

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan



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
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

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)	Donald + Janne Scobie (SUBMISSION 1)	
or Organisation (if relevant)	c/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	
Email Address	richard.coles@boffamiskell.co.nz	
Postal Address	PO Box 13373, Tauranga 3141	
Phone no. <small>include area code</small>	(07) 571 5511	Mobile no. 0274325154

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)

Rural zone provisions, ecological & landscape enhancement, Rural Rules R8 and R9 Subdivision section. Relevant objectives & policies associated with above.

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:

See attached submission.

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

See Attached

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 [Signature] Date 13/3/14

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



Submission for D&J Scobie

Re: 157 MOEWAI ROAD

Submission - Rural Zone Provisions and Zoning Considerations

The site is approximately twelve hectares located 1.6 kilometres up Moewai road from State Highway 25. The site has previously been subject to a subdivision consent, where native bush areas were protected as offset mitigation for an additional lot. The balance of the land has the original house and approximately 4 ha grass and also several shed buildings. The balance land is undulating to steep and includes an 8ha pine plantation. The pine plantation is likely to be felled in the near future.

Immediately to the southeast of the property is an existing native bush area vested in Thames Coromandel District Council. To the northwest of the property is the recreational passive zone. This area has also been identified as having special rural amenity values and parts are considered to be classified as outstanding natural features and landscape. These are within 100 metres of the Scobie site.

Given the fact that this site is effectively sandwiched between indigenous vegetation there is an opportunity following the felling of the pine plantation to restore the land by planting the land in native trees. This would provide a continuous native vegetation corridor from the lower elevated areas around Whitianga to the ranges above the site.

Currently a proposed subdivision to achieve the above would be considered to be non-complying activity under the proposed district plan. It therefore seems that there is a gap in the proposed District Plans ecological and landscape protection strategy as sites such as the Scobie site will be difficult to subdivide. There is therefore no incentive to retire land from farming activities and restore native vegetation corridors. This appears to be inconsistent with the Proposed District Plans objectives and policies, which seek to promote ecological and landscape restoration.

Decision Sought

- Amend rules R8 and R9 to allow limited subdivision where further enhancement and restoration of native bush areas have demonstrable ecological and landscape benefits.
- Establish a minimum lot size for the rural zone where ecological restoration is undertaking – this may be 5 hectares. The activity classification for such a subdivision proposal should be restricted discretionary activity with assessment criteria that is clearly linked back to Council's objectives and policies and environmental outcomes sought.
- Alternatively apply a Rural Lifestyle Zone to the Scobie land.
- Any further consequential amendments to the proposed district plan that will enable the subdivision of the Scobie property and also protection of the rural amenity values of the Scobie property and Moewai Rd from the proposed industrial zone and future activities.

The Scobie's wish to be heard in the support of their submission.

The contact with regard to the submission is Richard Coles, Principal Planner, Boffa Miskell Tauranga. Ph: 07 571 5622 or 0274 325 154.

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan



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
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
- 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) <u>Donald + Janne Scobie (SUBMISSION 2)</u>	
or Organisation (if relevant) <u>c/- Boffa Miskell Ltd</u>	
Email Address <u>richard.coles@boffamiskell.co.nz</u>	
Postal Address <u>PO Box 13373, Tauranga 314</u>	
Phone no. <u>07 571 5511</u> <small>include area code</small>	Mobile no. <u>0274 325154</u>

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)

Industrial zoning proposed Map 17, TC218
location, traffic & amenity
considerations. Relevant objectives and
policies associated with the above

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:

See attached submission

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

See attached

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 *J. Hales* Date 13/3/14

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 Y N
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

Submission for D&J Scobie
Re: 157 MOEWAI ROAD

Submission - Proposed Industrial Zone, Alternate Zoning, TC218, Traffic and Amenity Issues

Planning Map 17 identifies land immediately opposite the Scobie site is proposed to be zoned industrial. The proposed zoning is a substantial increase in industrial zoning directly beneath the Scobie property. In addition is designation TC218, which is a new collector road. This road will generate substantial traffic in close proximity to the Scobie site. It is unclear what amenity controls have been applied to the industrial business zone to ensure that the rural amenity values of the area are maintained.

