



Submission on a Variation/Change to the Tasman Resource Management Plan

Return your submission by the advertised closing date to:
Manager, Policy
Tasman District Council
Private Bag 4, Richmond, Nelson 7050 OR
189 Queen Street, Richmond, Nelson OR
Fax 543-9524 OR Email steve.markham@tasman.govt.nz

OFFICE USE
Date received stamp:

11.3.16

Initials: [Signature]
Submitter No. 3015

Note:
This form is only for the purpose of making a submission on the Plan. It is NOT for making a further submission (i.e. in support or opposition to an original submission) or for making a submission on a resource consent or on Council's Annual Plan.

Submitter Name: Hoddys Orchard Ltd
(organization/individual)

Representative/Contact: Andrew Kininmonth
(if different from above)

Postal Address:
16 Aniseed Valley
RD 1
Richmond 7081

Home Phone: 021 42 7753
Bus. Phone: 03 544 6654
Fax: 03 544 4868
Email: andrew@hoddysorchard.co.nz
Date: 4 March 2016

Postal address for service of person making the submission:
(if different from above)

Signature: [Signature]
(Signature of person making the submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)
Total number of pages submitted: 2

IMPORTANT - Please state:

This submission relates to Variation/Change No.: 60 Section 16.3
Variation/Change Title/Subject: Rural Land Use
& Subdivision Policy Review

- I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission.
- I/we would be prepared to consider presenting my/our submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearings.

(1) My submission relates to: Provision No or Planning Map No. (Please specify, e.g. 34.2.20(a)(iii) or Zone Map 25)	(2) My submission is that: (State concisely the nature of your submission and clearly indicate whether you: • support or oppose the specific provisions, or • wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)	(3) I seek the following decisions from the Tasman District Council: Give precise details of the nature of the decision you seek in relation to the variation number and provision/map number given in column (1), e.g. addition, deletion or alteration. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for Council to understand your concerns.)	OFFICE USE Submission No.
<u>See Page 2</u>			
<u>Page 1.</u>			

Supplementary Sheet

OFFICE USE Submitter Number: 3015

<p>(1) My submission relates to: Provision No or Planning Map No. <i>(Please specify, e.g. 34.2.20(a)(iii) or Zone Map 25)</i></p>	<p>(2) My submission is that: <i>(State concisely the nature of your submission and clearly indicate whether you: • support or oppose the specific provisions, or • wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)</i></p>	<p>(3) I seek the following decisions from the Tasman District Council: <i>(Give precise details of the nature of the decision you seek in relation to the variation number and provision/map number given in column (1), e.g. addition, deletion or alteration. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for Council to understand your concerns.)</i></p>	<p>OFFICE USE Submission No.</p>
<p>Proposed Plan Change 60 - Rural land Use and Subdivision Policy Review Section 16.3 Subdivision</p>	<p>We support the philosophy of trying to protect Rural 1 productive land and keeping it in full production i.e. horticulture, viticulture and intensive farming, as much as possible</p> <p>We believe there are some options that may have been overlooked that would enable Rural 1 to be used more productively and be protected from further fragmentation and/or under-utilisation</p> <p>We support in part the proposed changes but would like to see the following amendments added as the current proposed changes make no provision for this possibility</p>	<p>Background</p> <p>In previous changes made to Rural 1 land, the subdivision of bigger areas of land on the Waimea Plains were allowed to be broken down into 4-6ha blocks (the old 10 acre blocks). At the time these blocks were viable in their own right – now most are not. As an example the latest MPI modelling shows you need approx 30ha of Pipfruit to be viable.</p> <p>We seek the following amendment/addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the owners of these smaller blocks (say 5ha for sake of this exercise) be allowed to subdivide off their house and some land (say 0.5ha total) keeping the title they currently have. This would free up capital for other use, remove the burden of the land while allowing them to continue living in the country as they wish - That the remaining productive Rural 1 land (4.5ha) be able to be purchased by another larger land owner with the intent of intensively farming this land without the over capitalisation of having a dwelling. They only want the land not the dwelling. - That this area of land be able to be added onto the larger land owner's title even if it does not have a common boundary onto/not directly adjoining the proposed block i.e. the 4.5ha could be 500m up the road from the proposed buyer. The could be refreed to as "land banking". - An additional dwelling on this 4.5ha, although not ideal may be able to be added as per the other proposed plan change 60 variations pertaining to multiple dwelling. 	<p>60</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

3777 HotHouse Communications

Feel free to contact us:



Tasman District Council
Email info@tasman.govt.nz
Website www.tasman.govt.nz
24 hour assistance

Richmond
189 Queen Street
Private Bag 4
Richmond 7050
New Zealand
Phone 03 543 8400
Fax 03 543 9524

Murchison
7 Hickmott Place
Murchison 7007
New Zealand
Phone 03 523 1013
Fax 03 523 1012

Motueka
7 Hickmott Place
PO Box 123
Motueka 7143
New Zealand
Phone 03 528 2022
Fax 03 528 9751

Takaka
14 Junction Street
PO Box 74
Takaka 7142
New Zealand
Phone 03 525 0020
Fax 03 525 9972

Golden Bay Community Board

C/- Tasman District Council

P.O. Box 74

Takaka 7142

Phone 03 525 0020

Email Carolyn: balmac@extra.co.nz or Laura: laura.page@tasman.govt.nz

11.03.2016



R 11.3.16
A

GOLDEN BAY COMMUNITY BOARD SUBMISSION ON RURAL LAND USE PLAN CHANGE 60

This plan change is a very important one for the people of Golden Bay who submitted in large numbers to the original draft proposal – over 80% of all submissions came from this ward. The major points coming through those submissions were around protection of larger blocks of Rural 1 productive land, multiple dwellings, subdivisions of smaller blocks, inappropriate zonings, affordable housing and temporary dwellings.

We agree with some staff and councillors that it is unfortunate the rezoning exercise was not done in tandem with or before this plan. It could have ironed out many of the issues that will continue to remain unaddressed by this plan change.

