

APPENDIX 1G - Proposed extension to Rural B Zone – Westmere

Submitter Name: Basil and Barbara McCullough (140 Francis Road)

Submission No: 13

Summary: We support the Proposed Rural B Zone in Westmere.

Decision Sought: No Change requested.

Submitter Name: John and Caroline Mackay

Submission No: 55

Summary: Submitter supports the Rural B zone change to allow 0.5 hectare lots.

Decision Sought: Resource Consents that the Council claims are current are reviewed immediately with a stated time frame. The proposal will have an adverse effect on current conditions.

Submitter Name: Robert Duncan Boyd (16 Cotswolds Close, Otamatea)

Submission No: 65

Summary: Submitter supports the extension of the Rural B zone. The submitter requests that the minimum lot size of 5000m² is gross and inclusive of any/all access ways to ensure maximum benefit of the proposed Plan change.

Decision Sought: That the 5000m² be gross and inclusive of any/all access ways.

Council Decision:

Submissions 55 by John and Caroline Mackay and 13 by Basil and Barbara McCullough and 65 by Robert Duncan Boyd be **Accepted in Part**.

No changes are made as a result of these Submissions.

Council Reason for Decision:

1. The Committee notes and appreciates the support of Submitters 13, 55 and 65 for the Rural B Zone extension in the Westmere area.
2. The Rural B Zone provisions to which Submitter 55 refers, were reviewed as part of Phase 2 of the rolling District Plan review. These provisions are outside the scope of this present Plan change and cannot be amended.
3. In response to Submission 65, having a minimum lot size of 5000m² gross area and inclusive of any/all access ways has the potential to reduce area available for effluent disposal. The balance area would be less than the minimum required by the Horizons Regional Council's One Plan to accommodate on-site waste water disposal. This request has the potential to make the District Plan inconsistent with the One Plan which would be unlawful. The extension to the Rural B Zone is proposed to be amended as a response to other submissions.

The decision sought would have implications on Rule 11.5.4 and the definitions chapter and goes beyond the scope of this Plan change.

Submitter Name: Valda and Murray Lilburn (101 Tayforth Rd)

Submission No: 1

Summary: Submitter is opposed to the decrease in minimum lot size from 1 hectare to 5000m². The submitter is concerned about being built out. The proposal is not supported. Roding, water noise, neighbours and rates are also a concern.

Decision Sought: Just leave it as it is.

Submitter Name: David Ian Higgins

Submission No: 44

Summary:

- Submitter is opposed to the Rural B zoning surrounding 107 Rapanui Road and the Higgins Poultry Farm. The Higgins Poultry Farm has been an established farming operation since 1951 with following throughout the North Island and are looking to expand into the South Island.
- The submitter expresses concern regarding the ability of surrounding properties to subdivide down to half a hectare and stresses this decision should not be taken lightly. Many of the blocks in the area are 2 hectares why let them subdivide lower?
- The submitter highlights that there are many rural industries in and bordering the proposed Rural B area. These industries bring so much into the District and need to be protected.

Decision Sought:

1. Retain the 1 hectare minimum lots size for the Proposed Rural B area in Westmere.
2. Failing this, retain the 1 hectare minimum lot size for the area from and including Rapanui Road to Francis Road down to Tayforth Road up to Taylor Road and a line through Erin Road.

Submitter Name: Kelly Anderson and Steven Darby (81 Francis Rd)

Submission No: 33

Summary:

- Submitter is opposed to the Westmere Rural B rezoning and wishes for it to remain 1 hectare minimum subdivision. No rural land should be subdivided below 1 hectare. This land was purchased, 2 and a half years ago, with the notion that neighbours would not be able to subdivide and build next door.
- The submitter states that one of the reasons that this area is to be rezoned is due to the lower unproductive quality of land. There are four successful and locally owned/operated rural industry businesses in the area. So how is this unproductive?
- When was the land testing done and why were residents not told about it? If these results are a direct link to the rezoning then everyone should have been made aware of the testing and results.

- Rapanui Road is one of the most dangerous roads in Wanganui, why add more traffic to this area with more subdivision? If land drainage is a problem due to dwellings why add to this pressure with more subdivision?
- 5000m² blocks are not enough to efficiently graze stock, this will lead to an increase in animal welfare issues, especially in this drought prone area.
- If the land becomes subdivide-able no doubt the land value will increase, resulting in an increase in rates over time.
- There are currently many lifestyle blocks that are struggling to sell, we don't need more.
- The submitter loves where they live, don't want to see it change and urge that the 1 hectare minimum remain as less than this will result in the around not being rural anymore.

