

# Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

THAMES  
COROMANDEL  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

## Submission Form

Form 5 Clause 6 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

### Your submission can be:

**Online:** [www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr)  
Using our online submissions form

**Posted to:** Thames-Coromandel District Council  
Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan  
Private Bag, Thames 3540  
Attention: District Plan Manager

**Email to:** [customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz](mailto:customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz)

**Delivered to:** Thames-Coromandel District Council, 515 Mackay Street, Thames  
Attention: District Plan Manager (or to the Area Offices in Coromandel, Whangamata or Whitianga)



### Submitter Details

Full Name(s) Stewart William Warneford

or Organisation (if relevant) \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address stewwarneford@gmail.com

Postal Address 136 Opera Place Whangapoua  
Coromandel

Phone no.  
include area code

Mobile no. 0211 955032

**Submissions must be received no later than 5 pm Friday 14 March 2014**

If you need more writing space, just attach additional pages to this form.

### PRIVACY ACT 1993

Please note that submissions are public information. Information on this form including your name and submission will be accessible to the media and public as part of the decision making process. Council is required to make this information available under the Resource Management Act 1991. Your contact details will only be used for the purpose of the Proposed District Plan process. The information will be held by the Thames-Coromandel District Council. You have the right to access the information and request its correction.



**Your Submission**

The specific provisions of the Proposed District Plan that my submission relates to are:  
(please specify the Objective, Policy, Rule, Map or other reference your submission relates to)

The specific provisions to which our submission relates, as laid out in the letter attached to this submission.

**My submission is:**

(clearly state whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of the Proposed District Plan or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons for your view)

I support  oppose  the above plan provision.

**Reasons for my views:**

Please refer to the accompanying letter which forms part of this submission.

The decision I seek from the Council is that the provision above be:

Retained  Deleted  Amended  as follows:

Please refer to the accompanying letter which forms part of this submission.

**Proposed District Plan Hearing**

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.  Y  N

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.  Y  N

Signature of submitter

*Kulu Parepare*

Date

12-3-2014

Person making the submission, or authorised to sign on behalf of an organisation making the submission.

**Trade Competition**

Please note that if you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.  Y  N

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

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 effects of trade competition.

Y  N

If you require further information about the Proposed District Plan please visit the Council website [www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr)

## TCDC Proposed District Plan

### Submissions by Waikato District Health Board

To: The Thames Coromandel District Council

Pursuant to Clause 6 of the First Schedule. Resource Management Act 1991, the Waikato District Health Board (WDHB) makes the following submissions to the TCDC Proposed District Plan.

The WDHB would not gain an advantage in trade competition through these submissions.

The specific provisions of the TCDC Proposed District Plan that these submissions relate to are as follows:

#### 1) Section 26.3 Site Specific Activities; Objectives and Policies

The WDHB generally supports the adoption of the Site Specific Activities approach for Thames Hospital. However, while Objective 1 (section 26.3) encourages existing site specific activities to be able to change and grow to meet the needs of the Community, Policy 1a implies that the scale of the activity is not to significantly alter from what exists on a site. As such the Objective and the Policy that falls off it are inconsistent and incompatible one with the other. The WDHB supports Objective 1 but considers Policy 1a should be amended to support growth and change provided the amenities of the surrounding area are maintained.

##### Outcome Sought

Delete Policy 1a and replace it as follows:

##### Policy 1a

*Changes to and growth of site specific activities identified in Table 1 shall be provided for consistent with the amenities of the surrounding area.*

#### 2) Section 26.4 Table 1 – Site Specific Activities

- i) This table records that the Thames Hospital is zoned Residential. The WDHB notes that part of the Thames Hospital Site (Birthing Unit on Mary Street) is zoned Extra Density Residential and this should be referenced in Table 1.
- ii) The site location is shown as 606 – 610 Mackay Street, Thames. This is correct for the Main Hospital site but not for the Birthing Unit which is located at 412 Mary Street. This should be included in Table 1.
- iii) The legal description in Table 1 is incomplete and incorrect in places. This should be revised as noted below. In this regard we do not consider that Lot 2 DPS 8811 is part of the hospital. It is a very narrow title which appears to be associated with the adjacent church properties not the Thames Hospital land. No CT appears to be available for this land.