We also acknowledge that, while there is strong local sentiment around several of the issues covered by the plan, it is an extremely complex and unwieldy document even for councillors, which makes submitting effectively by the average citizen very difficult. For this reason, there are those who feel unable to submit. However, the Board very much appreciated the presentations and information sessions held by planning and consenting staff in Takaka for the community.

We support and applaud the policy direction of Co-operative Housing and Low Impact Development, but believe it should apply across all zones, not just Rural 2, as it is still very much at the discretion of Council, therefore large tracts of productive land would still be protected. It is the smaller blocks that can't be incorporated into larger farms that are often ideally suited to subdivision or co-operative housing. Realistically, we do not know how this Co-operative Housing policy will play out in practical terms and seek reassurance that more flexibility will be commensurate, with greater certainty and less cost than what is now possible. Otherwise we are concerned it might be just a nice-sounding policy with no real teeth.

The extra housing allowances, while a good step forward for larger hold landowners (over 25 h), does not bring about any change for those on the smaller and often most appropriate unproductive land lots, which is the case for many sincere and increasingly frustrated Golden Bay submitters. Ironically, it is these unproductive lots, which, if allowance were made for multiple dwellings, would most likely end up being more productive than being left as they currently are. People who choose to live together are usually doing so to grow their own gardens, woodlots and run small livestock. We would like to see this housing rule apply as of right to any size Rural 2 or Rural Residential block, where appropriate.

In terms of affordable housing, it seems that the plan accommodates those who are more asset-rich than those who are not. While there is allowance for co-operative housing, mortgages are not possible for those on a shared title...another blow to the concept of affordable housing. For this reason, smaller unproductive lots should be allowed to subdivide easily, particularly where the

area is already built up. We also have many under 25h lots that are turning into scrubby wastelands due to ageing owners unable to care for their land and unable to subdivide – this is a worse look for Tasman District than having the land lived on and cared for.

Temporary dwellings were also strongly submitted on and we are disappointed to see no movement in this area. This is one way that affordable housing could be possible for some people. If the principles of low impact development and basic health and safety standards applied, we would like to see a loosening up around an activity that already flies under the radar across the district. This activity is only going to increase when rules do not change to accommodate common sense trends and social needs. The 'Tiny House' movement and other temporary dwelling solutions have global momentum now, with downsizing and simplifying the order of the day. Tasman District needs to be thinking ahead to the new ways of social living taking place in other parts of the world. Rather than spending money on compliance and taking residents to court, which is an expensive headache for Council and does not engender good community relationships, we would like to encourage Council to enable this activity in a healthy and controlled way. Allowance for temporary dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity, with a renewable as-of-right tenure of 2-5 years at a time would seem a good first step.

We understand the concerns of Councillors wanting to protect rural amenity and productive land, however, we feel that the plan is too restrictive for the needs as stated by the people of Golden Bay. Concerns that what would work here might not translate well to other areas in the district, e.g. Waimea Plains, is not good enough reason to avoid providing what is appropriate for the needs of the Bay. There is very little scope here for housing of young families and the elderly – to keep this area alive and vital, more flexibility is needed. There is still the option of Golden Bay having specific rules around areas that would lend themselves to subdivision and more affordable housing. The Board would be well suited to discuss these specific areas with staff to come back to Council for approval.

Finally, a point on cross boundary effects from noise – namely motocross, which has been a real issue in the Bay over the years. We think that it is reasonable to protect neighbours from unacceptable noise from machinery and activities that are not involved in productive agricultural activity, especially of a repetitive nature. We are concerned and request that casual construction or gradual development of motocross tracks or recreational activities that may be noisy, disruptive, odour-producing or which may impact on a neighbour's peaceful enjoyment of their own property, should be subject to a Limited Notification Resource Consent application.

To summarise, the Golden Bay Community Board:

- Supports the Co-operative Housing and Low Impact Development policies, but request it apply to across all zonings, where appropriate. ① ②
- Supports the extra dwellings allowable on larger blocks and request that this rule be allowed on appropriate land of any size i.e., less than the 25h suggested. ③
- Subdivision rules to accommodate the smaller unproductive Rural 2 lots. ④
- Support for 2-5 year renewable tenure of temporary dwellings as an affordable housing option for our more vulnerable, younger, elderly and less affluent. With restricted discretionary activity status. ⑤
- If more options for affordable living situations are unable to be accommodated across the district, we request a special dispensation for Golden Bay. The Golden Bay Community ⑥



Board to work with planning staff and councilors towards areas of agreement where some of these options can be explored, without adversely affecting other areas in the district.

3592

- Motocross activity in the form of regular practice or establishment of casual racing tracks which may impact on neighbours to be a limited notified resource consent.

8



15th March 2016



LATE
RIS.3.16 @
3660
landmark life^{ltd}
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Tasman District Council
Private Bag 4
Richmond 7040
Attn: Steve Markham

Lucas House, 51 Halifax Street, Nelson
PO Box 243, Nelson 7040
Phone: 03 550 0350
Mobile: 027 244 3588
Email: mark@landmarklife.co.nz
www.landmarklife.co.nz

Dear Steve,

Plan Change 60: Rural Land Use and Subdivision Policy Review
Submission – *St Leger Group Limited*

Please find attached submissions to Plan Change 60 on behalf of St Leger Group Limited. These submissions relate to the introduction of new setbacks to Rural 2 and Rural Residential properties.

The submitter does wish to be heard in support of these submissions.

Please contact me if you have any further queries.

