

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN

Sections 3 and 9: Rural Zone and Subdivision

Rural Density Standards

Report No 21

Prepared by

Boffa Miskell Limited

For

Ashburton District Council

May 2011

Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	HOW TO READ THIS REPORT	3
3.0	BACKGROUND	3
4.0	THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS.....	4
5.0	KEY ISSUES.....	5
6.0	ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS.....	7
7.0	STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS	13
8.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	13
	APPENDIX ONE: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS	14
	APPENDIX TWO: DISTRICT PLAN AMENDMENTS.....	77

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been commissioned by the Ashburton District Council (ADC) in accordance with Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to consider all submissions received in relation to the rural density standards, following the public notification of the proposed Ashburton District Plan including Planning Maps, and to make recommendations on those submissions.
- 1.2 The evaluations and recommendations presented in the report are based on the information available prior to the hearing, including that contained in the submissions and further submissions. The purpose of this report is to bring to the attention of the Hearings Panel the relevant information and issues regarding this section of the proposed District Plan. It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations made in this report are my own and are not binding upon the Hearings Panel. It should not therefore be assumed that the Hearings Panel will reach the same conclusion following consideration of all the evidence to be presented at the hearing. The recommendations in this report are made on the basis of the information available at the time of writing. It should be noted that subsequent reports prepared on other topics may include recommendations that differ due to additional information becoming available during the course of hearings.
- 1.3 This report has been prepared by Stephanie Styles. Please refer to the Section 42A Preface Report for more information on the report author, along with background to the development of the proposed District Plan.

2.0 HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

- 2.1 This report is structured as follows:
- Background to the plan sections
 - Description of the relevant provisions
 - The key issues
 - Analysis of submissions, including recommendations and reasons
 - Statutory considerations
- 2.2 Appendices attached to this report include:
- **Appendix One:** Summary of Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions
 - **Appendix Two:** District Plan Amendments

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 This report relates to parts of Sections 3 and 9 (Rural Zone and Subdivision) of the proposed District Plan, in so far as they relate to the rural density standards only. These parts of the Plan set out the minimum allotment sizes for subdivision within the

Rural A, B and C zones, and the minimum allotment sizes for erecting a residential unit within these zones. The specific provisions covered in this report are rule 3.10.1 and rule 9.9.1a) in relation to the rural zones only.

3.2 This report does not cover any other parts of the rural or subdivision chapters or the zoning of land. Those issues will be addressed in other reports.

4.0 THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS

4.1 The following table sets out the relevant provisions considered in this report. It includes the provisions in the operative District Plan and those in the proposed District Plan (as notified) to enable comparison.

	Operative District Plan	Proposed District Plan as notified															
Rural zone rule	<p>Site standard</p> <p>7.6.5.1.1 Residential Density</p> <p>a) Minimum net area for any site shall be 2ha for each residential unit contained within the site.</p> <p>b) There shall be only one residential unit on any land comprised in a separate site of less than 8ha in area.</p> <p>c) On land comprised in a separate site of greater than, or equal to, 8ha in area, there may be more than one residential unit, where the additional residential unit(s) are accessory to and situated on the same site as a farming activity.</p>	<p>Zone standard</p> <p>3.10.1 Residential Density</p> <p>a) Minimum net area for any one residential unit shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8ha Rural A <p>Except that one residential unit may be built on sites of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares that existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50ha Rural B and Rural C <p>Except that in the Rural B zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000</p>															
Subdivision rule	<p>6.6.5.1.1 Allotment Size</p> <p>No allotments created by subdivision, including balance titles, shall have a net area or average net area less than the minimum specified for each zone below, except as provided for in a, b, c, d, e and f below. The averaging provisions shall only apply to subdivisions of more than three resultant allotments.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zone</th> <th>Minimum Net Allotment Area</th> <th>Minimum Average Net Allotment Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rural A</td> <td>8 ha</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural B & C</td> <td>50 ha</td> <td>-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone	Minimum Net Allotment Area	Minimum Average Net Allotment Area	Rural A	8 ha	-	Rural B & C	50 ha	-	<p>9.9.1 Allotment Size</p> <p>a) No allotments created by subdivision, including balance titles, shall have a net area less than the minimum specified for each zone below, except as provided for in clauses b, c and d and Rules 2-4 below:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zone</th> <th>Minimum Net Allotment Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rural A</td> <td>8 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural B & C</td> <td>50 ha (provided that the Lake Hood Storage Park may be subdivided to a minimum of 6000m²)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone	Minimum Net Allotment Area	Rural A	8 ha	Rural B & C	50 ha (provided that the Lake Hood Storage Park may be subdivided to a minimum of 6000m ²)
Zone	Minimum Net Allotment Area	Minimum Average Net Allotment Area															
Rural A	8 ha	-															
Rural B & C	50 ha	-															
Zone	Minimum Net Allotment Area																
Rural A	8 ha																
Rural B & C	50 ha (provided that the Lake Hood Storage Park may be subdivided to a minimum of 6000m ²)																

5.0 KEY ISSUES

5.1 The key issues involved in considering the subject of rural density standards include:

- “Openness” or “Rural-ness”. One of the key values
- Reverse Sensitivity
- Diminishing rural opportunity
- Historic entitlement/expectations
- Cumulative effects
- Lifestyle choice

5.2 “Openness” or “Rural-ness” is one of the key values of the rural areas within Ashburton District. In general, the rural zones are characterised by large open areas of arable and grazing farming land, interspersed by trees and shelter belts and scattered with rural buildings and dwellings. The general feeling of rural areas is one of wide open spaces with vistas towards the high country and across the Plains. This openness and feeling of rural character provides a high level of amenity and is highly valued by most living within the District.

5.3 The openness of the rural areas can be adversely impacted by increases in building density, creating a feeling that the areas are being changed from a rural emphasis to a more mixed character. This loss of openness can also impact on the valued rural amenity. However, the scale of the rural areas is such that significant change from the present development density would need to occur to make a noticeable change in most areas. Some areas where there has been historic residential development clustered in the rural area are however more vulnerable to incremental change.

5.4 Through consultation processes during the development of the proposed Plan, it is quite obvious that this is an issue of importance to the community. There are clearly mixed views within the community, with some highly concerned over changes to the rural environment and others wanting continued change and development to occur. I understand that the Ashburton District Council is seeking to ensure the protection of the rural character and amenity in a form similar to what occurs at present.

5.5 “Reverse Sensitivity” is a term used to describe the situation where a new activity is introduced into an environment which then has the potential to limit the operation of existing activities. The concept of reverse sensitivity has evolved through a number of legal cases and articles to become a label describing a type of effect which should be considered by planning decision-makers.

5.6 Reverse sensitivity is the legal vulnerability of an established activity to complaint from a new land use. It arises when an established use is causing adverse environmental impact to nearby land, and a new, usually benign, activity is proposed for that land. The “sensitivity” is this: if the new use is permitted, the established use may be required to restrict its operations or mitigate its effects so as to not adversely affect the new activity. Under the RMA, reverse sensitivity has been found to be a legitimate reason for restricting new land uses. It may justify declining resource consent, imposing conditions on consent, or restricting or prohibiting activities in

district plans. Decisions based on reverse sensitivity protect established uses from having to have the method of operations changed, or otherwise have the ongoing viability of the established use protected.

- 5.7 For the rural areas of Ashburton District, the concept of reverse sensitivity is particularly relevant for new residential activities within the rural environment. The existing rural activities operate with a range of effects that would be considered normal for rural dwellers, but may be less so for people moving into rural areas with less experience of the rural environment. Some such effects include use of loud machinery (e.g. harvesting), use of spray equipment, and hours of operation for farm machinery.
- 5.8 I am aware that the Ashburton District Council is mindful that rural productivity is the backbone of the District and is keen to ensure that these activities can continue to operate into the future with limited restriction. I understand that one of the reasons the Council proposed a change to the rural density rule in the proposed Plan was to seek greater control over residential activities within the rural zones, to protect rural activities from reverse sensitivity effects.
- 5.9 The issue of diminishing rural opportunity is related to the situation where an existing large landholding may be diminished in its ability to carry out rural productive activities due to being subdivided for other land uses. Many of the large rural landholdings are made up of multiple land parcels (allotments) with each parcel of sufficient scale being eligible for residential development. If such development and division was to occur to any significant degree, it could reduce the ability of farms to continue to operate into the future. This issue again turns to the Council's concern that it is important to protect the rural productivity of the rural environment.
- 5.10 Cumulative effects are a relevant consideration where significant residential development has the potential to cause cumulative change in character and amenity leading to further impacts on the wider rural environment. It is very difficult to know how much cumulative effect could occur and in what areas as the demand for residential development is unknown at this time.
- 5.11 Within the rural environment there are many landowners who have enjoyed an historic entitlement to subdivision or development of their land, even though they have not chosen to take up this opportunity. This has led to expectation by these landowners that they may be able to utilise their land differently in the future from what they currently do. Often this is expressed in public consultation as the desire to build a new house for their retirement in the future, or a potential opportunity to subdivide land from the farm to raise capital, or to pass on to family members.
- 5.12 I am aware that the Council is very conscious of these expectations and is alert to the community concern that the proposed Plan provisions would take away such historic entitlement and expectations for many landowners. I understand that this was an issue the Council balanced against the protection of rural amenity and productivity when coming to the decision to include the amended rule in the proposed Plan. I am also aware that the Council is very alert to the community concern that this approach caused and that this has subsequently led to the Council's own submission on this issue.
- 5.13 Lifestyle choice is also a relevant consideration. The proposed Plan includes a range of opportunities for different lifestyle choices. These range through the urban spectrum (Residential A to Residential D), with Residential D enabling allotments to a

minimum of 4,000m² if serviced with reticulation (or 10,000m² if un-serviced). Within the rural spectrum, the scale ranges from minimum allotments of 8ha for the Rural A zone to a minimum of 50ha for the Rural B and C zones. It is important to note that within these minimum area provisions, there is the ability for a wide range of allotment sizes. For example, the Residential D area could have subdivision to 1ha allotments to provide for those wanting larger sections but wanting also to remain within the urban boundary.

- 5.14 I consider such a range important in ensuring that there is sufficient choice to cater for different community needs. The range of allotment minimums allows many choices for purchasers and ensures that choice is maintained. I do not consider there is any need for additional levels of development minimums as the current range allows for much variation at the time of subdivision or development whilst maintaining a clear differentiation between urban and rural areas. I also note that there is a high degree of consistency between the proposed and operative plans, with the same minimum subdivision areas being used as a baseline.