##### Outcome Sought

Amend Table 1, Thames Hospital as follows (additions in **bold**, deletions ~~strikeout~~)

##### Overlay Map and Zone

31 C

Residential Zone and Extra Density Residential

Activity Name

Site Location

Legal Description

Thames Hospital

606 – 610 Mackay Street, Thames (**Main Hospital**) and **412 Mary Street, Thames (Birthing Unit)**

~~Pt Lot 1 DPS 14512, Lot 2 DPS 8811~~ Pt Pohnaua 2A Blk, **Pt Te Kopi 3 Blk**, Sec 1 and 2 SO 58959, **Sec 1 SO 353385**, Pt Te Kapua 1 Blk, Pt 479 Whakaupapaiti, Pt 480 – 481 Whakaupapa.

#### 3) Section 26.7 Standards – Table 4 Thames Hospital

The WDHB supports the Standards included in Table 4 for Thames Hospital. Here it is assumed (but not particularly clear) that where no requirement is included in Table 4 for the Site Specific Activities, the standards in the underlying zone apply (here, Residential and Extra Density Residential). Not only is it unclear which of the zoning provisions would apply, there are cases where more than one standards applies

in a particular zone – e.g. coverage in the Residential zone is either 40% or 50% depending on the activity involved.

To address these uncertainties, the WDHB submits that the only bulk and location type standards that apply to the Thames Hospital Site Specific Activity should be those set out in Table 4. In adopting this approach and to provide appropriate controls, there should be some additions to the standards already provided.

**Outcome Sought**

Amend Section 26.7 Standards Table 4 Thames Hospital by adding the following Standards:

Height in relation to boundary – 3m and 45°

Coverage – 50%

Earthworks – Residential Zone rules apply

No other zone standards apply.

**4) District Wide Rules Section 36 – Hazardous Substances**

Hazardous facilities are provided for as permitted activities depending on the quality of hazardous substances used or stored on a site. These permitted volumes of hazardous substances are higher in less sensitive zones (Industrial), less in Commercial or Rural areas, and lowest in the more sensitive areas, e.g. Residential.

As District Wide rules apply to Site Specific Activities and given the Residential zoning of the Thames Hospital, the volumes of hazardous substances that may be used/stored on the hospital site as a permitted activity are very low (basically domestic quantities). Various hazardous substances are used/stored at the hospital including medicinal gases, fuel etc. These hazardous substances are an integral component of the hospital activity which is located on a large "institutional" site and under controlled management.

To avoid the need for resource consents for the use of relatively small quantities of hazardous substances on the Thames Hospital site, the area should be deemed to be a Commercial Site for the purposes of Hazardous Substances Quantities.

**Outcome Sought**

Amend Section 36.8 – Table 3 by including SSA 1 Thames Hospital as a Commercial Area, Rural Area, Transport Area for this purpose only as follows (bold additions).

Commercial Area, Rural Area, Transport Area **and SSA 1 (Thames Hospital – for Hazardous Substances matters only).**

The WDHB wish to be heard in support of these submissions.



W D Burton  
 Authorised Agent for WDHB  
 12 March 2014

**Address for Service:**

AECOM New Zealand Ltd  
 PO Box 434  
 Waikato Mail Centre  
 Hamilton 3240  
 Attention: Dave Burton

Phone: 07 834 8980  
 021 220 3805

Email: dave.burton@aecom.com

## Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

### Submission by

Name: *Hennie van Kooten*  
 Address: *47 B Gibson Rd Hamilton*  
 Phone: *0274832383* Email: *henniepaint@xtra.co.nz*

**Given the outstanding landscapes and ecology of the Coromandel Peninsula and for the benefit of communities and future generations, we need much stronger planning regulations to protect our environment from Mining Activities. The PDP does not articulate the special Qualities, Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel Peninsula, therefore:**

