

SUBMISSION TO:

PROPOSED WANGANUI DISTRICT PLAN 2014

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 36 - RURAL

**Wanganui District Council
P. O. Box 637
WANGANUI 4500**

By:

T. J. Matthews

**Address for service: 316 Ohaumoko Road
R. D. 7
WANGANUI 4577**

**Phone : 06 342 7783
Email : matthews.tj@xtra.co.nz**

Date : 4 June 2014

Hearing: I do wish to be heard at the Plan Hearings

Statement: a. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

b. I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of this submission that adversely affects the environment; and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

SUBMISSION:

1. Rural A Zone Extent and Definition of Rural A Zone

3.3 Policies

- 3.3.6 Avoid ad hoc urban development in the Rural A zone especially on the fringes of the Rural B and Rural Settlement Zones

Decisions Requested:

- 1.1 **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.**

Reason: 1 There is little subdivision pressure on properties west of the Okehu Stream as travel time to Wanganui is around 15 minutes.

2 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.

3 The quality soils in this area need only wind protection and sometimes irrigation which is available, to produce high quality produce.

4 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.

5 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.

- 1.2 **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.**

Reason: 1 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.

2 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.

3 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.

4 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.

2.0 3.9.8 Performance Standards Trees

Decision Requested:

1.3 3.9.8 a. No tree for forestry, shelter belt or soil conservation purposes shall be planted within 10 metres of any boundary

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."

Reason: 1 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.

2 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.

3 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.

4 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.

There would need to be consequential amendments for Rural B and C Zones.

SUBMISSION ENDS

Signed:

TIM MATTHEWS

