

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
1	Valda and Murry Lilburn	101 Tayforth Road Wanganui	The submitter is opposed to the proposed extension to the Rural B zone.  The submitter is concerned about being built out. The proposal is not supported. Rooding, water noise, neighbours and rates are also a concern.	1. Leave the zoning as is, Rural C.
2	Mark Stratford	51 Helmore Street Wanganui East Wanganui	Submitter wishes to rezone property at 12 Lenihen Street from Reserves and Open Space zoning to Rural C to keep in line with the surrounding zoning.	1. Change zone of 12 Lenihen Street from Reserves and Open Space to Rural C.
3	Peter Roy Warnock	PO Box 908 Whanganui 4540	I support the proposal for minimum of 10 hectare lot size. Class 1 and Class 2 land should not be subdivided below 10 hectares.	1. I ask Wanganui District Council to make the 10 hectare minimum lot size change
4	John Smart	1324 Brunswick Road RD 1 Wanganui 4751	Submitter supports the minimum lot size of subdivision of 10 hectares for the Rural A zone. The Proposed Plan is not clear about what is the effective date for these changes are. The submitter is concerned that subdivision will occur before the Proposed Plan is approved.	1. clause 3.4.1(h) be extended to say "being 1 May 2014" at the end. 2. that clause 3.4.2(c)(ii) be extended with the following words "any subdivision requested after this date will not be permitted to have a dwelling" 3) 11.5.4 be effected from 1 May 2014.
5	Allan Royce Anderson	1008 Brunswick Road RD 1 Wanganui 4571	Submitter supports Plan Change 36. Subdivision of Class A land should be retained for agriculture, close subdivisions of non-serviced units render waste disposal unsustainable; already regular heavy transport user field complaint from lifestyles.	No change
6	Christine Ann Jones (Anne)	626 Waikupa Road Okoia RD 12 Wanganui	Submitter opposes the 10 metre from boundary rule for all new structures. The use of the building needs to be taken into account as different activities can cause greater effects (such as odour, dust, noise and storm water run off) than others and need to be located further from the boundary, especially if a dwelling is close by.  Asking the question what is the building used for, where is the nearest dwelling and is anyone going to be affected by the construction will save time, money and stress as the current process is flawed.	1. More detail about the use of the building be required, depending on the use and potential effects the structure may need to be located further from the boundary.  2. Consultation needs to take place with effected parties.  3. Include these two questions as mandatory when assessing the location of a structure. 1) Where is the nearest dwelling? 2) Is anyone going to be affected by this new construction?
7	Garland William Saunders	432 Maxwell Station Road RD 4 Wanganui 4574	Submitter supports the purposed allotment subdivision of small sections, off present land titles, as a one off event between 2500m <sup>2</sup> and 5000m <sup>2</sup> that would not apply to future subdivision. Submitter support the 10 hectare minimum lot size. I would like to see entry costs for allotments set at a standard low cost to encourage up take of these rather than the 10 hectare blocks.	1. That entry costs for allotments set at a standard low cost.
8	Noel Cooper	Cooper Coolpac Ltd 24 Riverbank Road Wanganui	Submitter's land was purchased for it's subdivision potential as well as its productive orchard capability.  The price paid for the land was higher as to reflected the potential to subdivide into lifestyle blocks near town. The property is surrounded by lifestyle development. Rural B would be a more appropriate zoning for this area. The ability to subdivide is important in an event of a PSA virus breakout, subdivision would be the fall back option. Best practice noise control methods are in place and have minimal effect on neighbours. Submitter supports the protection of Class 1 soils however there is plenty of Class 2 land.	1. Zone our property at 135 Papaiti Road as Rural B with a minimum subdivision of 5000m <sup>2</sup> .  2. Do not zone 135 Papaiti Road as Rural A with a 10 Hectare minimum subdivision.  3. Alternatively retain the Rural zoning with a 1 hectare minimum lot zone.

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
9	Anthony John Harrison	Riverland 32 Riverbank Road RD3 Wanganui 4573	<p>Plan Change 36 needs to look at opening up areas that are already subdivided into small sections that would be more appropriate as Rural B.</p> <p>The area of 32 - 58 Riverbank Road is currently zoned Rural, however Rural B would be a more appropriate zoning as it is already in small holdings and are unlikely to be used for commercial rural purposes in the future.</p> <p>1 - 39 Riverbank Road is currently zoned as Rural B. This zoning should continue through to 140 Riverbank Road.</p>	<p>1. For 1 to 140 Riverbank Road to be zoned as Rural B with a minimum 5000m<sup>2</sup> lot size.</p> <p>2. For 32 to 58 Riverbank Road to be changed from the Rural Zone with 1 hectare minimum lot size to Rural B Zone with 5000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size.</p>
10	Barbara Gray and John Gray	187 Papaiti Road RD 14 Wanganui 4585	<p>Submitter opposes the proposed Rural A zoning of 187 Papaiti Road. It will devalue the property.</p> <p>Council says lots less than 10 hectares would not be economically viable.</p> <p>The future of farming is on smaller land holdings, intensive but environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>The Submitter understands what Council is trying to achieve and would not like to see the area cluttered with big houses.</p> <p>Only allowing a farm to subdivide off a small 0.5 hectare lot is not wise as lots between 2 and 5 hectares are more viable.</p> <p>Each piece of land should be assessed on its own merits. One further subdivision on their property would not have a major effect on what the Council is trying to achieve.</p> <p>Submitter states that most lots from Flemington Road to Waireka Road are already below 10 hectares, some as small as 0.6 Hectares.</p> <p>Papaiti soils was not considered to be ideal as far as land quality was concerned, it has a very thin layer of top soil and then it is pumice having little if any nutritional value. Plants grown on pumice are susceptible to blowing over in strong winds.</p>	<p>1. That 187 Papaiti Road is not zoned Rural A or</p> <p>2. Lots be 2 - 5 hectares depending on location.</p> <p>3. Failing this to be compensated for the loss or</p> <p>4. Allow one further subdivision per property.</p>
	Barbara Gray and John Gray continued		<p>187 Papaiti Road is 11 Hectares, approx. 4.69 hectares is very steep hillside and swampy at the base.</p> <p>The submitter questions is they will be compensated as they stand to be \$180,00 worse off for our retirement. Will the rates decrease? Why label land below 10 as Rural aA? Will Council take into account that those on existing small sections will probably not submit? and those of us who are affected may be in the minority?</p> <p>The submitter states with innovation and imagination there are endless possibilities for creating potential on a small block. Restrictions such as council proposes are limiting and will not achieve in the long run.</p>	

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address1</b>	<b>Submission Summary</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>
11	Powerco Limited	Burton Planning Consultants Limited Level 1, 2-8 Northcroft Street PO Box 33-817 Takapuna Auckland 07401	Submitter supports 3.4.1 Rural A Permitted Activities and 3.8.1 Rural C Permitted Activities with a minor amendment. These advice notes are important to alert users to requirements under the NZECP 34:2001. This advice note should also be included in the Rural Settlement Zone.  Submitter supports 3.11.8.f, 3.5.6.f and 3.9.6.f. Identification and Health and safety are important to warn people of the risks associated with the corresponding infrastructure.	1. To amend the advice note in 3.4.1 and 3.8.1 to state New Zealand Code of Practice 34:2001.  2. To include the amended advice note in 3.10.1.  3. To retain 3.11.8.f, 3.5.6.f and 3.9.6.f without modification.  4. Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission as a result of the matters raised.
12	Sue Huijs	126 No. 2 Line RD 2 Wanganui	The submitter supports the new changes. It is very important to protect rural, fertile soils for the future.	No Change requested
13	Basil and Barbara McCullough	140 Francis Road RD 4 Wanganui	We support the Proposed Rural B Zone in Westmere.	No Change requested
14	Leighton Sevress	189 Mosston Road Wanganui	Submitter opposes 189 Mosston road to be zoned Rural C as it is located next to the Residential Zone.	1. For 189 Mosston Road to be changed to Rural B
15	Leighton Minnell	26 Newton Street Fitroy New Plymouth	Submitter opposes 10 Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C as it is located next to the Residential Zone	1. For 10 Clarkson Ave to be changed to Rural B
16	Lance Attrill	12 Clarkson Ave Wanganui	Submitter opposes 12 Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C as it is located close to the Springvale Indicative Plan Proposal.	1. For 12 Clarkson Ave to be changed to Rural B
17	Lauren Toy	10a Clarkson Ave Wanganui 4501	Submitter opposes 10a Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C as it is located next to the Residential Zone	1. For 10a Clarkson Ave to be changed to Rural B
18		8 Clarkson Ave Whanganui	Submitter opposes 5 Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C.	1. For 5 Clarkson Ave to be Zoned Rural B
19	Alan Davison	270 Rapanui Road Wanganui	Submitter Supports Rural A Zone changes 3.3.5 - 3.3.8 To protect the best soils and rural activities are not affected by lifestyle properties.	No change requested.
20	Margaret and Alan Cooper	757 Rapanui Road RD 4 Wanganui	Submitter generally supports the protection of Class 1 and 2 land for future productive use.	1. Preservation of Class 1 and 2 soils.  2. If house are permitted to be cut off, balance area should be amalgamated to neighbouring properties.
21	Paul and Trish Webster	165 Mosston Road Wanganui	Submitter opposes 12 Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C as it is located close to the Springvale Indicative Plan Proposal.	For 12 Clarkson Ave to be changed to Rural B
22	Tony and Carrie Eades	654 Great North Road Kai Iwi Wanganui	Submitter opposes the changes as they may wish to subdivide in the future.	Do not change the zone of 654 Great North Road.
23	Derek Alexander Priest	1091 No. 2 Line RD 2 Wanganui	Submitter seeks land already below 10 hectares to be subdividable. Land was purchased to subdivide.	For land below 10 hectares to continue to be able to be subdivided.
24	Donald George Kilpatrick	372 Blueskin Road RD 1 Wanganui	Submitter oppose the 10 hectare minimum lot size for properties under 20 hectares.  Submitter opposes 1 dwelling pre 10 hectare site area.	1. For a 4 hectare minimum lot size to be adopted.  2. For 1 dwelling per 4 hectares, exemptions be made for family circumstances.

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
25	Wayne Baxter	24 Dickens Lane RD 1 Wanganui	<p>Submitter oppose provisions around allotment sizes for the Rural A zone. The submitter states the Case Study is inaccurate, there is a lack of economic analysis and a this is an attempt to control urban sprawl. The 2013 Case study contains confused and inconsistent data, it is of concern that the Plan Change has been given life on this basis. The statement referring to the loss of 12% of productive land, whilst we are lead to believe that this is not a driver, must have must have been used to promote the case.</p> <p>High density areas such as Mannington Road, Pickwick Road, Dickens lane and Kai Iwi are not shaded as per the legend. Has the correct base data been use to measure the growth?</p> <p>Despite the study being a reference for decision making it provides a 'waiver' with the statement "that the information in this report is an indicator only of the numbers and extent of small holdings in Westmere". This statement itself diminishes the reports value.</p> <p>Economic effects have been glossed over. Comments such as "protecting soil capacity and versatility will have economic benefit to wider Wanganui community". There is no objective analysis to measure the amount of economic return or employment brought the region.</p> <p>Commercial farming entities traditionally have a nett average return of less than 5% on capital. The reality is that it is difficult for those enterprises to finance purchase of neighbouring blocks that may be for sale when in close proximity to the city.</p>	<p>The submitter wishes to see one of the following amendment/options made;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain the Status Quo</li> <li>2. Move the Rural A Zone further out from the City boundary towards Kai Iwi thus retaining the transition from town to country whilst preserving the value of higher valued rural properties.</li> <li>3. Allow a 5 year lead in to these changes thus giving property owners time to take action to minimize their wealth loss.</li> </ol>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Sales of land less than 10 hectares can be one option for the small farmer to stay afloat, given higher values of land close to the city. Under this proposal farming platform will be further depleted by commercial farmers having to sell off 10 hectares minimum, further hindering their longterm commercial stability.</p> <p>It is likely that this will result in some rate relief to the affected land owners. Presumably WDC require the same total agricultural rates take, so will other landowners pay more to cover this? has this been spelt out to the rest of the farming community?</p> <p>Presumably Quotable Value have valued our 10 hectare lot as land with subdivision potentia given it has a current value of \$95,000/hal. If therefore this Proposed Plan Change went ahead our land value would recede to if suspect \$500,000 less than it is now. Other will also be in this position and may be left with little equity.</p> <p>The Westmere portion of the Rural A zone has been rightly pointed out as long being an area of choice for many ratepayers despite the availability of cheaper land. Has there been an evaluation of homeowners' investment in building the same value home in a less desirable semi rural area? This is a possible indirect economic consequence for the local struggling building industry.</p> <p>There is comment that agriculture is the backbone of the Wanganui region. It possible is, however the agricultural economic wealth is spread widely in the Wanganui hinterland and is not dependant on a very small parcel of Westmere Rural A land.</p>	
			<p>Obviously Class 1 and Class 2 soils have always been available for higher valued farming but there has been minimal uptake and certainly no evidence of long-term success.</p> <p>The benefits for the region from this Plan Change are not clearly spelt out.</p> <p>Submitter sates that other cities have a lifestyle buffer around the city which become residential as the city grows. This proposal is contrary to this pushing intended purchases in either, area further from the city, least preferred localities or larger than preferred holdings for many lifestylers.</p> <p>The submitter believes small parcels can co-exist in the rural zones with some clear Council conditions that protect the rural amenity values. That may require some innovative planning.</p>	

