



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:	Fiona king		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)	Elbury Holdings		
Contact person (if different):			
Full Postal Address:	345 State Highway 1, RD2 Kaitaia		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 0274988133	Home:	Work:
Email (please print):	elbury@xtra.co.nz		
2. (Please select one of the two options below)			
<input type="checkbox"/> I could not 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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			
<input type="checkbox"/> 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:			
SUB-SI Minimum allotment sizes — Rural Production Zone			
Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Support In-part <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose			
(please tick relevant box)			
My submission is:			
The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The effects of this restriction include:			



- a reduction in vitality for rural communities,
- no longer allowing farmers to retire in their existing homes with a small area of land,
- the creation of 8ha blocks, which are too large for lifestyle blocks and too small to be productive,
- no longer allowing for the creation of appropriately sized and desirable lifestyle blocks,
- reduce the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for young family members to build on and enter the property market (this is contrary to Council policies in relation to affordable housing),
- reduced capacity for farmers to decrease their debt burdens by subdividing off small blocks of land that do not significantly add to the productivity of their farm. Where it is necessary to reduce debt by subdivision, subdividing off 8ha will diminish the productive capacity of the farm more than a smaller block.

The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.

With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks.

It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Previously blocks down to 4000sqm were allowed under the Operative District Plan. Perhaps the new District Plan could reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. This would give effect to Policy SUB-P8.

Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel — subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush.

This would provide vitality in rural areas, opportunities for farmers to develop their land, relief for urban services, continued local jobs, lifestyle blocks for those that want them, and all while still protecting the productive capacity of the land.

This will also affect other related rules, such as:

- RPROZ-R3 Residential activity
- SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision

As a retiring farmer I would like to cut off my home with a small area surrounding it. Not ha's that needs management of weeds, pest, livestock ect. This does not affect in productivity. Stocking rates of 2 per ha (all year round).

Intensive dairy farms operate on 2-3 cows per ha. Make 8ha unviable in rural areas – and they cause many issues in a rural farming environment, ie; weeds, poor drainage, animal health issues (overstocking/calving ect). Should 2 to 4ha block – maintain size.

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

GRZ-R9 Residential activity (multi-unit development)

Confirm your position: Support Support In-part Oppose

S519.001



□

(please tick relevant box)

My submission is:

Rule GRZ-R9 enacts the following policy: "GRZ-P3: Enable multi-unit developments within the General Residential zone, including terraced housing and apartments, where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure." The rule allows for up to 3 residential units to be placed on urban sections.

Rule GRZ-R9 does not take into consideration the capacity of existing infrastructure, namely water supply, stormwater and wastewater, as required under Policy GRZ-P3. These systems already appear to be at capacity in some areas, for example, wastewater and water supplies in Paihia and Taipa-Mangonui.

This rule could result in extra loadings on already straining infrastructure, which could result in discharges of untreated sewage to waterways or the sea, reductions in quality or shortages of drinking water, or exacerbated damage during stormwater events. These effects are already being seen in some of our communities, so it seems irresponsible to make them worse.

While the infilling does limit the need to extend infrastructure, this is better achieved through appropriate zoning.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

This rule should only be allowed in areas where all infrastructure has been upgraded and maintained to allow for the maximum development potential under this rule and subdivision rules. These areas could be shown on one of the FNDC GIS Maps.

S519.004

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

Objectives IB-01, SUB-02

Policies IB-PI, SUB-P8

IB-R4 Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA.

SUB-R17 Subdivision of a site containing a scheduled SNA

Others associated with these provisions, where appropriate

Confirm your position: **Support** Support In-part **Oppose**

(please tick relevant box)

My submission is:

After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Under this method, ALL bush is subject to SNA rules unless the owner (at their own expense) can prove that it is not an SNA. Because the ratepayer-funded SNA mapping is no longer publicly available, these rules will now not only affect landowners who had push previously mapped as SNA in the 1990s, but also owners whose bush was NOT mapped as SNA.

Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.

Is the Council using these rules to get the ratepayers to submit to the SNA mapping??

According to a quote from John Carter on the FNDC website, there has been "an increase from around 30 per cent when the district was last mapped for a similar purpose in the 1990s". This tells us that over the last 30 years, indigenous bush/forest has increased by some 30% without much control by the Council. This means that, overall, the rural landowners of the Far North have, of their own volition, increased, not decreased these areas. There are many examples of farmers and landowners fencing off and restoring wetlands, waterways and bush areas, and the Council are now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to do this work, not an incentive.

So, by looking at historical performance and by the Council's own admittance, these "stick" methods are unnecessary to achieve the protection, enhancement and enhancement of SNAs. Therefore, why is Council's



involvement necessary? Especially given the two following objectives which are not reflected in the PDP:
 "IB-04 The role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki and landowners as stewards in protecting and restoring significant natural areas and indigenous biodiversity is provided for.

IB-05 Restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is promoted and enabled. "

Then under SUB-P8 and SUB-R6 we start to see the protection of SNAs "in perpetuity" coming in. While previously covenants were done by consent notice and constituted "bush protection covenants", covenanting under the Reserves Act or QEII constitutes a loss of ownership in the former, and a loss of control in the latter. This is significantly more than a simple bush protection covenant. This is a loss of property or property rights.

SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Acknowledge that the ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA's in the District, and instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. By setting strict and harsh rules that deny landowners the right to remain as stewards to their land, you are in breach of your own policies 1B-04&05.

Given that Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNA's under the Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, I suggest that the approach be modified. Under the Draft NPS, Section 8.2 (2)(a) Partnership, the Council has failed to do this by coercing landowners into Scheduling their SNAs, and as a result I hold the Council in breach of the Draft NPS.

Provide incentives, not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land. Provide support and resources for landowners. If you do not do this, you will accentuate the current issue you have with a severe lack of community support and compliance. Human nature means that in being MADE to do something, people will often resist doing something that they would otherwise have happily done.

If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just the Reserves Act and QEII covenants.

Make the SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.

Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs.

S519.006,
S519.042
to
S519.046

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

SUB-S8 Esplanades

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

My submission is:

Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Make it not a requirement to take an esplanades reserve

S519.010

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

IB-P9 Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.

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

My submission is:

DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests.



Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition, and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Remove the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist". If you want to leave the "require" word in there, then you will either have to enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.

S519.011

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

The whole PDP, in general.

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

My submission is:

While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives.

Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land.

Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.

S519.012

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

Planning maps, Coastal Hazards Zone Maps, Ahipara, 2,4 and 5 Panorama Lane.

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

My submission is:

The coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps are not drawn and established relative to the gabion basket heights, and the

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Change the maps for the coastal erosion hazard 2 line maps to be reflective of geology, as it is clear that different substrates erode at different rates, and also that the site contains gabion baskets that have lifted the site well above the surrounding properties, and has been established by a geotechnical engineer – PK engineering, in June 2017.

It is formally requested to change this line where it runs past this site to reflect this, as per the PK engineering assessment that was also provided to Toby Kay at NRC when the coastal hazard mapping was done by NRC (13.6.17). A generic approach has been taken, instead of looking at the geology of the site, and therefore if it will erode or not. The report from PK engineering specifically has considered potential erosion of the sub-strate, and it is clear that blue rock will not erode such as sand or other sedimentary rock may do so. PK engineering will present at the hearing to reflect these facts, and his letter of evidence is shown below:

S519.013



Our ref: 16-53
Your ref: 275 Foreshore Road – Fiona King

Tuesday 13th June 2017

Felicity Foy
Northland Planning and Development
1421 Church Road
Kaitiāia

Dear Felicity,

RE: SOIL STRATIFICATION AT 275 FORESHORE ROAD

I have been to the above mentioned site and done numerous bore holes and soil tests along the cross section forming the land form at 275 Foreshore Road.

I can confirm that the geomorphology of this whole site is as follows;

- Approximately 1.5m of conglomerate – silty and gravelly soils inter bedded on a clay matrix.
- Well weathered basaltic rock (lava flow) for a depth of at least 10-15m
- On the lower portion of the site there is a thin veneer of loosely compacted sand (approximately 0.5-1m deep) in the only in Nor East corner which was removed from underneath the foundations of the existing gabion rock fill retaining walls.

No sandy layers were discovered on the upper regions of the slope on this site.

Should you require any further information please contact me on 09 407 3255.

Regards,

Pradeep Kumar.
B.E hons, NZCE, MIPENZ,
IntPE, CPEng.
(Structural, Geotechnical)
Chartered Professional Engineer.



I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.

S519.014

The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are:
MUZ-S6, MUZ-S7, MUZ-S8



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

My submission is:

Retain MUZ-S6 standards for verandahs on sites with pedestrian frontage identified on the planning maps.
Retain MUZ-S7 standards for screening of outdoor storage areas from adjoining sites and roads.
Retain MUZ-S8 standards for 50% landscaping and screening along road boundaries.

S519.015,
S519.016,
S519.017

I seek the following decision from the Council:

We support a town centre zoning and/or bylaw that requires pedestrian frontages of commercial buildings in the new mix used zones to have presented and upkeep to maintain Amenity values in town centres.

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

Planning Maps

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

My submission is:

We support the new mixed used Zones, and submit that we support a greater area of mixed use zone in Coopers Beach, and Cable Bay/Doubtless Bay, to encourage more activation of this area and to allow a wider range of housing options. Would like to have an added zone for Ahipara and Pukenui and other serviced settlements

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend the Planning Maps to increase the area of the Mixed Use zones at Coopers Beach, Cable Bay and Doubtless Bay, Ahipara, Pukenui and other serviced settlements.

S519.018

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

SUB-02, SUB-P8, SUB-P9, SUB-S1

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

My submission is:

Delete paragraph a) of SUB-02, so that protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.
Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle bocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.
Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle bocks in the Rural Production Zone.
Amend standard SUB-S1 in relation to the Rural Production Zone, to generally allow lots of 4ha, and allow lots less than 4ha around existing houses.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

SUB-P9 overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.