6.0 ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

- 6.1 A range of submissions and further submissions were received on these parts of the proposed District Plan. Consideration of these submissions has been undertaken by with submitters grouped as appropriate. The following analysis focuses on those parts of the submissions that seek specific outcomes and does not discuss any parts of submissions that comment on aspects of the Plan in passing or provide general discussion. My analysis of submissions below is generally in relation to broad issues or topics raised, with some specific relief sought being mentioned where necessary. Based on this analysis, included in Appendix One to this report are my specific recommendations on each submission point (accept, accept in part, or reject).

Submissions received

- 6.2 The change to the rural zone provision (zone standard 3.10.1) was one of the most significant changes undertaken within the proposed District Plan and was probably the one change that generated the greatest number of submissions and the most significant reaction from the public generally. In most part the reaction from the public was negative, with many submitters requesting a change to this rule (either a return to the operative provisions or other suggested relaxations to the rule). There were however also a number of submissions received in support of the change to the rule.
- 6.3 I consider it appropriate to initially note the submission made by the Ashburton District Council. This submission was a reaction to the public response to the proposed Plan and signals the view from Council that these provisions need to be considered further.
- 6.4 This submission included a specific submission point on clause 3.10.1 which stated *“Recognition needs to be given to existing titles, which have development potential. These allotments may have been created by subdivision consent or that have been purchased with the intent to build on the basis that the Operative District Plan allows the development of these lots. The proposed rule should seek to retain the open character of rural areas, avoid the loss of productive rural land and to minimise the effects of reverse sensitivity, while also allowing the development of existing small titles.”* The submission suggested the rule be amended to read:

3.10.1 Residential Density

a) *Minimum net area of a site for any one residential unit shall be:*

- 8ha Rural A

~~*Except that one residential unit may be built on sites of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares that existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.*~~

- 50ha Rural B and Rural C

~~*Except that in the Rural B zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000*~~

~~*Except that the minimum net area for one residential unit on any allotment existing at the time of decisions shall be 2ha, subject to compliance with District Plan requirements (incl. rules and standards) for servicing (sewerage treatment and disposal, water supply, stormwater treatment and disposal), the avoidance of natural hazards and compliance with other rules in the District Plan.*~~

~~*Note. ECAN has requirements for septic tanks and water bores that may require resource consent.*~~

- 6.5 In this regard, I note that that the elected Council who made the decision on the rule to be included in the proposed District Plan as notified and the wording to be included in the submission, is different from the elected Council who will be making the decisions on the proposed Plan.
- 6.6 A number of submissions were received in support of the rural density provisions being more restrictive in the proposed Plan. The reasons for such support included:
- A desire to limit expansion of residential / low density / lifestyle blocks onto valuable, highly productive and/or versatile soils best utilised by farming.
 - A request to consider the future form of the District and protect the productive lands that have made the Ashburton District what it is today.
- 6.7 This support is acknowledged. It is also noted that similar sentiments were expressed in some of the further submissions in opposition to the submissions seeking change to this rule. Many of these views reflect the issues discussed above in the issues section of this report.
- 6.8 The submissions received in opposition to the proposed provisions are addressed further below.

Section 3: Residential density in the Rural Zones

- 6.9 The submissions received in opposition to the rural density rule seek a range of solutions:
- Deletion of the rule in its entirety
 - A return to the operative rule
 - An exemption for existing allotments

- Changes to the sunset/grandfather clauses¹

Deletion of the rule

- 6.10 I do not consider it appropriate to delete the rule in its entirety as that would leave a situation where there is no guidance within the rural zone chapter regarding the appropriate scale of land necessary for residential development. It would be inappropriate and inefficient to have no rule setting out the minimum net area for residential units. This would allow unlimited development for residential purposes which would fly in the face of the intention by the Council to control residential use and protect rural activity.
- 6.11 Such an approach would go beyond just “returning” development rights removed by the proposed Plan rule, to a totally unrestricted subdivision/residential development regime. This would also require wholesale change to the objectives and policies to reflect such an approach, and would appear to be counter to the Council’s principle aims for the rural area.

Return to the operative rule

- 6.12 I do not consider a return to the operative rule to be generally appropriate as the operative rule did not recognise the underlying density of the zones. This led to a situation where there was an apparent difference between the subdivision standard and the development standard, leading to confusion and the potential of conflict internally within the Plan. I do not consider it appropriate to perpetuate this situation with a return to the rule in its present form.
- 6.13 However, the operative rule did provide clarity around situations where sites were greater than 2ha but less than 8ha. I consider that if the rule is altered, consideration should be given to also including such clauses within the rule to enhance the clarity of the rule for users. If the Hearings Panel were to adopt this approach, I suggest the addition of the following wording to the rule:

b) There shall be only one residential unit on any land comprised in a separate site of less than 8ha in area.

An exemption for existing allotments

- 6.14 I consider a return to the exemption for existing allotments of 2ha or greater to be appropriate. This is consistent with the historic entitlement enjoyed by landowners. A return to such an exemption would not create any further disadvantage to landowners relative to historic entitlements. Assuming no all who would be eligible would take up this entitlement, and even if reasonable numbers were to exercise it, development on allotments of 2ha or greater is not likely to lead to significant adverse effects on rural character and amenity in most situations. Nor is it likely to lead to reverse sensitivity effects in most cases, as such sections would have sufficient size

¹ A “sunset clause” is a provision that has a limit on the period in which it can be used. In this case, the part of the rule that states “*This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan*” provides a sunset clause allowing that part of the rule to apply only for a limited time. A “grandfather clause” is a provision that enables historical activity to be accommodated. In this case, the part of the rule that states “*Except ..., where that site was created after 1 January 2000*” allows some historical situations to be accommodated within the rule as an exception.

to ensure that residential activity can be located away from neighbouring activities that could cause concern.

- 6.15 I do note however that the quantum of such development is unknown and could vary from area to area based on both the availability of sections of smaller sizes and the uptake of such sections by landowners. The Council has advised that there are many allotments presently existing that are less than the zone minimum area. These include:

Zone	Site Area	Number of Allotments	
		Operative Plan zone boundaries	Proposed Plan zone boundaries
Rural A zone	between 2 ha and 8 ha	610	276
Rural B zone	between 2 ha and 50 ha	3898	4349

- 6.16 Having considered the various suggestions for wording to achieve this, in this case, I prefer the wording proposed by the Council's submission as this appropriately references the need to also ensure compliance with other District Plan requirements. This would replace the two exceptions in the rule as notified and read:

Except that the minimum net area for one residential unit on any allotment existing at the time of decisions shall be 2ha, subject to compliance with District Plan requirements (incl. rules and standards) for servicing (sewerage treatment and disposal, water supply, stormwater treatment and disposal), the avoidance of natural hazards and compliance with other rules in the District Plan.

Sunset and grandfather clauses

- 6.17 An exception as discussed above, does not include any grandfather clause – it is not restricted in time – but would enable any existing title over 2ha (no matter when created) to accommodate a dwelling. I consider this to be acceptable as there are unlikely to be such numbers of new dwellings created that cumulative effects may occur in most areas. However, as discussed above, it is simply not possible to speculate at this time over how many such dwellings could be developed, in what areas and over what time period. Therefore any actual level of effect is difficult to establish. If there are to be adverse effects, these are most likely to occur if multiple lots are in close proximity and lead to clustering of development. Such potential is a matter the Hearings Panel will need to consider.
- 6.18 However the Council may wish to include a grandfather clause within the rule to recognise that there are numerous smaller allotments scattered across the District that were created a very long time ago and which are much less likely to be developed than those created in more recent times. Submitters have suggested a range of dates including from 1995 and 1950. Such a clause could read:

Except that this exception shall only apply where that site was created after 1995.

- 6.19 The use of a sunset clause for this exception could still be a consideration for the Council. These types of clauses seek to balance historic entitlement/expectations with a move towards greater restriction or protection. They provide a method of recognising existing titles at the same time as bringing in restrictions that will protect rural character and activities into the future.

- 6.20 The Council may wish to consider adding a sunset clause to the 2ha exemption to signal a future change in policy direction. I suggest that if the Council were to consider such an approach it would be appropriate to provide considerable time such that those planning to develop can undertake intended development. A reasonable period of time would be 10 years from the decisions being made on this Plan. This would align with the next District Plan review and enable this to be reconsidered further at the time of that review. At that time, the Council may determine that the rural areas are still not at risk from smaller scale development and choose to extend the exception. Alternatively they may decide to remove the exception and place greater priority on protection of the rural resource. In either case, the lengthy timeframe enables this to be signalled to the community for a long period. Such a clause could read:

This exception shall apply for 10 years from the date of decisions on this Plan.

- 6.21 I do note that any sunset clause would inevitably disadvantage someone at some time. This however may be considered appropriate and necessary by the Council to provide a clear direction to the community that the Council desires to either see small sites develop or that the uncertainty of such entitlement be removed to better protect the wider rural environment.

Section 9: Subdivision density in the Rural Zones

- 6.22 The subdivision provisions for the rural zones have remained unchanged from the operative Plan rule to the proposed Plan. The scale of 8ha in the Rural A zone and 50ha in the Rural B and C zones has been long established within the District. I do not consider it would be appropriate to alter such provisions at this time as sought by some submitters. Reducing this baseline scale for development would send the message that it is appropriate for smaller scale development widely across the rural parts of the District, which I do not believe is appropriate or sought by either the Council or the public generally. Having minimum allotment sizes enables a range of sizes above this to provide variety and choice. I do not consider it appropriate to alter or delete the subdivision provisions for the rural zones.
- 6.23 I consider the status of the subdivision and density rules as Zone Standards (for which a breach of the rule is a non-complying activity) is appropriate as the consideration of these matters is critical to rural character and amenity and any development of a greater intensity should be carefully considered against the tests in the Act.
- 6.24 Overall, I consider that the real issue in relation to allotment scale is about exceptions to the minimum standards for residential activity and this issue is addressed above.

