

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

1.2 Holliss Avenue



Mr Wilson, a resident of Holliss Avenue, addressed the Board regarding various concerns relating to future subdivision of Holliss Avenue; in particular, his application for a subdivision consent.

Karilyn Shutt, Council Solicitor, provided clarification regarding the terms of the covenant registered against titles 1 – 13 Holliss Avenue. Ms Shutt advised that the Council (in its RMA regulatory capacity) could not have regard to the terms of the covenant when deciding whether to grant or decline Mr Wilson's application for a subdivision consent. The subdivision consent was therefore issued. The covenant is a side issue in terms of the subdivision consent, and affects the Council as landowner only. The Council's land (Lot 14) is presently fee simple land (not legal road). Residents have the benefit of an easement which allows them right of way access over Lot 14.

Mr Peter Rumens, resident of 114 Holliss Avenue, advised Board members he is not opposed to the road, but believes the Council is not dealing with this sufficiently in terms of fairness and equity. The proposed option is not affordable to some residents. Mr Rumens considered it acceptable for people to subdivide their properties, but felt that those residents wishing to do so, should bear the cost of the road – not those residents not wishing or unable (from a practical perspective) to subdivide. It would be preferable for the present road to be upgraded.

Mr Tony Hughes-Johnson, QC, addressed the Board on behalf of Yullundri Pastoral and Land Development Co Ltd, a neighbouring landowner to Holliss Avenue. The company would, in fact, expect to pay its reasonable share of costs in order to gain access to its adjoining property. Mr Hughes-Johnson believed that the officers who had investigated this matter had recommended the best choice in terms of striking a rate and upgrading the road to make it a public road. The company owns a large section of land zoned urban purposes adjacent to Holliss Avenue, that cannot currently be accessed. The road would possibly solve the problem of access to its property if the road were made a public road. The company would be prepared to pay towards the cost of the road if it could gain access from its land to Holliss Avenue.