The proposed industrial zone extension is a substantial change from the existing industrial zone area and previous rural zone. The industrial activities will likely have adverse effects on the amenity of Scobie property and Moewai Road as a result of additional industrial buildings, industrial activities, traffic generation and associated noise effects.

There is a high level of uncertainty regarding the future traffic effects on Moewai Rd.

It is therefore recommended that Council reconsider their zoning proposals in favour of Rural Lifestyle zone buffer, which would be a better fit and transition to the passive recreational zone land, which also has amenity and outstanding landscape overlays applying. Buffer planting may also be appropriate along Moewai Road to maintain amenity values of the area.

Decision Sought

- Reduce the size of the industrial zone proposed to provide an appropriate buffer so the effects of the industrial zone do not detract from rural amenity values of the Scobie site or Moewai Rd.
- Rezone the lower land in the vicinity of TC218 to Rural Lifestyle zone to provide a transition from the industrial to rural land uses.
- Relocate designation TC218 further south away from the Scobie property
- Implement a landscape buffer along the length of Moewai Rd to reduce the visual impact of the industrial zone.
- Consider appropriate noise standards or zoning of a light industrial zone area to the periphery of the industrial zone to ensure that rural amenity values in the rural zone are maintained.
- Undertake a detailed acoustic assessment of the potential impact on the Scobie property and other adjacent rural land to guide the appropriate location of the industrial zone and establish appropriate noise standards/mitigation.
- Any consequential amendments to the Proposed District Plan necessary to protect amenity values of the Scobie land and Moewai Rd.

The Scobie's wish to be heard in the support of their submission.

The contact with regard to the submission is Richard Coles, Principal Planner, Boffa Miskell Tauranga. Ph: 07 571 5622 or 0274 325 154.

From: Diana Rutherford [drutherford@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 14 March 2014 11:55:09 a.m.
To: TCDC General Mail Address
Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Name

Diana Rutherford

Address

11 George St
Auckland 1024
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

Phone

09 6386582

Email

drutherford@xtra.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 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:

We have lived and or visited thy Coromandel and watched the run off from hills that should never have been cleared and fertilisern clog up the bays.
We want our grandchildren's children to enjoy the beauty and joys of the Haurakui Gulf and Pacific Ocean and all Aucklanders.
Care for the environment. Don't exploit it.

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,

Diana Rutherford

Date

14/03/2014

From: Rose Kavanagh [rosemkavanagh@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 14 March 2014 11:59:54 a.m.
To: TCDC General Mail Address
Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Name

Rose Kavanagh

Address

123 Linton Cres
Whangamata 3620
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

Email

rosemkavanagh@hotmail.com

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 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.

- Yes

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

Yours sincerely,

Rose Kavanagh

Date

14/03/2014

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
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
- 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) _____	
or Organisation (if relevant) <u>The National Trading Company of NZ Ltd</u>	
Email Address <u>c/o Barker & Associates Kaypk@barker.co.nz</u>	
Postal Address <u>Po Box 1986 Shortland St Auckland 1140</u>	
Phone no. <u>(09) 375 0902</u> <small>include area code</small>	Mobile no. <u>029 502 4550</u>

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)

Please see attached 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 see attached

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

Please see attached

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 [Signature] Date 14/03/14

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



**SUBMISSION TO THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL'S
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Thames-Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES 3540
Attention: District Plan Manager

1. **The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited (“NTC”)**, (c/o Barker & Associates Limited at the address for service set out below), provides this submission as follows.
2. **NTC** is the property holding company for Foodstuffs North Island Ltd (“Foodstuffs”). Foodstuffs is a 100% New Zealand owned co-operative company, which operates the 4 Square, New World and Pak’n Save retail brands across the North Island. As the property holding company, NTC actively participates in regional and local planning processes to provide for the sustainable growth and development of its brands within the Foodstuffs region. Within the Thames-Coromandel District, NTC operates New World supermarkets in Whitianga and Whangamata, a Pak’n Save supermarket in Thames, and five 4 Square stores in Coromandel township, Tairua, Whitianga and Thames. These stores have specific operational requirements particularly in terms of building form, car parking, access and servicing which need to be provided for under the District Plan.
3. **The general provisions of the Proposed District Plan that this submission relates to are as follows:**
 - i. The PDP does not currently include a stand-alone definition (and subsequent activity category) for supermarkets, as an activity distinct from other forms of retail.
 - ii. Subsequently, there is no clear car parking ratio that would apply to supermarket activities, which themselves have distinct parking requirements.
 - iii. Specific issues regarding noise and heritage provisions, as set out below.

