Before hearing commissioners

At Waikato regional council

Under :	the resource management Act 1991
In the matter of:	Proposed plan change 1 to the Waikato reginal plan
	Hearing submissions and further submissions
Between:	Andrew Gore and Christine Gore
And:	Waikato Regional Council

Hearing 3 Rebuttal

Submitter 330 and FS1062

Dated 18 October 2019

Introduction

Rebuttal by Christine and Andrew Gore

Concerning 42a report

Hamilton city council Chapter 5 rural environment

Future Proof

- We oppose changes to the plan under rural environment that avoid rural subdivision
- We oppose changes to the plan under rural environment that prohibit discretionary subdivision

Submitter 794 middlemiss farm holdings seek decision for careful management and carefully designed development

The Hamilton Urban area of interest

We support collaboration over the land use.

We believe the land owner should be part of the collaboration

We agree that the rural productive nature of land be maintained

Strategic agreement WA,R2 and HT1

- We do not think this can be managed in all areas due to factors outlined in our submission
- We do not believe the provisions in place are addressing changes that have affected the area in the last 10 years.

For example the effect of large scale roading projects on the land and environment, as we have outlined in submission

- We are opposed to having legitimate rural activity consents prohibited under the UEPA
- We think discretionary activities should be permitted
- We are not in support of future large growth nodes into green areas We think a more ecological and conservation approach seems more appropriate,
- We are opposed to reserving all land on the HCC boundaries for city development We think areas of country living zone compliment the environment and have the potential to be more ecological and preserving of the rural landscape than high intensity urbanisation that occurs in the city

Submitter 387 diamond creek farms also outlines support for country living

- We are opposed to Hamilton city council having an enhanced level of control particularly in resource consent of land use that is zoned rural but is in the HCC identified area of interest
- We perceive that the protection of land for intensive urbanisation is in conflict with the ecological basin objectives
- We are opposed to prioritising HCC strategic plans and urban growth strategies into the rural zone
- We are opposed to prohibited activity status as a way for preserving land for intensive urbanisation.

We believe country living and conservation lot developments can be integrated into the future urban needs.

We believe the WDP should protect the interests of the land resource for the rural land owners.

Green fields development as described by HCC

We draw attention to WDP Introduction that states S42A 42.3

(b) In addition the rural parts of the district are valued for their landscape character and amenity value.

42.3.2Protecting the rural environment

A key focus is to ensure that the resource does not become so fragmented that its attraction for activities that require a rural setting is diminished

- We are opposed to development that does not support these objectives.
- We believe rural amenity and ecological management should be the priority of the WDC

Future proof

• We are opposed Future Proof using their strategies to shape land use and development