consent. The appellants also argued there was no tension with RPS directives.

The Court considered the architecture of the relevant provisions within the AUP. The AUP included five broad "nesting" tables that sorted land use activities by group and their "nested" sub-groups. One table was a general "Residential" nesting table that included larger-scale developments in its nested activities (such as retirement villages, integrated residential developments and boarding houses) as well as dwellings. However, specific activity status tables for the rural zones did not refer to residential activities or to those larger-scale developments. The key issue before the Court was that the present inclusion of the term "residential" in certain objectives, policies and zone descriptions for the rural zones appeared to give support to residential activities in those zones. The Court said the specific activity tables for the rural zones made it "clear" that broad support for residential activities in rural zones was not an objective of the AUP. It said "[t]he decision having been made not to include all the activities described by the residential nesting table in the rural zone activity table, the provisions that support that rule need to align with it". The Court then considered the objectives and zone descriptions for the relevant rural zones, which provided for "rural lifestyle living", an undefined term. The Court preferred the evidence of the council's expert planner that this was a reference to smaller rural sites that contained generally single dwellings and that were used as hobby farms "where lifestyle aspects of rural living take precedence over rural production". The Court agreed these would be centred around a dwelling and would not include multi-dwelling developments. Therefore, by removing "residential" references from rural zone provisions and replacing them with "dwelling", PC20 would achieve greater alignment with the rural zone activity tables, better articulate the anticipated form of development and reduce potential for confusion.

The Court also considered the relevant chapters of the higher-order RPS relating to urban growth and the rural environment. It referred to the evidence of the council's expert planner that the RPS' directives for rural land highlighted a strong emphasis on the protection of land for food supply, as well as a strong directive of planned urbanisation. It cited his analysis that PC20 would give better effect to the RPS than the status quo by removing the possibility of specific policy support for activities that were potentially inconsistent with RPS directives. For example, retirement villages and integrated residential developments were activities that
~~~~~~

were "more urban in nature than rural" and less likely than single dwellings to support food production and other rural activities.

Finally, the Court concluded that PC20 would not "close the door" on opportunities for the types of residential development the appellants may wish to propose. Retirement villages and integrated residential developments would continue to default to discretionary activity status, so while PC20 would clarify the characteristics of the rural zones and provide greater certainty, it would not exclude the types of activities of interest to the appellants. The decisions version of PC20 was confirmed. The appeals were dismissed and costs were reserved.

Judgment Date 11 May 2022 - Your Environment 2 June 2022

~~~~~~

Otago Regional Council v Queenstown Lakes District Council _ [2022] NZEnvC 75

Keywords: consent order; resource consent

This consent order concerned an appeal by Otago Regional Council against a decision of Queenstown Lakes District Council to grant resource consent for a 52-bedroom hotel and car park in Glenorchy. The parties had filed a consent memorandum setting out their agreement to resolve the appeal, which was also signed by the s 274 parties to the appeal. Pursuant to s 279(1)(b) of the RMA 1991 the Court directed, by consent, that the conditions of consent were amended as agreed by the parties. There was no order as to costs.

Decision date 9 May 2022 - Your Environment 1 June 2022

~~~~~~

The above brief summaries are extracted from "Alert 24 - Your Environment" published by Thomson Reuters and are reprinted with permission. They are intended to draw attention to decisions that may be of interest to members. Please consult the complete decisions for a full understanding of the subject matter.

Should you wish to obtain a copy of the decision please phone Thomson Reuters Customer Care on 0800 10 60 60 or by email to judgments@thomsonreuters.co.nz.

