

DDPR_feedback_0356s	
Name	Peter Mitchell
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 28 22 07:58:02 am
Notes	Peter Mitchell
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	General Rural Zone
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Strongly support
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	GRUZ Objectives and Policies
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	<p>I strongly support the objectives particularly "The general rural zone provides for primary production". It is important the district takes a long term view to protect productive soils and the on going ability for this soil to provide income and employment for the whole district and indeed the country.</p> <p>I support the need to limit the urban spread, its a big cost for councils and rates payers to support the infrastructure required and it is a big cost to primary producers as they are slowly forced away from urban development areas due to high cost of land and complaints and general difficulty to carry about primary production in these areas. (smells, noise, and dust etc).</p> <p>I have experienced this happening in my life time as a primary producer.</p> <p>I think in general the changes go some way to helping protect primary production and of course the beauty of these natural landscapes.</p> <p>The difficulty is on the boundary between GRUZ and RLZ as it is not always practical or sometimes possible to avoid noise, dust and smells.</p> <p>I certainly try my best but I do not find it very rewarding when neighbours complain and we then have to spend time dealing with the authorities sorting out issues that are permitted activities carried out in a legal way.</p> <p>I think we need some stronger wording in the RLZ providing more practical protection of GRUZ with some "reverse sensitivity" particularly for those on the boundary of a RLZ . This could apply to 200 m on the RLZ next to a GRUZ boundary. See my comment in my RLZ feedback.</p> <p>Between the GRUZ and the RLZ I believe there is a sensible lay out of zoning areas, (see my comments in my maps feedback) limiting the spread, providing opportunity for housing developers, limiting infrastructure costs for rate payers, and protecting primary production and natural landscapes.</p>
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	GRUZ-R15 Carbon forestry
Q6	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Strongly agree carbon forestry is controlled. Particularly in regard to fire mitigation and pest control and removing indigenous plantings and planting where it negatively effects water ways.</p> <p>Agree with CON-2 does not take place on highly productive land.</p>
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	GRUZ Standards - S1
Q8	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Supportive of this standard - at 20 ha and the ability for existing smaller sites to have one residential unit built in the future.</p> <p>This standard will reduce the amount of urban spread and loss of productive land, but still allow someone to build in the country should they wish.</p> <p>The planned zoning (as per maps) RLZ and GRUZ provides scope for developers to continue to develop, a farmer to retire or someone else to live and enjoy a rural outlook.</p> <p>I strongly support the intent of this, it is important to protect one of Waitaki's stronger industries (primary production). Waitaki has some wonderful soils, naturally fertile and able to produce some great nutritional</p>

	<p>and high quality food with unique local flavours, Jersey Benny potatoes and Whitestone cheese and who knows what else in the future.</p> <p>They are not making any more soil and covering these soils in concrete and breaking up larger economic areas for short term gain is not sensible in my view.</p> <p>I'm pleased that this standard if adopted will help support protection of our natural assets and provide a frame work for sensible urban growth.</p> <p>One problem that could arise from this standard could be that if a 20ha block came up for sale with a house on it, a neighbouring primary producer may not be able to afford to purchase the block and have it as part of their farm. They may be able to make use of the land for primary production but not require the house. To make the viable business case for primary production the producer would need to sub divide the house. Which wouldn't be possible under the 20 ha min rule.</p> <p>Sub leasing or renting the house may be an option but not the best long term solution.</p> <p>To over come this, if the primary producer could purchase the block and then sub divide off the house (if the house was located in a sensible location on the property) via a boundary adjustment, on sell the house and return the majority of the land to primary production. This may need to be a consented activity to close any possible loop holes.</p>
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	Supporting documents?
Q12	If you need more space, or have other general comments, please leave them here

