

EVIDENCE 49

TOPIC 85 - A-8864-B 83/102/14

SUB# Rural Plan changes

DATE 24/07/2017

Good Morning...

I am Fiona Baird, responsible for submissions 353, 354 and 355.

I trust you have these submissions before you, together with pages 74 & 75 of part 6 zoning submissions of the WDC S42A Report.

Unfortunately there was error in the submission numbers in this report. So to clarify, Submission number 353 needs to be exchanged with submission number 354.

Evan Cook, as WDC Senior Planner, recommends submissions 353 and 355 be accepted. The table on pages 74 & 75 outlines the reasons for acceptance of these submissions, in accordance with Rural Living Environment zoning criteria. As a layperson I cannot presume to build upon his expertise, but certainly endorse his recommendations and appreciate your consideration to do the same.

However, it is to submission 354 that I wish to draw your attention. When I initially received notification from WDC of the proposed environment designation for this property, it stated both rural production and rural living, which to me seemed quite logical when I read the respective criteria and realized the pines trees were considered production.

Evan has recommended you reject my submission for this property to be included in the Rural Living Environment designation. He states size as the sole reason this property does not meet the zoning criteria for inclusion. At face value, with a land parcel of 32 hectare, and viewing the supplied WDC proposed planning maps of 68E & more clearly, 11E, this would appear to be the case. However, what these maps neglect to show is vegetation of any nature and therefore any supportive evidence that this land parcel is a large productive unit.

I have provided you with a map showing the vegetation. As stated in my submission, the two areas of significant bush have been covenanted with QE11. The surplus of 10 hectare comprises 5 hectare of 30 year pine trees, which were accessible prior to a neighbouring subdivision and are now uneconomical to harvest, leaving ⁴5 hectare of grassland. This is the productive area of this sizable property. This is a significantly smaller area than many of the highly productive neighbouring properties designated as rural living environment. I graze about 10 cattle and being Kikuyu have to buy in silage. At this point in time, this income without fertilizer, pays the rates, but not an economic productive unit. As the map illustrates, my rural living environment neighbours with orchard, poly houses, horticulture of some sort, are without doubt more productive. They may not have bush, but they do have production. I have had the privilege of living on this property for the past 40 years and have seen what was productive farmland subdivided and now designated as rural living environment. The whole of my western boundary borders rural living environment and as the rest of my boundaries are bush clad, it seems logical to include this property as rural living or at least the appropriate portion of it, as initially identified. Thus, this property, apart from size, which I have endeavoured through my map and explanation to

put in realistic terms, evaluated against rural living environment zoning criteria, (Evan's table), can justifiably be re designated as rural living environment.

Thank you for your consideration of my submission and I look forward to a favourable outcome.



EVIDENCE 52
TOPIC 85A-0, 86A-0, 97, 104, 114
SUB# _____
DATE 24/07/2017