### **I oppose any part of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) which allows Mining Activities, including underground mining, in the District, especially in CONSERVATION, COASTAL, RURAL and RESIDENTIAL ZONES.**

- I require the PDP to uphold biodiversity values expressed in the RMA Section 6. I require the Plan to **Prohibit all Mining Activities in Outstanding Natural Landscape, Natural Character and Amenity Landscape Overlays** in the Section 32 Rules.
- The Objectives and Policies in Section 14 do not reflect community and biodiversity values required by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS), the Resource Management Act (RMA) and Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act (HGMPA).
- I require the Plan to specifically protect our coastal environment from mining. The Coastal Zone has been removed without giving adequate protection to coastal biodiversity from adverse impacts of mining. I require the Coastal Environment Overlay to include a rule prohibiting all mining activities.
- The TCDC has failed to translate the 'High Value Conservation Areas' identified in Schedule 4 into 'Outstanding Natural Landscapes' (ONL). I require the Plan to accurately protect Schedule 4 land on the Coromandel Peninsula from all Mining Activities by including all identified Schedule 4 land within the Conservation Zone and classifying mining activities as prohibited activities.
- I am concerned that Newmont's Mining Activity in Waihi, including broken promises and mining expansion under people's homes without their consent, is a threat to our small coastal communities. I want the Plan to **Prohibit** Mining Activities under people's homes.
- I need to be confident that the TCDC has recognised the views of tangata whenua on mining in the PDP.

### **I oppose Section 37 - Mining Activities.**

- Section 37.4 Note 1 fails to provide any rules for Underground Mining Activities in affected Zones outside the access zone.
- I want the TCDC to amend Section 37.4 Table 1 of the PDP to state that all **Mining Activities are Prohibited in all Zones**, including prospecting and exploration, or other such relief that has the same effect.
- I support Quarrying activities to be separated from Mining Activities to avoid confusion.



## **I oppose Section 14 - Mining Activities.**

- I want the language of in Section 14.1 (Mining Activities) to clearly state how future mining activities will have a major adverse impact on the unique Conservation Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel. We must acknowledge the adverse impacts of the modern Mining Industry on small communities.
- I want the TCDC to remove the sentence: "The District has a long history of mining for gold and other minerals." (p73), and instead acknowledge that the Gold Mining boom lasted only 70 years, between 1860 and 1930, and was a small scale industry compared to the Mining Activities of today.
- I want the Plan to acknowledge the long term economic, social and environmental legacy and the detrimental effects of historical mining in the District.
- Of particular concern to me is the statement "The Plan includes provisions to enable the Council to take the presence of mineral resources into account when assessing proposals for the subdivision, use and development of land." (p73) Along with Section 14.2.2 this gives mining priority over other forms of development. I oppose Mining Activities having such a priority. I completely disagree with the intention of Section 14.2.2 and require this to be removed as it is unrepresentative of community values.
- The Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, where community values were assessed, has not been fully translated into the Plan and sustainable and development and biodiversity growth are not prioritised. I support the council to change the wording in the PDP to uphold these values expressed by Coromandel communities.
- There is no acknowledgment of the fact that a large number of Coromandel residents are opposed to mining, TCDC must acknowledge this, and that the 40 year history of the 'No Mining' campaign in Coromandel has contributed significantly to our Natural Character.

**In summary: I require the plan to be amended so that all mining activities are prohibited in all zones and overlays, or other such relief that has the same effect, and the language amended in Section 14 to accurately represent the history of mining and the opposition to it.**


**The special nature of the Coromandel warrants robust protection especially as there is so much economic revenue and employment dependent on our reputation as a clean green holiday destination. It is vital we do not allow mining into the Peninsula, as this is contrary to the existing Natural Character of the Thames-Coromandel District.**

My further comments:

- I would like to speak to my submission.
- I would consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission.
- I would like to thank the Council for this opportunity to submit on the PDP.

Yours sincerely,

Signature:



Date: 11 March 2014

Sent: Wednesday, 12 March 2014 4:14:46 p.m.

