

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:	Adele Gardner		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)	Te Hiku Community Board		
Contact person (if different):			
Full Postal Address:	Far North District Council, Private Bag 752 KAIKOHE 0400		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 021 1879985	Home:	Work:
Email (please print):	Adele.Gardner@fndc.govt.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			
<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 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			
<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: <i>(please provide details including the reference number of the specific provision you are submitting on)</i> MUZ-P3			
Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support			
My submission is: 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.			



<p>I seek the following decision from the Council: Retain policy MUZ-P3 a) and b), requiring development in the Mixed Use zone to contribute positively to high quality streetscapes and pedestrian amenity. S257.001</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: <i>(please provide details including the reference number of the specific provision you are submitting on)</i> MUZ – S5</p>
<p>Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support</p>
<p>My submission is: Retain MUZ-S5 standards for pedestrian frontages identified on the planning maps.</p>
<p>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 upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres. S257.002</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: MUZ-S6, MUZ-S7, MUZ-S8</p>
<p>Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support Op</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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 upkept to maintain Amenity values in town centres. S257.003, S257.004 and S257.005</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: Planning Maps</p>
<p>Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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. S257.006</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: SUB-02, SUB-P8, SUB-P9, SUB-S1</p>
<p>Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose</p>
<p>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 blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses. Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone.</p>



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.
<p>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. S257.007, S257.008, S257.009 and S257.010</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: <i>Planning Maps, HA-Overview, HA-P9 HA-R2, HA-R4, HA-R5, HAR6</i></p>
Confirm your position: Oppose
<p>My submission is: We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.</p>
<p>I seek the following decision from the Council: Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps. S257.011 Delete from the Overview the text relating to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.012 Delete policy HA-P9, relating to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.013 Amend rule HA-R2 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.014 Amend rule HA-R4 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.015 Amend rule HA-R5 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.016 Amend rule HA-R6 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B S257.017</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: <i>GRZ-P3, GRZ-R9, SUB-S1</i></p>
Confirm your position: Support In-part
<p>My submission is: <i>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.</i></p>
<p>I seek the following decision from the Council: Retain policy GRZ-P3, enabling multi-unit development S257.018 Retain rule GRZ-R9, enabling multi-unit development up to three residential units per site. S257.019 Retain in SUB-S1 the 600m2 minimum lot size in the General Residential zone as a controlled activity. S257.020 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.</p>
<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are: <i>NH-R2, NH-R3</i></p>
Confirm your position: Oppose



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. **S257.021**

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. **S257.022**

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

Infrastructure, Planning Maps

Confirm your position: **Oppose**

My submission is:

We seek some rules under the District Plan for the existing mapped drainage district drains, as the 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.

I seek the following decision from the Council:

Amend the Infrastructure section, by adding objectives, policies and rules providing for existing mapped 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 Land Drainage Bylaw 2019.

Add to the Planning Maps, maps indicating location of drainage channels in the Kaitaia, Waiharara/Kaikino and Motutangi drainage areas, as defined in the Far North Land Drainage Bylaw 2019. and overland flow paths in urban areas. **S257.023**

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

Planning Maps, RPROZ

Confirm your position: **Oppose**

My submission is:

The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui 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.

The Planning Maps show the Rural Production Zone in some areas e.g. Awanui 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 developed with infrastructure for urban development and substitute an appropriate urban zone; OR amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted. **S257.024**

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. **S257.025, S257.026 and S257.027**

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

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

Confirm your position: **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. **S257.028**

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. **S257.029**

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. **S257.030**

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. **S257.031**

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

The whole PDP in general

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


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. **S257.032**



<input type="checkbox"/> I wish to be heard in support of my submission
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you wish to present your submission via Microsoft Teams? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 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.



SUBMISSION NUMBER