These are expanded upon in the submission that follows.

4. **Grounds for the submission:**

In the absence of the relief sought in this submission being granted, the Proposed District Plan:

- i. will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
- ii. will otherwise be inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”);
- iii. will enable the generation of significant adverse effects on the environment;
- iv. will not warrant approval in terms of the test in section 32 of the RMA; and
- v. will be contrary to sound resource management practice.

5. **The specific provisions of the Proposed District Plan that the submission relates to are as follows:**

Without limiting the generality of this submission, the following particular provisions are supported / opposed as set out below.

i. **Section 3 - Definitions**

The submission is that:

- The PDP does not include a specific 'supermarket' definition. Rather, a combination of activities might apply to a supermarket activity based on the current provisions.
- For example, "general commercial" is defined as "*an activity, not otherwise defined in the Plan, where the primary purpose of the activity is the sale of goods and services to the general public*". The definition goes on to specifically include "retail outlets / shops" and exclude restaurants, and other activities.
- This is a confusing definition in that it excludes those activities otherwise defined, but then expressly includes them in the definition.
- Then, "retail" is no longer defined, but was included in the draft provisions, defined as "*the presentation of goods for sale, where the goods are not to be resold as new goods, and excludes wholesaling*". This was a confusing definition and NTC supports its deletion in the PDP.
- For this reason, there is some uncertainty as to the status of activity proposed for a supermarket in many of the zones.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Provide for "Supermarkets" as a separate category/definition as distinct from "general commercial" and defined as follows:

"a retail shop primarily selling a wide range of fresh produce and meat, plus frozen or packaged groceries, food and beverages, together with an ancillary range of non-food grocery items of a kind and to a relative extent that is normally found in supermarkets from time to time."

- Provide for "supermarkets" as a permitted activity in the Commercial, Pedestrian Core and Gateway zones.

ii. **Section 39 - Transportation**

The submission is that:

- Following on from the confusion surrounding an appropriate definition and activity status for a supermarket, there is a variety of car parking ratios set out in Table 5 that might apply.
- For example, "retail store greater than 500m²" requires one space per 20m² GFA accessible to the public and then one space per 40m² of other GFA. "Buildings in the Waterfront Zone and Pedestrian Core Zone" require 1 space per 40m² GFA, while "Other commercial outside the Pedestrian Core Zone and the Waterfront Zone" requires 1 space per 30m² GFA.

- Arguably any of these ratios could apply, however “retail store”, “commercial activities” and “other commercial” are not defined.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- With the exception of the Pedestrian Core Zone, where it is clear the Council is seeking to minimise the parking requirements for all activities, insert a new “supermarket” ratio in Table 5 at section 39, as follows:

<u>Supermarkets</u>	<u>1 for every 20m² GFA that is accessible to the public plus 1 for every 40m² GFA of remaining floor area or outdoor space used for the display of goods.”</u>
---------------------	---

iii. **Section 51 – Pedestrian Core**

The submission is that:

- Rule 51.4.1.2 requires controlled activity consent for new buildings in this zone, provided a number of urban design related controls are met, including provision of verandahs, frontage and access.
- NTC opposes the controlled activity status of buildings and instead seeks permitted activity status for buildings, with consideration given to the fact that any proposal not meeting the identified standards will require resource consent and will therefore be able to be assessed as regards its contribution to the urban design outcomes for each centre where this zone applies.
- NTC supports the identification of specific streets to which additional controls, including verandahs, buildings adjoining the street and glazing should apply.
- Further, NTC supports Rule 51.4.1.4, which notes that if the controls are not met (thus requiring restricted discretionary activity consent), such an application shall be assessed without public or limited notification.
- Whilst the provision for processing these applications on a non-notified basis is supported, NTC consider that the assessment criteria at Table 7 of Section 51 are overly onerous and in particular, criteria 4(a) – (f) are heavily weighted towards fine-grained, high street style development that doesn’t therefore translate to larger-scale development, including supermarkets. Some flexibility needs to be built into the assessment criteria that balances the desired urban design outcomes with the operational requirements of supermarkets, and indeed other commercial activities.
- Finally, proposed standard 10 (Table 5) requiring service lanes for access at the side or rear of a lot is an onerous and unworkable control, particularly where developments are proposed within established town centres. More concerning is Rule 51.4.1.7 that notes, where a service lane is not provided, non-complying activity consent will be required. A more suitable approach to encouraging the use of service lanes is through the provision of an assessment criterion, with an example is set out below.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Provide for buildings associated with permitted activities, including supermarkets as sought in this submission, as permitted activities in the Pedestrian Core zone.
- Delete Standard 10 in Table 5 and corresponding Rule 51.4.1.7.
- Rationalise the number and coverage of assessment criteria at Table 7 of Section 51, including the insertion of the following new criterion 14 as follows:

“14. The extent to which the above criteria can be achieved having regard to the operational and functional requirements of the proposed activity.”

iv. **Section 47 – Light Industrial Zone**

The submission is that:

- NTC operate a New World in Whangamata on land proposed to be zoned Light Industrial (currently zoned Service Industrial in the Operative Plan).
- Since the supermarket is an existing activity, it is suggested some flexibility could be built into the PDP to allow for a certain amount of upgrades (additions or alterations) as a permitted activity, up to a certain threshold. Otherwise, as drafted, the PDP requires that any minor applications for small extensions or reconfigurations for efficiencies incur a non-complying activity status.
- This is particularly appropriate for the supermarket since section 47.1 currently identifies the distinguishing features of the zone include *“large scale buildings, with the scale and design of the buildings derived from their function”* and *“a significant number of vehicle movements from light trade vehicles, delivery vehicles and cars”*. A supermarket activity is consistent with these features and therefore any alterations to such an activity should be provided for in the Light Industrial zone.
- The coverage controls in the Industrial zone (Rule 47.8: 70%) are more onerous than those in the Commercial (Rule 42.8: 80%) zone. The Industrial zone should have no coverage restrictions given the scale and nature of the activities permitted. Alternatively, they should meet or exceed the coverage controls of the Commercial zone, where issues of bulk and urban design are more suited to additional control.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Introduce an entry into the Activity Table at Section 47 that allows for additions and alterations to existing supermarket developments that result in extensions of up to 20% of existing GFA. Allow for these upgrades as a restricted discretionary activity.

- Change the coverage controls at Rule 47.8 to reflect a more lenient maximum site coverage figure, at least 80% comparative to the Commercial zone, or remove the control altogether.

v. **Section 45 – Gateway Zone**

The submission is that:

- As with the Pedestrian Core zone, NTC seeks the inclusion of a supermarket definition and associated permitted activity status in the Gateway zone.
- Further, NTC opposes the controlled activity status of buildings in this zone, and instead seeks permitted activity status, with reliance on the stated standards at Table 3 to ensure appropriate design outcomes are achieved for development in the zone.
- Likewise for the Industrial zone, the coverage controls in the Gateway zone (Rule 45.7: 40%) are more onerous than those in the Commercial zone (Rule 42.8: 80%). Given the scale and nature of permitted activities in this zone (i.e. large-format), the Gateway zone should meet or exceed the coverage controls of the Commercial zone, where issues of bulk and urban design are more suited to additional control.
- Finally, the assessment standards (Table 3) include reference to a “Residential Area Yard” of 15m. Provided the appropriate buffer controls, including fencing, height to boundary and landscaping are applied, it is considered onerous to apply a further, and excessive, yard of 15m between commercial and residential activities. This control is therefore opposed.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Amend the Activity Table at Section 45 in line with recommendations made re Section 3 above to ensure that supermarkets are a permitted activity in the Gateway Zone.
- Provide for buildings associated with permitted activities, including supermarkets as sought in this submission, as permitted activities in the Gateway zone.
- Change the coverage controls at Rule 45.7 to reflect a more lenient maximum site coverage figure, at least 80% comparative to the Commercial zone, or higher.
- Delete the “Residential Area Yard” standard at Table 3.

vi. **Section 31 – Historic Heritage**

The submission is that:

- The changes to activity status for various activities involving non-heritage buildings in the Heritage policy areas are considered onerous compared to the operative provisions.

