



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:

Manu Burkhardt Macrae
12 Princes Street Kensington Whangarei 0112
New Zealand
Email: manu@fnr.nz

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 65.1 **S279.002**

Section: Subdivision

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

SUB-R3 Subdivision of land to create a new allotment

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

I oppose the minimum allotment size of 40ha in the Rural Production Zone, as a controlled activity, in particular for land which is not highly productive land as described in the NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.

Relief sought

The relief sought is that the minimum allotment size of 20ha in the Rural Production Zone, as a controlled activity, as it is in the operative plan, in particular for land which is not highly productive land as described in the NPS Highly Productive Land 2022.

Point 65.2

Section: Subdivision

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision

Sentiment: Support **S279.003**

Submission:

This rule is supported as it has the potential to reward land owners who have retained and protected indigenous vegetation and wetlands and incentivise landowners to do so.

Relief sought

Retain in its entirety.

Point 65.3 **S279.004**

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: 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 65.4 **S279.005**

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 65.5 **\$279.006**

Section: Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

IB-R4	Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance outside 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. Per-1 imposes a cost burden to engage a 'suitably qualified and experienced ecologist to meet the permitted standard. Per-2 provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and disturbance without a report. 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.