To: TCDC General Mail Address

Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

## Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

---

### Name

Jill Kaeppli

### Address

40 Gray Ave Kuaotunu  
Whitianga 3592  
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

### Email

[paradise@kaepplis.co.nz](mailto:paradise@kaepplis.co.nz)

### My submission is:

Given the outstanding landscapes and ecology of the Coromandel Peninsula and for the benefit of communities and future generations, we need much stronger planning regulations to protect our environment from Mining Activities. The PDP does not articulate the special Qualities, Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel Peninsula, therefore:

I oppose any part of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) which allows Mining Activities, including underground mining, in the District, especially in CONSERVATION, COASTAL, RURAL and RESIDENTIAL ZONES.

- I require the PDP to uphold biodiversity values expressed in the RMA Section 6. I require the Plan to Prohibit all Mining Activities in Outstanding Natural Landscape, Natural Character and Amenity Landscape Overlays in the Section 32 Rules.

- The Objectives and Policies in Section 14 do not reflect community and biodiversity values required by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS), the Resource Management Act (RMA) and Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act (HGMPA).

- I require the Plan to specifically protect our coastal environment from mining. The Coastal Zone has been removed without giving adequate protection to coastal biodiversity from adverse impacts of mining. I require the Coastal Environment Overlay to include a rule prohibiting all mining activities.

- The TCDC has failed to translate the 'High Value Conservation Areas' identified in Schedule 4 into 'Outstanding Natural Landscapes' (ONL). I require the Plan to accurately protect Schedule 4 land on the Coromandel Peninsula from all Mining Activities by including all identified Schedule 4 land as part of the Outstanding Landscape Overlay.

- I am concerned that Newmont's Mining Activity in Waihi, including broken promises and mining expansion under people's homes without their consent, is a threat to our small coastal communities. I want the Plan to Prohibit Mining Activities under people's homes.

- I need to be confident that the TCDC has recognised the views of tangata whenua on mining in the PDP.

I oppose Section 37 - Mining Activities.

- Section 37.4 Note 1 fails to provide any rules for Underground Mining Activities in affected Zones outside the access zone.

- I want the TCDC to amend Section 37.4 Table 1 of the PDP to state that all Mining Activities are Prohibited in all Zones, including prospecting and exploration, or other such relief that has the same effect.

- I support Quarrying activities to be separated from Mining Activities to avoid confusion.

I oppose Section 14 - Mining Activities.

- I want the language of in Section 14.1 (Mining Activities) to clearly state how future mining activities will have a major adverse impact on the unique Conservation Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel. We must acknowledge the adverse impacts of the modern Mining Industry on small communities.

- I want the TCDC to remove the sentence: "The District has a long history of mining for gold and other minerals." (p73), and instead acknowledge that the Gold Mining boom lasted only 70 years, between 1860 and 1930, and was a small scale industry compared to the Mining Activities of today.

- I want the Plan to acknowledge the long term economic, social and environmental legacy of historical mining in the District and it's detrimental effects.

- Of particular concern to me is the statement "The Plan includes provisions to enable the Council to take the presence of mineral resources into account when assessing proposals for the subdivision, use and development of land." (p73) Along with Section 14.2.2 this gives mining priority over other forms of development. I oppose Mining Activities having such a priority. I completely disagree with the intention of Section 14.2.2 and require this to be removed as it is unrepresentative of community values.

- The Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, where community values were assessed, has not been fully translated into the PDP and sustainable and development and biodiversity growth are not prioritised. I support the council to change the wording in the PDP to uphold these values expressed by Coromandel communities.

• There is no acknowledgment of the fact that a large number of Coromandel residents are opposed to mining, TCDC must acknowledge this, and that the 40 year history of the 'No Mining' campaign in Coromandel has contributed significantly to our Natural Character.

In summary: I require the plan to be amended so that all mining activities are prohibited in all zones and overlays, or other such relief that has the same effect, and the language amended in Section 14 to accurately represent the history of mining and the opposition to it.