- For example, currently external additions and alterations to non-heritage buildings require controlled activity consent, whereas the PDP now seeks a restricted discretionary activity status. Further, the draft district plan provisions allowed for this consent matter to be considered on a non-notified basis, however this provision has been removed from the PDP.
- Likewise, new buildings in the Heritage policy areas were previously a controlled activity (in the operative plan) but the PDP seeks a restricted discretionary activity status within defined Heritage Areas.
- It is considered that controlled activity status is suitable for the above mentioned activities since the sole issue to address in the Heritage Areas, over and above other areas where new development occurs, is the potential for impact on heritage items, which is a discrete matter that can have appropriate controlled activity assessment criteria attached.
- NTC supports demolition in Heritage Areas (of non-heritage items) being provided for as a permitted activity.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Apply controlled activity status to the construction of new buildings and to additions and alterations to existing non-heritage buildings in Heritage Areas.
- Further, allow for these applications to be considered on a non-notified basis.
- Retain the permitted activity status of demolition of non-heritage items in Heritage Areas.

vii. **Noise Controls**

The submission is that:

- Rule 45.4.7 (Table 2) sets out the noise level standards for the Gateway zone. It requires that noise from any activity in the zone cannot exceed 40 – 50dBA (depending on the time of day) as received within the boundary of “any other zones” (i.e. not the commercial zones identified in row 1 of the table). While it is sensible to require a lower noise standard for noise-sensitive / non-commercial zones, what is not clear is why the Gateway noise standards as received by these other zones are more onerous than the same provisions in both the Light Industrial zone (Rule 47.4.8 (Table 2): 50 – 60dBA) or Commercial zone (Rule 42.4.8: 50 – 60dBA). The key should be a maximum noise level considered acceptable for the noise sensitive zones and then this should be applied across the board, regardless of the zone within which the noise is generated.
- A further matter for consideration is the importance of maintaining continuity of service in times of emergency circumstances where power outages occur. To this end, NTC has been rolling out the provision of emergency generators in all new and upgraded stores, particularly in the wake of the Christchurch earthquakes.

- Therefore, given the use of these generators is rare and that when in use, they are not run for long periods of time, NTC seeks the exclusion of such emergency use from the relevant noise controls for the relevant zones. This approach is in lieu of noise attenuation measures to ensure compliance with regular noise limits as these are often costly and indeed, cost-prohibitive, particularly when considering the temporary and emergency nature of the generator's use.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Change the noise level standards in Table 2 of Section 45 such that the maximum noise levels received by the "other zones" are consistent with other zone provisions, namely the Commercial and Light Industrial zones, and across the board.
- Amend each zone chapter's "Noise not covered by another rule" rule (e.g. 45.4.7 of the Gateway zone) to include the following permitted activity:

(e) It is from the temporary use of an emergency generator for continued power supply.

viii. **Section 1 – Background and How to Use the Plan**

The submission is that:

- The approach whereby an activity is deemed non-complying if it is not included in a zone's Activity Table but is included in the Activity Summary Table found in Section 1 of the Plan is considered a convoluted and confusing approach to determining an activity status.

The following relief is sought from the local authority:

- Delete the Activity Summary Table from Section 1 and instead confirm that an activity that is not provided for in each Zone Activity Table is either a discretionary or non-complying activity (depending on the activity and the zone provisions).

ix. **All consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments noted above is also sought.**

3. **NTC wishes to be heard in support of this submission.**

4. **NTC would consider presenting a joint case with any other party seeking similar relief.**

DATED at Auckland this 14th day of March 2014

The National Trading Company of New Zealand

Handwritten signatures of Matt Norwell and Kay Panther Knight.