Mark Lile
Landmark Life Limited
Resource Management Consultant

Subm. C60		TRMP: Rural Land Use and Subdivision Review
Rural 2 Zone		
1	Rule 17.6.3.1(j)(i) (5.2.19)	<p>Notified:</p> <p>Amend condition 17.6.3.1(j)(i) as follows:</p> <p><i>(i) 10 metres from road boundaries <u>except as provided for under condition (ma), and ...</u></i></p> <p>Submission: Opposed</p> <p>Reasons: This change does not make sense. Condition (ma) does not relate to road boundaries.</p> <p>Relief Sought: Delete change.</p>
2	Rule 17.6.3.1(ma) (5.2.20)	<p>Notified:</p> <p>Insert new condition into rule 17.6.3.1:</p> <p><i>(ma) A building may be set within 5 metres of an internal boundary where <u>the landowner of the property has provided written permission.</u></i></p> <p>Submission: Neither support nor oppose</p> <p>Reasons: While it is understood what this change seeks to achieve, the manner in which this rule will provide for certainty to a property owner is yet to be properly understood. Written approvals can be withdrawn and so, if that is what is meant by written permission, this needs to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Relief Sought: Amend the rule as necessary to ensure there is certainty.</p>
3	Rule 17.6.3.1(n) (5.2.21)	<p>Notified: Delete and replace condition 17.6.3.1:</p> <p><i>If the adjoining property has horticultural plantings where pesticides may be discharged to air, any dwelling or any other building used for residential activity is set back at least:</i></p> <p><i>(i) 30 metres from the boundary common to the horticultural plantings and the building; or</i></p> <p><i>(ii) 20 metres from horticultural plantings where a spray belt is established along the boundary common to the horticultural plantings and the building; or</i></p> <p><i>(iii) 30 metres from the horticultural plantings that are vineyards.</i></p> <p><u>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least:</u></p> <p><i><u>(i) 30 metres from any internal boundary, except where the activity is an alteration to a dwelling, and the existing setback to the boundary is not thereby reduced;</u></i></p>

		<p><u>(ii) 300 metres from any building or enclosure that houses poultry on an existing lawfully established intensive livestock farm which is a poultry farm on or before 30 January 2016.</u></p> <p>Submission: Oppose</p> <p>Reasons: A mandatory 30m setback from internal boundaries in the Rural 2 zone is considered to be unnecessary and excessive. This will not provide for the sustainable use of rural 2 land resources. Nor does the rule take account of subdivision and land use consents already granted but not yet given effect to. There is a very high likelihood that a number of approved new allotments will no longer be able to be developed with a residential dwelling in these circumstances. Likewise, this change does not take account of rural 2 land that is deferred for residential purposes.</p> <p>Relief Sought: Delete changes</p>
Rural Residential Zone		
<p>4</p>	<p>Rule 17.8.3.1(n) (5.4.9)</p>	<p>Notified: Delete and replace condition 17.8.3.1(h):</p> <p>If the adjoining property has horticultural plantings where pesticides may be discharged to air, any dwelling or any other building used for residential activity is set back at least:</p> <p>(i) 30 metres from the boundary common to the horticultural plantings and the building; or</p> <p>(ii) 20 metres from horticultural plantings where a spray belt is established along the boundary common to the horticultural plantings and the building; or</p> <p>(iii) 30 metres from the horticultural plantings that are vineyards.</p> <p><u>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least:</u></p> <p><u>(i) 30 metres from any boundary where that boundary is to a Rural 1, Rural 2 or Rural 3 Zone;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) 300 metres from any building or enclosure that houses poultry that is on an existing lawfully-established intensive livestock farm which is a poultry farm on or before 30 January 2016.</u></p> <p>Submission: Oppose</p> <p>Reasons: A mandatory 30m setback from internal boundaries in the Rural Residential zone is considered to be unnecessary and excessive. This will not provide for the sustainable use of this land resources. Nor does the rule take account of subdivision and land use consents already granted but not yet given effect to. There is a very high likelihood that a number of approved new allotments will no longer be able to be developed with a residential dwelling in these circumstances. Likewise, this change does not take account of rural residential land that is deferred for residential purposes.</p> <p>Relief Sought: Delete changes.</p>

3

4

Anonymous.



SUBMISSION TO TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 60

RURAL LAND USE AND SUBDIVISION POLICY -30TH JANUARY 2016

3939

I've been going through the information handed out at the presentation in the Takaka Fire Brigade meeting room on Thursday 18th February. The presentation was very competent, I was amazed at how hard staff, especially Sonya, had worked to try and address Golden Bay issues of land use, zoning and subdivision, and rules. I've been sitting here trying to get my head around the information supplied in order to make a proper submission, but my head is swimming. It is just too complex and disjointed, so I'm instead making anonymous comments and observations. I think you might find a low submission level if others feel as I do.

My thoughts and observations from the Consultation meeting.

I have attended all of these consultation meetings, including to local meetings discussing the issues. At Wednesday night's meeting I observed the same atmosphere from the audience that I have observed in all previous meetings. Frustration and needs not being met.

Comments and observations.

It seems that having not dealt with zoning issues first there are modern issues which are simply not fitting. These policies, especially zoning, are old, a lot has happened in society since they were drafted. There are modern issues which simply cannot fit well and people are being unnecessarily and extraordinarily disadvantaged and the burden is falling on the young.

I am 73 years old, have raised a family who are in turn raising their own, and I have seen a lot of changes in New Zealand since the current zoning and rural land use and subdivision rules were written.

One of the biggest is that life is much harder for young people starting out. Where we used to take for granted that we would own our own homes, I have heard it expressed that most young people won't ever own their own home. I have seen the Government statistics for wages paid back before the turn of the 20th century. They haven't changed much, but the cost of housing is astronomical. These kids have student loans to repay that the young didn't have back then and unstable rental markets are putting huge strain on their ability to settle down to provide stability for child raising.

In my day we finished school and had a range of free training opportunities for jobs which we moved seamlessly into. Today's young face huge instability and both parents are strained to find a way to have the level of quality time and input with their children because they both have full time jobs. Something has to happen to enable young families to gain

cheaper, high quality community conditions in which to raise their families in a less stressful environment. Hence these planning policies and zoning issues are so vital for the future and it is so important to get them right.

Two impressions I have been left with from these rural land use meetings.