The special nature of the Coromandel warrants robust protection especially as there is so much economic revenue and employment dependent on our reputation as a clean green holiday destination. It is vital we do not allow mining into the Peninsula, as this is contrary to the existing Natural Character of the Thames-Coromandel District.

**I would like to speak to my submission.**

- Yes

**I would consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission.**

- Yes

**I would like to thank the Council for this opportunity to submit on the PDP.**

---

**Yours sincerely,**

Jill Kaeppli

**Date**

12/03/2014



**PROPOSED THAMES COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN****Submission by BR and MY Dale****Ratepayers: 13 Florence Place, Hahei Beach****In support of PJ and MA Mahoney's Submissions****Reference: Part 3C – Consultation**

From reading the proposed changes to the TCDC District Plan, it does appear that the drafters have either not considered or adequately reflected the views of the Hahei community as incorporated in the detailed submissions and report originally prepared and submitted to Council under the document:

*Hahei Community Plan*

*Draft 2005 to 2015*

The submissions as previously presented to Council at its behest, followed very exhaustive and detailed consultation with members of the Hahei Beach community. The results were incorporated in the plan submitted to Council. Essentially the opinion of the community at that time regarding future growth of the Hahei Village was the recommendation that: *the TCDC accept the plan as a positive step forward by the community in determining the destiny and future of Hahei. It was also suggested that the views incorporated in the community plan be incorporated in the Council's Strategic Plan.*

It is indeed unfortunate that the now proposed reviewed TCDC Plan does not appear to make specific reference to nor incorporate the recommendations as then presented to Council, with the emphasis of Council now apparently being on the blueprint and identification of the principal growth areas, namely: Thames, Coromandel township, Whitianga and Whangamata.

The current review of the District Plan does however incorporate some proposals for rezoning of part of the rural land on the western fringe of the Hahei Village area. This former rural zoned land is now to be considered as a "rural lifestyle" zone. However, without any specific details or disclosure, there appears to be no regard had to the obvious requirement for a comprehensive review to be undertaken by Council regarding the need for sustainable infrastructure essential for preserving the existing amenity and in consideration of any future growth strategy for the Hahei Village area.

The infrastructure issues which need to be identified and planned include:

**(a) Sewage/waste water disposal**

Acceptable sewage disposal for all existing properties and ratepayers, before any consideration is given for further land to be developed for residential purposes. Anecdotally, comments/suggestions have been made that the existing TCDC Treatment Plant in Pa Road has available capacity for further development. If there is currently excess capacity in this treatment plant, why is this not being utilised for the benefit of existing ratepayers, rather than the continuation of existing septic tanks and individual in ground sewage disposal systems?

**(b) Water reticulation**

Again, this is a critical infrastructural element which needs to be addressed, with as many as three or possibly four separate water supply systems operating in the village. Many of the rateable properties within the village area do not enjoy the advantages of a reticulated water supply and rely upon tank and roof fed supply which is not a satisfactory long term solution.

**(c) Stormwater disposal**

There appears to be no specific reference to Council's planning or intentions for appropriate stormwater disposal/run-off, particularly where this discharges into the Wigmore Stream and other smaller waterways. The lack of any coherent long term planning or implemented policy in this regard has given rise to major health issues in both the Wigmore Stream/Estuary as well as in the Tutaritari Reserve/Stream. These matters need to be clearly addressed in any planning for development within the Hahei Village urban area.

**(d) Parking for beach access**

It is well recognised by most residents and observant visitors, that there is a undersupply of available community parking for those wishing to utilise the beach and other amenities. This situation is notably evident with the shortage of parking for the multiple thousands of visitors over the summer period wishing to visit Cathedral Cove.

This shortfall will likely be further exacerbated if the suggested Council/Mayor's proposed coastal walkway project linking Hahei Beach with Hot Water Beach is pursued.

**(e) Beach resource**

The attractive Hahei Beach is an amenity which over a defined period in the summer months receives intensive use and provides much enjoyment to

residents, visitors and in particular family groups. The beach however has over recent years become far more congested with concessionaires and licensed operators operating from the beach for various tourist related activities. This coupled with the growing number of tractors and motorised vehicles, particularly along the eastern end of the beach near the Wigmore Stream/Estuary, is now well at capacity with little or no further capacity in the event of further urban development.