Other related issues

- 6.25 A number of submissions have sought other outcomes, including:
- site specific exemptions from the rule (e.g. that the rule not apply to a specific property)
 - consideration of specific proposals on certain properties (e.g. that on a certain property a dwelling be permitted on a site of 1.5ha or a 4ha subdivision be allowed)

- consideration of specific activities (e.g. rural contractors).
- 6.26 It would be quite inappropriate to include specific exemptions for sites within a general rule applying across the whole of the rural zones. In particular it is not possible to undertake the level of assessment necessary to be sure that such exemptions would be appropriate and would not create adverse effects, as there is little detail given in the submissions on what is proposed to occur on the properties. The level of assessment necessary would be similar to that required for a resource consent application and it is more appropriate that such consent level assessment occur for allotments that are undersized. A District Plan rule cannot easily provide for a project level consideration and thus I do not recommend that any requests for site specific rule exemptions be accepted.
- 6.27 Likewise, it would be inappropriate to provide for specific proposals or activities to occur within these rules. This too should be considered on a case by case basis through the resource consent process.
- 6.28 Some submissions seek that the rules recognise situations already considered through subdivision or resource consent processes. In these situations the landowner/developer is already entitled to carry out the consented proposal and there is no need for the rules to specifically cater for their consented project. It is important for the Panel to differentiate between activities occurring under existing use rights or consents (and which may continue under such provisions irrespective of any new rules), from future activities which would be subject to any new rules applied in the new District Plan.
- 6.29 One submission refers to development at Lake Hood. This submitter may have confused the rules as the subdivision and development of Lake Hood is covered by relevant area specific rules and not by these rural standards.
- 6.30 The submission from Selwyn District Council seeks that the residential density of the Rural C zone along the District Boundary be reduced, i.e. by requiring more land per dwelling; in order to mitigate adverse effects in terms of cross-boundary landscape and character issues. The current minimum allotment size for the Rural C zone is 50ha for subdivision and this retained in the proposed Plan. I consider that this is an appropriate scale for this area with no need for the minimum site area to be further increased (reducing overall density). I also note that such a scale would not allow the creation of many new dwellings in this area, when combined with other restrictive rules applying to this high country. Within the Rural C area there is a high level of protection afforded to outstanding natural landscape areas and this would be considered in any application for smaller land parcels. In addition I note that the majority of land in the Rural C zone is in substantially larger land holdings and likely to remain that way into the future with the implications of tenure review being taken into account. There are also large tracts of land now in the Conservation estate in the Rural C zone.
- 6.31 Should the Hearings Panel agree to make changes to these rules, it will also be necessary to reconsider the way in which other parts of the District Plan are addressed. In particular the issues, objectives and policies (and their associated explanations), and reasons for rules (3.7.1) would need to be amended to reflect changes to the rule/s. Such consequential changes would be necessary to ensure that the rules are adequately explained and applied, but cannot be crafted until a decision is made on the form the rules would take.

7.0 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The relevant statutory considerations in relation to these submissions are whether the outcomes will be consistent with sections 31 and 32 of the Act, along with Part II of the Act. I consider that the recommendations above are both effective and efficient and will ensure that the methods contained in this section are the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Plan. I consider that this section of the Plan is appropriate under Part II of the Act in achieving sustainable management within the Ashburton District.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Based on the discussion above, I consider that, subject to the recommended changes to text set out below, these parts of the proposed District Plan should be accepted.

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

APPENDIX ONE: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S2	David Errol Oakley	1	That the ADC retain the existing minimum areas for rural housing and subdivision.	Accept in part
S13	Timothy Michael Silva	1	That Rule 3.10.1 be deleted in its entirety.	Reject
S15	Delia Achten	1	Please do not introduce the proposed changes to the minimum residential size section (Zones B and C).	Accept in part
S17	Joanne Catherine Smith	1	Rural B density to remain as 2 hectares per dwelling, and be able to adjust title line to give one title of 2 hectares to build on and have existing house on 1.5676 hectares.	Accept in part
S20	Colin and Marian Bellamy	1	To be allowed to build a home on 2.32 hectares.	Accept in part
S25	James and Joanne Callaghan	1	That the Residential Density rule remain as 2 hectares in Rural B.	Accept in part
S26	Kevin Noel McCracken	1	Any existing property being affected by the proposed new changes should have a further 5 years to develop or finish developing their lifestyle properties.	Accept in part
S27	John and Heather McKimmie	1	That 2 hectare blocks already created are able to have one residential unit built on them.	Accept
S28	David Samuel John Keating	1	To remove section 3.10.1: Zone Standards completely from the District Plan	Reject
S29	Paul McFall	2	Keep the current Plan that allows a dwelling to be built on an allotment of 2 hectares or more.	Accept in part
S33	Justin Kenneth Bird	1	The Council should let all the people who are affected by this proposed plan have a vote on whether it should go ahead.	Reject
S33	Justin Kenneth Bird	2	The Council should leave the block sizes as 1-2 hectare blocks not 8 hectares.	Reject

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S36	Robert John Watson	1	Recommend that Council do not proceed with this proposed plan and new dwellings do not require a resource consent.	Reject
S38	Harley Shearer	1	That all existing 2 hectare titles are still able to be built on.	Accept
S46	Peter John Howden	1	The proposed plan as written to be approved must go on from 'now' and existing titles retain their rights. Rural B over the bulk of the District is ok from 'now' but there are areas over which it is not ok as it totally stifles any growth of amenities, schools, recreation, halls etc. These are vital to service Rural B and C for contractors etc and for tourism in Staveley as discussed at their meeting. Maybe some Residential D in specified areas.	Accept in part
S50	Bally Bryne Co Ltd	1	Retain current rural density rules.	Accept in part
S51	Eric and Maxine Watson	1	Support the proposed rural density rules.	Accept in part
S52	Grant Goodwin	1	Retain submitter's section as status quo for rule 3.10.1.	Accept in part
S56	Margaret Jane Catherine Dick	1	Should have the right to build on our 3 acres as we have already put resource consent in to build on our corner 3 acres.	Reject (not relevant as relates to resource consent situation rather than District Plan)
S62	Darren and Michelle Green	1	Suggest that Rule 3.10.1 be amended to allow building on these kinds of parcels in the Rural B Zone where either the parcel was created after 1 January 2000, or the builder of any residential building was in ownership of the land prior to the publication of the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part
S63	Bridget Annabell Edith Kok	1	Productive farmland should be protected from further unnecessary subdivision.	Accept in part
S63	Bridget Annabell Edith Kok	2	Disagree with changing the rules for property already subdivided. What's done is done and the rules should not change now. Leave property now subdivided as it is, with the ability to build on it whenever people want to. Dramatic changes to laws and rules that effect people's homes and finances are not fair, as that is people's security.	Accept in part
S63	Bridget Annabell Edith Kok	3	Will this mean that the Lake Hood smallholding development will also only have 12 months to build on the sections?	Reject (covered by specific rules relating to the Aquatic

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
				Park zone)
S65	J EA Landgon	1	Congratulates Council on ending sheer waste of good land going into lifestyle blocks, but you are about 30 years too late.	Accept in part
S66	Baden Sommerville	1	That the present rural density rules are retained.	Accept in part
S69	Darrell Ian Hydes	2	That people with existing titles of 2-8 hectares should be able to build on them as in the current District Plan.	Accept in part
S71	Barry Thomas Cameron	1	Keep the District Plan for properties in Rural A Zone as status quo: that you can build a dwelling on more than 2 hectares of land.	Accept in part
S75	Shirley Margaret McLachlan	1	Clause to include Rural B, replacement of dwellings on small blocks already developed be allowed to proceed at a time the owner wishes.	Accept in part
S76	Dougal Stuart Forbes	1	Opposes the new amendments and support the Foothills Group's plans. There is no reason to change the current rules.	Accept in part
S77	Richard and Vicki Green	1	There needs to be some grandfather; provisions on historical titles where the new district plan provisions take 10 years to take effect.	Accept in part
S82	Hamish Ian Burrowes	1	The action the Council should be taking is to leave blocks that are already subdivided in Zone B which were bought under the old District Plan. There should be no new changes to the blocks that have already been bought. These blocks were bought in good faith that who ever, when ever could build on them.	Accept in part
S83	Stuart John and Elizabeth Kaye Ellis	2	Seek graduated 2 and 4 hectare blocks, so that 2 hectare blocks share boundary with Residential D and 8 hectare blocks can share boundary with Rural B.	Accept in part
S84	John Wheeldon	1	Oppose the proposed change to residential density in Rural B. No change to present system or a longer timescale of 3 years or longer.	Accept in part
S86	Lindsay Colin Rountree	1	Option to sell 50 hectares of 54 hectare site. The 4 hectares with house and buildings would become lifestyle block to retire on.	Reject