By their duly authorised agents

Barker & Associates Limited
PO Box 1986
Shortland Street
AUCKLAND 1140

Attention: Matt Norwell / Kay Panther Knight

Barker & Associates

Address: Level 4
Old South British Building
3-13 Shortland StreetEnvironmental
& Urban PlanningPost: PO Box 1986
Shortland Street, Auckland 1140

T +64 9 375 0900

F +64 9 375 0901

E admin@barker.co.nz

W www.barker.co.nz

14 March 2014

Thames Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES 3540
Attention: District Plan Manager

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission to Proposed District Plan

On behalf of our client The National Trading Company of New Zealand Ltd, please find attached a submission to the Proposed District Plan.

A soft copy of this submission was emailed to Council today (14 March 2014).

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Barker & Associates Ltd



Kay Panther Knight

Senior Planner

DDI: 09 375 0902

B&A

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
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

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) MARK WICKHAM (MATARANGI KATEPAH GVR)

or Organisation (if relevant) _____

Email Address mark.wickham@xtra.co.nz

Postal Address 8 TORI WAY, OMOKOROVA, 3114

Phone no.
include area code

(07) 5681917

Mobile no.

021326826

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)

PART V, SECTION 27.3

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:

see attached material

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

see attached material

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 *[Signature]* Date 14/3/14

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 Y N
- 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

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



Submission 1

The use of the Matarangi Structure Plan to manage activities within the area covered by the Structure Plan, and the inclusion of Hole 1 and Hole 2 of the Matarangi golf course within the Structure Plan, are supported.

Reason

The Structure Plan approach is the most appropriate technique to provide for future high quality development at Matarangi. Inclusion of Hole 1 and Hole 2 of the golf course in the Structure Plan will help ensure that the intentions of earlier subdivision consents at Matarangi can continue to be upheld.

Relief Sought

That the Matarangi Structure Plan continue as the principal technique for managing change and development at Matarangi and the area encompassing Hole 1 and 2 of the golf course (Lot 36 DPS 72837) be included within the boundary of the Structure Plan.

Submission 2

The Open Space zoning applied to the area encompassed by the Matarangi golf course is supported.

Reason

The zone gives effect to the intention of the proposed Matarangi Structure Plan, and to previous versions of the District Plan, to retain the area occupied by the golf course as structuring open space separating compartments of residential development.

Relief Sought

That the Open Space zoning over all land occupied by the Matarangi golf course be retained.

Submission 3

The Purpose, Objectives, Policies and Rules of the Matarangi Structure Plan should be altered and expanded on to ensure:

- a. That better provision is made for dedicated walking routes, other than on roads
- b. That an appropriate width of reserve is provided between the Whangapoua Harbour edge and any future residential development.
- c. That any future subdivisions are clearly required to provide a ratio of 40% open space to 60% residential lots.
- d. That all open space areas within new subdivisions are either vested in the Council as reserve, or have a consent notice on their title that preserves public access to the open space in perpetuity.

Reason

The quantity and quality of open space provision that is evident in most of the early subdivision of Matarangi has not been provided with the more recent development that has occurred on the southern side of Matarangi Drive. To avoid this happening in future a more specific statement of purpose is required, and strong rules are required to ensure that appropriate open space is provided and that it is protected in perpetuity.

Relief Sought

(a) That the second paragraph under '27.3.2 Purpose' of the Draft Plan be deleted and replaced with the following wording:

New development will be based around Whangapoua Harbour with distinct neighbourhood cells defined by areas of open space. There will be enhancement of the natural character of the Whangapoua Harbour coastline, protection of the Coromandel Ranges visual backdrop and strong and dedicated pedestrian connections to the ocean, the harbour, the commercial centre, other neighbourhood cells and to recreational opportunities

PTO

(b) That the following new or replacement standards be included under a new heading 'Key Structural Elements' in Rule 4 (Subdivision in the Residential Zone) of the Matarangi Structure Plan.

(i) Residential lots are no closer than 40 metres from Mean High Water Spring (MHWS) or the Whangapoua Harbour boundary of the esplanade reserve vested in the Council, and any land between the residential lots and the existing Council reserve is vested as Council reserve; and

(ii) Subdivisions provide a ratio of 40% open space to 60% residential lots; and

(iii) All open space areas either have a consent notice on their title that preserves public access and the open space character in perpetuity, or are vested in the Council.

