

- c) The proposed subdivision (and the residential development it would facilitate) will further change the rural character of the subject site and the surrounding environment. It would introduce a greater intensity of subdivision and rural living than currently exists. The resulting land use pattern particularly for proposed lot 1 would be more akin to suburban 'large lot residential' environment. It would further undermine the rural amenity and character of this area resulting in a greater intensity of development than envisaged by the zone and than that which exists now.
- d) The proposal is particularly contrary to a number of the objectives and policies in the District Plan including – Objectives 5.3.1, 5.3.5, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, and 8.3.3, policies 5.4.5, 5.4.7, 8.4.2, 8.4.3, 8.4.4.
- e) For the reasons set out above the proposal fails to pass either gateway test for a non complying activity under section 104(D) of the Act. The adverse effects on rural character and amenity values, including cumulative effects, are more than minor and overall the proposal is contrary to the relevant objectives and policies that relate to amenity values, subdivision and development.
- f) There is nothing unusual / truly exceptional about this proposal or anything to distinguish it from other land in the immediate or wider locality that would 'justify' such departure from the provisions of the District Plan. The proposal would create an undesirable precedent effect where it would be possible and / or likely other landowners would seek similar subdivision consent.
- g) The District Plan provides for subdivision and development to occur while placing significance on existing character and amenity values of the locality and the existing pattern in density of land use. This proposal would change the existing character and amenity values and as discussed is not consistent with the existing pattern and density of development in the adjacent area.

Issued this 12 day of December 2014



John Childs
Hearings Commissioner