1. Young people want to be able to purchase a small block of land where they can self build a simple dwelling (as happened in our New Zealand past) and soil good enough to enable them to grow vegetables and fruit and have animals, and to be able to share knowledge with their peers on this style of living. They need to be in cycling distance of schools and community assets. Hence their drive to be able to purchase land or share land and to live in community with a low cost entry because they don't have much money.
2. Wages are low in Golden Bay. Many people need 3-4 jobs to make a living wage (if they can get those jobs, or if they have skills producing something people want) yet Golden Bay is a safe, high quality environment with incredible infrastructure and a very interactive and cohesive community able and willing to help and support the young to raise their families. We have to have zoning and policies which enable the young to live self-sustaining rural lives, able to manage with several low paying jobs.
3. Personal Observations. When we came to live in Golden Bay 25 years ago we were able to buy an old house on 5 good quality acres of land with several out buildings in which to conduct small hobby businesses and growing our own food. We paid \$100,000 for this. Twenty years later we sold it for \$475,000. It would have been a brilliant place for a young family but we needed the \$475,000 to purchase our retirement home. I have gone back 25 years to observe what wages were back then and they haven't changed much, not nearly as much as the cost of land and housing has.
4. The Zoning rules and Rural Land Use and Subdivision policies are trying to deal with what were suitable policies and rules back then, but the situation has changed drastically since they were drafted. It is imperative in my mind that Council urgently take on examining and updating the Zoning policies and Rules so that the Rural Land Use and Subdivision Policies can be written properly and make impact on the urgent issues that face us in 2016. My opinion is that what was presented to us on Wednesday 17th February won't meet people's needs without Zoning changes. Each has the power to sabotage the other.
5. Quite a number of our friends came to Golden Bay in the hippy era when land was cheap and they were able to build for themselves, small, cheap dwellings. They are growing old now but have had enormously satisfying lives.
6. What is happening with young people is that they are struggling hard to live here but find they cannot afford to stay. Some are squatting on someone else's land illegally and self-building or erecting alternative dwellings, but live in fear of being evicted. My neighbours are moving to Wellington next week. They are local young people,

with student loans, whose families live in Golden Bay. They purchased the old house next door in a panic when the 20% deposit was about to be introduced. They both had jobs, worked long hours, also each had a small business selling to others at market day and through other outlets; they gave up both of their spare bedrooms for boarders, but have still been unable to make life in Golden Bay work for them. I have noticed other young people who also bought their 'cheap' homes just before the 20% deposit rule. They are struggling with several jobs and some having to move out of their home to rent it and live communally with someone else and meanwhile they are having to put off having children.

7. I just don't see how these new policies and rules will make the needed difference. They still make it very hard for young people to get a start, but the last thing we need is for random small holdings to spring up everywhere in the rural environment. It needs to be planned. I realise that economic rural 1 property needs to be protected from being created into uneconomic farming blocks where the sub-divider is the only winner. This had happened on the five acre property we used to live on. The original 1857 family finally sold the farm and a developer purchased it and divided it up so that no single block was able to function economically but he personally, made a fortune.

I don't want to identify myself because I have imparted other people's personal information and do not want these individuals recognised without their permission.

3957

Submission on a Variation/Change to the Tasman Resource Management Plan

Return your submission by the advertised closing date to:

Manager, Policy
Tasman District Council
Private Bag 4, Richmond, Nelson 7050 OR
189 Queen Street, Richmond, Nelson OR
Fax 543-9524 OR Email steve.markham@tasman.govt.nz

OFFICE USE

Date received stamp

RECEIVED

15 MAR 2016

TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL
MOTUEKA

Initials: _____

Submitter No.

3957

Note:

This form is only for the purpose of making a submission on the Plan. It is NOT for making a further submission (i.e. in support or opposition to an original submission) or for making a submission on a resource consent or on Council's Annual Plan.

Submitter Name: Vicki Adams
(organization/individual)

Representative/Contact:
(if different from above)

Postal Address:
1085 Motueka River
Westbank Rd,

Home Phone: 0276676009

Bus. Phone: _____

Fax: _____

Email: _____

Date: 13-3-16

Postal address for service of person making the submission:
(if different from above) plus
RDI
MOTUEKA 7196

Signature: [Signature]
(Signature of person making the submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Total number of pages submitted: 1

IMPORTANT – Please state:

This submission relates to Variation/Change No.:

Variation/Change Title/Subject:

- I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission.
- I/we would be prepared to consider presenting my/our submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearings.

(1) My submission relates to: Provision No or Planning Map No. <small>(Please specify, e.g. 34.2.20(a)(iii) or Zone Map 25)</small>	(2) My submission is that: <small>(State concisely the nature of your submission and clearly indicate whether you: • support or oppose the specific provisions, or • wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)</small>	(3) I seek the following decisions from the Tasman District Council: <small>(Give precise details of the nature of the decision you seek in relation to the variation number and provision/map number given in column (1), e.g. addition, deletion or alteration. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for Council to understand your concerns.)</small>	OFFICE USE Submission No.
<u>Proposed Plan 60</u>	<u>In my instance, New Titles from 30 January be waived where as I propose to boundary swap</u>		

(1) My submission relates to: Provision No or Planning Map No. (Please specify, e.g. 34.2.20(a)(iii) or Zone Map 25)	(2) My submission is that: (State concisely the nature of your submission and clearly indicate whether you: • support or oppose the specific provisions, or • wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)	(3) I seek the following decisions from the Tasman District Council: (Give precise details of the nature of the decision you seek in relation to the variation number and provision/map number given in column (1), e.g. addition, deletion or alteration. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for Council to understand your concerns.)	OFFICE USE Submission No.
	<p>with my neighbour on one occasion to promote my property to over 24 hots so I can subdivide once to two similar lots, to reduce land size due to ill health. As 21 hots is too large and two smaller lots (with irrigation) already in place) is more manageable. The 30 January 2016 cut off date is unfair as currently allowed to do so but not with the '30-1-16 stipulation. I will lose the current "as of right" subdivision because of this date. And fall into new regulations before they come into law!</p>	<p>Waiver of 30/1/16 date to do a (one c boundary swap then immediate subdivision in half of my 21 ha property to two 12 plus hots lots. 10+ fully irrigated hots each. ①</p>	

Feel free to contact us:



tasman
district council

Tasman District Council
 Email info@tasman.govt.nz
 Website www.tasman.govt.nz
 24 hour assistance

Richmond
 189 Queen Street
 Private Bag 4
 Richmond, Nelson
 7050, New Zealand
 Phone 03 543 8400
 Fax 03 543 9324