Further, there is inadequate monitoring and policing by Council of vehicles which travel along the beach beyond the indicated Council signs at the foot of Wigmore steps. The demand for trailer and tractor parking could possibly be partially alleviated over the peak 4/5 week period by Council identifying and the public utilising some of the nearby reserves. However, this will need to be appropriately policed and monitored to ensure that residents can still enjoy the benefits of these vested reserves, particularly for young children and families and their recreational activities.

### **Proposed rural lifestyle zoning**

The proposed District Plan identifies approximately 38.5 hectares or 96 acres of land, formerly zoned rural, adjoining the western fringe of the Hahei Village area now to be rezoned "rural/lifestyle". This land bisected by the Hahei Beach Road, together with the adjoining 8 acre allotment on the western corner of Hahei Beach Road, is apparently identified as an area suitable for low density subdivision down to a minimum of 2.0 hectares per allotment.

The proposed rules also provide that the two hectare allotments can with adoption of a structure plan and appropriate resource consent approvals be reduced further to a minimum of 600 square metre building site. The proposal as such: is to rezone this land based on the existing rules and create the opportunity for further intensive residential development without appropriate regard being given to provision of and addressing essential infrastructure elements as identified above. The long term potential of this land for future development under the proposed "*rural lifestyle*" zoning could well then provide up to a further 200 building allotments which will place further demand and constraints on the existing infrastructure services with particular impact on: sewage disposal/treatment, stormwater run-off, water supply, available parking within the existing village area and future utilisation of the beach, particularly with additional tractors, boats and motorised transport.

### **Submission**

It is the writers' submission that:

- Any further intensive residential development within or adjoining the Hahei Village area should not proceed until Council has undertaken a comprehensive investigation and report on the essential infrastructure requirements for the existing and any planned future development.
- That the "*rural lifestyle*" zoning as proposed and rules associated therewith, are inappropriate and inconsistent with the inherent objectives of the District Plan to provide sustainable development in this location which will preserve and enhance the amenities of the locality as well as avoid development which is detrimental to both the environment and the attractiveness of the locality.

**Proposed Structure Plan for incorporation in the proposed District Plan as submitted by owners/applicants of 38.5 hectares of the "*rural lifestyle*" land**

The suggestion of a draft Concept or Structure Plan being considered and incorporated as a part of the "*rural lifestyle*" zoning change, is in the submitters' view a totally inappropriate mechanism to be considered or adopted by Council when addressing the prospects for future development of land so zoned. The current proposal as suggested by the existing owners is in our respectful submission arguably an attempt to enhance the value of this land for the possible eventual sale to an independent third party who could in the same manner as the present owners then likely use the Structure Plan or Concept Plan as the base negotiating document for further potentially more intensive development.

It is therefore submitted that the "*rural lifestyle*" zoning as proposed should provide as a permitted use: subdivision to the stated minimum of 2.0 hectares but with any further or intensive development being the subject of a *notified application* where the community and affected property owners/ratepayers, will have the opportunity to consider the proposal in greater detail and make their respective submissions accordingly.

The scale and type of development for this "*rural lifestyle*" land should not be left to the discretion of planning officers and applicants based on a Council adopted Structure Plan, without due regard to the overall effect and impact on the existing Hahei Village development and the opportunity for affected property owners/ratepayers to make appropriate submissions.

The Hahei Village with its special character and attractiveness should not be compromised and treated for future residential development in a manner similar to that which has taken place over recent years in nearby Cooks Beach and in other coastal locations such as Whangamata and Matarangi. The unique qualities of this special area of Hahei should be protected and any future development only undertaken with provision of sustainable supporting infrastructure.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large loop followed by several smaller loops and a trailing flourish.

BR Dale

A smaller, more compact handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be a name followed by a period.