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
26	Horizons Regional Council	Horizons Regional Council Private Bag 11025 Palmerston North	<p>Submitter supports Issue 3.1, Objectives 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5 and Policies 3.3.1, 3.3.4, 3.3.6, 3.3.7 and 3.3.8.</p> <p>Submitter supports Rule 3.4.1 but notes users need to be aware of Horizons Regional Council requirements relating to domestic waste water.</p> <p>Submitters supports Rule 3.4.2 but notes that creation of lots between 2500m2 and 5000m2 may result in domestic wastewater issue if a dwelling is proposed.</p> <p>Submitter supports Rule 3.4.3 and 3.4.4.</p> <p>Submitter supports 3.8.1 with an inclusion of an guidance note.</p>	<p>1. For the intent of Issue 3.1, Objectives 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5 and Policies 3.3.1, 3.3.4, 3.3.6, 3.3.7 and 3.3.8 be retained, any amendments be restricted to those to improve clarity.</p> <p>2. That the intent of 3.4.1 is retained, any amendments be restricted to those that improve clarity, and a guidance note be added advising users of the domestic wastewater requirements under the Proposed One Plan Rule 13-11.</p> <p>3. That 3.4.2(c) be amended to provide a 5000m2 minimum lot size and a guidance note be added advising users of the domestic wastewater requirements under the Proposed One Plan Rule 13-11.</p> <p>4. That Rule 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 be retained, any amendments be restricted to those to improve clarity.</p> <p>5. That 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 be retained, any amendments be restricted to those to improve clarity.</p>
	Horizons Regional Council Continued			<p>6. That a guidance note be to 3.8.1 be added advising users of the domestic wastewater requirements under the Proposed One Plan Rule 13-11.</p> <p>7. Any alternative or consequential amendments or relief that may be necessary or appropriate to give effect to the decision sought.</p>
27	Rural Community Board	28 Blueskin Road R D 1 Wanganui	<p>The submitter supports the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Plan Change. The Board is pleased with the level of consultation provided over Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zone. Public interest from the rural community has been high with the number of approaches to the Board members.</p> <p>The Board strongly supports the management and preservation of Class 1 and Class 2 soil resource and the keeping of it for productive purposes. The Board notes managing soil resource in this manner is consistent with the Principles of the Rural Enterprise Project which promotes the intensification of high-value food production using Wanganui's best soils and climate regime.</p> <p>The objective is to significantly lift Wanganui's income from exports to the world's emerging and discerning markets. This food will carry the selling point off having been grown in a soil based (natural) clean environment. The value is not only confined to exportable product and thus imported dollars, but will manifest itself in employment in food processing, transport, buildings, and management services.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is an issue and is exacerbated with an increase in lifestylers.</p>	<p>1. That Council implement Policies that support reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>2. That Council consider building the issues of damage to rural roads from increased forest activity into the District Plan.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The Board asks that Council work in a positive and supportive way with specific farms within the rural sector when issues of reverse sensitivity is raised, specifically around intensive agricultural production.</p> <p>The Board acknowledges the efforts already made to mitigate reverse sensitivity though the creation of the Rural A Zone.</p> <p>Damage to rural roads as a result of increased forestry activity can be mitigated in the future through a number of methods, including local, regional and nation arrangements.</p>	
28	Noel Edward Lindsay	Cherrywood 143 Francis Road RD 4 Westmere Wanganui	<p>Submitter opposes the extension to the Rural B zone. 5000m2 is too small for to be used practically as grazing of cattle or horse etc.</p> <p>Smaller lots will allow capital investment for the balance lot.</p>	1. Allow one off subdivision of a more flexible size.
29	Malcolm Anthony Young	252 Roberts Avenue RD 14 Wanganui	<p>Submitter wishes for the properties outlined within the submission be zoned as Rural B.</p> <p>This area is currently being considered for subdivision. This property would benefit from a 5000m2 minimum lot size.</p>	1. For the properties outlined in the submission be rezoned as Rural B
30	M J and J B Francis	9 Marybank Road Wanganui	<p>Submitter seeks 3 Marybank Road to be zoned as Rural Settlement to be consistent with neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Submitter states that sewerage is currently available at the property boundary gate.</p>	1. For 3 Marybank Road to be zoned Rural Settlement.
31	Louise Anne Allsopp	22 Matarawa Hill Road RD 2 Wanganui 4572	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed change as it will prevent future subdivision, building options will be limited and reduce income from rates. This will effect surveyors, builders, contractors etc. Are we wanting to encourage or stifle progress.</p> <p>A 10 hectare lot is far too great for most people wanting a rural lifestyle but is too small to productively farm in most cases. 10 hectares would not produce enough to keep it viable, but cannot easily be maintained by a working family wanting a rural lifestyle.</p> <p>Owners of previously subdividable land would see their land value decrease as it would only be able to be used as farm land.</p> <p>If the quality land is already broken into lifestyle blocks as is the case in our area, it has already been lost to productive farming and applying a 10 hectare subdivision to it will not bring it back.</p> <p>Farm animals are one of the highest contributors to atmospheric carbon dioxide after motor cars. In most circumstances, lifestyle farmers contribute more positively to the environment by planting trees and shrubs and do more to protect waterways than large scale farmers have in the past.</p>	<p>1. That existing lifestyle blocks below 10 hectares be able to subdivide further, or</p> <p>One off subdivision for all properties.</p> <p>2. That 22 Matarawa Hill Road be zoned Rural C, or</p> <p>That 22 Matarawa Hill Road be able to be split into two titles along the line of the zone change boundary.</p> <p>3. That compensation be made to landowners in Rural A.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
	Louise Anne Allsopp Continued		<p>The submitter feels the timeframes for both the submission process and the proposed changes are too short.</p> <p>The quality of 22 Matarawa Hill Road is poor and already a lifestyle block rather than a productive farm block. The property falls on two soils types and is on the boundary between areas that can be subdivided with a minimum of 1 hectare and a minimum of 10 hectares. Therefore the property should be Rural C or be allowed to split the title up into two along the boundary. We have the potential of a large mortgage on a piece of land that will be worth less than what we paid for it.</p> <p>The submitter argues that it does not make sense to allow a large farm to be broken up into non-productive 10 hectare blocks but not allow already non-productive lifestyle blocks under 10 hectares to be broken up further.</p> <p>The submitter contacted the Council twice and was told on both occasions that this property was not in the new zone. She was told that subdivision would need to be done before the 1st of May. The day after a phone call was received stating that twice a mistake had been made and the property was included in the new zone. This land was purchased based on valuation that said it could be subdivided. If this could not happen the value is reduced by about 100k, this was mentioned to a Council Officer and they agreed.</p>	
	Louise Anne Allsopp Continued		<p>The following day the submitter contacted Council to arrange a meeting and was told that essentially that there was no point discussing the matter as 'it was happening regardless'. What democratic process is being followed if this is to occur despite any submission to the contrary.</p> <p>It is said that is it much easier to get what you want in the plan before it goes to submissions yet we did not receive an official notification prior to the submission starting, so how were we supposed to influence the plan?</p>	



**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
32	Robert Brian Gardner	22 Matarawa Hill Road RD 2 Wanganui 4572	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed change as it will prevent future subdivision, building options will be limited and reduce income from rates. This will effect surveyors, builders, contractors etc. Are we wanting to encourage or stifle progress.</p> <p>A 10 hectare lot is far too great for most people wanting a rural lifestyle but is too small to productively farm in most cases. 10 hectares would not produce enough to keep it viable, but cannot easily be maintained by a working family wanting a rural lifestyle.</p> <p>Owners of previously subdividable land would see their land value decrease as it would only be able to be used as farm land.</p> <p>If the quality land is already broken into lifestyle blocks as is the case in our area, it has already been lost to productive farming and applying a 10 hectare subdivision to it will not bring it back.</p> <p>Farm animals are one of the highest contributors to atmospheric carbon dioxide after motor cars. In most circumstances, lifestylers contribute more positively to the environment by planting trees and shrubs and do more to protect waterways than large scale farmers have in the past.</p>	<p>1. That existing lifestyle blocks below 10 hectares be able to subdivide further, or</p> <p>One off subdivision for all properties.</p> <p>2. That 22 Matarawa Hill Road be zoned Rural C, or</p> <p>That 22 Matarawa Hill Road be able to be split into two titles along the line of the zone change boundary.</p> <p>3. That compensation be made to landowners in Rural A.</p>
			<p>The submitter feels the timeframes for both the submission process and the proposed changes are too short.</p> <p>The quality of 22 Matarawa Hill Road is poor and already a lifestyle block rather than a productive farm block. The property falls on two soils types and is on the boundary between areas that can be subdivided with a minimum of 1 hectare and a minimum of 10 hectares. Therefore the property should be Rural C or be allowed to split the title up into two along the boundary. We have the potential of a large mortgage on a piece of land that will be worth less than what we paid for it.</p> <p>The submitter argues that it does not make sense to allow a large farm to be broken up into non-productive 10 hectare blocks but not allow already non-productive lifestyle blocks under 10 hectares to be broken up further.</p> <p>The submitter contacted the Council twice and was told on both occasions that this property was not in the new zone. She was told that subdivision would need to be done before the 1st of May. The day after a phone call was received stating that twice a mistake had been made and the property was included in the new zone. This land was purchased based on valuation that said it could be subdivided. If this could not happen the value is reduced by about 100k, this was mentioned to a Council Officer and they agreed.</p>	

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The following day the submitter contacted Council to arrange a meeting and was told that essentially that there was no point discussing the matter as 'it was happening regardless'. What democratic process is being followed if this is to occur despite any submission to the contrary.</p> <p>It is said that is it much easier to get what you want in the plan before it goes to submissions yet we did not receive an official notification prior to the submission starting, so how were we supposed to influence the plan?</p>	
33	Kelly Anderson and Steven Darby	81 Francis Road RD 4 Wanganui	<p>The submitter is opposed to the Westmere Rural B rezoning and wish for it to remain 1 hectare minimum subdivision. No rural land should be subdivided below 1 hectare.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The submitter states that one of the reasons that this area is to be rezoned is due to the lower quality of land being unproductive. There are 4 successful and locally owned/operated in the area. So how is this unproductive?</p> <p>When were 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.</p> <p>Rapanui Road is deemed as one of the most dangerous roads in Wanganui, why add more traffic to this area with more subdivision?</p> <p>If land drainage is a problem due to dwellings why add to this pressure with more subdivision?</p>	1. That the Rural B zone is not extended and the 1 Hectare minimum remains.
	Kelly Anderson and Steven Darby Continued		<p>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.</p> <p>If the land becomes subdividable no doubt the land value will increase, resulting in an increase in rates in due time.</p> <p>There are currently many lifestyle blocks that are struggling to sell, we don't need more.</p> <p>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.</p>	
34	Samuel James Euan Hodges	816 Rapanui Road Wanganui 4574	<p>Submitter seeks Lot 3 DP 376999 to retain the 1 hectare minimum lot size provision.</p> <p>There is already reverse sensitivity issues occurring making it difficult to carry out normal farming operations.</p>	1. For Lot 3 DP 376999 to be zoned Rural C.