Murchison
 92 Fairfax Street
 Murchison 7007
 New Zealand
 Phone 03 523 1013
 Fax 03 523 1012

Motueka
 7 Hickmott Place
 PO Box 123
 Motueka 7143
 New Zealand
 Phone 03 528 2022
 Fax 03 528 9751

Takaka
 78 Commercial Street
 PO Box 74
 Takaka 7142
 New Zealand
 Phone 03 525 0020
 Fax 03 525 9972



Submission on a Change to the Tasman Resource Management Plan

Return your submission by the advertised closing date to:

Manager, Policy
Tasman District Council
Private Bag 4, Richmond 7050 OR
189 Queen Street, Richmond OR
Fax 03 543 9524 OR Email steve.markham@tasman.govt.nz

Note:

This form is only for the purpose of making a submission on the Plan. It is NOT for making a further submission (i.e. in support or opposition to an original submission) or for making a submission on a resource consent or on Council's Annual Plan.

Cover Sheet

OFFICE USE

Date received stamp:

11.3.16

[Handwritten initials]

Initials:

Submitter No.

3969

Submitter Name: **Claire Parkes**
(organisation/individual)

Representative/Contact: **Claire Parkes**
(if different from above)

Postal Address:
**310 Church Valley Rd
RD1 Wakefield
Nelson 7095**

Home Phone: **035419006**

Bus. Phone: **0212027284**

Fax:

Email: **castledowns@xtra.co.nz**

Date: **11-Mar-2016**

Postal address for service of person making submission:
(if different from above)

Signature: **Claire E Parkes**

NOTE: A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Total number of pages submitted *(including this page)*:

IMPORTANT – Please state:

This submission relates to Change No.: **60**

Change Title/Subject:
Rural Land Use

- I/we wish to be heard in support of my/our submission.
- I/we would be prepared to consider presenting my/our submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearings.

Please attach this cover sheet to your supplementary sheet(s) outlining your submission request(s).

Supplementary Sheet

OFFICE USE Submitter Number: 3969

<p>(1) My submission relates to: Provision No or Planning Map No. <i>(Please specify, e.g. 34.2.20(a)(iii) or Zone Map 25)</i></p>	<p>(2) My submission is that: <i>(State concisely the nature of your submission and clearly indicate whether you: • support or oppose the specific provisions, or • wish to have amendments made, giving reasons)</i></p>	<p>(3) I seek the following decisions from the Tasman District Council: <i>(Give precise details of the nature of the decision you seek in relation to the variation number and provision/map number given in column (1), e.g. addition, deletion or alteration. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for Council to understand your concerns.)</i></p>	<p>OFFICE USE Submission No.</p>
<p>Plan change 60</p>	<p>Oppose intensifying of Rural residential as buffer needs to exist alongside productive rural 1 and 2 land and existing land used in capacity of rural 1 and 2 criteria despite it having been rezoned in past to other another zoning criteria.</p> <p>Admendments need to be made to restrict activity on rural residential activity that impacts on the rural nature of existing and adjacent rural 1 and 2 used activities..eg dogs, inappropriate designed buildings such as white 2 story house in Totoraveiw subdivision, buildings too close to boundary, a mixture of ugly and inappropriate boundary fencing should be specified to uniform and appropriate materials, and acceptance of reasonable rural activities such as topdressing, spraying, stags roaring and stock grazing at rural boundaries. Also a need to keep public out of these areas for animal welfare, health and safety, security and conflict of values.</p> <p>Support the provisions of change 60 which are intended to protect the sustainable production from rural zones 1 & 2. Other council policies also have to be aligned to achieve this....a council proposed walkway through our property</p>	<p>Consideration to altering and rezoning from council that the unsuitability of some of existing zoning is inappropriate due to land contour and direction it faces, and impact on operation on adjacent existing rural land use.</p> <p>Rules to be imposed re size and visual requirements of rural residential to protect adjacent rural productive land.</p> <p>Rules re dogs owners adjacent to rural land</p>	<p>3</p>

194

(See attached for further text/comments)

2/2

3777 HotHouse Communications

Pam Meadows

Subject: Plan Change 60 Submission

One of the concerns I have is a plan showing a walkway through the middle of our farm. This is a huge concern for us and would have a disasterous effect on our farming operation, besides us being totally opposed to it being on our farm. There had been no consultation with us on that walkway and I beleive council are totally out of touch with the productive land owners to have put this in the current plan.

Council also need to be aware of incredibly high rates charged to productive rural ownners as this is going to lead to loss of these few remaining blocks in the south Waimea basin area.

Highly visible street lighting should not be placed so that larger rural owners are affected this.

Thanks, Claire Parkes

R 14.3.16

1

3974

**AGGREGATE AND QUARRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW ZEALAND
SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 60
TO THE TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
(RURAL LAND USE AND SUBDIVISION POLICY REVIEW)**

To: Tasman District Council
Private Bag 4
RICHMOND

Email: info@tasman.govt.nz

Name of Submitter: Aggregate and Quarry Association of New Zealand ("AQA")

Contact Person: Graeme Mathieson

Address for Service: Environmental Management Services Ltd
PO Box 97431
MANUKAU 2241

Telephone: (09) 2555127
Facsimile: (09) 2555129
Email: graeme.mathieson@emslimited.co.nz