(c) That the above three standards are governed by the following rule:
Subdivision in the Residential Zone that fails to meet any of the 'Key Structural Elements' standards is a non-complying activity.

(d) That Diagram A of the Matarangi Structure Plan be amended to show the direction of key pedestrian routes through land still to be developed, and that new Diagrams be prepared to demonstrate that these key pedestrian routes should be range between 10 and 15 metres in width and include a concrete path and an appropriate number and variety of trees.

Sent: Friday, 14 March 2014 9:36:24 a.m.

To: TCDC General Mail Address

Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Name

Jane Wells

Address

19 Fishermans Bend
Whiritoa Beach 3646
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

Phone

021547838

Email

janew@ihug.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 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:

As a Resident of Whiritoa I have seen the wear and tear inflicted on the local reading by this years log harvest in the Tairua Forest. I do not think the present infrastructure support for roading is anywhere near sufficient to cope with mining traffic. If the District Council is to consider the economic benefits of mining, they must balance this against the disruption and expense of the extra road work which will be constantly needed.

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,

Jane B. Wells

Date

14/03/2014

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan



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
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
- 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)	BLUE WATER ENTERPRISES LIMITED	
or Organisation (if relevant)		
Email Address	c/- matt.allott@bottamiskell.co.nz	
Postal Address	BOFFA NISKELL LIMITED, PO Box 15325, TAURANGA, 3141, ATTN: MATT ALLOTT	
Phone no. <small>include area code</small>	07 521 5511	Mobile no. 0274233604

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)

REFER TO ATTACHED LETTER

SECTION 38.5 + 38.6, RULES 8, 9 + 10 +
CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS.

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:

REFER TO ATTACHED LETTER.

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

REFER TO ATTACHED LETTER.

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  Date 14 APRIL 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

Level 2
116 on Cameron
Cnr Cameron Road & Wharf Street
Tauranga
New Zealand

PO Box 13373
Tauranga 3141
New Zealand

Tel: 64 7 571 5511
Fax: 64 7 571 3333
www.boffamiskell.co.nz

14 March 2014

Thames-Coromandel District Council
Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan
Private Bag
Thames 3540

Attention: District Plan Manager

Also via email: customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz

Boffa Miskell



Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan - Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to review and make submissions on the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan.

Background

Blue Water Estates Limited ("BWEL") owns a property at 404 Lees Road, Hahei. The property is legally described as Lot 1 DP 313183. The property is elevated above the coastline and enjoys views over the settlement of Cooks Beach and Mercury Bay. In 2001 two conservation lots were created (Lots 2 and 3 DP 313183). As part of this subdivision process two house sites were identified on Lot 1 DP 313183, vehicle access was constructed and covenanted areas for native planting were established and implemented. The surrounding environment comprises a number of rural lifestyle properties, which have been created by way of subdivision in recent times.

BWEL is currently seeking resource consent to subdivide Lot 1 DP 313183 into 9 rural lifestyle allotments. In acknowledging the receiving environment, particularly the natural character and amenity values associated with the site, the proposed subdivision promotes a number of measures to ensure that any actual or potential adverse effects on the environment are adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Submission

This submission by BWEL is in relation to the whole of the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan; however, particular focus has been afforded to a review of the proposed provisions contained in Sections 7 (Coastal Environment); Section 9 (Landscape and Natural Character); Section 15 (Settlement Development and Growth); Section 18 (Transport); Section 38 (Subdivision) and Section 56 (Rural Zone) of the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan.

Section 7 – Coastal Environment

BWEL agrees that the coastal environment is a key feature of the Coromandel. The protection and enhancement of natural coastal character is supported. Good subdivision design represents an opportunity to maintain and enhance natural coastal character.

At Section 7.2 Issue 1 states:

The protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the special values and characteristics of the Coastal Environment need to be carefully balanced with meeting peoples inherent interest in using the Coastal Environment as a place to work, live and play.

At Section 7.3 Objective 1 states:

Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment:

- *Maintains the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and*
- *Preserves the natural character, natural features and landscape values of the Coastal Environment; and*
- *Recognises the relationship of tangata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and*
- *Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and*
- *Manages coastal hazard risks; and*
- *Protects and enhances historic heritage values.*

BWEL supports this issue statement and objective.

