1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report shows the decisions made on the topics in the Planning Report.

1.2 For topics, any changes to rules are shown as follows; existing District Plan text in black, proposed changes as included in the Section 32 Report in red, and any changes resulting from decisions in blue.

2.0 Topic: Boundary Adjustment Rule

2.1 Decision

That the proposed explanatory note be deleted.

Explanatory Note: The Rural Zone has two minimum lot sizes that are based on the productive capacity of the land. Rule 18.4.2(c) provides standards that are required to be met if the minimum of 6ha is to be used to assess compliance. Any application for a boundary adjustment in the Rural Zone, if it is reliant on determining its compliance with the 6ha hectare minimum lot size, will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate its compliance.

The following submissions are therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Point Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stratum Consultants Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aurecon (Tauranga)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Reasons

2.2.1 The proposed explanatory note may actually create more confusion for applicants than what currently exists.

2.2.2 The resource consents team are comfortable with how the boundary adjustment rules are applied without the explanatory note despite any possible interpretation issues surrounding applicable minimum lot sizes. There are few applications where minimum lot sizes are an issue because most boundary adjustments involve smaller lots below both minimum lot sizes.

2.2.3 The requirements to provide sufficient information to determine compliance with the 6ha (opposed to the 40ha) minimum lot size will lead to similar cost and time implications as production
lot subdivisions. It is not appropriate for the same level of scrutiny to apply as no further lots are being created.