



Remember
further
submissions
close at 5pm,
Monday 4th
September

Proposed Far North District Plan further submission form

Form 6: Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission(s) on the notified Proposed Far North District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Far North District Council

This is a further submission in support of or in opposition to submission(s) on the Proposed Far North District Plan.

1. Further submitter details <i>(mandatory information)</i>	
Full name of individual/organisation making further submission:	P. Malcolm
Contact person <i>(if different from above):</i>	
Email address:	—
Postal address:	P.O. Box 596, Kerikeri, Northland Postcode 0245
Preferred method of contact:	<input type="checkbox"/> Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post
Phone contact:	Daytime: Mobile: 0274-477211

2. Eligibility to make a further submission (for information on this section go to RMA Schedule 1, clause 8)

I am:

- A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- A person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- the local authority

My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are:

Family owns rural blocks which contain areas which because of soil limitations etc have poor production characteristics.

For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups

Any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has is likely to include owners of land and users of resources directly affected by plan provisions. It is also likely to include iwi and hapu where their interests are directly affected.

3. Request to be heard at hearing

- Yes, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission; or
- No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission

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

- Yes No

Signature of further submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of further submitter)

P. G. Malcol

Date:

25.8.23.

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

Further Submission re. Proposed FNDC District Plan

Submitter – P.Malcolm, PO Box 596, Kerikeri 0245

I support submissions (S17,S28, S40, S41, S47, S77, S161, S163, S190, S415, S544 as well as others) mentioning that the proposed rural production minimum sizes are too large and / or restrictive.

Reasons – Some degree of flexibility would be beneficial to older farmers, family members working on family farms, farm (rural) workers and others wanting lifestyle blocks thus helping reverse current rural depopulation trends and rural labour shortages. Many older farmers wanting to retire / slow down, would appreciate the opportunity to remain on the farm where they had spent much of their life. Instead of selling and moving away from the district, they could reside on a smaller independent block thus retaining associations / connections with the area. Ditto for family members. Farm / rural workers are often tied to a particular employer because of the accomodation which is provided. The opportunity to purchase a small block will allow them greater financial security and independence, improved flexibility in their choice of work / employer and help cement their connection to the area. This policy could well lead to greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.

I seek the following:

(a) The retention of the 20ha minimum as a controlled activity and a limited number of 4ha lots as a discretionary activity. For larger blocks / titles a cluster option should also be available such as 4 x 10,000m² per initial parent lot with the size of the balance parcel containing a minimum specified area (40ha ?). For the cluster option, ideally the smaller parcels / lot sizes should be on less productive land and / or on land adjacent to other existing, smaller (rural lifestyle) blocks. This will provide lifestyle blocks for those who want them while still protecting the productive capacity of the land

(b) Boundary adjustments among existing titles in rural areas should be permitted. However the minimum area for the smaller parcel should be 1ha, not 8 ha as suggested in the Proposed FNDC District Plan. This will mean that if two neighbours, each with existing 20ha titles so wished, they could have a boundary adjustment such that one ended up with 39 ha and the other with 1ha. Similarly neighbours, one with 1ha and the other with 50ha, might adjust their titles such that one ended up with 4ha and the other with 47ha. Such a policy would not result in additional titles and indeed could lead to greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.

FS587.001 - FS587.014