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S89	Clifford John and Cynthia Lillian Begg	1	Rural density rules to be left the way they are at present.	Accept in part
S93	Rodger John Letham	1	That titles in existence at the date of the decisions of this Proposed Plan be able to be built on under the rules existing when the title was created.	Accept in part
S97	David Ewan Paul Harden	1	Keep status quo on building entitlements and existing rights on existing titles.	Accept in part
S98	Catherine Frances Duff Millin	1	Minimum size building site remains at 2 hectares and some provision also made for sites (existing) less than 2 hectares.	Accept in part
S99	Murray and Lynne Dalziell	1	Give owner a longer timeframe in which to come to terms with what is being changed.	Accept in part
S99	Murray and Lynne Dalziell	2	If any changes are to be made, it must be for proposed new subdivisions. Leave all existing subdivisions alone that have already been approved by Council.	Accept in part
S102	PT and MJ Binnie	1	That the current district plan zones are retained and Rural B remains at 20ha.	Reject
S104	Geoffrey Verdun Russell Read	1	Change the plan so regardless of how long a section has been surveyed, the submitter can still build a house on it.	Accept in part
S105	Alan and Gillian Greenslade	2	Should consider minimum allotment size of 4 or less not 8 hectares: this would have been a much more logical rezoning idea for the present A zoning areas.	Reject
F72	<i>Alan and Gillian Greenslade</i>	2	<i>support</i>	Reject
S107	Donald Andrew Houston	1	Request that the status quo remain in place for rural density.	Accept in part
S108	Gavin Doody	1	Oppose proposed rural density provisions.	Accept in part
S110	Keith Stewart Tonks	1	Any consented titles created before the new district plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2ha as consented.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S112	Janet Tayler Hay	1	Stay with existing plan (rural density and subdivision).	Accept in part
S116	Gerard Paul	1	Anyone with a land title of 2 hectares or more should have the right to apply for resource consent as we all pay our rates.	Accept in part
S118	Daniel Symons	1	Retain the existing 2ha minimum residential density rule as in the operative plan, or Reword the proposed rule so as to allow residential development on parcels of 2ha or larger resulting from subdivisions which have been granted a subdivision consent under the operative plan i.e. since 25th March 1995.	Accept in part
S119	Angela Kay Bowler	1	To remove time restrictions on building dwellings on subdivisions already in place at the time the new district plan comes into action.	Accept in part
S127	Jeanette Patricia Urlwin	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S128	HS Gordon Estate	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S130	Gordon Family Trust	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S131	Lynley Jayne Gordon	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S132	Brendon Henry Gordon	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S133	Gordon Family Trust	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S134	HS Gordon Estate	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S135	Keith Leslie Gordon	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S136	HS Gordon Estate	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S137	Drynomore Ltd	1	Stop any deterioration of existing property rights.	Accept in part
S142	GW & SE Prebble Family Trust	1	Leave all land zoning as is or at the very least allow the owners of all land that has been subdivided to around 8 hectares to build a dwelling as of right.	Accept in part
S144	Barbara Anne Farr	1	That existing two hectare blocks could still have a dwelling erected on them in the future	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S146	Christine Hesketh	1	Add a new rule that provides an exemption from resource consent for all existing titles (irrespective of date of creation) down to a minimum of 2 hectares in Rural B Zone that allows for a dwelling to be built anytime in the future.	Accept in part
S150	Shane Russell Stockdill	1	Amend the exception in 3.10.1 to read: Except that in the Rural B Zone....not less than 2.0 hectares where the site was created after 1 January 2000.	Accept in part
S153	Shirley Shadbolt	2	Remove the proposal to change building rules in respect of rural land.	Accept in part
S158	Robin and Janice Ford	1	All resource consents given by the ADC in the past for subdivision of 2 hectares and over in the Rural B Zone should have a grandfather clause as used by other district plans.	Accept in part
S159	Alistair Charles and Elaine Mary Pierce	1	Our properties (Lot DP10209 BLK IV Hinds S.D of 3.6852 hectares and Lot 1 DP21745 BLK IV Hinds S.D of 18.4511 hectares) to remain status quo and remain in the Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
S161	Lindsay James Forde	1	The status quo should exist for landowners of property currently zoned Rural A.	Accept in part
S167	Tricia Robertson	1	Any titles created before the new district plan that have been paid for and approved must be able to be built on with a minimum of 2 acres, without restriction.	Accept in part
S167	Tricia Robertson	2	Any titles consented after Jan 2000 must be allowed to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares.	Accept in part
S170	Ross, Rochelle and Joel Hewson	2	That the exception (permitting residential units to be built shall only last for a period of 12 months from the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan), should apply to all sites of between 2 and 8 hectares that exist at the time decisions are made on the Proposed District Plan in perpetuity.	Accept in part
S173	AW & KJ Hart Limited	1	Provide for dwellings on existing sites of 8 hectares or more within the Rural B Zone as a permitted activity.	Accept in part
F76	A L Hart	1	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S176	J A M Bakker	1	Keep blocks smaller.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S180	Robert Ian Rex Hewson	1	Reject the proposed increase in the minimum lot size for residential dwellings in Rural B Zone.	Accept in part
S182	C E Gowland	1	That people be able to build on existing land, also any three acre titles.	Accept in part
S184	Maureen Williams	2	That the decision be made to extend the timeframe in which to build a home on a property of less than 8 hectares be extended to 10 years.	Accept in part
S185	Donald and Judith O'Connor	1	Change of Lots 9-10 DP1017 of area 8.38 hectares down to 4 blocks of 2 hectares. The grandfather clause should be dropped as it pressures the natural building development of the area.	Accept in part
S186	Clive Seddon	2	Retain 2 hectares per dwelling in Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
S186	Clive Seddon	3	Do not create 8 hectare sections per dwelling.	Accept in part
S186	Clive Seddon	7	Stop new 4 to 8 hectare sites being created and put new 2 hectare policy into place.	Accept in part
S186	Clive Seddon	8	4 hectare to 8 hectare sites only created with resource consent.	Accept in part
S186	Clive Seddon	9	Allow 8-4 hectare properties to be subdivided within 5km radius of towns.	Accept in part
S187	Monica and Terry O'Neill	2	Landowners should be able to build on properties presently in 3 and 5 acre titles.	Accept in part
S188	Struan D Christie	1	To allow a dwelling to be built on 31.14 hectares of land known as 267 Cochranes Road (Lot 8 DP 237 Blks XIII XIV Ashburton SDBLK II Wakanui SD).	Reject
S192	Murray Johnstone	1	Make provisions for existing Rural B blocks to have a dwelling on them.	Accept in part
S193	BJ and PJ Croucher	2	Accept that Rural A blocks of 8 hectares and greater that there is no change.	Accept in part
S193	BJ and PJ Croucher	3	That blocks of under 8 hectares in the Rural A Zone retain the right to have a dwelling built on them.	Accept in part
S196	Edith Claire Tutty	2	Reject proposed new subdivision standards of 8 hectares in Rural A and 50 hectares in Rural B.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S196	Edith Claire Tutty	3	The owner of any legal subdivided block, what-ever the size, how-ever small, where-ever the zone, when-ever it was approved, should be accorded the right to build on that property when he desires.	Accept in part
S196	Edith Claire Tutty	4	Allow for any block of land legally subdivided into any size, over the last 60 years, to be eligible for building a dwelling at any time.	Accept in part
S197	Mark Robinson	1	My suggestion, if the Council feels it must do something to stop subdivision in Rural Zones and building homes on these, is to allow all blocks under 50 hectares (regardless of size) existing at the time of notification to retain the existing rights i.e. to build on them without resource consent.	Accept in part
S202	M R Ching	1	That if a land parcel of more or less than 2 to 8 hectares existed at the decision date, then the owner or new purchaser has the right to build on the site with no time limit set for the dwelling to be built on it.	Accept in part
S203	Peter Taylor	1	Leave existing titles in Rural B as status quo	Accept in part
S206	Mark Hunter Lemon	3	Leave rural density standards unchanged in the District Plan.	Accept in part
S207	Dawne Glenie	1	That the Rural A Zone be left unchanged and that the minimum allotment size be left unchanged.	Accept in part
S208	Raewyn Margaret Low	1	Land to stay in Rural A Zone instead of being put in Rural B Zone and the right to subdivide land.	Accept in part
S209	Mark David and Melanie Dawne Howden	1	If the new proposed Rural Zone standards and boundary changes are to be adopted, then because of our unique circumstances it would be appropriate for the Council to exercise an EXPRESS EXEMPTION to Lot 5 DP356105.	Accept in part
S210	Richard Roy Bruce	4	Remove Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density.	Reject
S211	John and Carolyn Nordquist	1	That a minimum of 8 hectares would become too expensive for some and for others too large to farm and manage to adequate standards.	Accept in part
S211	John and Carolyn Nordquist	2	We propose to retain current (Operative) District Plan.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S213	Campbell Atford McArthur	1	The proposed changes should start from now and leave existing blocks to do what they are allowed now.	Accept in part
S214	Ian Crosson	2	A grandfather clause that allows a residential dwelling to be built on existing 2 hectare or greater title in Rural A, B and C Zones.	Accept in part
S216	Malcolm Samuel Cretney	1	Rural density rules to remain as is.	Accept in part
S217	Bruce Kenneth McIlroy	1	To leave Rural A as it is and any changes to the plan to be made as from now.	Accept in part
S218	Langtry and Maureen Maginness	1	Strongly urge the Council to look again at these historic subdivisions which have been used by the Council to generate rates over many years.	Accept in part
S221	Bryan William Humm	2	Encourage country people to stay in community when older.	Accept in part
S222	Bryan William Humm	1	Every case for development in rural areas be considered on its merits or otherwise.	Accept in part
S222	Bryan William Humm	2	Set a date for any change in rules sometime in the future.	Accept in part
S223	Gavin Thomas Black	1	Leave all existing titles and building rights as in current District Plan and make changes to new titles under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part
S224	Lynwen Ann Morgans	1	Existing titles must be allowed to be built on otherwise compensation should be paid for loss of value.	Accept in part
S225	William Anderley Morgans	1	Existing titles must be allowed to be built on otherwise, compensation should be paid for loss of value.	Accept in part
S226	Alan Dallas Bean	1	Rule 3.10.1 be removed from the Plan.	Reject
S227	Robert Graeme Orchard	2	Present buildable sites remain buildable.	Accept in part
S228	Carol Ann Black	1	Leave all existing titles and building rights the same as in the current District Plan.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S230	John Henry Cuthbertson	1	Any consented titles created before the new District Plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares.	Accept in part
S231	Gordon Frank Biggs	1	That an extension should be in place for the grandfather clause for at least for 5 years.	Accept in part
S235	Aleisha Palmers	1	Any consented titles created before the new District Plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares.	Accept in part
S235	Aleisha Palmers	2	There should be no building restrictions or time limits on the 2 hectare titles that have been consented prior to the new District Plan.	Accept in part
S236	Jacky Oakeshott	1	To be able to subdivide 4 hectare blocks and to remain that you can build on 2 hectare and the smaller blocks on titles now, be allowed to build.	Accept in part
S239	Alastair Neill Scott	1	The status quo should apply to existing properties; or A grandfather clause should be included to enable residential units to be built on existing titles over 2 hectares in the Rural B Zone with no time limits.	Accept in part
S240	Silver Fern Farms	61	No change required to Section 9.	Accept
S242	Donal and Frances Stanton	2	Proposed Rural Zone site standards not be implemented as proposed. More realistic and fairer recognition of existing entitlements be allowed for.	Accept in part
S244	Wendy Rhoda Stevenson	2	Leave size for building at 4 hectares.	Accept in part
S244	Wendy Rhoda Stevenson	3	Change the date 1 January 2000 to 1st January 1950 or remove the date altogether.	Accept in part
S245	Tim Stoddart	1	Any consented titles created before the new District Plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 ha as consented.	Accept in part
S245	Tim Stoddart	2	There should be no building restrictions or time limits on the 2 hectare titles that have been consented prior to the new District Plan.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S246	Denis Stoddart	1	Any consented titles created before the new District Plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares as consented.	Accept in part
S246	Denis Stoddart	2	There should be no building restrictions or time limits on the 2 hectare titles that have been consented prior to the new District Plan.	Accept in part
S247	M J Stoddart	1	Any consented titles created before the new District Plan becomes operative should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares as consented.	Accept in part
S247	M J Stoddart	2	There should be no building restrictions or time limits on the 2 hectare titles that have been consented prior to the new District Plan.	Accept in part
S251	John Gordon Harrison	2	Want to retain the ability to rebuild a dwelling on a title in the Rural B Zone if destroyed or removed.	Accept in part
S252	John Young	1	The rules in relation to both Rural A and B need to be reviewed again. There should not be a restriction on time and at least should be increased from 12 month window. There should not be a restriction that a parcel of land created after 1 January 2000 can be developed on a site of 4 hectares or more. This should be open to all parcels, historical or not.	Accept in part
S253	Woodlands Farm (Elgin) Limited	1	The submitter requests the following relief: a) That the land recently subdivided by the submitters is zoned as Rural A. b) In the alternative, that a dwelling be able to be built on the subdivided sites. c) Any consequential or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised in the submission.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S259	Skevington Farm Limited	2	That proposed rule 3.10.1 be amended to read at the relevant part “That in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 2 hectares, where the site existed at the date where the Proposed Ashburton District Plan became fully operative”. Any consequential or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S259	Skevington Farm Limited	3	Any consequential or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised in this submission be undertaken.	Accept in part
S265	Peter Cates Farming Co Limited	2	In the alternative, if the Council is not prepared to take that action then the submitter seeks that the exemption provided for in Rule 3.10.1 be amended to read 'where the title for that site existed at the date when the Proposed Ashburton District Plan became fully operative'.	Accept in part
S270	MacFarlane Rural Business Ltd	1	Continue to manage rural housing density and associated waste water disposal and potable water requirement.	Accept in part
S270	MacFarlane Rural Business Ltd	2	In principle, we believe existing property rights can only be altered in a minor way. Emphasis should not be on subdivision size, but housing density. Rural housing is a positive influence in maintaining and growing healthy communities as long as the standard of housing, infrastructure and needs of that housing can be managed in a non-invasive manner.	Accept in part
S271	Marcus Timothy Jason Blackman	1	Implementation of Rural Zone rules.	Accept in part
S272	David and Nicola Copland	2	In the alternative, if the Council is not prepared to take that action then the submitter seeks that the exemption provided for in Rule 3.10.1 which currently reads 'The minimum area for any one residential unit shall be, in the Rural B Zone, 50ha with the exception that one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4ha where that site was created after 1 January 2000'. Be amended to read <u>where the title for that site existed at the date when the Proposed Ashburton District Plan became fully operative.</u>	Accept in part