Decision Sought: That Rural B zone is not extended and 1 Hectare minimum remains.

Submitter Name: Malvin Walton Booth (145 Francis Rd)

Submission No: 42

Summary: Submitter opposes the extension to the Rural B zone. Smaller lots will put more pressure on roads, reduce privacy, and increase unproductive use of land.

Decision Sought: To implement a 10 hectare minimum lot size.

Submitter Name: Michael James Russell (163A Great North Rd)

Submission No: 63.1

Summary: Submitter is opposed to the proposed Rural B zone extension. There has been little if any provision of infrastructure by Council to extend the Rural B zone which includes intensified residential development. The Council needs to have a long term vision which is agreed with and communicated to the community. Once this is agreed, zoning requirements can be assessed on the basis of the vision.

Decision Sought: Status quo should remain for Rural B until accurate Class 1 and Class 2 land has been mapped and a vision in place.

Submitter Name: Noel Edward Lindsay (143 Francis Rd)

Submission No: 28

Summary: Submitter opposes the extension to the Rural B zone. The proposed 5000m² is too small to be used practically as grazing of cattle or horse etc. Smaller lots will allow capital investment for the balance lot.

Decision Sought: Allow one-off subdivision of a more flexible size.

Council Decision:

Submissions 1 from Valda and Murray Lilburn is **Rejected** and Submissions 28 by Noel Edward Lindsay, 33 by Kelly Anderson and Steven Darby, 42 by Malvin Walton Booth, 63.1 by Mitchael James Russell and 44 by David Ian Higgins be **Accepted in Part**.


Make the following changes to the Plan as a result of these Submissions:

Amend District Planning maps Rural 18, Urban 3 and Urban 7 as indicated on the map below:

Council Reason for Decision:

1. Plan Change 36 changes the zone which applies to a number of properties and this results in different subdivision and development rules applying. Submitters are generally concerned that the change of zone enables smaller sites to be created and this will impinge on their sense of space and create adverse effects such as noise, traffic and reduced privacy. However it is noted that the proposed areas are already relatively developed with a number of sections subdivided to the minimum existing limit of one hectare. The areas identified are potentially attractive locations for development given proximity to the urban area and suitability given their relatively less versatile soils.
2. Zoning of these sites and surrounding area to Rural B is part of a combined set of methods designed to safeguard the District's most versatile soils from rural lifestyle and small holding fragmentation. However the Committee determined that the area bounded by Erin, Rapanui, Francis, Tayforth and Day roads are considered to be more appropriately retained as Rural C given the potential for reverse sensitivity and the greater distance from the urban area relative to other proposed Rural B zoned areas.
3. Regarding the concerns that 5000m² is insufficient land to effectively graze stock. The limit is only a minimum lot size; there is still the ability for large land parcels to be retained to provide adequate grazing area for stock. It is noted that the submitter supports the provision for a one-off smaller lot to be created.
4. Within the rural environment all stormwater and wastewater must be adequately dealt with onsite. This can be achieved with the proposed 5000m² minimum lot size, as provided for in the Horizons One Plan.
5. In response to Submission 44; it is accepted that one or more existing primary industry activities have the potential to be adversely affected by the extension to the Rural B Zone. An increase in lifestyle blocks has the potential to create reverse sensitivity issues. Primary industries such as Higgins Poultry Farm are important to Wanganui and its economy. There needs to be protection for these activities to ensure they can continue to operate within our rural environment.
6. In response to Submission 33; although this area was proposed as Rural B, that does not mean it is considered unproductive land. The purpose of the Rural B Zone extension is to ensure adequate lifestyle development options are provided for, on the fringes of the urban area and on the relatively less versatile soils, in order to safeguard the most versatile soils.

7. The Land Class Classification information is from Landcare New Zealand and is long established and recognised as the start point for establishing relative quality of land.
8. Potential increase in traffic along Rapanui Road had not been identified as an issue sufficient to negate more dense development. However it is acknowledged that this is a busy road and consideration is relevant.
9. In response to Submission 28; a one-off flexible subdivision size would still need to be at least 5000m² site area, as anything less would be inconsistent with the requirements of the Horizon's One Plan and therefore unlawful.



Changes to Maps - Rural 18, Urban 3 and Urban 7