AQA wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

If others make a similar submission, AQA would be prepared to consider preparing a joint case with them at any hearing.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Aggregate and Quarry Association of New Zealand (“AQA”) was formed in 1969 by companies involved in extracting and supplying aggregates in New Zealand (e.g. rock, sand, gravel, clay, limestone), in response to the need for an industry group that could represent aggregate suppliers on a range of issues, as well as liaise with regulators and end users of the materials (see www.aqa.org.nz for website). Membership of the AQA stands at over 80 companies, which between them produce 85% of the 50 million tonnes of aggregates and allied raw materials used in New Zealand annually. AQA members are active throughout New Zealand in terms of extractive industries and provide necessary materials for residential, industrial and commercial development, thereby contributing significantly to sustainable economic development.
- 1.2 Aggregate is a significant resource for the district, regional and national economies. A sustainable supply of aggregate is essential for continued development to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being. This is not only required to provide for building, construction and roading projects associated with growth, but also to maintain and redevelop existing infrastructure¹.
- 1.3 While demand for aggregate continues to grow, current supplies are being exhausted, mandating a need to provide future supplies. However, aggregates are a site-specific resource, which means that extraction can only occur where the resource is found and can be economically extracted and transported to local markets (n.b. an additional 30 km travel cost typically doubles the cost of aggregate). Such aggregate resources must be found, subjected to feasibility studies, before any necessary statutory approvals are secured (involving consultation with affected parties), prior to extraction, processing and earning an income. To find, assess, authorise and develop a new aggregate extraction and processing site can take many years at significant cost.
- 1.4 It is noted that one of the key objectives of Proposed Plan Change 60 is to protect the productive capacity of land with high productive value for plant and animal production. However, because aggregate is a site specific resource, it can be located under land of high productive value, and not easily accessible elsewhere. Accordingly, any relevant policy framework needs to recognise that aggregate extraction and processing activities may need to occur in such areas if there are no suitable and economically feasible alternative sites available. Aggregate extraction is a temporary land-use, whereby the aggregate material is extracted and processed before the area is rehabilitated to a former use, and/or an enhanced use. Responsible environmental management using best practice approaches is an integral part of any aggregate extraction and processing venture.
- 1.5 AQA is interested in future growth and planning restrictions that have the potential to adversely affect the general operation of aggregate extraction. In particular, AQA is concerned that:
- (i) Aggregate resources are recognised as a significant and essential resource for development;
 - (ii) New planning provisions do not unreasonably restrict future access to aggregate resources and provide for an efficient and cost-effective planning process to authorise aggregate extraction and processing activities; and

¹ In *Winstone Aggregates Ltd v Papakura District Council A96/98* at [50] the Court concluded “We are satisfied on the evidence that aggregate is a resource of primary significance to our society in a general and in particular to the Auckland region. It is required in very large quantities for roading and construction.”

(iii) Development does not occur over areas of significant aggregate resources restricting future access, or result in reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing or future aggregate extraction and processing activities.

1.6 Failure to adequately plan for future aggregate production within the Tasman District would lead to a substantial increase in the cost of aggregate (as a result of increased transportation costs) with flow-on effects on the cost of development and maintaining existing infrastructure, while increasing levels of heavy transport on regional roads will adversely affect the environment and the interests of other road users.

1.7 Sound planning is required to ensure that future access to aggregate resources is sufficiently recognised, provided for and protected for future generations.

2 GENERAL SUBMISSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

Submission

2.1 AQA generally supports the provisions of Proposed Plan Change 60 and seeks that they are retained, except to the extent that specific changes are made in accordance with the relief sought by AQA in the balance of this submission and any further submission that AQA may make at the appropriate time.

Relief Sought

2.2 Retain the existing provisions, except to the extent that specific changes are made in accordance with the relief sought by AQA in the balance of this submission and any further submission that AQA may make at the appropriate time.

2.3 Where AQA seeks specific relief in the balance of their submission, AQA would accept words to like effect or as otherwise may be required to ensure sustainable management.

3 SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS AND RELIEF SOUGHT

3.1 Specific submissions and relief sought are addressed in the table below.

Signature:

AGGREGATE AND QUARRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW ZEALAND
by its authorised agents Environmental Management Services Ltd



G.J. Mathieson

Date:

14th March 2016

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
1	Section 2.2 – Defined Words Definition of “quarrying”	Support in part	AQA considers that the definition of “quarrying” needs to be broadened to adequately capture all typical integral activities associated with mineral and aggregate extraction.	1 Amend the definition of “quarrying” as follows: Quarrying - means any land disturbance required for the extraction of any mineral including any rock, gravel, or sand, and includes any on-site storage or processing of any mineral extracted on the site, <u>blasting, distributing and selling mineral products, removing and depositing overburden, treating stormwater and waste water, landscaping and rehabilitation works including cleanfilling, recycling or reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry, or asphalt, accessory buildings and structures, ancillary residential accommodation for caretaking and on-site security; and site offices, but does not include:</u> (a) prospecting or exploration as defined in the Crown Minerals Act 1991 where no earthworks using machinery are carried out; or (b) construction or alteration of a bore.
2	Section 2.2 – Defined Words Definition of “rural industrial activity”	Support in part	The definition of “rural industrial activity” includes “the processing of minerals and quarry products”. There is some duplication within the definition of “quarrying” as it includes reference to the “processing of any minerals extracted on the site”. The Tasman Resource Management Plan contains a policy framework, rules and associated provisions specific to “quarrying”, which Proposed Plan Change 60 seeks to further modify (as does AQA’s submission). To avoid unnecessary duplication and contradiction between the different planning provisions, AQA seeks to delete reference to “the processing of minerals and quarry products” from the definition of “rural industrial activity”, and the remainder of the submission seeks to improve the planning provisions specific to “quarrying”.	2 Amend the definition of “rural industrial activity” as follows: Rural industrial activity - means the use of land and buildings for an industrial activity that depends on produce harvested from plant and animal production, or the sea, or any other land-derived product, including any sawmill, timber treatment plant, abattoir, stockyard, packhouse, cold storage, rural transport or contractor’s depot or yard, and the processing of minerals and quarry products.
3	7.1.2 Objective	Support in part	The District contains important aggregate resources essential for continued economic growth and development which need to be adequately recognised and provided for. An appropriate policy framework is proposed to safeguard future access to aggregate resources in the District, in particular ensuring that:	3 Insert the following new Objectives in 7.1.2 Objective: 7.1.2.4 To ensure there is a sustainable supply of minerals and aggregates to enable people and communities to provide for their economic, social and cultural wellbeing. 7.1.2.5 To ensure that existing and future quarrying activities