S519.019,
S519.020,
S519.021,
S519.022

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

GRZ-P3, GRZ-R9, SUB-S1

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

My submission is:

We support a higher density of housing in the new multi-unit development rules.
We support a higher density of housing in the residential zones



We support a higher density of subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity instead of a discretionary activity in the residential zone, as these areas should be encouraged for more housing and amenity value is of less of a concern to the provision of housing in these areas that do not have landscape or heritage overlays. We feel that it should be restricted discretionary to ensure that the assessment criteria that neighbours can have weighting over as an affected party is limited, to ensure that more housing can be provided with less likelihood of a hearing, as there should be a strong push to enable more housing in urban centres.

*As council is not able to keep with housing development in the district so encouragement should be for rural land to have housing density on soils that are not so productive
Maps of soil types would be beneficial in the PDP*

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development

Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site.

Retain in SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity.

Amend SUB-S1, to provide for subdivision down to 300m2 lot size in General Residential Zone as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion derived from the matters of control listed in rule SUB-R3.

S519.023,
S519.024,
S519.025,
S519.026

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

NH-R2, NH-R3

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

My submission is:

We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large extensions for modifications to existing buildings. The rule NH-R2 should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting building GFA or footprint. NH-R2 does not implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.

We do not support the new flood zone landuse rules and instead seek more flexibility in these rules to allow large decks, for modifications to existing buildings". The rule should provide for flood risks to be addressed through alternative building designs, not just by limiting deck area and height. NH-R3 PER 1 does not fully implement policy NH-P6, which allows for mitigation of hazards through building design.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend NH-R2 PER-1 to allow building extensions and alterations that increase GFA or footprint where the extension or alteration is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.

Amend NH-R3 PER-1 to allow new decks more than 30m2 and more than 1m in height where the deck is designed so that it will not impede flood flows.

S519.027,
S519.028

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

Infrastructure, Planning Maps

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

My submission is:

We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the draft management plan 2017 and current bylaws are not being enforced for the drainage districts.

Mapping of the drainage district drains and overland flow paths in urban areas should be included in the District Plan. And rules within the bylaws should be included under drainage districts ie; 10mtr set back for buildings

I seek the following decision from the Council:



S519.029,
S519.030,
S519.031,
S519.032

Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives, policies and rules providing for existing mapped Council drainage district drains, to ensure the ability to clean, unblock access and service the drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the draft management plan 2017.

And stop buildings being built within 10 mtrs of the drains as per the bylaws

Add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Draft Management Plans and Far North District Council Land Drainage Bylaw 2019 and the draft management plan 2017. and include overland flow paths in urban areas.

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

Planning Maps, RPROZ

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

My submission is:

The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Wireless road Kaitaia/ Awanui,

Wireless road from state highway one to Bell road intersection and part of Bell road itself. There is already development on wireless road including bus depot, playcentre, Kura school, butcher shop, storage yard and engineering business. This is opposite the Juken Nissho Triboard mill and the collard tavern.

State Highway one from Kaitaia boundary to Brott Road has housing and businesses established on road side this area should not be rural production and be changed to another zone. All serviced by town sewerage

Awanui township also from the rugby field to Spains road and around the Awanui school that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending the planning maps to a more appropriate urban zoning. A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie. 2000sq mtrs

The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui/wireless road kaitaia that are serviced by sewerage, footpaths, refuse collection etc. If this zoning continues, it will severely constrain future urban development, and this should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend the Planning Maps by removing the Rural Production Zone from areas as described above developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie. 2000 sq mtrs

Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production; OR amend Planning Maps to remove RPROZ from urban areas as separately submitted.

S519.033,
S519.034,

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

OSZ-R1, OSZ-R2, SARZ-R1, SARZ-R2

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

My submission is:

We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.



We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.

We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require minimum bulk/height and location rules. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.

We would like the parks and reserves in our district with new zoning rules that don't require impermeable surface rules for playgrounds and other parks. If there are to be some rules, these should be limited to activities that are not for public facilities or playgrounds or open space areas.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend rule OSZ-R1 by deleting the reference to OSZ-S1 (maximum height) and OSZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.

Delete rule OSZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.

Amend rule SARZ-R1 by deleting the reference to SARZ-S1 (maximum height) and SARZ-S5 (building coverage), OR at least amend the rule so that those standards do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.

Delete rule SASZ-R2 (impermeable surface) OR at least amend the rule so that impermeable surface restrictions do not apply to public facilities or playgrounds.

S519.036,
S519.037,
S519.038,
S159.039

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

The whole PDP in general

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

My submission is:

The council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do and start fighting for your community. Otherwise you are just puppets of the government and not our community's representatives. Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.

S519.047

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)

Date: 20 October 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.

The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: General Rural Zone (landuse rules)
Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support- <input type="checkbox"/> Support In-part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose
My submission is: We do not support the 30m setback from roads and instead submit to having a 20m setback, and only a 5m setback if it is a garage or non-habitable building. This will provide for open space and rural amenity, while still allowing efficient and effective use of the rural site. We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m ² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.



I seek the following decision from the Council:

It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m² of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.

It is submitted that the setback from the road boundary in this zone should be 20 metres for a dwelling, and 5 metres for a non-habitable dwelling.

S519.040,
S519.041

SUBMISSION NUMBER