

Submission on Waimakariri District Council - Proposed District Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waimakariri District Council - Development Planning Unit

Date received: 23/11/2021

Submission Reference Number #:76

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Waimakariri District Council - Proposed District Plan

Address for service:

N [REDACTED] Schaffer

New Zealand

Email: nathan.schaffer@mbie.govt.nz

I wish to be heard: Yes

I am willing to present a joint case: Yes

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- **No**

Submission points

Point 76.1

Section: GRUZ - General Rural Zone

Sub-section: GRUZ - General Rural Zone

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

I oppose the Draft Rural Plan to include my two properties at 593 Marshmans Rd and 581 Marshmans Rd in the GRUZ

proposed Zone. The basis that,

- The GRUZ boundary for the Loburn-Sefton Downs has been based solely on an arbitrary term of Rural Character. This term is not well defined by WDC or its consultants. The western side of Marshmans Rd has already been extensively subdivided into 4ha blocks. The remaining large titles are only semi productive farmland with no available irrigation supply - at best these are simply large lifestyle blocks which remain in generational families. The 'Rural Character' still remains today after the cutting up of farms into 4ha blocks - my argument is that most people would recognise the downlands as rural even in its subdivided form.

- There are large title blocks on Marshmans Rd (eg 383 Marshmans Rd, 146 McLeods Rd) which have been included in the RLZ Zone which is in direct conflict with the proposal to keep the rural character. My assumption is that the consultant used to assess Rural Character was not able to get a vantage point due to topography or vegetation to consider these blocks. How can some blocks be included and others not?

- In Yvonne Pfluger of Bofka Miskells report (11/3/2020) - she states the area along Ramsays Rd is undeveloped compared to Copples or Douds. However the titles along Marshmans Rd between Douds Rd and Ramsays Rd are all under 20ha - including my two titles. In fact the title on the corner of Ramsays and Marshmans Rd has recently been sub divided to two 4ha blocks. She even states - *"rather than rural residential/ lifestyle like in the more eastern parts (such as along most of Marshmans Road"* citing that the area is already well . The issue with this report is that it singles out a handful of well established land owners who have resisted the temptation to subdivide. Why now should they be punished and not reap some of the rewards that others in the past have obtained because a consultant from Auckland took a few photos from a car and said that it looked nice? One has to understand the history of the Sefton Downlands, its not profitable to farm unless its a generational farm with no debt - what makes it harder is that it is now predominantly a lifestyle area which makes farming practices even harder. If effort was to make these larger titles more intensive there would no doubt be push back from the lifestyle dwellings. Its hard for the council to say that its for Rural use when in reality that died back when farm subsidies where removed.

-It suggests the boundary was obtained by what looked like a large paddock from google earth should be GRUZ. Point in case is 383 Marshmans Rd - from Google Earth this looks like a number of small parcels yet it is one large title and a working farm but has been included in the RLZ Zone. Maybe i should of planted some more hedges?

- Boffa Miskell's draft Rural Zone Boundary 18 December 2019 clearly shows their original boundary was on the western edge of my property. I cannot find any documentation that explains why the boundary was adjusted to include my two titles?. It would appear that from emails obtained via OIA that a desktop analysis was performed and my parcels were thought to be included or still in ownership by the adjacent larger titles to the west. This is not the case and it makes no sense why my 8ha blocks would be included in the GRUZ where its been very deliberate along Marshmans road to exclude titles under 20ha?

- There is an awful lot of contradiction in the draft plan zoning boundaries. Why weren't we consulted on this as its a change to our current zoning? - i would of thought as rate payer i should be informed and allowed to challenge the proposal before it reached a draft plan

- This is a major change that could affect the livelihoods of many people - you are enforcing that titles in GRUZ zones are productive agriculture titles which simply is not the case. If so can i put a large scale pig farm on my title? - the answer is no and the council will be the first to shut me down as i will affect the lifestyle areas in the area. This is where you are missing the point - you cant have islands of Rural land with lifestyle areas, it doesnt work.

Relief sought

Ultimately the RLZ boundary should run across the boundary of Ashley Forest - the horse has bolted for subdivision in the area so why punish those who remain. However to purposely include my titles and deliberately change the boundary to include them is just plain wrong and needs to be amended