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
4	Objective 7.1.2.1	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral and aggregate resources are recognised as a significant and essential resource for development; New planning provisions do not unreasonably restrict future access to mineral and aggregate resources and provide for an efficient and cost-effective planning process to authorise extraction and processing activities; and Development does not occur over areas of significant mineral and aggregate resources restricting future access, or result in reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing or future aggregate extraction and processing activities. <p>Protecting land of high productive value is prudent in terms of sustaining the agricultural, horticultural and viticultural industries. However, aggregate is a site specific resource and can be located under land of high productive value, and not easily accessible elsewhere. Accordingly, any relevant policy framework needs to recognise that aggregate extraction and processing activities are appropriate rural activities and in some circumstances, aggregate may need to be extracted from under land of high productive value (which can then be reinstated following extraction).</p>	<p>are not unnecessarily compromised.</p> <p>Amend Objective 7.1.2.1 as follows: <u>Except where rural land is deferred for urban use or required for an activity that has a functional need to locate in rural areas (e.g. quarrying), avoiding the loss of value for all rural land of existing and potential productive value to meet the needs of future generations, particularly land of high productive value.</u></p>
5	Objective 7.1.2.2	Support in part	<p>Protecting land of high productive value is prudent in terms of sustaining the agricultural, horticultural and viticultural industries. However, aggregate is a site specific resource and can be located under land of high productive value, and not easily accessible elsewhere. Accordingly, any relevant policy framework needs to recognise that aggregate extraction and processing activities are appropriate rural activities and in some circumstances, aggregate may need to be extracted from under land of high productive value (which can then be reinstated following extraction).</p>	<p>Amend Objective 7.1.2.2 as follows: <u>Retention and enhancement of opportunities for plant and animal production on land with the highest productive value in the District, identified as the Rural 1 Zone, except where rural land is required for an activity that has a functional need to locate in rural areas (e.g. quarrying).</u></p>
6	Objective 7.1.2.3	Support in part	<p>Protecting land of high productive value is prudent in terms of sustaining the agricultural, horticultural and viticultural industries. However, aggregate is a site specific resource and can be located under land of high productive value, and not easily accessible elsewhere. Accordingly, any relevant policy framework needs to recognise that aggregate extraction and processing activities are appropriate rural activities and in some circumstances, aggregate may need to be extracted from under land of high productive value (which can then be reinstated following extraction).</p>	<p>Amend Objective 7.1.2.3 as follows: <u>Retention of opportunities primarily for plant and animal production on land that has varying productive value, identified as the Rural 2 Zone, except where rural land is required for an activity that has a functional need to locate in rural areas (e.g. quarrying).</u></p>
7	Policy 7.1.3.2	Support in part	<p>The Rural 1, Rural 2 and Rural 3 Zones all provide for small-scale quarrying as a permitted activity and larger scale quarrying as a discretionary activity. Accordingly, all three zones clearly anticipate the activity of quarrying to occur. Similarly, Chapter 12 (Land Disturbance Effects) refers to managing gravel extraction from under land that has high productive value in the Waimea and Motueka Plains. Policy 12.1.3.4 refers to the need to "...avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of earthworks for the purpose of mineral extraction, on the actual or potential productive values of soil, particularly on land of high productive value."</p>	<p>Amend Policy 7.1.3.2 as follows: <u>To avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of activities which reduce the area of land available for plant and animal production purposes in rural areas, unless there is a functional need for the activity to locate in rural areas (e.g. quarrying).</u></p>
8	Policy 7.1.3.6	New policy	<p>Further, one of the Environmental Results anticipated in Chapter 7 (Rural Environment Effects) is 7.50.3 which aims for "The continuing availability and accessibility of particular rural</p>	<p>Insert the following new policy after policy 7.1.3.6: 7.1.3.6G <u>To enable quarrying in rural areas to access underlying aggregate resources, subject to reinstatement of the land to the same (or similar) high productive value following aggregate extraction (if practicable).</u></p>
9	Policy 7.1.3.7	Support in part and new policies	<p>Further, one of the Environmental Results anticipated in Chapter 7 (Rural Environment Effects) is 7.50.3 which aims for "The continuing availability and accessibility of particular rural</p>	<p>Amend Policy 7.1.3.7 as follows: <u>To protect areas of specific resource value, such as hard-look quarry quarry resources for existing and future quarrying purposes, and to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects of subdivision and residential development on these areas. Locate</u></p>

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
			<p>resources, such as quarry resources, to meet present and future needs.”</p> <p>Accordingly, the activity of quarrying in the Rural 1, 2 and 3 Zones and on land that has high productive value is anticipated and provided for in the Tasman Resource Management Plan. However, the proposed changes to the policy framework contradict these provisions by effectively discouraging quarrying from occurring on land that has high productive value.</p>	<p>new subdivision and sensitive activities so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided; and Access is retained to such areas for future development (e.g. quarrying). <p>Add the following new policies after Policy 7.1.3.7:</p> <p>Policy 7.1.3.7A Council will work with the regional council, industry representatives and other relevant agencies to identify and map the location of significant aggregate resources for future use.</p> <p>Policy 7.1.3.7B The efficient investigation, extraction, processing and transportation of the District’s aggregate resources will be provided for, while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>Policy 7.1.3.7C When assessing the environmental effects of any new quarrying activities, the following is taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregates are a site-specific resource, which means that aggregate extraction can only occur where the resource is found and can be economically extracted and transported to local markets. Due to the nature of the activity there could be temporary adverse environmental effects, but these can be addressed through progressive rehabilitation and final reinstatement of the site where practicable. The extraction and processing of aggregate resources may be appropriate within areas identified as having land of high productive value if there are no suitable and economically feasible alternative sites available.
10	Objective 7.2.2	New Objective		<p>Include the following new Objective:</p> <p>7.2.4 Provision of opportunities for quarrying in rural areas (including on land of high productive value) to enable access to underlying mineral and aggregate resources.</p>
11	Policy 7.2.3.1	Support in part and new Policy		<p>Amend Policy 7.2.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>7.2.3.1 To enable activities which are not dependent on plant and animal production, to be located on land which is not of</p>