MY Dale

# Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

THAMES  
COROMANDEL  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

## Submission Form

Form 5 Clause 6 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

### Your submission can be:

**Online:** [www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr)  
Using our online submissions form

**Posted to:** Thames-Coromandel District Council  
Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan  
Private Bag, Thames 3540  
Attention: District Plan Manager

**Email to:** [customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz](mailto:customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz)

**Delivered to:** Thames-Coromandel District Council, 515 Mackay Street, Thames  
Attention: District Plan Manager (or to the Area Offices in Coromandel, Whangamata or Whitianga)

TO
RECEIVED
13 MAR 2014
Thames-Coromandel District Council
ECM No:

### Submitter Details

Full Name(s) MR and MRS RICHARD MULLIN  
or Organisation (if relevant) \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address randh.mullin@btinternet.com  
Postal Address 24 Motuhoa Road, TAIRUA 3508

Phone no. include area code \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile no. 0211417808

**Submissions must be received no later than 5 pm Friday 14 March 2014**

If you need more writing space, just attach additional pages to this form.

### PRIVACY ACT 1993

Please note that submissions are public information. Information on this form including your name and submission will be accessible to the media and public as part of the decision making process. Council is required to make this information available under the Resource Management Act 1991. Your contact details will only be used for the purpose of the Proposed District Plan process. The information will be held by the Thames-Coromandel District Council. You have the right to access the information and request its correction.



### Your Submission

The specific provisions of the Proposed District Plan that my submission relates to are:  
 (please specify the Objective, Policy, Rule, Map or other reference your submission relates to)

UNDERGROUND AND SURFACE MINING IN ALL PARTS  
 OF THE DISTRICT

SECTION 4 - 410

My submission is:

(clearly state whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of the Proposed District Plan or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons for your view)

I support  oppose  the above plan provision.

Reasons for my views:

THERE SHOULD BE NO MINING OR EXPLORATION ON  
 CONSERVATION OR OPEN LAND ON THE COROMANDEL  
 PENINSULAR NORTH OF A LINE DRAWN FROM

The decision I seek from the Council is that the provision above be:

Retained  Deleted  Amended  as follows:

KOPU TO PAUANUI AS  
 AGREED BY NATIONAL  
 GOVERNMENT IN 1997.  
 See additional comments

### Proposed District Plan Hearing

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.  Y  N

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.  Y  N

Signature of submitter Al J Mullin Date 2/3/14

Person making the submission, or authorised to sign on behalf of an organisation making the submission.

### Trade Competition

Please note that if you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.  Y  N

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

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 effects of trade competition.  Y  N

If you require further information about the Proposed District Plan please visit the Council website [www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr](http://www.tcdc.govt.nz/dpr)

THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL  
 Private Bag, 515 Mackay Street, Thames 3540  
 phone: 07 868 0200 | fax: 07 868 0234  
 customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz | www.tcdc.govt.nz



Addition pages for Submission re Thames-Coromandel District Plan

The Coromandel Peninsular is a fabulous area of outstanding natural beauty and should remain free of industrial activity such as mining.

Many New Zealanders feel that early settlers plundered the wealth and beauty of this country. In the Coromandel they took all of the Kauri forests and despoiled the natural beauty.

This generation must put measures in place to ensure that the Coromandel Peninsular and its natural beauty is held in trust for future generations.

Mining in the peninsular should be prohibited not just because of the spoiling of the land but also because huge quantities of spoil would need to be transported around the winding roads and across the narrow bridges that give the area its charm.

The Coromandel Peninsular – Too precious to mine!

*John Mullin*  
2/3/14

*[Signature]*  
2/3/14



Sent: Wednesday, 12 March 2014 4:21:43 p.m.

To: TCDC General Mail Address

Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

## Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

---

### Name

vanessa mack

### Address

9 woontons lane  
titirangi Auckland 0604  
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

### Phone

642102285266

### Email

[peaceness2001@yahoo.co.nz](mailto:peaceness2001@yahoo.co.nz)

### My submission is:

Given the outstanding landscapes and ecology of the Coromandel Peninsula and for the benefit of communities and future generations, we need much stronger planning regulations to protect our environment from Mining Activities. The PDP does not articulate the special Qualities, Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel Peninsula, therefore:

I oppose any part of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) which allows Mining Activities, including underground mining, in the District, especially in CONSERVATION, COASTAL, RURAL and RESIDENTIAL ZONES.