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
35	Stewart Donald Thomas	173 Mosston Road PO Box 4090 Wanganui	Submitter seeks Rural B to extend adjacent to Mosston Road. Many of these lots are small now.	1. For a Rural B Zoning to apply to properties adjacent to Mosston Road.
36	David Lewis Harrison	Mission Road RD 4	<p>Submitter opposes the Rural A zone and questions the understanding between Land Use Classification (LUC) and soil type. The LUC rates land units from 1 to 8 and each unit has its own soil type which may or may not have productive capacity. Each unit also has limitations, these may be Soil, Erosion, Climate and Wetness.</p> <p>Subdivision will not change the nature of the soils they will still be productive now and in the future. It may be that placing these soils into smaller titles they are used for more productive purposes such as orchards and vegetable production.</p> <p>Land value to the community should be assessed by its economic activity.</p> <p>Submitter states subdivision will not change the nature of the soils as they will still be productive.</p> <p>Submitter states the Rural B zone is contrary to the aim of Plan Change 36 as this area is sand based and with irrigation can be highly productive.</p> <p>Wanganui need economic growth the submitter states that this will reduce this.</p>	1. To retain the Status Quo for all the proposed zone changes.
37	Rhanda Lynette Campbell	368 Blueskin Road RD 1 Wanganui	<p>Submitter opposes the Rural A zone and a restriction of 1 dwelling per allotment.</p> <p>Submitter states that this is unfair and land owners will lose their current rights.</p>	<p>1. Two dwellings per 1 hectare or larger be permitted.</p> <p>2. Existing lots less than 20 hectares be permitted to subdivide to 1 hectare.</p> <p>3. Failing the above, existing landowners should be exempt from the restrictions until the property is sold.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
38	Raymond Andrew Jarden	C/- Wanganui Chronicle Cnr Guyton and St Hill Streets Wanganui	<p>The submitter opposes the introduction of the Rural A zone and the 10 hectare minimum lot size provision.</p> <p>The submitter owns a 40 hectare deer farm at 163a Papaiti Road. The submitter states that the plan change is wrong as it asserts that lifestyle blocks take land out of productive use as rural lifestyle blocks are in the main very productive.</p> <p>Many small blocks are self sufficient in meat, vegetables, fruit etc, just because it is not sold it still represents significant local production.</p> <p>Preventing these small lifestyle blocks will handbrake local economic development by reducing business for all tradesmen. Why would we want to prevent people from relocating to Wanganui and building/purchasing lifestyle blocks in the future?</p> <p>Why would Wanganui District Council want to take away future flexibility for property owners if their circumstances change.</p> <p>The submitter believes future lifestyle development will not affect the deer business. Infrastructure has already been invested to provide for future subdivision options on the property.</p>	<p>1. Retain the 1 hectare minimum lot size for 163a Papaiti Road.</p> <p>2. That minimum lot size remain 1 hectare.</p>
	Raymond Andrew Jarden Continued		<p>The value of properties will fall overnight, will Wanganui District Council compensate property owners for the reduced values?</p> <p>Options for future urban subdivision are limited within the city boundary, if we want to see Wanganui grow in the future it is necessary to provide lifestyle blocks close to the city boundary.</p>	
39	Keith Marshall Hey	368 Blueskin Road RD 1 Wanganui	<p>Submitter opposes the 10 hectare minimum lot size for properties that are less than 10 hectares and one dwelling per allotment.</p>	<p>1. All existing properties that are 20 hectares or larger should be restricted to 10 hectare minimum lot size.</p> <p>2. All existing properties that are less than 20 hectares be permitted to subdivided down to 1 hectare.</p>
40	Lindsay and Lynette Sim	22a Symes Road RD 4 Wanganui	<p>Submitter seeks their property to be zoned as Rural C as the soil is inferior to other prime land in the area.</p>	<p>1. For 22a Symes Road to be Zoned Rural C.</p>
41	Kathryn Frances Kirkwood	Kanuka 281 Koatanui Road Whanganui 4571	<p>Submitter opposes 281 Koatauni Road to be zoned as Rural A. The property is not Class 1 or 2 land, is sandy, deep and steep gullies and is land locked.</p>	<p>1. Change the boundary or the Rural A zone to exclude 281 Koatanui Road.</p>
42	Malvin Walton Booth	145 Francis Road Westmere Wanganui	<p>Submitter opposes the extension to the Rural B zone.</p> <p>Smaller lots will put more pressure on roads, reduce privacy, and increase unproductive use of land.</p>	<p>1. To implement a 10 hectare minimum lot size.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
43	Malcolm John Palmer	546 No. 2 Line RD 2 Wanganui	<p>Submitter states fragmentation of classes of land on property applied a blanket classification over total area. Which doesn't adequately represent the individual property and unfairly misrepresents the ability to subdivide even if wanted too.</p> <p>Submitter strongly objects that 546 No 2 Line be included in the Rural A zone. This property has hills and soil types on the property are predominantly clay and wet during the winter.</p> <p>There are Class 1 and Class 2 soil on the property however they are fragmented and do not constitute an area suitable for subdivision.</p> <p>The submitter states Wanganui is suffering from economic doldrum and this proposal will be another set back for developers, builders and service trades.</p> <p>The submitter recognises that areas have been open up for lifestyle development, however these are not in this area. A 2 hectare minimum lot size would cater for most.</p>	<p>1. To exclude 546 No. 2 Line from the Rural A Zone or</p> <p>2. A 2 hectare minimum lot size.</p>
44	David Ian Higgins	107 Rapanui Road RD 4 Westmere Wanganui	<p>Submitter is opposed to the Rural B Zoning surrounding 107 Rapanui Road and the Higgins Poultry Farm.</p> <p>The Higgins Poultry Farm has been an established farming operation since 1951 that following throughout the North Island and are looking to expand into the South Island.</p> <p>The submitter expresses concern regarding the ability of surrounding properties but 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?</p> <p>The submitter highlights that there are many rural industry in and bordering the proposed Rural B area. These industries bring so much into the district and need to be protected.</p>	<p>1. Retain the 1 hectare minimum lots size for the Proposed Rural B area in Westmere.</p> <p>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.</p>
45	Graeme Langridge	32 Flemington Road RD 14 Wanganui 4584	<p>Submitter is opposed to the Rural A zoning of his property. Many properties within this area have already been subdivided down the 1 hectare blocks.</p> <p>The property has poorer soils than the surrounding lots.</p> <p>The economics of farming in this area in the future would not be possible thus being able to subdivide to the 1 hectare blocks would be keeping with the surrounding area.</p>	<p>1. For the properties Lot 4 DP 369560, Lot 2 DP 310549, Lot 3 DP 369560 and PT Section 49 Left Bank Wanganui River to be zoned Rural C.</p>
46	Graeme Langridge	32 Flemington Road RD 14 Wanganui 4584	<p>The submitter seeks Lot 2 DP 310549 be zoned Rural B.</p> <p>Properties on either side of this property have been zoned Rural B as have the rest of the properties on either side of the street.</p> <p>The Rural A zoning of this property is an unfair disadvantage.</p>	<p>1. For Lot 2 DP 310549 to be zoned Rural B.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
47	Richard Austin	306 Blueskin Road RD 1 Wanganui	<p>The submitter holds two titles on Blueskin Road both in the proposed Rural A zone.</p> <p>One lot is used as a home block and one was purchase specifically for use as an orchard. At the time of purchasing the orchard block it was thought that subdivision would be an option to recoup investment costs if needed. It is a concern that the existing opportunity to subdivide may not be there in the future to cover outstanding losses.</p> <p>The submitter states that Council must consider the planning impact on existing commercial operations that have entered into and based investment profile upon current planning rules.</p>	<p>1. That there should be a period of time for existing commercial entities to take advantage of the current planning regime to transition out of their current activities.</p>
			<p>The submitter appreciates large tracks of land, perhaps, should not be subdivided and converted into lifestyle blocks and increase to chance of losing the capacity for maintaining a productive use of the land.</p> <p>Size does not necessary reduce the productive capacity of the land. In the 1990's the District Plan provided for small lots if the applicant could demonstrate that the land could be use productively. Having this as a condition of consent would act as a barrier for those intending to use the proposed use to circumvent the purpose of the District Plan.</p>	<p>2. Land less than 10 hectares should be permitted in cases where, as a condition of the subdivision, the applicant undertakes to establish a productive agricultural business.</p> <p>3. Failing this, land less than 10 hectares be allowed to be subdivided down to the existing 1 hectare.</p>
48	New Zealand Defence Force	C/- Property Group Private Bag 902 Upper Hutt 5140	<p>The submitter opposes section 3.2 Objectives and Section 3.3 Policies in part. A new objective should be added relating to infrastructure and physical resources of regional and national importance, to ensure Proposed Plan Change 36 gives effect to Objective 3-1 and Policies 3-1 and 3-2 of the Regional Policy Statement for the Manawatu-Wanganui Region (RPS) contained in the Proposed One Plan.</p> <p>The submitter requests that a policy be added relating to infrastructure and physical resources of regional and national importance, to ensure Proposed Plan Change 36 gives effect to Objective 3-1 and Policies 3-1 and 3-2 of the Regional Policy Statement for the Manawatu-Wanganui Region (RPS) contained in the Proposed One Plan.</p>	<p>1. That a new objective be added. Suggested wording is below. ' The establishment, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and other physical resources of regional or national importance is provided for with the Rural Zones.' or ' Infrastructure and other physical resources of regional or national importance located within the Rural Zones are protected from reverse sensitivity effects'</p>
	New Zealand Defence Force Continued			<p>2. That a new policy be added. Suggested wording is below. "When assessing applications for the establishment, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and other physical resources of regional or national importance, significant weight shall be given to the benefits of that facility'. or  "Land use and subdivision activities that would establish, or allow the establishment of, activities sensitive to the effects of existing activities, particularly infrastructure and other physical resources of regional or national importance, shall be avoided, as far as is reasonably practicable'.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
49	Brian Richard Kemp	214 Bushy Park Road R D 4 Wanganui	<p>The submitter has a 11.8 hectare block which would be to large for the majority of lifestylers, therefore reducing the pool of potential future buyers if they were unable to subdivide.</p> <p>Land closer to town is always more expensive and may not be an option for some people, but they may be able to purchase a small block 20k's out of town if the land is cheaper.</p>	1. Leave all the rules and regulations as they are currently.
50	Wilfrid Luke Emmett	176 SH 3 R D 4 Wanganui 4574	The submitter would like to see the 10 hectare minimum lot size lifted to 20 hectares. For people with uneconomic blocks under 10 hectares and surrounded by 1 hectare blocks they should be able to subdivide as neighbours have.	<p>1. A 20 hectare minimum lot size restriction.</p> <p>2. Existing small blocks be able to subdivide to 1 hectare minimum.</p>
51	New Zealand Transport Agency	PO Box 1947 Palmerston North 4440	<p>The Transport Agency is also an investor in the Wanganui District's local road network, funding maintenance and operations, renewals, capital works and public transport services.</p> <p>The submitter supports the overall intent and direction of Proposed District Plan. The Transport Agency's specific comments on Proposed District Plan are as follows: In particular: Acknowledging of reverse sensitivity along the State Highway corridors. In particular, ensuring sites which have road frontage to the State Highway Network have adequate setback distances to avoid any potential for reserve sensitivity issues. The Transport Agency supports the provisions allowing the establishment of small commercial activities Discretionary Activity, which generally have a small volume of vehicle movements.</p> <p>Submitter supports, In particular, e, Retail activities except where adjoining a state highway. The Transport Agency supports the establishment of small commercial activities which generally have a small volume of vehicle movements, on local roads.</p>	<p>1. 3.1.4 Issues, Rural A Zone. Support with inclusion (shown with underline below), <u>"To avoid noise sensitive activities where they will be located in existing high noise environments such as adjacent to a State Highway and the adverse effects of that noise cannot reasonably be mitigated."</u> Retain with inclusion.</p> <p>2. 3.3.17b. Objectives, Rural Settlement Zone. Support with inclusion (shown with underline below), ... especially to avoid any potential for reverse sensitivity issue arising, <u>including the noise and vibration from State Highway network;</u> and... Retain with inclusion.</p> <p>3. 3.4.3 Discretionary Activities, Rural A Zone. Support with inclusion (shown with underline below), In particular, b, Retail Activities up to 75m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area adjoining a state highway, <u>written approval must obtained from the NZ Transport Agency.</u> Retain with inclusion.</p> <p>4. Support with inclusion (shown with underline below), In particular, b, vi, Retail Activities up to 75m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area adjoining a state highway, <u>written approval must obtained from the NZ Transport Agency.</u> Retain with inclusion.</p> <p>5. Retain 3.10.1 Permitted Activities, Rural Settlement Zone as notified.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The Transport Agency seeks to include reverse sensitivity provisions, to encourage sensitive activities to establish further away from the State Highway, or install noise attenuation. Please see attached provisions, Appendix 1.</p> <p>The Transport Agency seeks the include for these provision across Rural A, Rural C and Rural Settlement Zones to protect the State Highway network with adequate setback to stop any reserve sensitivity issues arising.</p>	<p>6. inclusion to 3.10.1 Discretionary Activities, Rural Settlement Zone. Retail activities adjoining the state highway, <u>written approval must be obtained from the NZ Transport Agency.</u></p> <p>7. Definitions, Sensitive Activities. Seek inclusion (shown with underline below), Sensitive activities, means those activities within an electricity transmission corridor <u>or within 80 metres from a State Highway.</u> <u>Activities</u> that are particularly sensitive to the risk associated with electricity transmission lines because of either the potential for prolonged exposure to the risk or vulnerability of equipment or population that is exposed to the risk <u>and the exposure from traffic noise and vibration may exceed the desirable limit for a noise sensitive activity if not adequately insulated from noise arising from use of the State Highway Network.</u></p> <p>8. Proposed Rules. 8.1. New PPFs shall not be located within 20 metres of the edge of the nearest traffic lane of any state highway or within 20 metres of any state highway designation that does not contain an existing state highway. 8.2. Within 80 metres of the edge of the nearest traffic lane of any state highway or within 80 metres of any state highway designation that does not contain an existing state highway, any new PPFs or any alteration to a PPF beyond 10% of the existing gross floor area, shall be designed and constructed to comply with the following design sound levels:</p>
				<p>a) Road-traffic noise inside all habitable spaces: 40 dB LAeq(24h) b) Road-traffic noise in all other PPFs: No greater than the recommended maximum design guidelines in AS/NZS 2107:2000.</p> <p>8.3 If windows to habitable spaces are required to be closed to achieve the design sound levels in rule 2, the building shall be designed and constructed with a ventilation system to achieve the following: a) A quantity of air shall be provided to achieve the requirements of Clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code. At the same time as meeting this requirement, the sound of the system shall not exceed 30 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1 m away from any grille or diffuser. b) Either: air conditioning shall be provided; or a high air flow rate setting shall provide at least 15 air changes per hour (ACH) in the principal living space and at least 5 ACH in all other habitable spaces. c) At the same time as meeting the above requirement in b), the sound of the system shall not exceed 40 dB LAeq(30s) in the principal living space and 35 dB LAeq(30s) in all other habitable spaces, when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser. d) The internal air pressure shall be no more than 10 Pa above ambient air pressure due to the mechanical ventilation. e) Where a high air flow rate setting is provided, the system shall be controllable by the occupants to be able to alter the ventilation rate with at least three equal stages up to the high setting.</p>



