



Submission on Proposed Far North District Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Far North District Council - District Planning

Date received: 21/10/2022

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Proposed Far North District Plan

Address for service:

Arahia Burkhardt Macrae
356 Paparore Road Paparore Awanui 0486
New Zealand
Email: kareponia5818@gmail.com

I wish to be heard: No

I am willing to present a joint case: No

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- No

Are you 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 effects of trade competition

- N/A

Submission points

Point 51.1 **S255.001**

Section: Subdivision

Sub-section: Standards

Provision:

Zone	Controlled Activity	Discretionary Activity
Rural Production	40ha	8ha

Rural Residential	4,000m ²	2,000m ²
Rural Lifestyle	4ha	2ha
General Residential	600m ²	300m ²
Mixed Use	2,000m ² onsite wastewater disposal 250m ² reticulated wastewater disposal	no minimum lot size
Light Industrial	2,000m ² onsite wastewater disposal 500m ² reticulated wastewater disposal	no minimum lot size
Heavy Industrial	2ha	5,000m ²
Horticulture Processing Facility	2ha	5,000m ²
Horticulture	10ha	4ha
Settlement	3,000m ²	1,500m ²
Kororāreka Russell Township	1,000m ²	800m ²
All other zones	N/A	N/A
All allotments created for public works, network utilities, reserves or access	No minimum lot size	no minimum lot size

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

Oppose 40ha minimum allotment size as a controlled activity standard in Rural Production Zone, in particular for land that is not classed/mapped as highly productive land by NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.

Relief sought

Retain current 20ha minimum allotment size as a controlled activity in Rural Production Zone.

Point 51.2 S255.002

Section: Subdivision

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

I support this rule as it rewards landowners who have existing protection for significant indigenous vegetation and wetlands, and it also incentivises landowners to protect same.

Relief sought

No relief sought as submission is in support.

Point 51.3 S255.003

Section: Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

IB-R1 Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities within and outside a Significant Natural Area

Sentiment: Support in Part

Submission:

There is no provision in this rule to credit landowners who are protecting indigenous vegetation or significant natural areas on their site while at the same time wishing to carry out a landuse activity which requires the removal of same, elsewhere.

Relief sought

A provision equivalent to SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision but for landuse which rewards landowners who have already protected areas and incentivises landowners to protect area.

Point 51.4 **S255.004**

Section: Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

IB-R3 Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance within a Significant Natural Area

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. It is a perverse to penalise such a landowner if they wish to then carry out a land use activity which requires vegetation clearance or land disturbance while at the same time still retaining or protecting the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site.

Relief sought

Provide for an increase in the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as provided for in the SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision rule. This would reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.

Point 51.5 **S255.005**

Section: Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

IB-R4 Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a Significant Natural Area

All zones Activity status: Permitted Activity status where compliance not

Where:

PER-1

1. A report has been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken; and
2. It does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period:
 - i. Rural Production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone and Treaty Settlement Land Overlay – 5,000m² if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m² in a remnant forest;
 - ii. All other zones – 500m².

PER-2

1. A report has not been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and a report has not been submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken; and
2. It does not exceed 100m² per site in any calendar year.

Note: *This rule only has immediate legal effect for indigenous vegetation clearance where compliance is not achieved with PER-2 (i.e. in circumstances where a report confirming that the indigenous vegetation is not a Significant Natural Area has not been obtained).*

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. Per-1 imposes a cost burden to engage a "suitably qualified and experienced ecologist" to meet the permitted standard. It is perverse to penalise a landowner if they wish to carry out a land use activity if the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site remains protected and retained.

Relief sought

Provide for an increase in the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as provided for in the SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision rule. This would reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.