

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

of the hearing of submissions to Variation 3 to  
the Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan  
(Taiwawe Catchment Structure Plan)

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF**

**TRACEY MICHELLE LAMASON**

**ON BEHALF OF DIANE HINDS (SUBMITTER 11)**

**DATED 6 SEPTEMBER 2021**

---

- 1.1 Diane Hind continues to seek that the Taiwawe Catchment Structure Plan (Version 13) be rejected due to the effects that the proposed development would have on the amenity and rural character of the area and potential reverse sensitivity effects associated with a development of this scale on the subject site.
- 1.2 The main effects of the further revised TCSP (Version 13) in relation to the submitter, Diane Hinds' adjoining property at 151 Boat Harbour Road, Whenuakite are as follows:
- Effects on rural character and amenity
  - Reverse Sensitivity Effects
  - Effects on threatened national species, particularly on the North Island Brown Kiwi colony within the area.

- 1.3 In the event that revised Variation 3 Version 13 be approved, further changes to the TCSP are necessary to ensure the above effects are no more than minor.
- 1.4 The lower northern portion of the subject site is located in closer proximity to the residential beach settlement of Hot Water Beach, where it directly adjoins the Hot Water Beach Holiday Park and is located in closer proximity to the recently developed 790 Hot Water Beach Road property. The southern, and particularly the southwestern portion of the subject site adjoins rural farm land where there is little to no buildings and structures located. This describes the existing rural character of the site, in particular the upper southern portion of the site.
- 1.5 To ensure that rural character and amenity of the area is retained, the submitter seeks the development area of Diagram A be amended (and if necessary, the number of residential allotments within the Structure Plan be reduced) so that residential development does not occur within the southern portion of the site. In total lots 8 to 16 would allow up to nine additional dwellings (plus accessory buildings/minor units) as a permitted activity in an area that is currently in, and adjoining, bush and farmland.
- 1.6 The revised TCSP Version 13 as it is written would permit up to two buildings per defined building area with a maximum building footprint of 350m<sup>2</sup> (Table 3: Standards for Buildings and Earthworks). Under Rule 2.2 more than two buildings (Dwellings and Accessory Buildings) on a lot would require resource consent as a **discretionary activity**. However, under Rule 3 (Minor Units) up to three total buildings on a site would only require resource consent as a **restricted discretionary activity**. There is inconsistency between these two rules.
- 1.7 For consistency purposes it makes good planning sense that Rule 3 (Minor Unit) also be subject to standards 1(c) and 1(d) of Rule 2.1 which addresses colours and reflectivity. It does not make sense that dwellings and accessory buildings are subject to these standards but not minor units on the same lot. Furthermore, as a restricted

discretionary activity, Rule 3.2 (Minor Units) does not state which restricted discretionary matters the Council would restrict its discretion to. If this rule was to remain it is expected that Rule 3.2 relates to Matters 7 and 8 in Table 2 in 27.9.6.

- 1.8 The TCSP Version 13 now includes Restricted Discretionary Activity Matter 10 in Table 2 which looks at reverse sensitivity effects resulting from subdivision. The submitter seeks that the wording of assessment criteria 10 be amended as outlined in my statement of evidence so that it not only acknowledges lawfully established activities on the adjoining property but also “any permitted activities within the Rural Zone” which can be undertaken on the site as of right.
- 1.9 The submitter acknowledges the additional amendments made to the standards and assessment criteria of the Structure Plan and supports the inclusion of Rule 4.4 that seeks to make walkways accessible to the general public to be a **Prohibited Activity**.
- 1.10 The submitter is still concerned with dogs being allowed on the development sites and is concerned with how standard 1(k) will be monitored. In the past the submitter has also experienced instances of dogs worrying and even killing sheep on their property. The submitter therefore seeks that standard 1(k) be deleted and that dogs be included in standard 1(j) so that no dogs shall be kept on, or introduced to, any lot within the Structure Plan area.

**TM Lamason**  
**September 2021**