

7 October 2024

Hearings Panel
Far North Proposed District Plan
Far North District Council
Private Bag 752
Kaikohe 0440
By email to: pdp@fndc.govt.nz alicia-kate.taihia@fndc.govt.nz

Tēnā koutou Commissioners,

Far North Proposed District Plan – Hearing 6/7 – General District Wide Matters

McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) (**McDonald's**) is made up of several independent co-operatives, with all employees and retail members supportive of the organisation's commitment to provide New Zealanders with the best possible service and quality products. McDonald's have a total of 170 restaurants throughout New Zealand, which includes three established restaurants in the Far North District at the following sites:

- 87-93 North Road, Kaitaia (McDonald's Kaitaia)
- 87 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri (McDonald's Kerikeri)
- 41 Station Road, Kaikohe (McDonald's Kaikohe)

In McDonald's experience, regional and district planning frameworks often do not properly recognise the need for business growth to occur, including alongside residential growth. Given McDonald's significant past and planned further investment in New Zealand, the contents of District Plan provisions is integral to the continuing operation and development of McDonald's in the Far North.

McDonald's support the Reporting Officer's recommendation contained in "Section 42A Report Signs" with respect to accept McDonald's submission points:

- S385.010 Signage general, amend Note 1; and
- S385.011 SIGN-R5 and S385.012 SIGN-R6, new definitions.

McDonald's does not support the Reporting Officer's recommendation contained in "Section 42A Report - Signs" to accept in part McDonald's submission point S385.013 SIGN-R7. The Reporting Officer does not support the requested deletion of "windows, fence or wall" as sought by McDonald's. McDonald's remain concerned that this recommendation will result in SIGN-R7 being overly restrictive, it is common practice for signs and imagery to change to reflect current sales and marketing and will create issues for signage on existing and future stores unnecessary triggering resource consents.

Relief sought by McDonald's seeks to amend SIGN-R7 to exempt signage is directly related to the use of that building/comprises branding from the maximum area (SIGN-S1) and maximum number (SIGN – S3)

standards and remove duplication between SIGN-R7 PER-1 and SIGN-S2. It is not necessary to restrict signage from protruding above the highest point of a building when signs are managed by a maximum height limit, which McDonald's considers to be a sufficient standard to manage potential amenity effects. For these reasons, McDonald's continue to seek that relief sought in submission point S385.013 be accepted.

The Reporting Officer has recommended rejection of McDonald's submission point S385.014 SIGN-S1 to enable increased areas of signage citing that *"The Mixed Use zone standards are appropriate based on: the nature of the zone, consistency with current ODP standards, increasing the permitted size could lead to adverse effects on amenity, they are consistent with other district plans, further restrictions are not appropriate because commercial activities are a fundamental part of the Mixed Use zone and it is appropriate that signs exceeding the threshold can apply for consent so a case by case assessment can be made."* McDonald's disagree with the Reporting Officer, the notified standard is overly restrictive for a commercial setting, resulting in unnecessary consenting costs for existing and future stores triggering resource consents.

The Reporting Officer has recommended rejection of McDonald's submission point S385.015 SIGN-S2 to enable freestanding signs to have a maximum height of 12m instead recommending that a 6m height limit be applied. Stating that they *"agree that the current standards lack clarity but disagrees that 12m is appropriate as the Far North District is a low-density urban environment and this height is excessive and inconsistent"*. McDonald's disagree with the Reporting Officer, noting that the proposed plan enables buildings to a height of 12m within MUZ-S1 which clearly indicates that built form within this zone is intended to provide for built form to this height and the relief sought is not excessive or inconsistent. Further to this, the recommended amendment from the Reporting Officer to specify a maximum 6m height limit is outside the scope of the original submissions. McDonald's sought to increase the maximum height limit. With no submission to the contrary, the Reporting Officer has recommended a more restrictive requirement. Such an inconsistent amendment is not within the bounds of what McDonald's submitted on in its submission point on this matter.

I can confirm that McDonald's will not be filing evidence for Hearing 6 at this stage and does not wish to be heard at the hearing. However, I am available to answer any questions from the Hearing Panel either in writing or via videoconference if required.

Yours sincerely | Nāku noa, nā

Barker & Associates Limited



David Badham

Partner/Northland Manager

021 203 1034 | DavidB@barker.co.nz