

HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF A HEARINGS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, GROUND FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, LYNDON ROAD EAST, HASTINGS
HELD ON FRIDAY, 27 APRIL 2012 AT 10.00AM**

[THEN RECONVENED LATER ON FRIDAY, 27 APRIL 2012 IN PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION FOR PART 2 OF THIS COUNCIL INITIATED PLAN CHANGE]

(THE “FINAL” RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS PART OF THIS COUNCIL INITIATED PLAN CHANGE WILL BE FORWARDED TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION)

PRESENT: **Councillors:** Lester (Chair), Poulain (Deputy Chair) and Twigg

ALSO PRESENT: Mr P McKay, Environmental Policy Manager
Mrs M Gaffaney, Environmental Planner (Policy) – Reporting Planner
Mrs C Hilton, Committee Secretary

AS REQUIRED: **“Submitters”**
Mr C Bridgeman
Mr R Vickers, Manager, Bridgeman Properties Ltd
Mr M Waite, McKay Mackie – appearing for Bridgeman Properties Ltd
Mr A McSporrán, the Coop Group
Mr M Holder, Consult Plus – appearing for the Coop Group

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Watkins had not been involved in Part 1 of this Plan Change hearing and so he could not be a member of the Hearings Committee when it considered Part 2.

A Pierce (HNth Business Association); Mackersey Development and Lomac Properties had all advised they would not be attending this part of the hearing.

2. COUNCIL INITIATED PLAN CHANGE 54 – HAVELOCK NORTH VILLAGE CENTRE – PART 2

(Planning report and background information previously circulated) (Written evidence circulated at meeting)

The Chair, Councillor Lester, and the members of the Hearings Committee introduced themselves and the Council Officers present. The Chair made his opening comments and outlined the process to be followed at the hearing, together with addressing housekeeping issues. The planner’s report had the

same status as any other evidence being considered at this hearing. The Committee had been on a site visit prior to the first part of this hearing, but had not been on a further site visit prior to this second part of the hearing.

The Chair briefly backgrounded the events that had led to the timing of Part 2 of this plan change hearing. He advised that Progressive Enterprises Limited had initially asked for its submission to Plan Change 54 to be addressed separately in February 2012. The hearing of that submission and associated further submissions was then rescheduled, again at the request of Progressive Enterprises, with today's date of 27 April 2012 being agreed to by the Council and that submitter. Then on 20 April, Progressive Enterprises advised the Council that its submission had now been withdrawn.

After Part 2 of the hearing has been completed and the respective evidence has been considered, the Committee would deliberate in Public Excluded [Confidential] Session and its subsequent Recommendations would be referred to the Council for consideration.

PRESENTATIONS BY SUBMITTERS

Mr Holder circulated and read submissions on behalf of **Mr McSporran**, of the Coop Group, interpolating briefly as appropriate. Mr Holder advised that he was presenting submissions, rather than evidence, and that he was appearing as an advocate, rather than as a planner giving evidence.

The main points highlighted in the submissions presented, or issues that were addressed by Mr Holder/Mr McSporran in response to questions from the Committee included:

- Paragraph 4 – the Havelock Road address referred to the Bridgeman site.
- Why limit the location for a supermarket to only one site.
- They want to identify the Coop Group's site as the alternate supermarket site.
- Paragraph 5 – McDonald's had ok to establish in that area. Why are other food activities considered to be contrary uses?
- Paragraph 5 - clarification of word "displaced" and wording regarding high value industries. Such industries did not need a large site.

The Chair sought clarification from Council Officers regarding high value industries.

Messrs C Bridgeman, M Waite and R Vickers were present representing Bridgeman Properties Ltd.

Mr Waite circulated and read Submissions on behalf of **Bridgeman Properties Limited**, interpolating as appropriate. The main points that were highlighted in his Submissions or that were addressed in response to questions from the Committee included:

- Paragraph 4 – this existing site was at the far end of the village.
- First sentence, Paragraph 6 – Bridgeman was not suggesting this type of use be established in the employment precinct.
- Second sentence, Paragraph 6 – he read out Recommendation "F" on Page 14 of the latest planning report.
- The original submission from HN Business Assn ("HNBA") did not refer to the establishment of a second supermarket. He did not agree with the planning report now stating that the HNBA opposed supermarkets.
- Extensive use of the word "throughout" in the report implied there will be specific sites appropriate for a supermarket.

CG-10-3-9-015

- Second point, Paragraph 8 – the Bridgeman site would meet that criteria.
- There appeared to be a contradiction, with the planner suggesting that there is no need for a supermarket now that Progressive Enterprises was “off the scene”.
- He felt there was a place for a “metro-style” supermarket in the Employment Precinct to create competition – a reasonable size, but not on a large scale.

In response to questions from the Committee, both submitters gave examples of some metro-style supermarkets in other parts of the country.

The Chair advised the hearing would now continue in Public Excluded Session to enable the Committee to undertake its deliberations regarding the issues and evidence addressed at today’s hearing session and to formulate its Recommendations to be forwarded to Council.

Councillor Lester/Councillor Twigg

That the public be excluded from the deliberations in relation to Part 2 of the Council Initiated Plan Change 54 hearing – Havelock North Village Centre. The reason for passing this Resolution in relation to this matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(2)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this Resolution is as follows:

That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in:

- a) **Any proceedings before a local authority where:**
 - i) **A right of appeal lies to any Court or Tribunal against the final decision of the local authority in those proceedings; or**
 - ii) **The local authority is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings.**

CARRIED