**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
				<p>8.4 A design report prepared by an acoustics specialist shall be submitted to the, District Council, demonstrating compliance with Rules 2 and 3, prior to construction of any PPF or alteration to a PPF beyond 10% of the existing gross floor area, within 80 metres of the edge of the nearest traffic lane of any state highway or within 80 metres of any state highway designation that does not contain an existing state highway. The design shall take into account future permitted use of the state highway; for existing roads by the addition of 3 dB to existing measured or predicted levels.</p> <p>[PPF to be in defined in plan as per NZS 6806] [Habitable space to be defined in the plan as per Building Code]</p>
52	Michael and Carole Simpson	209a Rapanui Road Westmere Wanganui	The submitter is opposed to 209a Rapanui Road being rezoned as Rural A. The property 2.2 hectares currently and is on the fringe of the proposed Rural A zone.	1. To exclude 209a Rapanui Road from Rural and retain the Rural C zoning.
53	Allan and Glenna Allott	124 SH 3 R D 4 Westmere Wanganui	<p>The submitter seeks existing blocks below 10 hectares be allowed to be subdivided to 1 hectares. The submitter opposes the provision as smaller blocks will not become part of 10 hectare lots.</p> <p>The submitter wishes to be able to do a boundary adjustment and amalgamation with neighbouring properties without needing a Non-complying consent.</p>	<p>1. For existing lots under 10 hectares to be able to be subdivided down to 1 hectare.</p> <p>2. That a boundary adjustment or amalgamation not be classed as a non-complying activity.</p>
54	Wanganui District Council	101 Guyton Street Wanganui 4500	<p>The submitter proposes changes to the names of each zone as it the proposed names are confusing and unhelpful to users. Having specific names for each zone ease of use for officers and public.</p> <p>The submitter requests the inclusion of Residential activities excluding Residential Care Facilities as this enables reasonable residential activities to occur in the rural area.</p> <p>To change the wording in 3.4.1(e) and 3.4.3(b) to be consistent with the wording in 3.5.10(b).</p> <p>To clarify that 3.5.2 applies to all adjacent properties.</p> <p>To clarify that rules 3.5.8(b), 3.7.5(b) and 3.9.8(b) applies to all other trees other than Shelter Belts and Forestry.</p> <p>As the rules 3.4.1(h) and 3.8.1(e) are currently written there is a risk of consents being granted for subdivision which will create substandard lots requiring resource consent to build a single dwelling. This is contrary to the intention of the rule which is intended to provide for dwellings on substandard lots created before the rules take full effect.</p>	<p>1. That the Rural A be renamed <u>Rural Soil Protection Zone</u>, Rural B be renamed <u>Rural Living Zone</u> and Rural C b renamed <u>Rural General Zone</u>.</p> <p>2. That 'Residential activities – excluding Residential care facilities' be included under Permitted Activities in the Rural A Rural C and Rural Settlement zone.</p> <p>3. That the words '<u>not exceeding</u>' replace 'less than' and 'up to' in 3.4.1(e) and 3.4.3(b) respectively.</p> <p>4. That the word '<u>property</u>' replace 'zone' in 3.5.2.</p> <p>5. That the word '<u>other</u>' replace the word 'ornamental' in 3.5.8(b), 3.7.5(b) and 3.9.8(b).</p> <p>6. That '<u>received before the date decisions on Plan Change 36 are released</u>' replace the words 'granted on or before 1st May 2014' in 3.4.1(h) and 3.8.1(e)</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested								
			<p>5000m<sup>2</sup> minimum site area is constant with the Horizons One Plan. Maximum site area of 1 ha is included to ensure protection of Class1 and Class 2 land.</p> <p>The table in 3.11.6 is a double up from the subdivision section. Having the table in two different sections is unnecessary and confusing for users.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that 3.4.2(c)(ii) and 3.10.2(b)(ii) be constant with the wider rural area. To achieve urban design outcomes are unnecessary.</p> <p>2 metres for antenna dishes is constant with the reviewed section of the plan.</p>	<p>7. That the words 'minimum of 5000m<sup>2</sup> site area maximum of 1 hectare site area' replace the words 'minimum site area of 2500m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum of 5000m<sup>2</sup> site area' in 3.4.2(c).</p> <p>8. That the following text and table be removed from 3.11.6.</p> <p>Sealed vehicular access shall be provided and formed to the widths detailed in the following table:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1558 483 1914 703"> <thead> <tr> <th>No of Units Served by Access</th> <th>Minimum Width of Access</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 - 3</td> <td>3.6 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 - 6</td> <td>6.5 metres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 or more</td> <td>Road</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>9. That the words 'ability of the site to achieve quality urban design outcomes' are removed from 3.4.2(c)(ii) and 3.10.2(b)(ii).</p> <p>10. That '<u>2 metres</u>' replace '3 metres' in 3.5.5 and 3.9.5.</p>	No of Units Served by Access	Minimum Width of Access	1 - 3	3.6 metres	4 - 6	6.5 metres	7 or more	Road
No of Units Served by Access	Minimum Width of Access											
1 - 3	3.6 metres											
4 - 6	6.5 metres											
7 or more	Road											
55	John and Caroline Mackay		The submitter support the Rural B zone change which allows 0.5 hectare lots.	1. Current 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.								
56	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited Level 16, Grand Plimmer Tower 2-4 Gilmer Terrace PO Box 2313 Wellington 6011	<p>The relief sought consistent with that by Transpower in the earlier submissions.</p> <p>The submitter supports the general intent of the Plan Change insofar that it makes provision for network utilities within the rural environment. Notwithstanding, a number of additions are required to ensure that the NPSET is given effect to. Specifically to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~sensitive activities in proximity to National Grid assets are managed appropriately.</li> <li>~ongoing maintenance, operation and upgrading of the National Grid is provided for.</li> <li>~adverse effects on the National Grid are avoided.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Seeks consequential amendments to terminology, namely the terms given to the different corridors and yards of the buffer corridor approach.</p> <p>2. Seeks to incorporate the buffer approach provisions including for subdivision and earthworks within the chapter to which this plan change relates only.</p> <p>3. That Plan Change 36 is approved, subject to appropriate amendments that ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full effect is given to the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008;</li> <li>- Effect is given to the policies of the One Plan;</li> <li>- Recognition of the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities and ensure that there are no conflicts with provisions of the District Plan and the NESETA (s44A of the RMA);</li> <li>- The protection of the existing network from issues of reverse sensitivity and the effects of others' activities through the provision of appropriate National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision provisions;</li> <li>- Provide an appropriate policy framework for the development of new electricity transmission lines; and</li> <li>- Provide for the on-going operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing transmission lines.</li> </ul>								

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>These proposed amendments are provided as one option for achieving Transpower's relief sought; however, Transpower notes that there may be other means of drafting provisions to achieve the outcomes sought in submission point 1.</p> <p>The submitter opposes section 3.1 because, as currently proposed, the issues statements fail to recognise that infrastructure is subject to specific locational, operational and technical requirements that require it to be located in the rural zone.</p>	<p>2. Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary to address the relief sought in submission point 1 above and all other submission points that follow.</p> <p>3. The submitter support the use of exclusive definitions of sensitive activities in District Plans.</p> <p>4. That Plan Change 36 is approved, subject to the amendments which follow that ensure that policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET are given effect to.</p> <p>5. Insert the following paragraphs into the introductory section of Chapter 3 as follows:  <u>The National Grid infrastructure plays a key role locally, regionally and nationally. It forms an essential part of the efficient functioning of the District and its maintenance and development contributes to the health, safety and well-being of residents. The national, regional or local benefit of having a sustainable, secure and efficient utility network must be recognised and provided for.</u>  <u>The Council is required to give effect to any National Policy Statement (NPS). The stated objective of the NPSET is to "Recognise the national significance of the electricity transmission network by facilitating the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing transmission network and the establishment of new transmission resources to meet the needs of present and future generations, while: ~Managing the adverse environmental effects of the network; and</u></p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The submitter opposes Section 3.2 of the Plan Change. As currently proposed, the objectives set up an inappropriately high and inflexible policy direction that seeks only to safeguard productive land and protect rural land based productive activities. Policy directions that seek to protect rural land use and to safeguard the life supporting capacity of productive land should not be at the expense of appropriate resource use and development, particularly the use and development of significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 3.2.4 as currently worded dictates that rural character and amenity values be protected to ensure that a predominance of rural productive activities and open, low density development continues to define the wider rural environment. This objective is too obsolete and seeks an unbalanced protection of character and amenity values. It therefore sets a high and inflexible policy direction that is not consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA. The RMA does not afford the absolute protection of amenity values. The potential for adverse effects on the National Grid is of particular concern to Transpower, given the national and regional significance of National Grid assets.</p>	<p>~Managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network". OR words to the like effect.</p> <p>6. Amend Issue 3.1.1 as follows:  <u>3.1.1 Inappropriate subdivision, land use or development can lead to adverse effects on the visual amenity value of the open space characteristics of the rural environment and the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid.</u>                      AND                      Insert a new issue under the 'Rural A Zone' heading as follows:  <u>Some infrastructure facilities, especially the roading network, electricity transmission and telecommunications facilities have specific locational and operational requirements resulting in a need to establish in the rural environment.SP8.</u></p> <p>7. Amend Objective 3.1.1 as follows:  <u>3.2.1 Safeguard the versatility and life supporting capacity of soils within the District, particularly Class 1 and 2 soils, from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u> Or words to the like effect.</p> <p>8. Amend Objective 3.2.2 as follows:  <u>3.2.2 Rural land use and development and other established land uses that have a functional necessity to be located within the rural environment, including National Grid assets, is not compromised by the establishment of non-rural activities.</u> Or words to the like effect.</p>
			<p>The submitter opposes section 3.3 of the Plan Change as proposed. As currently worded the policies only address the effects of subdivision and urban development on rural land and seek only to protect rural character and rural activities.</p>	<p>9. Amend Objective 3.2.4 as follows:  <u>3.2.4 Protect rural character and amenity values to ensure that a predominance of rural productive activities and open, low density development continues to define the wider rural environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u>                      Or words to the like effect</p> <p>10. Insert a new objective as follows:  <u>3.2.6 Avoid land use activities and subdivision that could adversely affect (including through reverse sensitivity) the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid.</u> Or words to the like effect.</p> <p>11. To insert the following to Policy 3.3.5  <u>c. regionally or nationally significant infrastructure including National Grid assets;</u> Or words to the like effect.</p> <p>12. Insert a new policy in Section 3.3 as follows:  <u>Recognise and provide for the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of essential network utilities, including the National Grid.</u>                      OR words to the like effect.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Transpower generally supports the inclusion of network utilities as a permitted activity (Rules 3.4.1(i) and 3.8.1(h)) and the advice note regarding works within proximity to electricity lines.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the restricted discretionary subdivision rules (3.4.2(b), 3.4.2(c) and 3.8.2(b)). Failure to comply with the 20-metre setback rule currently provided as the default corridor rule for the rural zone will only require consent as a discretionary activity not a non-complying activity as required in the Residential and Rural B zones.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that a consistent approach to the implementation of the buffer corridor approach be taken for all zones instead of the imposition of the new corridor setbacks for some zones and a generic 20m setback for others. Transpower have suggested a number of options in the submission points that follow in order to implement the buffer corridor subdivision approach (refer SP19).</p> <p>Historically, Transpower located substations away from population centres however overtime, residential developments have occurred around and next to some of Transpower's 176 substations, causing a range of effects including reverse sensitively effects. Transpower consider that it is appropriate that buildings within 150m of the yard of a National Grid substation require restricted discretionary resource consent.</p>	<p>13. Insert a new policy in Section 3.3 as follows: When managing the effects of essential network utilities consider the locational, technical and operational requirements of network utilities and the contribution they make to the functioning and wellbeing of the community and beyond in assessing their location, design and appearance. OR words to the like effect.</p> <p>14. Amend permitted activities 3.4.1(i) and 3.8.1(h) as follows: Network utilities as provided <u>permitted</u> by District Wide Rule 40-4-Utilities (Rule R15) SP18. Amend the Advice Note provided in 3.4.1 and 3.8.1 as follows: Advice Note: works in close proximity to any electricity line can be dangerous. Compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Proactive 34:2001 is mandatory for all buildings, earthworks and mobile plant within close proximity to all electric lines. Vegetation to be planted within near electricity lines should be selected and/or managed to ensure that it will not result in that vegetation breaching the Electricity (Hazards from Tress) Regulations 2003. To discuss works, including tree planting, near any electrical line, contact the line operator. <u>Compliance with the permitted activity standards of this Plan does not ensure compliance with NZECP34:2001.</u></p>
			<p>There are no provisions that control earthworks that could potentially compromise National Grid assets located in the Rural A and Rural C zones.</p> <p>The combination of Plan Change 27 and the proposed Plan Change 36 District Plan amendments would mean earthworks within the National Grid yard in the rural zone would be a permitted activity under Rule R274(f) being 'Earthworks in all other zones, unless otherwise stated'. There are no standards applying to this rule that would ensure effects on the National Grid located in the rural zone would be avoided.</p> <p>Given that the majority Transpower's National Grid assets are located in the rural environment it is considered necessary to control earthworks within the National Grid Yard in order to give effect to the NPSET, specifically policies 10 and 11.</p>	<p>15. Amend restricted discretionary activity rules 3.4.2(b) and 3.8.2(b) to include: <u>The identified Building Platform shall be located outside the National Grid Yard</u> AND Amend restricted discretionary rule 3.4.2(c) to include: <u>The identified Building Platform shall be located outside the National Grid Yard.</u></p> <p>16. Insert the following matters of discretion under rules 3.4.2(b), 3.4.2(c) and 3.8.2(b): ~ <u>Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid.</u> ~ <u>The ability of future development to comply with NZECP34:2001.</u> ~ <u>Technical advice provided by Transpower</u> ~ <u>The ability of the applicant to provide a complying building platform.</u> ~ <u>Location, design and use of the proposed building platform or structure as it relates to the National Grid.</u> ~ <u>The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u> ~ <u>The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid Lines.</u></p>

Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
				<p>OR insert a new restricted discretionary rule in sections 3.4.2, 3.8.2, and 3.10.2 of the District Plan as follows:</p> <p><u>Subdivision of land located within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor where a building platform for the principal building and any dwelling is located outside of the National Grid Yard</u>  <u>Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:</u>  ~ <u>Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid.</u>  ~ <u>The ability of future development to comply with NZECP34:2001.</u>  ~ <u>Technical advice provided by Transpower.</u>  ~ <u>The ability of the applicant to provide a complying building platform.</u>  ~ <u>Location, design and use of the proposed building platform or structure as it relates to the National Grid.</u>  ~ <u>The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u>  ~ <u>The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid Lines.</u>  OR words to the like effect.</p>
				<p>17. Insert a new restricted discretionary activity rule and matters of discretion into sections 3.4.2 and 3.8.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>Any building within 150m of the secured yard of a National Grid substation.</u>  <u>Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:</u></p> <p>i. <u>The extent to which the development may adversely affect the efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the substation.</u>  ii. <u>The extent to which the proposed development design and layout enables appropriate separation distances between activities sensitive to National Grid lines and the substation.</u>  iii. <u>The results of any detailed investigations to determine appropriate separation distances between activities sensitive to National Grid lines and the substation.</u>  iv. <u>Any other measures proposed to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the substation.</u>  v. <u>The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u>  OR words to the like effect.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
				<p>18. Insert a new restricted discretionary activity rule and matters of discretion into sections 3.4.2 and 3.8.2 as follows:  <u>Earthworks within 12m of a National Grid support structure that fails to comply with performance standard XX(c)(i)</u></p> <p><u>Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>~ Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid.</u></p> <p><u>~ Compliance with NZECP34:2001.</u></p> <p><u>~ Technical advice provided by Transpower.</u></p> <p><u>~ The risk to the structural integrity of the National Grid.</u></p> <p><u>~ Any impact of the ability of the National Grid owner (Transpower) to access the National Grid.</u></p> <p><u>~ The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u></p>
			<p>Transpower supports the provision for network utilities, not provided for as permitted activities, as discretionary activities. However, Transpower seeks minor wording amendments to clarify the link between the activity status of network utilities in the Rural A Zone and Rural C Zone.</p>	<p>19. Amend discretionary activity rules 3.4.3(f) and 3.8.3(f) as follows:  <u>Network utilities as not provided for as permitted activities by General District Wide Rule – Utilities (rule RXX) of the Plan.10.1.</u></p> <p>20. Amend non-complying activity rules 3.4.4(a), 3.4.4(b), 3.8.4(a) and 3.8.4(b) as follows:</p> <p>a. <u>The establishment or expansion of any sensitive activity within an electricity transmission yard.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Buildings and structures located within the electricity transmission yard, which are more than 2.5m in height and/or 10m<sup>2</sup> in area.</u></p> <p>a. <u>Any activity, building or structure within the National Grid Yard which does not comply with performance standard XX.b or XX.c</u></p> <p>b. <u>Any earthworks within the National Grid Yard which does not comply with performance standards XXXc(ii) and XXXc(iii)4</u></p> <p>c. <u>Any building or addition to a building for a sensitive activity within the National Grid Yard.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Any change of use to a sensitive activity or the establishment of a new sensitive activity within the National Grid Yard.</u></p> <p>e. <u>A hazardous facility within the National Grid Yard</u></p> <p>f. <u>Any subdivision of land in any zone within the National Grid Corridor which cannot provide a building platform for the principal building or any dwelling n any allotment being created outside of the National Grid Yard.</u></p> <p>Or words to the like effect.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Transpower oppose the performance standard sections as there are no performance standards that specifically apply to development and activities located within the National Grid Yard that give effects to NPSET Policies 10 and 11. Specifically, Policy 10 of the NPSET requires that the District Plan ensure that the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised.</p> <p>The submitters is primarily concerned about the area directly below the wires and immediately next to the structure foundations. The 'red zone' typically extends 12 metres either side of the transmission line (10m on single pole lines). Within this area Transpower considers that inappropriate development should be avoided due the effects on and from the Transmission Lines.</p> <p>It is appropriate these activities require non-complying activity resource consent if the permitted activity performance standards cannot be met within the National Grid Corridor, the undertaking of earthworks could potentially compromise the network.</p> <p>The submitter seek the addition of specific earthworks performance standards within the rural zone provisions in order to appropriately manage earthworks within the National Grid Yard.</p>	<p>21. Insert new performance standards in sections 3.5, 3.7 and 3.9 of Chapter 3 as follows:  <u>3.X.X Activities within the National Grid Yard</u></p> <p><u>a. On any sites within any part of the National Grid Yard any new buildings or structures shall be:</u></p> <p><u>i. A fence less than 2.5m in height; or</u>  <u>ii. A Network Utility within a transport corridor or any part of electricity infrastructure that connects to the National Grid; or</u>  <u>iii. An uninhabitable farm building or structure for farming activities (but not a milking/dairy shed excluding ancillary structures, PSA3 Structures, or intensive farming buildings; or</u>  <u>iv. An uninhabited horticultural building or structure other than a commercial greenhouse or intensive farming building.</u></p> <p><u>b. On any sites within any part of the National Grid yard any new buildings or structures complying with any of the conditions of a. shall:</u></p> <p><u>i. Have a minimum vertical clearance of 10m below the lowest point of the conductor associated with National Grid lines; or</u>  <u>ii. Demonstrate that safe electrical clearance distances required by NZECP34:2001 are maintained under all National Grid line operating conditions.</u></p> <p><u>c. On any sites within any part of the National Grid Yard earthworks except earthworks for a Network Utility or earthworks undertaken as part of agricultural or domestic cultivation, or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath, driveway or farm track shall:</u></p>
			<p>Transpower accepts the inclusion of the following standards as either performance standards or permitted activities provided that failure to comply with the standards / activities results in the appropriate resource consent triggers.</p>	<p><u>i. be no deeper than 300mm within 12m of any National Grid support structure foundation except that vertical holes not exceeding 500mm in diameter beyond 1.5m from the outer edge of pole support structure or stay wire are exempt.</u>  <u>ii. not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure;</u>  <u>iii. not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances below what is required by Table 4 of NZECP34.</u>  OR any other such relief that achieves the same outcome i.e. to provide for the above standards as permitted activities in all relevant sections of the chapter.</p> <p>22. Insert new performance standards in sections 3.5, 3.7 and 3.9 of Chapter 3 as follows:  <u>3.X.X Buildings and Structures around National Grid support structures</u></p> <p><u>a. Buildings and structures, except horticultural structures, within 12 metres from a National Grid support structure shall be:</u></p> <p><u>i. A fence less than 2.5m in height; or</u>  <u>ii. A fence located within 5m of a support structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.3.3 of NZECP34:2001</u>  <u>iii. A Network Utility within a transport corridor or any part of electricity infrastructure that connects to the National Grid</u>  <u>iv. Commercial scale electricity generation infrastructure.</u></p>