~~~~~~

This month's cases were selected by Roger Low, rlow@lowcom.co.nz, and Hazim Ali, hazim.ali@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

~~~~~~

Other News Items for July 2022

~~~~~~

Regulations to support prefabricated housing announced

Stuff reports that new regulations to support the Government's new modular component, or prefab, manufacturer scheme have been announced. The scheme, which was part of changes made to the Building Act last year, allows prefab manufacturers to be certified to produce their products.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Moves to speed up building, resource consent processing at Christchurch City Council

The *Star News* reports that Christchurch City Council's head of building consenting, Robert Wright, says new methods will help them improve the processing timeframes for consents. The council has been dealing with a record number of consent applications.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

No resolution yet after mediation held regarding cycle trail in Kawarau Gorge

The Otago Daily Times reports that a dispute over the expansion of Central Otago and Queenstown Lakes' network of cycle trails has yet to be resolved after the parties went to mediation. With no resolution made at the meeting, parties are bound to confidentiality.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

$300 m raised to fund five large solar farms

The New Zealand Herald reports that Lodestone Energy has raised $300m in capital to fund fund five large solar farms. Building of the first farm will start later this year near Kaitaia, with more than 58,000 panels.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

$46 m Nelson riverside library plan threatened by sea level rise

Radio New Zealand reports that Nelson City Council will review plans for its $46 million riverside library, as new data shows sea level rise will affect the region sooner than anticipated. The council voted last year to go ahead with the riverside location, over refurbishing the existing library or building elsewhere.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Significant Timaru subdivision granted resource consent

The *Timaru Herald* reports that a significant slice of undeveloped land at the south-eastern edge of Timaru could soon accommodate up to 150 houses after an application to subdivide it was given the go-ahead by the council - 15 years after the landowner began applying for it. The rezoning from rural to residential has been achieved in stages. The developer said there's some uncertainty around numbers as he waits for clarity on upcoming changes to building directives such as easement sizes.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

35,000 native trees to be planted in 40 schools

Radio New Zealand reports that the Government is providing a grant to enable the planting of 35,000 native trees in 40 schools. The announcement was made on Arbor Day.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Fatbergs cleared from Wellington's wastewater system

Stuff reports that more than 30 tonnes of solid mass has been cleared from Wellington's wastewater system. The two common problems clogging New Zealand's drains are fatbergs – congealed masses of oil and fats that pick up other objects – and rag monsters, clumps of wet wipes and sanitary products.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Water tanks in Auckland

Auckland Council has notified that Plan Change 54 and Plan Modification 13 (Enable Rainwater Tank Installation in Residential and Rural zones) to the Auckland Unitary Plan will become operative as from 10/06/22.

~~~~~~

Council fund to support efforts to eradicate feral pigs from private land

The Press reports that feral pigs have become a major threat to Banks Peninsula's natural environment and moves are afoot to eradicate them from the area. Christchurch City Council decided on Wednesday to spend $60,000 from its Biodiversity Fund to help cull feral pigs across thousands of hectares of privately-owned land on the peninsula. It was one of seven projects to receive a total of $143,697 from the fund, which supports private landowners who are taking voluntary action, and investing their own time and money, to protect and enhance biodiversity on their properties.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Cave in Kahurangi National Park's Ōparara Basin to close for a year to protect rare spiders

Radio New Zealand reports that a cave in the Kahurangi National Park's Ōparara Basin will close for a year to protect the Nelson cave spider. They are the only spider protected by the Wildlife Act 1953.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Christchurch stadium to cost almost $700 m

Stuff reports that the proposed covered 30,000 seat stadium in central Christchurch is now projected to cost up to $683 m, following confirmation of a budget blowout of up to $150 m.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Ryman plans new $220m village in Taupō

Stuff reports that Ryman, New Zealand's largest retirement village operator, acquired a 9.79-hectare site at Acacia Bay Rd in Nukuhau, just 1.7km from Taupō's town centre and have announced plans for an integrated retirement village with town houses, serviced apartments and a care centre offering resthome, hospital and dementia care.

Read the full story here.

~~~~~~

Regional and District Plans

Auckland Council has notified that a late submission relating to Proposed Plan Change 74 (Private): Golding Meadows and Auckland Trotting Club Inc to the Auckland Council Unitary Plan (Operative in part) has been accepted resulting in a separate further submissions process in respect of that submission. The submission and the summary of the decisions requested in this submission is now available on the council website. Further submissions on the points listed in the Summary of Decisions requested close 27/06/22.

~~~~~~
~~~~~~