11 12 13 14 15 3974

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
				high productive value, unless there is a functional need for the activity to locate in rural areas (e.g. quarrying). Insert the following new policy after Policy 7.2.3.1: 7.2.3.1H In some circumstances, quarrying may need to establish on land which is of high productive value to extract underlying mineral aggregate resources (prior to reinstatement). Amend 7.50.3 as follows: <u>Continued access to a sustainable supply of the continuing availability and necessity of particular rural resources, such as quarry resources, to meet present and future needs.</u>
12	7.50 Environmental Results Anticipated 7.50.3	Support in part		
13	Policy 7.1.3.6E	Oppose	Policy 7.1.3.6E states: <i>To accommodate rural living, commercial, industrial and rural activities in the Rural 1 Zone where the activity is wholly undertaken within existing buildings.</i> The policy could potentially unnecessarily restrict appropriate rural activities (including quarrying) by requiring associated activities to be wholly undertaken within existing buildings.	Amend Policy 7.1.3.6E as follows: <i>To accommodate rural living, commercial, and industrial and rural activities in the Rural 1 Zone where the activity is wholly undertaken within existing buildings.</i>
14	Policy 7.2.3.1E	Support	Policy 7.2.3.1E states: <i>To minimise the potential for conflict between rural and residential activities by way of setbacks from boundaries and separation between incompatible uses.</i> This policy is supported because it addresses potential reverse sensitivity effects between incompatible activities in rural areas.	Retain Policy 7.2.3.1E.
15	Condition 17.5.3.2(f)	Oppose	Condition 17.5.3.2(f) is proposed to be amended as follows: <i>Dwellings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing <u>hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects</u>, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(iii).</i> AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the	Amend Condition 17.5.3.2(f) as follows: <i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i>

16

17

18

19

20

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
15	Condition 17.6.3.1(o)	Oppose	<p>proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected, and only if they are likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). Also parallel condition 17.7.3.2(f) refers to "habitable buildings" (as well as "dwellings") so a change is sought accordingly to ensure consistency and to ensure that the condition is sufficiently broad enough. <p>Condition 17.5.6.3.1(o) is proposed to be amended as follows: <i>Dwellings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(iii).</i></p> <p>AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates 	<p>Amend Condition 17.6.3.1(o) as follows: <i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard-rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(iii).</i></p>

20

3974

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
16	Condition 17.7.3.1(ga)	Oppose	<p>uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). Also parallel condition 17.7.3.2(f) refers to “habitable buildings” (as well as “dwellings”) so a change is sought accordingly to ensure consistency and to ensure that the condition is sufficiently broad enough. <p>Proposed Plan Change 60 proposes to introduce the following Condition 17.5.6.3.1(ga) for the Rural 3 Zone: <i>Dwellings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(iii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p> <p>AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). Also parallel condition 17.7.3.2(f) refers to “habitable buildings” (as well as “dwellings”) so a change is sought accordingly to ensure consistency and to ensure that the condition is sufficiently broad enough. 	<p>Amend Condition 17.5.6.3.1(ga) as follows: <i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard-rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p>

20

3974

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
17	Condition 17.7.3.2(f)(iii)	Oppose	<p>Proposed Plan Change 60 proposes to amend condition 17.7.3.2(f) including through the introduction of the following new condition (iii):</p> <p><i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least... (iii) 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(iii), condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p> <p>AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). 	<p>Amend condition 17.7.3.2(f) as follows:</p> <p><i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least... (iii) 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard-rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p>
18	Condition 17.8.2.1(j)	Oppose	<p>Proposed Plan Change 60 proposes to amend Condition 17.8.2.1(j) for the Rural Residential Zone as follows:</p> <p><i>Dwellings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p> <p>AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be</p>	<p>Amend Condition 17.8.2.1(j) Zone as follows:</p> <p><i>Dwellings and habitable buildings are set back at least 500 metres from any boundary of an existing hard-rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii) or condition 17.7.2.1(b)(ii).</i></p>

22

3974

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
19	Condition 18.7.2.1(a)	Oppose	<p>protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is <u>likely</u> to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). <p>Also parallel condition 17.7.3.2(f) refers to "habitable buildings" (as well as "dwellings") so a change is sought accordingly to ensure consistency and to ensure that the condition is sufficiently broad enough.</p>	<p>Amend Condition 18.7.2.1(a) as follows: Dwellings and habitable buildings or residential activities are set back 50 metres from any existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), condition 17.6.2.1(a)(ii), or condition 17.7.2.1 (b)(ii).</p>
			<p>Proposed Plan Change 60 proposes to amend Condition 18.7.2.1(a) for the Special Area as follows: Dwellings or residential activities are set back 50 metres from any working existing hard rock quarry site that is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects, except for a quarry permitted under condition 17.5.2.1(a)(ii), condition 17.6.2.1(ba)(ii), or condition 17.7.2.1 (b)(ii). AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is <u>likely</u> to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. 	

REF	PROVISION	SUPPORT OPPOSE	SUBMISSION	RELIEF SOUGHT
20	Matters 18.7.2.1(1), (3) and (4) Reasons 18.7.20	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). Also parallel condition 17.7.3.2(f) refers to "habitable buildings" (as well as "dwellings") so a change is sought accordingly to ensure consistency and to ensure that the condition is sufficiently broad enough. <p>Proposed Plan Change 60 proposes to insert the word "hard rock" before "quarry", "quarrying" and "quarries" in Matters 18.7.2.1(1), (3) and (4) and Reasons 18.7.20 (for consistency with the proposed changes to the setback requirement in Condition 18.7.2.1(a)).</p> <p>AQA is supportive of planning provisions that protect all aggregate extraction and processing activities from potential reverse sensitivity effects. However, the effect of the proposed changes is that only hard rock quarry sites would be protected. AQA is opposed to the proposed changes on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry that is not a hard rock quarry would no longer be protected from potential reverse sensitivity effects; There is now a subjective element to the condition as it requires a judgement of whether a quarry site is likely to create noise, vibration and dust effects which creates uncertainty and potential difficulties in implementation. The proposed changes are not consistent with the policy framework in the District Plan which aims to protect access to all quarry resources (not just hard rock quarries). 	Delete reference to "hard rock" before "quarry", "quarrying" and "quarries" in Matters 18.7.2.1(1), (3) and (4) and Reasons 18.7.20.

23
24

3974