**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The specific provision that this submission relates to is the definition of 'Sensitive Activities' proposed to be insert in Chapter 13 - Definitions of the District Plan. The inclusion of this definition is supported in part as minor wording amendments are sought to ensure consistency with the terminology used for the National Grid corridor that was formerly identified as the 'electricity transmission corridor'. Further, the amendments sought seek to clarify that sensitive activities may be activities that fall outside of the National Grid corridor.</p>	<p>b. Agricultural and horticultural structures within 12m from a National Grid support structure shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Meet the requirements of the NZECP34:2001 for separation distances from the conductor; and</li> <li>ii. Be less than 2.5m in height; and</li> <li>iii. Be removable or temporary, to allow a clear working space 12 metres from the pole for maintenance and emergency repair purposes; and</li> <li>iv. Allow all weather access to the pole and a sufficient area for maintenance equipment, including a crane; and</li> <li>v. Have obtained the written approval from Transpower in accordance with Clause 2.4.1 of NZECP34:2001 to be located within 12m of a tower or 8m of a pole support structure.</li> </ul> <p>OR provide for the above standards as permitted activities in all relevant sections of the chapter.</p> <p>23. Amend the definition of 'Sensitive Activities' as follows: Sensitive activities, means those activities <del>within an electricity transmission corridor</del> that are particularly sensitive to the risks associated with electricity <del>National Grid high voltage</del> transmission lines. because of either the potential for prolonged exposure to the risk or the vulnerability of the equipment or population that is exposed to the risk. Such activities include childcare and educational facilities, residential buildings, hospitals and health care facilities. OR words to the like effect.</p>
				<p>24. Retain the definition of 'non-rural activities' as notified.</p> <p>25. Insert a new definition of 'National Grid Yard' and diagram illustrating the yard as follows: <u>National Grid Yard Means:</u> ~ the area located 12 metres in any direction from the outer edge of a National Grid support structure; and ~ the area located 12 metres either side of the centreline of any overhead National Grid line AND any consequential amendments to replace reference to 'electricity transmission yard' throughout the District Plan with 'National Grid Yard'</p> <p>26. Insert a new definition of 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' as follows: <u>National Grid Subdivision Corridor</u> <u>Means the area measured either side of the centreline of above ground National Grid line as follows:</u> ~ 16m for the 110kV lines on pi poles ~ 32m for 110kV lines on towers ~ 37m for the 220kV transmission lines AND any consequential amendments to replace reference to 'electricity transmission corridor' throughout the District Plan with 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor'.</p> <p>27. Retain the inclusion of the transmission lines on the District Plan maps as proposed.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
57	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Regional Policy Advisor Federated Farmers of New Zealand PO Box 422 New Plymouth 4340	<p>The submitter strongly supports the intention outlined in Proposed Plan Change 36 to safeguard the versatility of highly productive soils, as well as to ensure that rural land use is not compromised by the establishment of non-rural activities.</p> <p>Intensification of residential development often results in a permanent loss of these areas to farming.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity issues brought about by increasing residential development in rural zones are of major concern to us. Federated Farmers strongly supports the Council's intention outlined in this Plan Change (Section 3) to protect existing farming activities from adverse effects created by increasing residential occupation. We suggest that this should be a priority in all rural zones.</p> <p>There remain some practical issues of how proposed changes to zoning and subdivision rules should be implemented at zone margins. As the proposed changes stand, if a Rural A land title consists mostly of poorer soils (Classes III-VII) and only a small area is highly productive (Classes I &amp; II), they will still fall under the new proposed restrictions on subdivision.</p>	<p>1. that a note on LIMS and PIMS of properties in this zone could state that complaints of smell, noise, light spill etc. from existing rural activities will not be actioned by Council.</p> <p>2. '3.3.4 Minimise the demand for lifestyle living on productive land by providing <u>encouraging lifestyle development</u> in areas in the Rural B zone, which do not compromise Class 1 and 2 soils. <u>Existing rural activities will not be impeded by lifestyle or residential development, which may require buffer areas between dwellings and incompatible existing uses. The Council will use Land Information Memoranda and Project Information Memoranda to ensure that new developments are aware of the existing primary production uses and that nuisances such as (but not limited to) noise, smell, dust, traffic, light spill can occur. Complaints about these effects will not be actioned where the existing activity is using its best practicable option.'</u></p> <p>3. 3.3.10 Subdivision and rural development in the Rural B zone shall maintain or enhance the rural lifestyle character, <u>but will allow primary production activities to continue.'</u></p>
	Federated Farmers of New Zealand continued		<p>We recommend that in such cases, on the margins between Zones A and C, landowners should be able to subdivide as for the less restrictive Rural C zone, to minimum of 1ha.</p> <p>On land zoned Rural B, current farmers will be subject to pressure from more closely subdivided areas (0.25 - 0.5ha). While Plan Change 36 does not include a review of provisions relating to the Rural B zone, we think the issue worth noting here.</p> <p>While it is sensible to direct lifestyle development into the Rural B zones, there are still ongoing primary production activities occurring as pre-existing uses and those uses should not be compromised or impeded as more residential development is encouraged into these areas.</p> <p>Is the term 'quality urban design outcomes' appropriate for lifestyle development in a rural zone? We suggest that 'quality rural or rural lifestyle design outcomes' is more appropriate.</p>	<p>4. In Section 3.4.2 the following changes are suggested – 'Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The ability of the development to be serviced by on-site means with regard to effluent and storm water disposal.</li> <li>· Impact of the character of the surrounding area, ability of the site to achieve quality urban design outcomes.'</li> </ul> <p>5. '3.1.2 Trees and structures adjacent to boundaries can cause shading and/or soil fertility or moisture loss which may compromise activities on neighbouring properties.'</p> <p>6. '3.5.8 Trees</p> <p>a. No tree for forestry, shelter belt or soil conservation purposes shall be planted within 10 metres of any boundary; <u>nor have any branch that projects from the tree trunk between ground level and a height of 6 metres overhanging the adjoining boundary, unless written consent of the adjacent neighbour and any adjacent network utility (if there are existing lines near the boundary) has been obtained and registered with Council.'</u></p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
	Federated Farmers of New Zealand continued		<p>The adverse effects of trees and structures on surrounding land can include pasture and crop suppression, stock poisoning, weed ingress, damage to fences from trees and branches, stock camps, shading or blockage of roof rainwater collection systems or loss of outlook and open space to dwellings. Boundary plantings should be non-toxic to livestock and have a low propensity for spread, by vegetative or reproductive means.</p> <p>A number of common or day-to-day primary production activities could be interpreted as hazardous substances. These include use, storage and transport of pesticides, agrichemicals, fertilisers, fuels and lubricants and occasionally explosives. These are essential for the running of most farming enterprises, but are normally held or used in farm-scale quantities.</p> <p>Use of a common size limit of 3m<sup>2</sup> would avoid confusion and allow use of standard sheets measuring 2.4m by 1.2m, without contributing to visual pollution or driver distraction. The same applies to Section 3.9.6.</p> <p>There are no provisions for renewable energy structures included in this plan change. Clauses could be added to allow small wind turbines and other renewable energy options as permitted activities in rural zones.</p>	<p>b. <u>No ornamental tree shall be planted within 4 metres of any boundary nor have any branch that projects from the tree trunk between ground level and a height of 6 metres overhanging the adjoining boundary, unless written consent of the adjacent neighbour and any adjacent network utility (if there are existing lines near the boundary) has been obtained and registered with Council.</u></p> <p>c. <u>No tree shall be planted within 20 metres of any dwelling, unless written consent of the adjacent neighbour and any adjacent network utility (if there are existing lines near the boundary) has been obtained and registered with Council.'</u></p> <p>7. That above tree amendments are also made to the Rural B and Rural C Zone .</p> <p>8.'3.5.4 Hazardous substances Any new or expanded hazardous facility, <u>except for Primary Production activities</u>, is subject to the provisions of Appendix F Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure.'</p> <p>9. That the Hazardous substances amendments also be made to the Rural B and Rural C zones.</p> <p>10. A sign not exceeding 2 3m<sup>2</sup> erected in connection with tourist publicity or special public information denoting places or points of special interest.'</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Soils are not Class I or II, they comprise 1 factor of 6 that are combined to produce a LUC Class. LUC Class II soils for example will have features such as impeded drainage that prevents their use for dairying or intensive vegetable production and will not be found in a LUC Class I classification.</p> <p>Federated Farmers acknowledges that dairy sheds are not listed in the definition of 'sensitive activities' which are not permitted in electricity transmission corridors. However, the wording of the definition is broad and we recommend that it be made explicit that normal farming activities (including dairy milking parlours) are not considered a sensitive activity and therefore would be allowed in electricity transmission corridors, subject to the advice note contained in Section 3.4.1.</p> <p>A new definition is needed for Intensive Farming here. There are a number of definitions of intensive farming in use, including Horizon's One Plan. What is the Council seeking to control as a Discretionary Activity in Rural A and C Zones, which is not controlled under the One Plan?</p>	<p>11. That references to Class 1 and 2 land throughout the document should be more correctly referred to as LUC Class I and II (in Roman Numerals) by convention.</p> <p>12. That Section 3.4.1 Rural A Zone Permitted Activities (h) read " ... on or <u>before</u> 1st May 2014."</p> <p>13. Sensitive Activities definition. Sensitive activities, means those activities within an electricity transmission corridor that are particularly sensitive to the risks associated with electricity transmission lines because of either the potential for prolonged exposure to the risk or the vulnerability of the equipment or population that is exposed to the risk. Such activities include childcare and educational facilities, residential buildings, hospitals and health care facilities <u>and exclude normal farming activities (e.g. dairy parlours).</u></p> <p>14. Amenity Values Definition. Means the natural or physical qualities or characteristics of an area that contributes to peoples appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes – including but not limited to; landscape and visual characters, land use, environmental health and safety characteristics, <del>consciousness</del>, comfort and character.'</p> <p>15. Shelterbelt definition. a row or rows of trees or hedges planted to partially block wind flow, primarily on <del>cultivated</del> cultivable land.'</p> <p>16. That a new definition for intensive farming be added.</p>
58	Brian and Lynley Shaw	578 No 2 Line R D 2 Wanganui	<p>The submitter is opposed to the blanket reclassification over a total area. This does not adequately represent an individual property and unfairly restricts the ability for subdivision with functional implications as a result.</p> <p>A blanket approach does not recognise the fragmentation of different classes of soil types on the individual property and any natural restrictions for subdivision due to such fragmentation.</p>	<p>1. That boundary lines on the proposed plan change 36 in the Fordell area be reviewed and changed to recognise the natural fragmentation and topography with regard to thus property specifically.</p>
59	G K, A J and R K Donald	C/- R K Donald 23 Tarata Street Wanganui	<p>The submitters oppose the proposed Rural A changes. The proposal intends to protect high productive soils but wrong captures other soil types that are inferior which should be used for residential or other development.</p> <p>The 10 hectare proposal minimum lot size will result in a significant decrease to the value of this land.</p>	<p>1. Rural A be more specific to accurately reflect the purpose of the proposal.</p> <p>2. If Council is not willing to incur the cost of better defining the soil types and/or area, that the new zoning rules allow for a discretionary subdivision consent where applicants can demonstrate that land is not predominantly made up of class 1 land.</p>
60	Kevin and Carol Battersby	43 Hewitts Road R D 2 Wanganui 4572	<p>No comment on Proposed Plan Change 36 made.</p>	<p>No remedy sought.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
61	Liam and Beverly Graves	527 Rapanui Road R D 4 Wanganui	<p>The submitter is opposed to the rezoning of 527 Rapanui Road as Rural A. Green Pastures Camp is operated off this site and part of the long term plan was to subdivide for future investment.</p> <p>It is probably a good thing for the overall growth of Wanganui in the long run and has some logic behind it a strong rural sector is very important.</p> <p>However, some of the zoning boundaries do not fit with the aim of the plan. This 9.6 hectare property has a mix of average soil, clay, swamp and not used productively. The neighbouring property is larger and use as a productive farming unit however is proposed to be zoned Rural C. How will cutting the neighbouring block into 1 hectare lots be more productive than they are now?</p> <p>The submitter states that there will not be any traffic implications if the property retained the 1 hectare subdivision limit.</p> <p>This land does not meet the criteria regards to soil type or land use or productive farming to fit into the Rural A zone.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that this proposal will have fanatical implications as it will negatively impact the market value and threaten the long term viability of our property.</p>	1. To be included in the Rural C zone.
62	Bruce Leonard Hodges	Bruce Hodges R D 4 Wanganui	<p>The submitter is opposed to the Rural A 10 hectare minimum lot size. It should remain as 1 hectare.</p> <p>Wanganui needs subdivision as it creates and brings people to into the town and surrounding area.</p>	1. To retain a 1 hectare minimum lot size provision.