- I require the PDP to uphold biodiversity values expressed in the RMA Section 6. I require the Plan to Prohibit all Mining Activities in Outstanding Natural Landscape, Natural Character and Amenity Landscape Overlays in the Section 32 Rules.
- The Objectives and Policies in Section 14 do not reflect community and biodiversity values required by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS), the Resource Management Act (RMA) and Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act (HGMPA).
- I require the Plan to specifically protect our coastal environment from mining. The Coastal Zone has been removed without giving adequate protection to coastal biodiversity from adverse impacts of mining. I require the Coastal Environment Overlay to include a rule prohibiting all mining activities.
- The TCDC has failed to translate the 'High Value Conservation Areas' identified in Schedule 4 into 'Outstanding Natural Landscapes' (ONL). I require the Plan to accurately protect Schedule 4 land on the Coromandel Peninsula from all Mining Activities by including all identified Schedule 4 land as part of the Outstanding Landscape Overlay.
- I am concerned that Newmont's Mining Activity in Waihi, including broken promises and mining expansion under people's homes without their consent, is a threat to our small coastal communities. I want the Plan to Prohibit Mining Activities under people's homes.
- I need to be confident that the TCDC has recognised the views of tangata whenua on mining in the PDP.

I oppose Section 37 - Mining Activities.

- Section 37.4 Note 1 fails to provide any rules for Underground Mining Activities in affected Zones outside the access zone.
- I want the TCDC to amend Section 37.4 Table 1 of the PDP to state that all Mining Activities are Prohibited in all Zones, including prospecting and exploration, or other such relief that has the same effect.
- I support Quarrying activities to be separated from Mining Activities to avoid confusion.

I oppose Section 14 - Mining Activities.

- I want the language of in Section 14.1 (Mining Activities) to clearly state how future mining activities will have a major adverse impact on the unique Conservation Values and Natural Character of the Coromandel. We must acknowledge the adverse impacts of the modern Mining Industry on small communities.
- I want the TCDC to remove the sentence: "The District has a long history of mining for gold and other minerals." (p73), and instead acknowledge that the Gold Mining boom lasted only 70 years, between 1860 and 1930, and was a small scale industry compared to the Mining Activities of today.
- I want the Plan to acknowledge the long term economic, social and environmental legacy of historical mining in the District and it's detrimental effects.
- Of particular concern to me is the statement "The Plan includes provisions to enable the Council to take the presence of mineral resources into account when assessing proposals for the subdivision, use and development of land." (p73) Along with Section 14.2.2 gives mining priority over other forms of development. I oppose Mining Activities having such a priority. I completely disagree with the intention of Section 14.2.2 and require this to be removed as it is unrepresentative of community values.

• The Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint, where community values were assessed, has not been fully translated into the Plan and sustainable and development and biodiversity growth are not prioritised. I support the council to change the wording in the PDP to uphold these values expressed by Coromandel communities.

• There is no acknowledgment of the fact that a large number of Coromandel residents are opposed to mining, TCDC must acknowledge this, and that the 40 year history of the 'No Mining' campaign in Coromandel has contributed significantly to our Natural Character.

In summary: I require the plan to be amended so that all mining activities are prohibited in all zones and overlays, or other such relief that has the same effect, and the language amended in Section 14 to accurately represent the history of mining and the opposition to it.

The special nature of the Coromandel warrants robust protection especially as there is so much economic revenue and employment dependent on our reputation as a clean green holiday destination. It is vital we do not allow mining into the Peninsula, as this is contrary to the existing Natural Character of the Thames-Coromandel District.

**I would like to speak to my submission.**

- No

**I would consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission.**

- No

**I would like to thank the Council for this opportunity to submit on the PDP.**

---

**Yours sincerely,**

vanessa mack

**Date**

12/03/2014