S272	David and Nicola Copland	3	Such other alternative or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised in this submission	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S277	Keith Gordon	1	I urge Council to consider the extremely profound and widely spread implications of such a drastic and draconian change measured as proposed, in the instance particularly of that which pertains to the minimum allowable site size for erecting/establishing of a dwelling in the Rural B Zone especially. I find it difficult to comprehend and would like to think Council will after further consideration allow this potentially destructive (in many ways) proposal to lapse, and better direct its efforts in planning and fostering the future development and economic/life quality potential of this District.	Accept in part
S280	Holmeslee Enterprises Limited	5	That Rule 3.10.1 provide that one residential unit may be built on a site of 2 hectares and up to 8 hectares, without any time restriction but if the Council requires a time restriction then it be for not less than 5 years from the date of decisions on the Plan.	Accept in part
S280	Holmeslee Enterprises Limited	7	Any consequential or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised.	Accept in part
S282	Nicola Lamont	1	There should not be a restriction on time or at least it should be increased to 5-10 years not 12 months.	Accept in part
S282	Nicola Lamont	2	The rules in relation to both Rural A and B need to be reviewed again.	Accept in part
S282	Nicola Lamont	3	There should not be a restriction that a parcel of land created after 1 January 2000 can be developed on a site of 4 hectares or more. This should be open to all parcels, historical or not.	Accept in part
S283	Gregory and Joanne Lovett	2	In the alternative, if the Council is not prepared to take that action then the submitter seeks that the exemption provided for in Rule 3.10.1 which currently reads 'The minimum area for any one residential unit shall be, in the Rural B Zone, 50ha with the exception that one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4ha where that site was created after 1 January 2000'. Be amended to read <u>where the title for that site existed at the date when the Proposed Ashburton District Plan became fully operative.</u>	Accept in part
S283	Gregory and Joanne Lovett	3	Any consequential or alternative relief which better gives effect to the issues raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S285	Peter Leslie Forrest	2	4 hectares to stay as land size for building in Rural A.	Accept in part
S285	Peter Leslie Forrest	3	Date to change to 1 January 1950 or remove the date altogether.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S291	Rosemarie Wheeldon	1	To have at least five years to have the option to build.	Accept in part
S294	Alan Bruce Totty	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan.	Accept in part
S298	Clive Seddon	1	Subdivision in Rural A to be as small as 2 hectares with larger blocks by resource consent only.	Accept in part
S300	Robert Schikker	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.3 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that site lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions).	Accept in part
S302	Julia Mary Paton	1	Withdraw section 3.10.1 from the Proposed Plan and consider that by having subdivision rules of minimum size of 8 hectares for Rural and 50 hectares for Rural B that this will have the effect of reducing opportunities of subdivision of large parcels of land and protect the productive use of the land for the future.	Accept in part
S302	Julia Mary Paton	2	Keep the section in the current Ashburton District Plan that allows for a dwelling on a site of 2 or more hectares in the Rural Zones.	Accept in part
S302	Julia Mary Paton	3	Any other consequences the Ashburton District Council sees fit to meet the submitter's concerns.	Accept in part
S304	Margaret Anne Parnham	2	Amend Rule 3.9.1 so it is not retrospective.	Accept in part
S306	Jeanette McLennan	1	Retain existing rules regarding minimum size for building consent for all existing titles in Rural B less than 4 hectares.	Accept in part
S310	P R Corbett	1	Remove the following words from Rule 3.10.1: 'where that site was created after 1 January 2000.'	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S311	Stephanie Lee Cretney	1	Would like to see pre-existing titles remain without the timeframe stipulations re: building within a year.	Accept in part
S312	Philip Joseph Daley	1	Maybe some change or amendment be made to people like myself, in this sort of situation.	Accept in part
S315	Peter Hampton	1	Maintain present zoning rules, policies and objectives as they apply to Rural A.	Accept in part
S316	Jon and Emma Harmer	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that site lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S319	Murray Hawkes	1	Rural subdivisions down to 2 hectares to be allowed where subdivision is associated with an open space covenant on 10-20 hectares per title created.	Reject
S322	Mark and Melanie Howden	1	That all allotments which were created or purchased during the current Operative Plan be exempt from any new residential density rule change.	Accept in part
S323	Kehi Jufer	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that site lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S326	David Thomas Howden	4	Where the Council has been party to approving a recent subdivision consent on current Rural A land and have accepted the payment of fees and rates based on the new rateable value, the Council must let the development proceed without a time constraint as an existing right.	Accept in part
S333	Croziars Turkeys Ltd	1	Retain existing rural zone rules.	Accept in part
S335	Heather Louise Haslett	1	Any current owner of a smallholding should have the right to build or rebuild on it, particularly if there is already a derelict house on it. The zone should stay as it is.	Accept in part
S336	Geoffrey Rickard Horrell	1	Allow existing 2-4 hectare blocks to erect houses without the need for resource consent and associated cost.	Accept in part
S341	Brian Robert Lowe	1	Allow subdivision to 2 hectares in existing Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
S342	Lower Greenstreet Landowners Group	2	A further recommendation would be to remove the grandfather clause and allow building on any parcel of land that has been legally approved.	Accept in part
S343	Ian and Deborah McCaw	1	Either the rules are left as they are or we are given more time to do the subdivision.	Accept in part
S344	Wayne and Maxine Muckle	1	Seek exemption from the 50 hectare rule for all existing small sites in our area, down to 2 hectares and the return to the existing rule in the current Plan.	Accept in part
S347	Amanda Jane Sibley	1	Don't go ahead with proposed changes to rural density rules.	Accept in part
S348	Robyn Potbury	1	All existing titles should be able to be built on.	Accept in part
S349	N J Mackenzie	2	Blocks in the rural zones should have a maximum not a minimum size.	Reject
S350	Robert William Gooseman	1	Change to .5 hectares or leave as it is.	Accept in part
F46	<i>Matthew and Hilary Lovett</i>	1	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S354	Steven and Carolyn Handley	1	To be able to build a house on 4 hectares without resource consent.	Accept in part
S355	Pamela Grace Hastie	2	Building size to stay at 4 hectares in Rural A.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S358	AW and MJ Urquhart	1	Any legal lot 2 hectares or over should continue to be able to be built on in future years.	Accept in part
S360	John Roger McCormick	1	Continue to hold right to build dwelling on existing 2 hectare blocks in the future.	Accept in part
S361	Mark and Beverley Walls	1	Changes to Rural A, B and C zoning should not be implemented retrospectively.	Accept in part
S362	MJ and AW Urquhart	1	Any legal lot 2 hectares or over should continue to be able to be built on.	Accept in part
S363	Gavin Borthwick	1	Any existing consented titles i.e. before the new Plan, on Rural A and B land should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares as consented.	Accept in part
S365	Brian George McGuigan	3	Allow dwellings on lots of less than 8 hectares.	Accept in part
S365	Brian George McGuigan	4	Allow subdivision into lots of 2000m ² or allowing more Residential C.	Reject
S366	Adrienne Paula Cromie	1	All existing titles should remain as they are and any future changes made before they are sold not after.	Accept in part
S367	Broughton Trust	1	To allow all parcels of land of 8 hectares and over in Rural B which are already created to automatically be granted building consent for a dwelling.	Accept in part
S368	Martin M Dodson	1	To leave existing titles and rights as in the existing Plan. If issues do exist, then restrict new blocks and subdivisions from a date 1 year from the Plan Change to give people options and time.	Accept in part
S369	Selwyn Arthur Ellred	1	To leave existing rights to these smaller lots as they are under the existing District Plan or extend the period they can be built on until 2018.	Accept in part
S371	Mark Allred	1	Remove the timeframe within which Rural A blocks between 2 and 8 hectares may be used for residential purposes.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S373	Donald Peter Guilford	1	Any existing consented titles i.e. before the new Plan, on Rural A land should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares as consented.	Accept in part
S373	Donald Peter Guilford	2	Any existing consented titles i.e. before the new Plan, on Rural B land should be able to be built on without restrictions down to a minimum of 2 hectares as consented.	Accept in part
S378	Robert and Jane Wuthers	1	Retain the right to build on less than 50 hectares in the Rural B Zone on existing historical titles.	Accept in part
S383	Ronald and Janet Cross	1	Status quo is maintained and the Council looks at and assesses all consents to build in the rural zones with an open mind.	Accept in part
S391	Brent Francis Schmack	2	Stick with status quo whereby a dwelling can be built on an allotment of greater than 2 hectares.	Accept in part
S392	AM and WJ Dabbs	1	That if a land parcel of more or less 2 hectares to 8 hectares existed at the date of decisions then the owner or new purchaser has the right to build on the site with no time limit for the dwelling to be built on it.	Accept in part
S395	LG and EJM Braam	1	Oppose Rural A zoning of their property (Lot 1 DP68169) as shown on Planning Map U76 and proposed Zone Standard 3.10.1 Residential Density- Rural A. That the provisions for the Rural A Zone be deleted as stated above.	Accept in part
S395	LG and EJM Braam	3	Such further or other relief, including consequential amendments to these and other relevant provisions, of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S400	JB and LK Tavendale	1	The submitters suggest an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 that might give effect to this rule for Council's consideration: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that site was created after 1st January 2000.	Accept in part
S400	JB and LK Tavendale	4	Request that the 12 month period be deleted from Zone Standard 3.10.1(a).	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S400	JB and LK Tavendale	5	Request that Zone Standard 3.10.1 is reworded so that the 4 hectare minimum be reduced back to 2 hectares and the 1st January 2000 date be deleted.	Accept in part
S400	JB and LK Tavendale	6	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S401	Jurgen Thiele	3	The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S402	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	3	The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S403	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50h: Rural B and Rural C. Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that site lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S404	Annette and Ivan Syme	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S405	Chrissie and Chance Sullivan	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S406	Chrissie and Chance Sullivan	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S407	Ken and Anna McNally	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S408	Warren Bryson	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S409	James and Jo Callaghan	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S410	Lyn Chamberlain	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S411	Murray Clemens	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S412	David and Judith Cook	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S413	Stephanie Cretney	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that site lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S414	Alan and Lorna Dent	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S415	Annie Ennor	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S416	Nigel and Myriam Birt	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S417	Phyllis and Ritchie Bruce	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S418	Dougal Forbes	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S419	Kate Frewen	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S420	Grant Goodwin	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S421	Bruce and Marilyn Gray	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S422	Sandra and Vincent Harnett	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S423	Jack and Jeanette Harmer	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S424	Murray Hawkes	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S425	Christine Hesketh	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S426	Andrew Jackson	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S427	Murray and Christine Harrison	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S428	Keri Johnston	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S429	Caroline and John Lartice	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S430	Margaret and Bruce Lee	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S431	Brian Lock	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S432	Jeanette McLennan	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S433	Ken and Anna McNally	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S434	Wayne Muckle	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S435	Leone and Bryan Petrie	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S436	Gary and Sarah Rackham	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S437	Gary and Sarah Rackham	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S438	William Edward Robb	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S439	Heather Schofield	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S440	Carl and Dorothy Shannon	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares of greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S441	Brent Stanaway	3	The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where that lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S442	John and Daphne Syme	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S443	John and Daphne Syme	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows:</p> <p>8ha: Rural A</p> <p>Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S444	Dan Symons	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows:</p> <p>50ha: Rural B and Rural C</p> <p>Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions).</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S445	Jurgen Thiele	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows:</p> <p>50ha: Rural B and Rural C</p> <p>Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions).</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S446	Heather and John Tiffen	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S447	Alan and Jane Totty	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S448	Ian and Kate Totty	1	The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S449	Rob and Jane Withers	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S450	Caroline and John Lartice	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S452	Bruce and Marilyn Gray	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S453	Murray and Christine Harrison	1	<p>The removal of the currently proposed density standard exemption for the Rural B Zone under Zone Standard 3.10.1 and the reinstatement of part of the current rural zone density standard 7.6.5.1.1 in the Operative Plan as follows: 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a separately saleable lot site 2 hectares or greater than 4 hectares, where that lot existed at the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (or alternatively insert the date of decisions). There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S454	Keri Johnston	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S455	Dougal Forbes	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S456	Grant Goodwin	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows:</p> <p>8ha: Rural A</p> <p>Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S457	James and Jo Callaghan	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows:</p> <p>8ha: Rural A</p> <p>Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S458	Annie Ennor	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows:</p> <p>8ha: Rural A</p> <p>Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</p> <p>There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S459	Phyllis and Ritchie Bruce	3	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S460	Dan Symons	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S461	William Eward Robb	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S462	Peter and Lois Moodie	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S463	Jeannette McLennan	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S464	Murray Hawkes	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S465	Nancy Harmer	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S466	Murray Clemens	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part
