



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:	Andrea Vicki Thomas		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)			
Contact person (if different):			
Full Postal Address:	5A Taipa View Road Taipa 0483		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 0276554140	Home:	Work:
Email (please print):	Tepend.antenna.ltd@gmail.com		
2. (Please select one of the two options below)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> -Yes I do not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission <input type="checkbox"/> I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission			
<i>If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete point 3 below</i>			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 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			
<i>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</i>			
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)			
<p>SUB-S1- Rural Production Zone. \$43.001</p> <p>I oppose the new sub-division rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8H (without a management plan). This will restrict the ability to create small rural lots.</p> <p>These blocks are too large for lifestyle blocks AND TOO SMALL to be productive so that a living could be had.</p> <p>This will also no longer allow rural landowners to provide small blocks for young families to build on And enter the property market.</p>			



*Sub diving off 8ha will diminish the productive capacity of a farm more than a smaller block.
With Council struggling to provide urban stormwater, sewerage and water supply and people wanting to live independent of these services it makes sense to allow smaller blocks.
In our area in Doubtless Bay we are already in overload and Council is not coping.
It is fine to protect rural productive potential. This can still be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.*

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

My submission is:

(Include details and reasons for your position)

Objectives IB-01, SUB-02

Policies IB_P1, 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.

I oppose the added expense to landowners to now engage a ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA.

Any help by Council will be at the Rate payers expense having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping.

Has there not been an increase of 30% from when the district was last mapped for a similar purpose in the 1990's.

This tells us that over 30 years our bush and forest has increased not decreased. Our land owners of the Far North have actually taken it upon themselves to increase these areas. They have fenced and restored wetlands, waterways and bush areas.

What you are doing is creating a disincentive for landowners to do this work, not an incentive.

SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNA's 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:

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

To acknowledge that the ratepayers have enhanced 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 land owners the right to remain Stewards to their land.

Council is in breach of your own policies IB-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-R17as this does not protect SNAs.

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)

Andrea Thomas

Date:

10/10/2022

(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