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
63	Mitchael James Russell	163A Great North Road Otamatea Wanganui	<p>The submitter is opposed to the proposed Rural A zone and proposed Rural B zone extension.</p> <p>The proposed change map depicting the class 1 and class 2 land in the Wanganui District is generalised and inaccurate.</p> <p>The submitter states that the Rural A zone contains a large area that is not class 1 or class 2 land nor close to the urban area.</p> <p>There is no evidence supporting the idea that people who own lifestyle blocks are any less productive. Some choose relatively unproductive pursuits and others produce goods or lease the land to farmers.</p> <p>There has been little if any provision of infrastructure by council to extend the Rural B zone which includes intensified residential development.</p> <p>The Wanganui District 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.</p>	<p>1. Status Quo should remain for Rural A and Rural B until accurate Class 1 and Class 2 land has been mapped and a vision in place.</p> <p>2. The Rural A zone should not extend beyond 10kms from the urban CBD.</p>
64	Quentin Handley	756 Rapanui Road Wanganui	<p>The submitter supports the Rural A Zone in principle however the 'one off' subdivision for lots larger than 10 hectares should also apply to existing lots less than 10 hectares.</p>	<p>1. That existing lots less than 10 hectares have the ability to do the one off subdivision.</p>
65	Robert Duncan Boyd	16 Cotswolds Close Otamatea Wanganui	<p>The submitter supports the extension to the Rural B zone.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1. That the 5000m2 be gross and inclusive of any/all access ways.</p>
66	Robert Wayne and Christine Rose Gilbertson	829 Rapanui Road R D 4 Wanganui	<p>The submitter does not support Proposed Plan Change 36. The changes would directly affect our ability to provide for our continued lifestyle in our present home in our old age. The property was purchase knowing that one day we could sell off the back paddock. It is a basic human right to which every land owner is due.</p> <p>There are already many 1 hectare blocks what is the difference of a few more? I realise there are a number of beef producers, but they are not being forced to sell and subdivide to why is the amendments necessary anyway?</p> <p>Also this property is fully productive with a very high lambing rate percentage.</p> <p>It is unfair and we purchased our property in good faith that we had invested wisely in our family's future. By changing the goal posts our wrights as landowners are gone.</p>	<p>1. That an exemption allowing 1 off subdivision of 1 hectare in the future.</p>
67	Clive Parnell Gibbard	107 Peat Ave R D 4 Wanganui	<p>I support the 10 hectare minimum lot size for subdivision on some class 1 and class 2 land.</p>	<p>1. Proceed with the proposed plan change.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
68	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	C/- Beca Group Ltd PO Box 3942 Wellington 6104	<p>The submitter raises some remaining concerns relating to the provision of adequate fire fighting water supplies in areas that cannot be connected to a reticulated water network. The submitter requests that the remaining Rural A, Rural C and Rural Settlement Zones be added to Rule 11.5.7 as this would provide a consistent approach throughout the Plan.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned with development that may take place separately to the subdivision process in areas of the District with no connection to reticulated water supply including dwellings, commercial and structures with a high occupancy that might take place in the Rural Environment.</p>	<p>1. That Rural A, Rural C and Rural Settlement be included in Chapter 11 Site Serviceability Rule 11.5.6(a) and 11.5.6(b).</p> <p>2. Include the following in structures Rules 3.5.5, 3.7.8, 3.9.5, 3.11.5: <u>All new habitable structures to be used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes shall be provided with a fire fighting water supply and access to this supply with accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supply Code of Practice 2008 SNZ PAS 4509:2008</u></p> <p>3. That if Proposed Plan Change 36 is approved the above requested are included in the final wording.</p>
69	Ridgway Trust	28 Blueskin Road R D 1 Wanganui	<p>The submitter strongly supports Proposed Plan Change 36 but asks for modifications.</p> <p>Wanganui's land resource is largely rolling-to-steep in topographical terms with most of its soils being low fertile. However, there are inliers of high quality Class 1 and Class 2 land.</p> <p>Wanganui's District is blessed with a temperate climate suitable for growing a wide range of food and fibre. This combination is unusual in New Zealand.</p> <p>The last half century has witnessed an acceleration of buildings constructed on quality soil. Currently 15 to 20% of Wanganui's Gross Domestic product is derived from our agriculture resource and the potential for the largest increase in this lies with better use of, and more intensive and valuable production from our best soils.</p> <p>John Dymond a Landcare Research Senior Scientist has warned against further fragmentation of rural land. "Fully one-tenth of New Zealand's most productive land has already been converted to lifestyle sections and this has increased rapidly in the last 10 years". Daymond goes on to say "smallholders overall did not engage in high levels of production . . . once subdivided, the land was generally unlikely to return to economic for production".</p>	<p>1. Supports the restriction of the defined Class 1 and Class 2 land.</p> <p>2. Seeks the removal of the "one off" subdivision for lots less than ten hectares that are subject to the 1st May 2014 exemption.</p> <p>3. That all trees plantings on boundaries are subject to the 10 metre set back in the Rural A zone.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Reverse sensitivity is anecdotal, but real. Conventional scale farmers talk of instances of pressure to cease aspects of, or their total operation. Agrichemical application, fertiliser spreading, livestock effluent disposal etc. lead to tensions between lifestyle dwellers and more conventional farmers.</p> <p>Neighbour behaviour can have unintended negative economic impacts. This might be a little as unwanted shading of ground or as large as significant bird and insect damage to crops facilitated by a neighbour's tree planting programme.</p> <p>Increased subdivision has the potential for the demand and cost implications of urban services such as water, wastewater, rubbish collection and increased road maintenance.</p> <p>The submitter argues that allowing smaller titles will not necessarily mean rates take will increase, as spread of development is not making use of our existing services, however creating the demand for more.</p> <p>The submitter argues that the 'one off' provisions for further subdivision on already approved lots (as of 1st May 2014) smaller than 10 hectares be removed.</p> <p>The submitter argues that the 10 metre minimum distance for from boundary for tree planting should apply to all trees within the Rural A zone, closer than this can lead to issues when properties are sold.</p>	
70	Richard Owen	40 Parsons Street St John Hill Wanganui	The submitter seek the Rural B zoning to extend along Mosston Road towards Castlecliff. Lifestyle development is already in existence in this area and Plan Change 36 should reflect this.	1. Extend the Rural B zoning along Mosston Road.



**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
71	Horticulture New Zealand	PO Box 10 232 Wellington	<p>Horticulture NZ generally supports the approach in Plan Change 36 to ensure that land is available for high value production, such as horticulture. Clear identification of potential for reverse sensitivity and provisions to manage it are critical to enabling rural production activities. Throughout the Plan Change there is reference to Class 1 and 2 soils. The classifications are based on the NZ Land Resource Inventory which is based on more than the components of the soil – rather the nature of the land and climate. Therefore the reference should be to Class 1 and 2 land rather than soils.</p> <p>It is noted that Rural B provisions have been reviewed separately and are not subject to submission as part of Plan Change 36. This means that the effect of the changes to the Rural Zones cannot be seen in their totality. Provisions should have been assessed as part of the same plan change.</p> <p>The statement about buffer areas may not always apply so amended wording is sought. Productive land is not 'lost' as the productive nature of the land still exists, even if under houses. Rather it is not available for production land activities.</p> <p>'Rural character' which is in essence a subset of visual amenity value, but is more clearly linked to the rural environment and context. In addition, while the rural environment is generally more open than urban environments there are buildings and structures which exist and are essential to rural production activities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend all references to 'Class 1 and 2 soils' to 'Class 1 and 2 land'.</li> <li>2. Amend 4th paragraph by deleting 'The quality of' so that the paragraph reads: "The rural environment is characterised by...."</li> <li>3. Include the area of Class 1 and 2 land in Wanganui in the introduction to Rural A.</li> <li>4. Amend para 3 2nd of the Rural A introduction sentences as follows: This may result in a loss of land available for rural production activities may be avoided or limited near boundaries to avoid reverse sensitivity and neighbour issues. However the onus is not on the lawfully established rural activity to mitigate effects in this way.</li> <li>5. Amend Issue 3.1.1 as follows: Inappropriate subdivision, use or development can lead to adverse effects on the rural character, particularly the generally open nature, of the rural environment.</li> <li>6. Amend the last sentence of 3.1.4 to: This may result in less productive land being available for rural production activities.</li> <li>7. Amend 3.1.5 by changing 'soil resource' to 'the land resource'.</li> <li>8. Amend Objective 3.2.2 to Rural activities, land use and development.....</li> <li>9. Amend Objective 3.2.4 to 'Maintain rural character .....</li> </ol>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Generally the issues are supported but changes sought to be consistent with changes sought above, particularly the focus on land rather than soils.</p> <p>However the objective should not be limited to rural activities as some other rural land uses are appropriate in rural areas. Objective 3.2.4 seeks to 'protect' rural character and amenity values. This is a higher threshold than provided for in Section 7 of the RMA.</p> <p>Policies 3.3.1 and 3.3.4 seem to duplicate the same issue in respect of lifestyle development.</p> <p>The policy that describes the rural character is supported. However a few changes are sought so that it better describes the rural environment.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.7 uses the term 'large' holdings. It is a subjective term and would be better to be linked to the outcome that is sought.</p> <p>The policy that describes the rural character is supported. However a few changes are sought.</p> <p>Submitter supports the Rural Activities definition as it provides for ancillary uses which are incidental and secondary to the rural activity, although it does not list examples of such ancillary activities but does not include rural industries.</p>	<p>10. Define lifestyle development as 'development where the predominant purpose for the site is rural residential living rather than rural production.'</p> <p>11. Delete Policy 3.3.4</p> <p>12. Amend Policy 3.3.5 e) rural activities and practices and odours from rural activities are acceptable provided best practicable options are used f) a varied noise environment may exist, including intermittent noise from rural machinery and equipment.</p> <p>13. Amend Policy 3.3.7 as follows: Retain Class 1 and 2 land in holdings of sufficient size to enable opportunities for a range of rural activities to occur.</p> <p>14. Amend Policy 3.3.14 e) rural activities and practices and odours from rural activities are acceptable provided best practicable options are used. f) a varied noise environment may exist, including intermittent noise from rural machinery and equipment.</p> <p>15. Ensure that the definition of rural activities includes packing sheds on farm or orchard artificial crop protection structures, and also use of land for airstrips and agricultural aircraft. Rural activities should also include frost fans and bird scarers subject to meeting performance standards.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>Horticulture NZ is concerned that a new dwelling could be built as a permitted activity on a site 5000m2 with only a setback of 10 metres from the boundary. This gives potential for reverse sensitivity complaints.</p> <p>A larger setback is sought. There needs to be provision for activities that are able to be undertaken in proximity to the National Grid as permitted activities. This will include artificial crop protection and crop support structures.</p> <p>Horticulture NZ is concerned that there is a presumption that small sites are not economical or good use of productive land. A site of 4 hectares of kiwifruit can be an economical operation. Requiring a minimum site area of 10 hectares in the Rural A Zone could preclude such uses of the land.</p> <p>Changes need to be made to reflect the inclusion of a permitted activity rule for activities within the National Grid Yard.</p> <p>Horticulture NZ does not support the use of the Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure and considers that meeting the requirements of HSNO in respect of hazardous substances should be the requirement in the District Plan. Appendix F has not been reviewed as part of this Plan Change but it has the potential to have a significant impact as to whether an activity is permitted or not. In particular there needs to be provision for the storage and use of agrichemicals and fertilisers where these meet best practice standards such as NZS8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals and the HSNO Fertiliser Group Standards.</p>	<p>16. Include a permitted activity rule in the Rural A and Rural C Zones for the National Grid Yard.</p> <p>No buildings, structures or Sensitive Activities shall be located within the National Grid Yard except that this shall not apply to the following provided they comply with the requirements of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001), and are located at least 12m from the outer visible edge of a National Grid transmission line support structure unless otherwise specified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Fences located at least 5m from a National Grid line support structure</li> <li>ii) A fence located within 5m of a support structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.3.3 of NZECP34:2001.</li> <li>iii) Alterations and additions to existing buildings that do not involve an increase in the building envelope or floor space.</li> <li>iv) Network utilities (excluding buildings and structures for dams and irrigation schemes).</li> <li>v) Uninhabitable farm buildings and structures for farming activities, but excluding milking sheds and buildings for Intensive Farming including commercial greenhouses.</li> <li>vi) Artificial Crop Protection Structures, located at least 8m from the outer edge of a transmission line support pole (not tower) provided it is no more than 2.5m high, is removable or temporary to allow a clear working space of 12m from the pole when necessary for maintenance purposes, and is located a sufficient distance from a pole to provide unimpeded access for maintenance equipment, including a crane.</li> <li>vii) Artificial Crop Protection Structures, located within 8m of the outer edge of a transmission line support pole or 12 of the outer edge of a tower where Transpower New Zealand gives its written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of NZECP34:2001.</li> </ul>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>There is also a need to provide for signs on all properties to meet HSNO requirements in respect of hazardous substances.</p> <p>Rather than an arbitrary setback the threshold should be linked to shading of a neighbouring property or the height of the tree. Shelterbelts are important for orchards and if Class 1 and 2 land in Rural Zone A is to be used for high value production then there needs to be provision for shelterbelts.</p> <p>The plan proposes to amend the definition of amenity values beyond the definition in the RMA. This is not supported as the RMA definition has been subject to case law and does not require the additional matters listed. The amended definition has wider application than just the Rural Zones so any changes need to be included in a wider plan change.</p> <p>Changes are sought to the provisions for the National Grid to provide for artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures. Inclusion of definitions would assist in implementing these provisions.</p> <p>Seeks that it is clear that a number of associated rural activities are included within the definition of rural activities. In particular it should ensure that frost fans and bird scarers are specifically provided for and would like to discuss provisions with Council.</p>	<p>b) All earthworks, quarrying and mining within a National Grid Yard shall meet the following standards:</p> <p>Around poles:            Shall not be deeper than 300mm within 2.2 m of a transmission line pole support structure or stay wire; and            Shall not be deeper than 750mm between 2.2m to 5m from a transmission line pole support structure or stay wire.            Except that vertical holes not exceeding 500mm diameter beyond 1.5m from the outer edge of the pole support structure or stay wire are exempt from these conditions.</p> <p>Around Towers            Shall not be deeper than 300mm within 6m of the outer visible edge of a transmission line tower support structure; and            Shall not be deeper than 3m between 6m to 12m from the outer visible edge of a transmission line tower support structure.</p> <p>At any location in the National Grid Yard            Do not create an unstable batter that will affect a transmission line support structure; and/or            Do not increase ground levels such that the minimum ground to conductor clearance distances in NZECP 34: 2001 are not met            Provided that the following earthworks are exempt from the above:            Earthworks undertaken by a network utility operator (complying with NZECP 34: 2001); or            Earthworks undertaken as part of normal rural cultivation, or the repair, sealing or resealing of a road (including a farm track), footpath or driveway.</p> <p>Include a definition for National Grid Yard as 12 metres from a transmission support structure or the centreline of the conductor.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
				<p>17. Add to 3.4.2 b) matters of discretion i) the ability of sites to: avoid potential reverse sensitivity</p> <p>18. Amend 3rd matter: maintain or enhance rural lifestyle character.</p> <p>19. Amend 3.4.2 c) matters of discretion 2) Impact on the rural character of the surrounding area and to avoid potential reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>20. Revise 3.4.2 b) to ensure that blocks suitable for rural productive purposes such a horticulture are able to be established.</p> <p>21. Amend 3.4.4 b) and 3.8.4 b): Any building or structure located within the National Grid Yard that does not meet the permitted activity rule 3.4.1 and 3.8.1 respectively.</p> <p>22. Add a provision under 3.5.4 for storage and use of agrichemicals and fertilisers where these meet best practice standards such as NZS8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals and the HSNO Fertiliser Group Standards.</p> <p>23. Add a 3.5.5 e) Dwellings shall be located 20 metres from the side and rear boundary.</p> <p>24. Delete 'shelterbelts' from 3.5.8 a) 3.7.5(a) and 3.9.8(a)</p> <p>25. Delete the 10 metres setback distance in 3.5.8, 3.7.5 and 3.9.8.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
				<p>26. Include a provision for where a tree is over 8 metres it does not shade neighbouring property at midday on the shortest day in 3.5.8, 3.7.5 and 3.9.8.</p> <p>27. Add a definition for National Grid: The National Grid is the electricity transmission network owned and operated by Transpower NZ.</p> <p>28. Amend all references to 'electricity transmission lines' to 'National Grid'.</p> <p>29. Delete proposed changes to the definition of amenity values.</p> <p>30. Add definition: Artificial Crop Protection Structures means structures built with material used to protect crops and/or enhance growth (excluding greenhouses).</p> <p>31. Add definition: Crop support structures are open structures on which plants are grown –</p> <p>32. Add definition: Greenhouses are a totally enclosed structure where plants are grown in a controlled environment.</p> <p>33. Ensure that the definition of rural activities includes packing sheds on farm or orchard artificial crop protection structures, and also use of land for airstrips and agricultural aircraft. Rural activities should also include frost fans and bird scarers subject to meeting performance standards.</p> <p>34. Make changes which are consequential to the decisions sought in this submission.</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
72	Mike O'Sullivan, Steven Archer, Victoria Loughlin- Drover and Emma Bullock	PO Box 4136 Wanganui 4541	<p>The submitters agrees with the principle to safeguard the versatility and life supporting capacity of Class 1 and Class 2 soils, and do acknowledge that there are often reverse sensitivity issues that arise as a result of residential activity in the rural zone.</p> <p>The submitters recognise Council's efforts in acknowledge the demand for rural residential living and support the extension to the Rural B Zone.</p> <p>The three proposed Rural A zones: The Western Zone - 19900 hectares, affecting 1610 allotments and made up of 43% Class 1 or 2 Land. The Fordell Zone - 5100 hectares, affecting 315 allotments and made up of 49% Class 1 and 2 Land. The Papaiti Zone - 1900 hectares, 195 allotments and 73% Class 1 and Class 2 Land.</p> <p>The submitters state there are statistical errors in the Westmere Case Study (2013) that exaggerates the increase in lifestyle blocks established over the past 19 years. The blanket approach is too simplistic, and does not take into account the specific circumstances that may exist for a particular proposal. It would appear the statistics were not verified or checked against other sources before being published or used for decision making policies.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That all references to 1st May 2014 be changed to date of the Plan becoming Operative.</li> <li>2. That Map Urban 3 not show land currently Rural B as Rural A</li> <li>3. That in rule 3.4.1 one dwelling is a permitted activity on a site created by subdivision.</li> <li>4. Rules 3.4.2.(b).(i). and 3.4.2.(c).(i) we believe that 10 hectares per allotment should be reconsidered and that the minimum of 5000m<sup>2</sup> should be increased and considered on a case by case basis.</li> <li>5. Rule 3.8.2.(b) That the minimum size be whatever are is required to adequately provide for a suitable building platform and on-site disposal or domestic effluent and storm water.</li> <li>6. Performance Standard 11.5.4 That the minimum size be whatever is required to adequately provide for a suitable building platform and on-site disposal or domestic effluent and storm water.</li> <li>7. The the subdivision of Class1 and 2 land in the Rural A zone should be assessed under the Resource Management Act as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.</li> <li>8. That reverse sensitivity be controlled by consent notices on the title.</li> </ol>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
	Mike O'Sullivan, Steven Archer, Victoria Loughlin- Drover and Emma Bullock continued		<p>The focus on the Westmere Case Study is on the loss of productive Class 1 and 2 Land and disregards the social and environmental effects that can arise from the development of lifestyle properties. The most significant anomaly is the maps and statistics from the 1994 study indicate only Rural B land was included in the study. Land around the Mannington Road- Dickens Lane area and in the Kai iwi Rural Settlement were not included whereas these localities have been included in the 2013 study. From visual inspection it is apparent the 2013 study also included many parcels that existed in 1994 but were excluded from that study. E.g.. Table 3 implies 551 (661-110) small holdings have been created since 1994. That is a gross inaccuracy and leads to misleading conclusions for the reader.</p> <p>2013 statistics include parcels of land created by non-subdivisional process e.g.. parcels affected by government land acquisitions.</p> <p>The category of "less to or equal to 1 hectare" in the 2013 study has produced skewed results which resulted in a less than sound statistical analysis. A subdivision constraint was introduced shortly after the 1994 study which resulted in the minimum lot size being 1ha - so there is an unusual sample of allotments with an area or precisely a hectare. Table 3 indicates 382 (435-53) have been created since 1994 which is grossly inaccurate.</p>	
			<p>The statement "there has been a four fold increase in the number in the number of residential development" and small holdings have increased by 382" is grossly inaccurate as most of that land was not included in the 1994 study. Therefore the significant trends the report writer eludes to are also inaccurate. The "nine fold increase" in properties containing less than 1 hectare is grossly inaccurate. Council introduced a policy that subdivision of rural land holdings less than 1 hectare was not a complying activity. This resulted in an inflated demand for small holdings and an increase in subdivisions with a minimum of 1 hectare. This rule has caused an increase in the land value of small holdings and made a creation of small holdings a viable return for the investment.</p> <p>The statement "three fold increase of properties 2-3ha" is incorrect. There have been 29 such properties created - nine before 2004 and 20 since. Six allotments are on land containing only some class 1 and 2 land and the rest gully, plus one allotment created in the Kai iwi Coastal Protection Zone.</p> <p>The methodology of the 2013 study was not robust and led to distorted statistics and conclusions. Furthermore the erroneous statistics and exaggerated trends have been extrapolated to the much larger Rural A Zone.</p>	