S467	Tim Blyth	2	<p>The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S475	Bonifant Partnership Limited	9	We request the following changes to these rules: 3.10.1 Residential Density 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where that lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. 50 hectares: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that sites was created after 1 January 2000 <u>before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.</u>	Accept in part
S475	Bonifant Partnership Limited	12	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S477	David Wyse Smith	2	Amend subdivision rules to allow subdivision of non-compliant parcels for rural service contractors once consent has been granted for the activity. Also allow the building of a dwelling on that committed parcel.	Reject
S477	David Wyse Smith	4	Amend Rule 3.10.1 to a minimum allotment size of 2 hectares and remove the reference to 1 January 2000. Maintain the status quo.	Accept in part
S479	DC and FR Ensor	1	DC and FR Ensor would welcome the opportunity to participate in further consultation regarding the District Plan review, not only in respect of the topics identified but also other topics under review as they relate to DC & FR Ensor.	Accept in part
S481	NJ & JK Allen	2	That the 12 month period be deleted from Standard 3.10.1.	Accept in part
S481	NJ & JK Allen	3	Amend Rule 3.10.1 as follows: 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that sites was created after 1 January 2000 <u>before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.</u>	Accept in part
S481	NJ & JK Allen	5	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S482	BF & JA Smith Family Trust	3	We request an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as follows: 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that sites was created after 1 January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.	Accept in part
S482	BF & JA Smith Family Trust	8	We also request that consideration be given to making the above standard (3.10.3 and 3.10.4) site standards as opposed to zone standards.	Reject
S482	BF & JA Smith Family Trust	9	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S483	Baxter Holdings Ltd	3	The limitation of 12 months for the erection of a dwelling seems to be unnecessary and therefore the second sentence should be deleted from 3.10.1. That the provisions for the Rural A Zone be rejected as stated above.	Accept in part
S483	Baxter Holdings Ltd	4	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S485	M A Wightman	5	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 is reworded and the 12 month period from this standard.	Accept in part
S485	M A Wightman	6	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 is reworded and request that the 4 hectare minimum area be reduced back to 2 hectares and 1 January date be deleted.	Accept in part
S485	M A Wightman	10	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan. That may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S486	Radfield Trustees Ltd	1	We oppose Site Standard 3.9.1 and seek that a minimum area commensurate with the proposed amended residential standard be imposed.	Accept in part
S486	Radfield Trustees Ltd	5	We therefore request the following amendment to Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as follows: 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that sites was created after 1 January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S486	Radfield Trustees Ltd	12	The District Plan removes the opportunity to subdivide below the minimum standards to provide for rural service activities such as contractors. We oppose this change and request the subdivision requirement allowing subdivision for such activities be reinstated.	Reject
S486	Radfield Trustees Ltd	14	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S488	D & S Wyllie	3	We therefore request an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 that might give effect to this rule for Council's consideration: 3.10.1 Residential Density. 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where that lot existed on the date of decisions on this Plan.</u> This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.	Accept in part
S488	D & S Wyllie	4	The submitter requests the following change to this rule: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 2 hectares, where that site was created after 1st January 2000 <u>prior to the decision on submissions to the Proposed District Plan.</u>	Accept in part
S488	D & S Wyllie	6	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan. That may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S489	GWJ, EJ and BA Small	1	We request an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 that might give effect to this rule for Council's consideration: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000. That the Rural Zone residential density standards and reasons for the standards be amended and/or rejected as stated above.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S489	GWJ, EJ and BA Small	2	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan. That may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S494	Jan Hay	2	That the provisions for the Rural B Zone be rejected.	Accept in part
F47	Wendy Rhonda Stevenson	2	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S495	Ealing Dairies Limited	4	We request an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 that might give effect to this rule for Council's consideration: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that site was created after 4 January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010. That the Rural Zone residential density standards and reasons for the standards be amended and/or rejected as stated above.	Accept in part
S495	Ealing Dairies Limited	11	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S496	Lumphanum Farms Limited	2	We oppose standard 3.10.1(a) as it is worded and request that the 12 month period be deleted from the standard.	Accept in part
S496	Lumphanum Farms Limited	3	We oppose standard 3.10.1(a) as it is worded and request that the 4ha minimum area be reduced back to 2ha and the 1st January date be deleted from the standard.	Accept in part
S496	Lumphanum Farms Limited	5	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S497	Craigton Farm Limited	2	We seek to have our land zoned Rural A as stated and provided for in the Proposed Ashburton District Plan with all the site and zone standards that are proposed for the Rural A Zone.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S497	Craigton Farm Limited	3	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S499	Sheryl Stivens	2	Re-evaluate the Rural Zone change. Define the values of what will attract people to live here which will include producing their own food and living sustainably and productively, which will require small tracts of land being available for small groups of people.	Accept in part
S500	Jon and Andrea Hughes	1	We request an amendment that might give effect to rule 3.10.1(a) for Council's consideration. 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000 <u>before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.</u>	Accept in part
S500	Jon and Andrea Hughes	2	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S502	LC & AJ Hunt	4	We request an amendment to Rule 3.10.1 that might give effect to this rule for Council's consideration: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000.	Accept in part
S502	LC & AJ Hunt	5	We oppose the 12 month restriction being applied to Rule 3.10.1	Accept in part
S502	LC & AJ Hunt	6	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S504	Des Millar Construction Ltd	2	We request an amendment that might give effect to rule 3.10.1(a) for Council's consideration. 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 2 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.	Accept in part
S504	Des Millar Construction Ltd	3	We seek that the minimum area in the exception clause be 2ha as follows: 3.10.1 Residential Density 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 2 hectares, where that site was created after 1st January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.	Accept in part
S504	Des Millar Construction Ltd	4	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S505	Paul Gray	1	Do not go ahead with the proposed changes to the rural density rules.	Accept in part
S506	Corey John Hastie	1	Would like to see the Rural A and B Zones have a residential density of 8 hectares and Rural C 50 hectares, and the removal of the grandfather clause allow building on any parcel of land that has been legally approved.	Accept in part
S507	Soil and Health Association (Mid Canterbury)	1	Look at applications for housing on rural zoned land on a case by case basis in terms of social, economic and environmental outcomes.	Accept in part
S508	Ruth Hall	2	To remove the 12 month restriction upon erecting dwellings.	Accept in part
S508	Ruth Hall	4	Amend Rule 3.10.1 as follows: 50ha: Rural B and C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4-2 hectares, where that sites was created after 1 January 2000 before notification of the Proposed District Plan 2010.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S508	Ruth Hall	5	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S510	MJ and LJ Bland	1	Amend the zone boundary between the proposed Rural A and Rural B Zone so as to include the submitters land in the Rural A Zone. Alternatively, provide for dwellings on existing sites of 8 hectares or more within the Rural B Zone as a permitted activity.	Accept in part
S512	David and Tracey Fisher	1	Remain as stated in current District Plan for Rural A.	Accept in part
S513	Warren and Maree Smith	1	Would like to see rural density rules stay as they are.	Accept in part
S516	Mary Louise Pearson	1	Section 3.10.1 Residential Density should be amended to either: a) Apply only to future subdivisions not retrospectively and/or b) Amending the wording of the exceptions to 3.10.1 to allow a residence to be built on existing sites of over 2 hectares (rather than 4ha) in Rural B; and c) No timeframe for building on currently owned sites in either Rural A or Rural B should be introduced.	Accept in part
S519	Allister Tate	1	That the new District Plan enable the owners of small blocks of land to apply for resource consent when and if, they choose to build a house on their land, and remove the timeframe to ensure landowners have the choice as to when building takes place.	Accept in part
S521	Estate Robert Hawkins Johnson	2	As a minimum, seek a return to the Rural Zone policies and rules under the current District Plan.	Accept in part
S522	N K Salter Surveying Ltd	1	Retain the existing 2 hectare minimum residential density in the Rural A and B Zones.	Accept in part
S522	N K Salter Surveying Ltd	2	Change the proposed rule to allow dwellings to built on lots 2 hectares or greater created or which were granted a subdivision consent since the current plan was notified (25th March 1995).	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S524	James Giller	1	Written permission to be able to construct a future dwelling on 2.25 hectare property.	Accept in part
S524	James Giller	2	Clear information on how existing 4 hectare properties will be treated if proposed rule 3.10.1 goes ahead.	Accept in part
S527	Byron John Watson Pearson	1	Section 3.10.1 Residential Density should be amended to either: a) Apply only to future subdivisions not retrospectively and/or b) Amending the wording of the exceptions to 3.10.1 to allow a residence to be built on existing sites of over 2 hectares (rather than 4ha) in Rural B; and c) No timeframe for building on currently owned sites in either Rural A or Rural B should be introduced.	Accept in part
S529	David and Shirley Denize	1	Allow subdivision to be 1 hectare or larger or maintain the status quo.	Accept in part
S529	David and Shirley Denize	2	Allow 24 month period to build a dwelling on existing subdivided land.	Accept in part
S535	Burrows Farms Limited	1	That the Rural Zone Issues, Objectives and Policies, Residential Density Zone Standards and Reasons for the Zone Standards be amended and/or rejected as appropriate to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S535	Burrows Farms Limited	2	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 be specifically amended as follows: 3.10 Zone Standards 3.10.1 Residential Density a) Minimum net area for any one residential unit shall be - 50ha: Rural B and Rural C Except in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000 before 21 April 2010, being the day the Proposed Ashburton District Plan was notified.	Accept in part
S535	Burrows Farms Limited	3	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan, that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S538	Evan Keith Chisnall	1	Small titles formed before 2000 are able to be built on.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S541	AgResearch Limited	14	Retain 50 hectare minimum allotment size for the Rural B Zone.	Accept in part
S544	Midland Seeds Ltd	1	Retain extent of Rural B Zoning and Rules.	Accept in part
<i>F57</i>	<i>AgResearch Limited</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S544	Midland Seeds Ltd	2	Retain Critical Standard 9.9.1 (a) Allotment Size, as it relates to the Rural B Zone.	Accept
S546	Murray and Judith Nelson	1	<p>As first preferred relief: To reinstate the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A Zone.</p> <p>As second preferred relief: To retain Proposed Rule 3.10.1 for the Rural A Zone except subject to the further relief that the exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site between 2 and 8 hectares in size applies to all lots created by subdivision consent applications granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan without an expiry date.</p> <p>And consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S547	John and Helen Cunliffe Family Trust	1	<p>As first preferred relief: To reinstate the Rural A Zoning for the submitters land subject to the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A Zone.</p> <p>As second preferred relief: To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that: The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan or held in existing Certificate of Title comprising at least 4 hectares irrespective of the date that the lots were created.</p> <p>And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S548	Murray and Jillian Burrowes	1	<p>As first preferred relief: To reinstate the Rural A Zoning for the submitters land subject to the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A Zone.</p> <p>As second preferred relief: To retain the land within the Rural A Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for subdivision and residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that: The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site between 2 and 8 hectares in size applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan without an expiry date.</p> <p>As third preferred relief: To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for subdivision and residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that: The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site between 2 and 8 hectares in size applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan. And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S549	Montana Trust	1	<p>To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that:</p> <p>The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan or held in existing Certificate of Title comprising at least 4 hectares irrespective of the date that the lots were created.</p> <p>And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	Accept in part
S551	Paul and Judith Stoddart	1	<p>As first preferred relief:</p> <p>To reinstate the existing operative zoning for the submitters and in particular, that all of the land owned by the submitters that is proposed to be rezoned from Rural A to Rural B should be reinstated as Rural A, and to reinstate the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A and B Zones.</p> <p>As second preferred relief:</p> <p>To reinstate the submitter's land within the Rural A and B Zones as shown in the Operative District Plan for each of those zones; subject to changes to the minimum lot size for subdivision and residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that:</p> <p>For each of the Rural A and B Zones, the exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 that applies for the Rural A Zone should apply to each of these zones, and that the rule be further amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site between 2 and 4 hectares in size applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan without an expiry date.</p> <p>Deletion of the changes to the Boundary Adjustments Rule 9.9.2 and reinstatement of the boundary adjustment rule in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>As third preferred relief:</p>	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
