Ken Jackson. Speaking Notes.

Hearing on District Plan Review.. Speech.

I will go through my original submission and comment on each issue as appropriate. You should have a copy .

It is my understanding that Highly Productive Land and Natural Environment Values (ONLs) have both been taken out of the District Plan Review for now so I will move straight onto Earthworks in rural areas.

EARTHWORKS. RURAL AREAS.

EW S.4 I support the transport of 400cu3 of class 5 cleanfill which will in effect help take pressure off large land fills , reduce carbon emissions and allow for practical recycling of natural materials.

This should be a permitted activity subject to being a minimum of 5 m from waterways , incorporating only raw materials that needs to be rehabilitated within 3 months from completion of the Earthworks.

EW S.1 AREA OF EARTHWORKS

I oppose 1000sqm in a general rural area for the following reasons.

I had initially suggested that 4,000 sq m would be appropriate for a general rural area which I would still support but due to lack of submissions supporting that amount of area I would like to suggest that 2,000 sq m would be a more acceptable area..

Scale has been talked about on this topic in the so I have given approximate examples of other zones.

1. Residential . 250 sq m Approx 50 % of total area.
2. Commercial . 500 sq m . Approx 25% of total area
3. Rural lifestyle. 1000 sq m. 10% of total area.
4. General rural . 1000 sq m . .66% of the total area.

So I believe scale should come into the discussion when deciding on an appropriate permitted area in a general rural zone of 15 hectares.

GWRC has 3,000 sq m as their permitted area for Earthworks. Should HCC align with GWRC on this to make it less confusing for landowners and also there is likely to be amalgamation of Councils in the near future.

There is a large commercial sized cleanfill close to my property that will have 2,500 sq m of cleanfill exposed for 9 months of the year for the next 30 years , does this set a precedence as to what's an acceptable area for earthworks.?

EW S.2 Cut and fill.

I would like to see 1.5m expanded to 2.0m in a general rural zone again to align with scale of the size of the properties.

Subdivision General rural zone.

I had suggested in my original submission that 15 hectares could be reduced to 7 hectares and even though this would be a natural progression for rural areas without really effecting the open space feel , I believe it would be more important to give council the ability to be a lot more flexible with lot sizes under a controlled or restricted discretionary system.

My reasons for this is that I have been involved with 3 rural subdivisions and the impracticality of the survey lines to make this work has had a negative effect on the boundary lines and lacks commonsense.

We need to follow the natural lay of the land to avoid surveyed blocks being long and narrow making large areas of the property unusable and also boundary fences being almost impossible to establish.

FC S.3. Financial contribution.

I oppose the Reserves contribution going from $5,000 to $7,500 in a rural area for the following reasons.

1. I believe that rural subdivision would actually help take pressure off parks and reserves or it certainly doesn't add to that pressure as a residential subdivision would.

The residential contribution is proposed to go up from $10,000 to $12,000 which is only a 20% increase but a rural contribution is proposed to go up from $5,000 to $7,500 which is a 50% increase , so if the rural contribution needs to go up it should be inline with the 20% increase and be a maximum of $6,000 per lot.

Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori.

I believe this has also been put on hold for now and is not part of this District Plan Review.

I did not submit on a couple of issues, but if I'm able , I would like to make a couple of comments if possible.?

1. WRCA submitted on farm tracks being able to have the cut height extended from 2.5m to 3.5m. I support increasing that height due to it making the tracks potentially

safer rather than attempting to stay under the 2.5m especially as on occasions there may be a short area where you may need to get around a corner and need a slightly higher cutting. You could possibly add 3.5m for a maximum distance of say 50 m as a permitted activity.

2. Under 3.5.11 Earthworks within flood hazard overlays.

I have recently seen a consent being approved for a large clean fill on a floodplain. Within in the consent the expert remodeled the flood overlay showing a minor effect on neighboring properties of approximately 10mm.

I personally had seen the newly modelled areas substantially more flooded than what the new modelling showed would potentially happen. Would the new wording of reduced or not increased have prevented this from being accepted so easily.? How can we get a better assurance that neighboring properties are better protected from inappropriate development.?

Thank you.

Ken Jackson.