

11 December 2025

Far North District Plan Hearings

Attn: Jerome Wyeth

Dear Jerome

**RE: The Landing Precinct Provisions**

Thanks very much for the discussion regarding The Landing Precinct right of reply recommendations relating to the proposed subdivision rule which provides for subdivision of The Landing in accordance with TLP-Plan 1 and restricts the total number of reside total lots to 45. The proposed new rules were TLP - R2 and TLP – S1.

The above changes were identified at the hearing and included in the submitters post hearing response to the Panel. However, in reviewing that response, it omitted providing specific reasons for these changes although they were set out at the hearing. Following that, I acknowledge non response to your subsequent request for clarification of the changes sought, primarily due to the fact that I was in hospital for a period at that time. As a result of this miscommunication, the submitter is now requesting these provisions be including in The Landing Precinct provisions for the reasons set out below.

With regard to background and rationale for this inclusion. The original subdivision consent expires on 7 November 2027. The consent has been extended several times already and has allowed The Landing to continue to develop lots and carry out the associated ecological work in a manner that takes into account external forces such as Government legislation (in particular changes to the Overseas Investment regime) and global economic conditions. Additionally, in order to give effect to each stage significant investment is required for roading and infrastructure construction (required as s224c conditions). Upon applying for the most recent extension in 2023, the Council indicated that further extensions would be unlikely to be granted given the upcoming changes to the Far North District Plan – hence the reason for the submission and the request for The Landing Precinct provisions being included I the Proposed District Plan.

In my view these rules are necessary for the following reasons. I note here that if it is more appropriate to amend the references of RF1 or S1 to better fit within the format of the proposed district plan, then there is no issue with that.

#### TLP-R2 – Subdivision in Accordance with TLP – Plan 1

TLP-R2	<b>Subdivision:</b> <b>Subdivision of any residential lot in accordance with TLP Plan 1</b>	
<b>The Landing Precinct</b>	<b>Activity status: Controlled</b>  <b>Where:</b>  <b>CON-3</b> Subdivision of any Residential lot in accordance with TLP Plan 1 within The Landing Precinct.  <b>Matters of control are reserved over:</b> The location, shape, area and boundary of the lot being in accordance with TLP Plan 1;	<b>Activity status where compliance is not achieved with CON-3</b>  <b>(Does not apply where the lot has been relocated in accordance with rule TLP-R3 below):</b>  <b>Discretionary</b>

In my view, this provision is necessary and appropriate as there needs to be a subdivision rule within The Landing Precinct provisions that enables subdivision consistent with the precinct plan. Unlike other similar precincts, not all the lots at The Landing have as yet been titled. Therefore, if/when the current subdivision consent lapses prior to all the lots being titled, the default would be to the Natural Features and Landscapes or Coastal Environment Chapters, where the activity status would be discretionary or non-complying. Defaulting to the overlays or zoning is not considered to be the most appropriate approach for providing for subdivision within The Landing precinct as the new provisions of the proposed district plan would make future subdivision in the form of the current consented scenario very difficult. Instead, providing for subdivision within The Landing Precinct as a controlled activity is considered to be the most efficient and effective way of giving effect to TLP – Precinct Plan 1 and the subdivision already approved for The Landing.

Allowing this change would also ensure the provisions are consistent with TLP Policy TLP-P1(5) which provides for subdivision of residential lots in accordance with TLP: Plan 1. The submitter also advises that should the current consents lapse without this provision, then the existing covenants on the property state that the balance lot is prohibited from further subdivision. This in essence means that

we there is no opportunity to create any further lots on the property. This provision was put into the initial subdivision consent to ensure that there could be no more than the originally granted number of house sites (45), but should the consent lapse, then they are in a situation where they would be restricted to around 50% of the originally consented sites.

#### **TLP-S1 – Total Number of Residential Lots**

<b>Standards</b>		
<b>TLP-S1</b>	<b>Total Number Of Residential Lots</b>	
<b>The Landing Precinct</b>	1. The total number of residential lots within the precinct is restricted to a maximum of 45.	<b>Activity Status where compliance with S1 is not met:</b>  <b>Non-Complying</b>

In reviewing the precinct provisions prior to the hearing, it was apparent there was no specific provision limiting the number of residential lots to the number of lots that had been approved as part of the previous subdivision consent. I therefore consider it appropriate to include a standard that limits the total number of lots to 45. This aligns with TPL – Plan 1 and proposed subdivision rule R2 above. Non-compliance with this proposed standard is a non-complying activity, which aligns with and is consistent to the overlay subdivision provisions that apply over The Landing.

In my view, the addition of the above standard makes it clear to a district plan reader the quantum of development that is appropriate for the Landing and is more efficient than reviewing the details of TLP – Plan 1 – the precinct plan for The Landing.

I trust this clarifies the planning rational for the inclusion of the above two provisions.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries in regard to this letter.

Many thanks.

Regards,



Vijay Lala

Director/Planning Consultant

**Tattico Limited**