



PROPOSED INVERCARGILL CITY DISTRICT PLAN

Report No. 35(A)

Rural Zones

(Addendum to Report No. 35)

**11 – 12 May 2015, 9.00 am
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

**Reporting Officer: Dan Wells
PLANNING CONSULTANT, JOHN EDMONDS AND
ASSOCIATES LTD**

**Peer Reviewed by: Liz Devery
SENIOR POLICY PLANNER**

[THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
Appendix 1 Recommendations in response to submissions	3

[THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been brought to my attention that there are two submissions, and one related further submission, related to the Rural Zones which have not been directly addressed in the recently released s42A report for those zones. For both, the points have already been addressed in discussions in the report, but for completeness, the submissions and my recommendations on them are included in **Appendix 1** of this Addendum report.

[THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

APPENDIX 1: Recommendations in response to submissions

Submitter	Submission	Recommendation
<p>88.92 Federated Farmers</p>	<p>Oppose 3.18.6 in part.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see greater flexibility around the minimum lot size in both the Rural 1 and Rural 2 zones, ideally occur through site standards against which each consent could be considered on its individual merits, particularly given the wide range of factors Council is seeking to consider.</p> <p>The submitter considers it is also important that the District Plan recognises that unnecessary constraints on otherwise appropriate subdivision can also result in adverse effects, and that the economic and social drivers for subdivision differ between farming operations, and often require different treatment.</p> <p>The submitter believes that If the proposed minimum lot size of four hectares was reduced to two hectares in the Rural 1 Zone, there would be consistency of rules between the two Rural Zones, and there would be greater flexibility for land use decisions in the Rural 1 Zone while still allowing consideration of a number of issues relevant to subdivision, through the discretionary activity Rules 3.18.3 and 3.18.4.</p> <p>RELIEF SOUGHT:</p> <p>Option 1: Remove any reference to minimum Lot sizes for subdivision in the Rural Zones.</p> <p>Option 2: Retain the two hectare minimum lot size for the Rural 2 Zone, and reduce the minimum lot size for the Rural 1 Zone from four hectares to two hectares as follows:</p> <p>“(K) Within the Rural 1 Zone: Allotments of less than four <u>two</u> hectares.”</p>	<p>Reject – For reasons set out in Section 5 of the s42A Report 35 on Rural Zones.</p>
<p>107.2 A4 Simpson Architects Limited</p>	<p>The submitter supports the general Plan approach aimed at providing for infill residential development within the city limits rather than “Greenfields” development in rural areas.</p>	<p>Accept – for reasons set out in Section 5 of the s42A Report 35 on Rural Zones. As there are a few areas</p>

	<p>RELIEF SOUGHT:</p> <p>Set clear direction through zoning as to where residential development is appropriate and avoid “Greenfields” development in rural areas</p> <p>FS45.1 Leven Development</p> <p>Oppose in part submission 107.2</p> <p>The further submitter agrees that generally infill residential development within the city limits rather than ‘greenfields’ development in rural areas should be encouraged. However the further submitter considers that the city limits need to be better defined under the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>The further submitter considers that there are large areas of Rural 2 land isolated from the Rural 1 zone that are more likely to be developed for urban uses rather than rural, e.g 4 Beatrice St which the further submitter should be rezoned Business 6 given its isolation from other rural land and the size of the property.</p>	<p>proposed for greenfield residential development (most notably the proposed Residential 3 Zone), the plan is broadly in line with this submission due to its intent to limit the amount of greenfields residential development.</p> <p>Note – the issue of the zoning for 4 Beatrice Street is to be addressed in a forthcoming report on Business Zones.</p>
--	---	---