			<p>To retain all the submitters land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for subdivision and residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 for the Rural B Zone except subject to the further relief that:</p> <p>The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site apply to this zone and that this rule be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site between 2 and 4 hectares in size applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan without an expiry date.</p> <p>Deletion of the changes to the Boundary Adjustments Rule 9.9.2 and reinstatement of the boundary adjustment rule in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	
S552	Yukon Pastures Limited	1	<p>To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to the further relief that:</p> <p>The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan or held in an existing Certificate of Title comprising at least 4 hectares irrespective of the date that the lots were created.</p> <p>And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.</p>	Accept in part
S553	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	103	Retain proposed Residential Density Standards of 8 hectares in the Rural A Zone but do not put time constraint on existing consents.	Accept in part
S553	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	104	Retain proposed Residential Density Standards of 50 hectares in the Rural B and C Zones but do not put time constraint on existing consents.	Accept in part
S553	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	134	Retain proposed allotment sizes in Rural Zones.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S556	Bob Engelbrecht Consultancy Ltd	1	There is greater opportunity for the development of more rural-residential subdivisions.	Accept in part
<i>F44</i>	<i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>oppose</i>	Accept in part
S560	Peter Larkin	1	To reinstate the Rural A zoning for the submitter's land subject to the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
<i>F47</i>	<i>Wendy Rhoda Stevenson</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S562	David Clark	1	Retain the proposed Rural A boundary and the imposition of greater restrictions on the size of minimum allotments for the construction of dwellings, as proposed. While in no way do I wish to disadvantage other landowners, I would ask Council to consider the future form of the District and protect the productive lands that have made the Ashburton District what it is today.	Accept in part
S564	Mick Hydes	2	Take the sunset clause out of the Plan for properties that already have the right to build now.	Accept in part
S565	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	2	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 be amended to enable the building of a residential unit on every separate allotment in the Rural A and B Zones, or at least enable building of a residential unit as of right on the submitter's land.	Accept in part
S565	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	3	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 whether in its current for, or amended, be moved to the Site Standard section of the Plan to ensure that in the instance of non-compliance with the standard, resource consent as a discretionary activity will be required.	Reject
S565	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	5	Adopt the relief sought in the submission by the Foothills Group insofar as it is consistent with the relief sought in this submission.	Accept in part
S566	Stuart and Deborah Phipps	1	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 be deleted, or in the alternative but without prejudice to this submission	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S566	Stuart and Deborah Phipps	3	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 whether in its current for, or amended, be moved to the Site Standard section of the Plan to ensure that in the instance of non-compliance with the standard, resource consent as a discretionary activity (as opposed to as non-complying activity) will be required.	Reject
S566	Stuart and Deborah Phipps	2	That Zone Standard 3.10.1 be amended to enable the building of a residential unit on every separate allotment in the Rural A and B Zones, or at least enable building of a residential unit as of right on the submitter's land	Accept in part
S567	MD & RIJ Foster Trust and C Foster Family Trust	13	Delete Rule 3.10:1.	Reject
S567	MD & RIJ Foster Trust and C Foster Family Trust	17	In the event the Submitter's rezoning requests are declined, amendment of Rule 9.9:1 so that subdivision is allowed down to a minimum net allotment area of 1 hectare on the Land subject of this submission.	Accept in part
S567	MD & RIJ Foster Trust and C Foster Family Trust	18	The submitter seeks all consequential changes to the provisions of the Plan as may be necessary in order to achieve consistency with and give effect to the relief set out above and address the concerns raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S568	Barcoo Estate Limited	3	The deletion of Rule 3.10.1; or, in the alternative but without prejudice to this relief. Amendment of Rule 3.10.1 so that a dwelling may be established on every separate allotment within the Rural A and B zones (or just within the Land) as of right.	Accept in part
S568	Barcoo Estate Limited	8	The Submitter seeks all consequential changes to the provisions of the Plan as may be necessary in order to achieve consistency with and give effect to the relief set out above and address the concerns raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S569	Malcolm and Margaret McKay	4	The deletion of Rule 3.10.1; or, in the alternative but without prejudice to this relief. Amendment of Rule 3.10.1 so that a dwelling may be established on every separate allotment within the Rural A and B zones (or just within the Land) as of right.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S569	Malcolm and Margaret McKay	6	In the event the Submitter's rezoning request is declined, amendment of Rule 9.9.1 so that subdivision is allowed down to a minimum net allotment area of 8 hectares on the land subject of this submission or alternatively throughout the Rural A and B zones.	Accept in part
S569	Malcolm and Margaret McKay	11	The Submitter seeks all consequential changes to the provisions of the Plan as may be necessary in order to achieve consistency with and give effect to the relief set out above and address the concerns raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S570	J B Tavendale	2	That residential dwellings be allowed on all titles of 2 hectares or greater in the Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
S570	J B Tavendale	3	That the proposed 'exception' rule for the Rural A Zone for residential development be deleted.	Accept in part
S570	J B Tavendale	4	Council should create a rule which allows them to consider subdivision in Rural B below minimum lot size where there already exists a predominance of less than 50 hectare titles in the area.	Accept in part
S570	J B Tavendale	5	The restriction of 50 hectares for a building site in Rural B and C Zones be deleted.	Reject
S570	J B Tavendale	6	That building be allowed on all titles greater than 4 hectares in the Rural B and C Zones and reference to titles created after 1 January 2000 be deleted.	Accept in part
S572	Malcolm Edwin McCormick	4	The deletion of Rule 3.10.1 or in the alternative and without prejudice to this relief: Amendment of Rule 3.10.1 so that a dwelling may be established on every separate site within Rural A and B Zones (or just within the McCormick Property) as of right.	Accept in part
S572	Malcolm Edwin McCormick	9	The Submitters seek all consequential changes to the provisions of the Plan as may be necessary in order to achieve consistency with and give effect to the relief set out above and address the concerns raised in this submission.	Accept in part
S576	Diane and Ron Donaldson	1	Want the status quo to remain with regard to rural density.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S578	Selwyn District Council	2	That the residential density of the Rural C zone along the District Boundary be reduced, i.e. by requiring more land per dwelling; in order to mitigate adverse effects in terms of cross-boundary landscape and character issues.	Reject
S581	William John McCook	1	That the proposal to change any land zoned Rural A to Rural B and to restrict subdivision be deleted from the Proposed Plan and that the status quo remains.	Accept in part
S582	New Zealand Transport Agency	3	Retain Rule Zone Standard 3.10.1 as proposed.	Accept in part
S583	Aberdeen Farm Limited	1	To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to further relief that: The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan or held in an existing Certificate of Title comprising at least 4 hectares irrespective of the date the lots were created.	Accept in part
S583	Aberdeen Farm Limited	2	And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.	Accept in part
S584	Alice Fay Redfern	1	To reinstate the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural B Zone.	Accept in part
S584	Alice Fay Redfern	2	And for all alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S586	J W and J A Hughes	1	To retain the land within the Rural B Zone subject to changes to the minimum lot size for residential units in Proposed Rule 3.10.1 except subject to further relief that: The exception for the erection of a residential unit on an existing unit on an existing site be amended so that the right to erect a dwelling on an existing site applies to all lots created by subdivision consent application granted by the Council prior to the notification of the Proposed District Plan or held in an existing Certificate of Title comprising at least 4 hectares irrespective of the date the lots were created.	Accept in part
S586	J W and J A Hughes	2	And for all the alternative reliefs, consequential changes to the objectives, policies and explanations thereto to reflect and or give effect to the relief sought to the amendments sought to the rules.	Accept in part
S587	ALT and BM Lowe	1	To reinstate the submitters land within the Rural A Zone subject to the controls that exist in the operative version of the District Plan for subdivision and residential units in the Rural A Zone.	Accept in part
S592	Cleardale Station Limited	1	Request an exemption is provided for a residential unit to be built on lots in the Rural B and C Zones which are greater than 2 hectares and exist at the time decisions are made on the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part
S595	Alan Graham Grant	1	Any changes to Residential Density Standards should take effect only when the Rules are changed and not retrospectively.	Accept in part
S596	Carr Group Investments Limited	9	Delete Rule 3.10.1 and replace with the following: 3.10.1 Residential Density <u>a) Minimum net area for any site shall be 2 ha for each residential unit contained within the site.</u> <u>b) There shall be only one residential unit on any land comprised in a separate site of less than 8 ha in area</u> <u>c) On land comprised in a separate site of greater than. or equal to 8 ha in area, there may be more than one residential unit, where the additional residential unit(s) are accessory to and situated on the same site as a farming activity.</u> Or in the alternative, provide an amended grandfather clause for Rural B and	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
			Rural C Zones as follows: • 50 ha Rural B and Rural C Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000 <u>where the site existed prior to the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.</u>	
F44	New Zealand Transport Agency	9	oppose	Accept in part
S597	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	2	Retain the minimum net area for residential units in Rural B and C as 50 hectares.	Accept in part
S599	Adam Graham	1	Do not change rural density standards.	Accept in part
S603	S J Bland	1	Amend the zone boundary between the proposed Rural A and Rural B Zones so as to include the submitters land in the Rural A Zone. Alternatively, provide for dwellings on existing sites of 8 hectares or more within the Rural B Zone as a permitted activity.	Accept in part
S604	Murray Anthony Clemens	1	Provide for dwellings on 8 hectares or more, with an exception in respect of existing lots greater than 2 hectares, within the Rural B Zone as a permitted activity.	Accept in part
S610	Philip Dallas Bean	1	Proposed Solution for Rural B The solution is to put a proper grandfather clause in for Rural B that a residential unit be allowed on any site greater than say 20 hectares where that site was created after 1st January 1900.	Accept in part
S610	Philip Dallas Bean	2	Proposed Solution for Rural A. Allow a residential unit on any asite of 2 hectares to be built at any stage on a title created since 1st January 1900	Accept in part
S611	A Potbury	1	All existing titles should be able to be built on.	Accept in part
S612	Land Services Group Ltd	2	Delete the whole content of 3.10.1a), and replace with The minimum net area for the first residential unit on any site shall be 2 hectares, with any additional residential units on a site requiring an additional 50 hectares per each.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S612	Land Services Group Ltd	12	Council to revisit the minimum area requirements of the Rural B Zone.	Accept in part
S615	Mark Totty	3	The relief sought is to amend the current exemption under Rule 3.10.1 Residential Density as it relates to the Rural A Zone, as follows: 8ha: Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites a <u>separately saleable lot</u> of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares <u>where</u> that <u>lot</u> existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. There may however, be other methods of achieving stated relief.	Accept in part
S616	Rennie Davidson	1	More considered approach would be to allow subdivisions and in principle building consents for the next 12 months on the current zoning basis and these are valid for the next 20 years. After this 12 month process, the new zoning could be introduced.	Accept in part
S619	Marion Bridget Logan	1	Reject the proposed changes to subdivision rules in the Rural A from minimum allotment of 8ha to 50ha subdivision and additional building restrictions.	Accept in part
S620	Michael John Hanham	1	Provide for lifestyle sections of 1 hectare on land close to the town centre and Lake Hood that is connected to sewerage.	Reject
<i>F27</i>	<i>Michael John Hanham</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>support</i>	<i>Reject</i>
S621	Charles Richard Collett	1	To retain the ability to build on my existing titles.	Accept in part
S623	Murray Steven Haworth	1	That all Rural A parcels of land 2-8 hectares that exist on 1.4.2011 be able to have the right to build subject to the present requirements.	Accept in part
S625	Joanne Dennett	1	To have the right to build on my titles in the future.	Accept in part
S626	Alexander David Hastie	2	Minimum allotment size for building to stay at 4 hectares in Rural A.	Accept in part
S627	Myriam Birt	1	Remain as 'status quo' for rules around subdivision and activity in Rural Zones.	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
S632	Marilyn and Steve Cross	2	Remove the clause: This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on the Plan from Zone Standard 3.10.1.	Accept in part
S633	J & S Dargue	2	That the proposed minimum site density of the Rural A Zone and the exception clause be rejected.	Accept in part
S633	J & S Dargue	3	That the proposed minimum subdivision allotment size of 8ha be rejected.	Accept in part
S633	J & S Dargue	5	Such further or other relief, including consequential or alternative amendments to these and other relevant provisions of the Proposed Ashburton District Plan that may be required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part
S639	Ashburton District Council	25	Amend clause 3.10.1 a) as follows: a) Minimum net area <u>of a site</u> for any one residential unit shall be: ... - 8ha Rural A Except that one residential unit may be built on sites of 2ha up to 8ha that existed at the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan. -50ha Rural B and C. Except that in the Rural B Zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4ha, where that site was created after 1 January 2000. <u>Except the minimum net area for one residential unit on any allotment existing at the time of decisions shall be 2ha, subject to compliance with the District Plan requirements (including rules and standards) for servicing (sewerage treatment and disposal, water supply, stormwater treatment and disposal), the avoidance of natural hazards and compliance with other rules in the District Plan.</u> <u>Note: ECan has requirements for septic tanks and water bores that may require resource consent.</u>	Accept in part
F8	Donal and Frances Stanton	25	support	Accept in part
F10	Daniel Symons	25	support	Accept in part
F15	Ian L Totty	25	support	Accept in part
F18	J W and J A Hughes	25	oppose	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
F22	Jeanette McLennan	25	support	Accept in part
F28	Paul and Judith Stoddart	25	oppose	Accept in part
F41	Peter Cates Farming Co Limited	25	support	Accept in part
F42	Gregory and Joanne Lovett	25	support	Accept in part
F43	David and Nicola Copland	25	support	Accept in part
F48	David Wyse Smith	25	oppose	Accept in part
F52	Holmeslee Enterprises Limited	25	support	Accept in part
F55	Neil Salter	25	oppose	Accept in part
F61	Murray and Jillian Burrowes	25	oppose	Accept in part
F62	Bonifant Partnership Limited	25	support	Accept in part
F64	Jon and Andrea Hughes	25	support	Accept in part
F66	Malcolm Edwin McCormick	25	oppose	Accept in part
F67	Barcoo Estate Limited	25	oppose	Accept in part
F68	Errol and Jocelyn Syme	25	oppose	Accept in part

