



Remember
submissions
close at 5pm,
Friday 21
October 2022

Proposed District Plan submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

Form 5: Submission on Proposed Far North District Plan

TO: Far North District Council

This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for the Far North District.

1. Submitter details:

Full Name:	Lynley Newport		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)			
Contact person (if different):			
Full Postal Address:	59 Cook Road		
	R D 1 OKAIHAU 0475		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 021 257 3892	Home:	Work:
Email (please print):	lnewport2015@gmail.com		

2. (Please select one of the two options below)

- I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
 I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete point 3 below

3. I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
 (A) Adversely affects the environment; and
 (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition
- I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
 (A) Adversely affects the environment; and
 (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition

Note: if you are a person who could gain advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are:

(please provide details including the reference number of the specific provision you are submitting on)

Definitions

Confirm your position: Support Support In-part Oppose
(please tick relevant box)



My submission is:

(Include details and reasons for your position)

I support the comprehensive nature of definitions and appreciate that wherever possible these replicate the definitions specified in the National Planning Standards. There are some definitions, however, that I query or seek clarification about.

Unfortunately the National Planning Standards do not include a definition of “*impermeable surface*”. The definition proposed to be used by the Council does not adequately take into account surfaces that are semi-permeable or have run-off co-efficients substantially different from hard surfaces. Neither does the definition treat shared ROW’s equitably with access lots. The same rationale should apply to both, with the area of impermeable surface within a shared ROW, shared out between the users rather than falling completely onto the ‘burdened’ or ‘servient’ tenement property. The council did a considerable amount of work several years ago trying to come up with a better and fairer definition of impermeable surface – it seems to have thrown those efforts out (or has no record of them???)

Whilst appreciating the decision to include a definition of “*Limited Access Road*” into the Plan, it would be more helpful for the Plan to include a map layer depicting which roads are Limited Access Road. That map layer could also distinguish between Access, Secondary Collector, Primary Collector, Arterial and Strategic Roads. This would be a useful addition to the Plan given that there are rules relating to various classifications of roads, yet nowhere to readily identify what category applies to the road on which the application site is located.

“*Net Gain*” and “*No Net Loss*”. These two definitions don’t operate on a level playing field. To achieve a net gain a person has to prove ‘measurable’ positive effects of actions. Yet there is no requirement to ‘measure’ net loss? The burden of proof should be equal, otherwise a party applying for something requiring to prove ‘measurable’ positive effects can simply have their application dismissed because Council can claim there will be a net loss without ‘measurement’ being required.

I am puzzled as to why the definition of “*rural tourism activity*” doesn’t include visitor accommodation. Aren’t visitors tourists?

I think Council is getting a little carried away to include in a definition of “*sensitive environment*” anything within 100m setback from the edge of a surface water body.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

(Give precise details. If seeking amendments, how would you like to see the provision amended?)

- S121.001 Impermeable Surface definition – go back to the drawing board and reach consensus with the district’s engineering fraternity as to (a) what truly constitutes an impermeable surface; and (b) then look to treat shared ROW’s the same way as Access Lots;
- S121.002 Include a map layer in the District Plan showing road hierarchy classifications.
- S121.003 Amend definition of “no net loss” to read: “means that the measurable positive effects of actions match any measurable loss of extent or values...”
- S121.004 Amend definition of “rural tourism activity” to include visitor accommodation – delete exclusion 3.
- S121.005 Amend definition of “sensitive environment” by deleting item 8.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

(Please tick relevant box)

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Yes

No



Do you wish to present your submission via Microsoft Teams?

Yes No

Signature of submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'LH'.

Date: 17/10/2022

(A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

Important information:

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions (5pm 21 October 2022)
2. Please note that submissions, including your name and contact details are treated as public documents and will be made available on council's website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan Review.
3. Submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

Send your submission to:

Post to: Proposed District Plan
Strategic Planning and Policy, Far North District Council
Far North District Council,
Private Bag 752
KAIKOHE 0400

Email to: pdp@fndc.govt.nz

Or you can also deliver this submission form to any Far North District Council service centre or library, from 8am – 5pm Monday to Friday.

Submissions close 5pm, 21 October 2022

Please refer to pdp.fndc.govt.nz for further information and updates.

Please note that original documents will not be returned. Please retain copies for your file.

Note to person making submission

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- It contains offensive language
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.



SUBMISSION NUMBER