**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>The submitters real concern is a misleading reaction that has adversely affected consideration to proposed plan changes for development of rural land.</p> <p>A 10 hectare minimum lot size will not allow the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ The ability for a farmer to subdivide off an unproductive area of land, due to the physical location of the land, lower class of soil or vegetation cover.</li> <li>~The creation of lots for the next generation of families who are to take over management of a farm. Often separate title is required for mortgages finance to construct a dwelling.</li> <li>~Subdivision that allows family members to realise their share of a farm that may have been left to them after the death of a parent.</li> <li>~The creation of a rural residential lot to include the retiring farmers dwelling who wishes to remain on the property. Note that the 5000m<sup>2</sup> is considered too small.</li> <li>~The disposal of surplus houses now redundant due to a decrease in staff or the merger of farms.</li> <li>~The development of intensive land uses that do not require a large holding.</li> </ul> <p>Perhaps the most aggrieved are those who already reside on a lifestyle block properties. Often these properties have been bought with the intention of subdivision. It is not considered contrary to the objectives if the land has already been taken out of large scale farming.</p>	
			<p>While we accept that this is an issue that does arise, there are many instances where this has been controlled by either consents notices or covenants registered on the tile. E.g. properties next to the Palmerston North airport have a consent notice on then requiring structures to be built that minimise the effect of aircraft noise. Could the same approach not be taken in the rural zone.</p> <p>A blanket 10 hectare minimum is too restrictive. The zone extends out beyond the Class 1 and 2 land and therefore restricts subdivision for legitimate reasons with little regards to the primary objective of preserving these soils.</p> <p>The extent of these Rural A zone should be limited to a defined distance from the city boundary, beyond which the demand for lifestyle properties is minimal.</p>	
73	Peter Bridgland	449 Blueskin Road Wanganui	<p>The submitter supports the proposal.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the one off subdivision provision to relate to Rural A blocks that are less than 10 hectares. This will provide flexibility for small land owners and fairness to all Rural A landowners not just those over 10 hectares.</p>	1. That existing lots less than 10 hectares have the ability to do the one off subdivision.
Late 74	Cameron Shane Bruce Stone	22 Dublin Street Wanganui	Submitter opposes 12 to 14 Clarkson Ave to be zoned Rural C as it is located across from the Residential Zone. It is not cost effective to develop 1 ha blocks. 5000m <sup>2</sup> is much more developable.	1. That 12 to 14 Clarkson Ave to be changed to Rural B or Residential

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
Late 75	John D Moore	176 Wicksteed Street Wanganui	<p>The submitter has invested in this land and should be able to engage in the democratic governance of its management and use it as per councils regulation at time of purchase.</p> <p>The property 602 Parapara Road is only 50% Class 1 soil the balance is not fertile.</p> <p>The submitter questions the accuracy or the land evaluation at 602 Parapara Road. There has been little subdivision in this area historically.</p> <p>Commercially small blocks can produce good financial return.</p> <p>Small blocks attract professionals that give service to the area. It has been mentioned that new rural blocks owners complain about noise, sprays etc. This is an education issue, not to do with subdivision.</p> <p>There is no doubt that rural living is beneficial to general wellbeing.</p>	1. Keep the 1 hectare as it is.
76	Tim Matthews	316 Ohaumoko Road R. D. 7 WANGANUI 4577	<p>There is little subdivision pressure on properties west of the Okehu Stream as travel time to Wanganui is around 15 minutes.</p> <p>A minimum lot size of 10 ha would result in productive lifestyle blocks having too large an area to manage in combination with off-block income, resulting in wasted or less productive area.</p> <p>The quality soils in this area need only wind protection and sometimes irrigation which is available, to produce high quality produce.</p> <p>There are some appropriately subdivided blocks near Maxwell village but further subdivision near Maxwell would not compromise the larger blocks that already co-exist with lifestyle blocks. To retain a sense of community, as well as minimising the reverse sensitivity issues, lifestyle blocks should be grouped together, where water supply is available.</p> <p>The community has lost its garage, school and critical mass. Some rural repopulation would sustain it in the longer term if appropriate subdivision and residential development occurred, allowing farm workers and contractors a village style of accommodation near their place of work.</p> <p>While the need to have a Rural A zone has been established, properties on the northern and eastern margins especially are disadvantaged, because the LUC Classes I or II may only comprise a few hectares or less than 5% of the site total. Should they wish to subdivide less than 10 ha of land that is not LUC Classes I or II, they will face the same "hurdles" to subdivision as if the whole property was Rural A.</p>	<p>1. That the proposed Rural A Zone extends too far west, and that the western boundary should be the Okehu Stream from its seaward mouth inland to the northern mapped boundary of Rural A, which is approximately 1 km west of Rangitatau West road and Bushy Park Reserve.</p> <p>2. That properties on the margins of the Rural A Zone are not disadvantaged by the Council's method of defining the Zone, using Land Use Capability mapping which captures proportionately small areas of sites, yet the whole title is mapped as Rural A.</p> <p>3. 3.9.8 (a). No tree for forestry, shelter belt or soil conservation purposes shall be planted within 10 metres of any boundary</p> <p>add "...; nor have any branch that projects from the tree trunk between ground level and a height of 6 metres overhanging the adjoining boundary, unless written consent of the adjacent neighbour and the any adjacent network utility (if there are existing lines near the boundary) has been obtained and registered with the Council."</p>

**Proposed Plan Change 36 - Rural Zones - Summary of Submissions**

No.	Name	Address1	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
			<p>There is a need for a process in the relevant subdivision consent procedure that recognises that these marginal properties are different to Rural or Rural C, but that parts of them should be treated as Rural C.</p> <p>Landowners should not be disadvantaged because the Council has chosen to use partial LUC's to delineate the extent of the new Rural A zone, when most of the property is Rural C in nature.</p> <p>When the Council exercises its discretion to grant resource consent the process and cost should not exceed that for a subdivision of Rural C Zone.</p> <p>The last Review of this District Plan added the 6 metre branch restriction to this clause by Consent Order of the Environment Court after Appeal.</p> <p>There has been no good reason to change this provision in the past 10 years as it enables control of adverse effects while allowing neighbours to agree separately on tree management, providing such agreement is registered with Council.</p> <p>Forest owners are tending to avoid pruning management of their trees to reduce costs, which means that adjoining neighbours must bear the unintended consequences of tree and branch damage, stock poisoning and escape through fence damage, plus shaded pasture and crops, moisture and fertility theft by tree roots.</p>	
			<p>The District Plan provides a low cost encouragement method to ensure that tree owners do not abandon their responsibilities to manage nuisance from their crop adversely affecting occupiers outside their boundary.</p> <p>There would need to be consequential amendments for Rural B and C Zones.</p>	