DDPR_feedback_0357s		
	Name	Peter Mitchell
	Organisation	
	Email	[REDACTED]
	Response Date	Aug 28 22 09:55:04 am
	Notes	Peter Mitchell
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on	
	Rural Lifestyle Zone	
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?	
	Agree	
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
	RLZ -02 Character of the Rural Lifestyle Zone	
Q4	Feedback/Comments	
	<p>The 6 objectives listed under the above I agree with. I assume objective No. 6 applies to the resident living in the RLZ and that objective is fine and I agree with it.</p> <p>However what is missing is some wording that outlines what is fair to expect when living in a RLZ, particularly if you are living next to a boundary of a GRUZ.</p> <p>To protect productive and General rural zones there need to be some "reverse sensitivity" statements or rules attached to the RL zone.</p> <p>There is going to be from time to time noise, dust, smells etc.</p> <p>Yes primary producers do have a responsibility to operate legally and have good management practices and also be considerate where possible.</p> <p>But it is impossible to mitigate 100%. For example:-</p> <p>Harvest dust, harvest needs to happen when conditions a right and the crop is dry, the wind is generally blowing and sometimes that can take the dust directly onto neighbouring property's - making windows and washing dirty etc. Cultivation dust can be the same.</p> <p>Sometimes these activities take place at 3am in the morning and can be noisy.</p> <p>Spraying crops can also be a major problem. Yes spray drift has to be controlled, but the solvents which carry the active ingredient to the target plant and then evaporate off can have a noticeable smell. Which can't always be controlled.</p> <p>Over the years I have spent large amounts of time and money on technology and have changed management practices to overcome issues of having rural lifestyle neighbours and I will continue to keep doing so as the technology's develop.</p> <p>I have some fantastic neighbours and we get on really well and everything works very well, but neighbours change and some are very difficult to deal with. We need some protection please.</p> <p>I recognize it is difficult to keep everyone happy, but generally people choose to live in a rural lifestyle zone because they get to enjoy the pleasant outlook - the cows peacefully grazing the green grass or the spring lambs running around the paddock, the colourful sunflowers or radish crop or just watching the machinery out there producing food.</p> <p>The reality is, all this can't happen with out some noise, dust and smells from time to time.</p> <p>People moving to a rural lifestyle zone need to be aware so they have realistic view of what living next to rural general zone is like.</p> <p>I think it would helpful to include some reverse sensitivity rules or objectives into the RLZ.</p> <p>For example RLZ -02 an additional point.</p> <p>"if living next to a GRDZ, then this is an environment where from time to time there will be some noise, traffic, odour and dust etc."</p> <p>I would prefer if it was a rule, but important to have has an expectation as well.</p> <p>More than happy to discuss further</p>	

Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

DDPR_feedback_0462s	
Name	Peter Mitchell
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 06:23:48 pm
Notes	Peter Mitchell
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Zoning
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Agree
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	RURZ -02 Highly productive land
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	Agree with this.
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	RURZ -P1
Q6	Feedback/Comments
	Strongly agree with all 4 points here (see my other feed back in GRUZ and RLZ) I have looked at the maps and in general the highly productive land boundary's are not too bad.
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
	RURZ-P2
Q8	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Strongly agree with this policy. I have looked at the zone maps GRUZ and RLZ and believe the boundaries are well placed in the areas around Weston and South down to state highway 1 and across to Awamoa and up to Ardgowan.</p> <p>Well placed in particular the is the boundary on Parsons Rd. The south side is included in the Weston area and zoned RLZ and the north side GRUZ - perfect. And to the east of Parsons Rd towards Homestead RD to Ardgowan RD.</p> <p>Also the boundary west of Airedale Rd and Whiterocks Rd is well placed. This land is class 2 land and includes vegetable growing and some has irrigation. I personally farm in this area.</p> <p>There is plenty of room for Rural lifestyle development in this proposed area (I believe in excess of 950 hectares) with some wonderful outlooks and in the future if required the boundaries could be extended. The key is to avoid ad-hoc subdivision and urban expansion onto highly productive soils and control demand on rates required to develop and maintain the infrastructure the comes with urban development.</p>
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	Supporting documents?
Q12	If you need more space, or have other general comments, please leave them here