PROPOSED ASHBURTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARINGS REPORT 21
RURAL DENSITY STANDARDS

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Decision Sought	Recommendation
F69	<i>MD & RIJ Foster Trust and C Foster Family Trust</i>	25	<i>oppose</i>	Accept in part
F70	<i>Malcolm and Margaret McKay</i>	25	<i>oppose</i>	Accept in part
F78	<i>Wayne and Maxine Muckle</i>	25	<i>support</i>	Accept in part
S643	Brian and Julie Lock	1	Retain the existing 2ha minimum residential density rules as in the Operative Plan.	Accept in part
S645	Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd	1	Delete time limit for existing 2-8ha lots.	Accept in part

APPENDIX TWO: DISTRICT PLAN AMENDMENTS

Section 3: Rural Zones

Amend 3.10.1 as follows:

3.10.1 Residential Density

a) Minimum net area for any one residential unit shall be:

- 8ha Rural A

~~Except that one residential unit may be built on sites of 2 hectares up to 8 hectares that existed on the date of decisions on this Plan. This exception shall apply for 12 months from the date of decisions on this Plan.~~

- 50ha Rural B and Rural C

~~Except that in the Rural B zone, one residential unit may be built on a site greater than 4 hectares, where that site was created after 1 January 2000.~~

Except that the minimum net area for one residential unit on any allotment existing at the time of decisions shall be 2ha, subject to compliance with District Plan requirements (incl. rules and standards) for servicing (sewerage treatment and disposal, water supply, stormwater treatment and disposal), the avoidance of natural hazards and compliance with other rules in the District Plan.

b) There shall be only one residential unit on any land comprised in a separate site of less than 8ha in area.

Note: ECAN has requirements for septic tanks and water bores that may require resource consent.