Section 9 – Landscape and Natural Character

BWEL agrees that the maintenance of outstanding landscapes and amenity landscapes throughout the Coromandel is an important resource management issue.

Issue statements 1 and 2 under Section 9.2 are generally supported. Objective 1 and policies 1a – 1e, insofar as they relate to outstanding landscapes, are generally supported. Objective 2 and policies 2a – 2b, insofar as they relate to amenity landscapes, are generally supported. Planning Map 18 (Overlays) is not clear, but the assumption is made that a Natural Character Overlay applies to a portion of the property at 404 Lees Road. BWEL generally supports the policy framework that applies to the Natural Character Overlay (Objective 3 and policies 3a – 3d).

Section 15 – Settlement Development and Growth

The concentration of urban growth in the three main centres: Whitianga, Thames and Whangamata, is supported. However, this strategic planning initiative should not cast a negative shadow over the ability to apply for subdivision and/or land use consent in other more remote parts of the District. The regulatory approach proposed recognises this with a number of “checks and balances” applying to activities which are not located in the three main centres.

Section 18 - Transport

An integrated, safe and efficient transport network throughout the District is supported. Council need to work closely with the public to ensure the roadling network is maintained and upgraded accordingly. Funding arrangements for roading upgrades need to be transparent.

Section 38 - Subdivision

The proposed provisions for subdivision in the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan are generally supported. Good subdivision design and the promotion of appropriate mitigation (where required) are essential, particularly when subdividing land in sensitive receiving environments.

Given the policy framework in the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan, which seeks to promote positive biodiversity and landscape outcomes, consideration needs to be given to Rules 8, 9 and 10, which relate to the activity of subdlvislon in the Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone. Minimum lot sizes need to be established for the Rural Zone where net environmental benefits in terms of biodiversity and landscape outcomes are being promoted by a subdivision proposal. Alternatively, apply a Rural Lifestyle Zone to the property at 404 Lees Road, Hahei. Any further consequential amendments to the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan will also need to be considered.

Section 56 - Rural Zone

BWEL generally supports the proposed provisions for the Rural Zone. Careful consideration needs to be afforded to the regulatory mechanisms proposed for land use activities within the Coastal Environment in the Rural Zone.

Blue Water Estates Limited wish to be heard in support of their submissions.

If there are any queries in relation to this submission please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned directly.

Yours sincerely

BOFFA MISKELL LTD



Matt Allott

Principal / Planner

DDI: (07) 571 5623 Mob: 0274 233 604

Email: matt.allott@boffamiskell.co.nz

cc: Blue Water Estates Limited, PO Box 52, Whangamata, 3643
David McGregor, PO Box 37756, Parnell, Auckland, 1151

Sent: Friday, 14 March 2014 9:35:26 a.m.

To: TCDC General Mail Address

Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Name

Stephen Hutton

Address

62 Albert St
Whitianga 3510
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

Phone

6478671692

Email

steve@websiteguy.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 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.

- Yes

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

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Hutton

Date

14/03/2014

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan



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
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
- 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)	HILARY NEEDHAM	
or Organisation (if relevant)		
Email Address	hillyneedham@gmail.com	
Postal Address	P. O. Box 53180 AUCKLAND AIRPORT 2150	
Phone no. <small>include area code</small>	Mobile no.	021319737

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)

COASTAL PLAN: SECTION 7
SECTION 8
SECTION 9
SECTION 11

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:

SUBMISSION: ABEL'S TREE / POTATOE PATCH / IMAGINE RESERVE & MARINE PROTECTION AREAS

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

--

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  Date 14 MARCH 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 Y N
- 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

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



Section 7 Coastal Environment

North and South Boulder Banks, Slipper Island.

The Boulder Banks on Slipper Island are a significant coastal landscape and they form a unique coastal structure.

Boulder Bank

This boulder bank is unique

It may be the only boulder bank situated on a island, in the whole of the North Island if not New Zealand.

It is unique in the fact that when the Slipper Island Crater initially erupted, the boulders fell in order of size.

Nearest the crater point, the boulders stem in height of a double story house of 7 to 8 metres. As the boulder bank extend down the west coast of Slipper Island towards Home Bay, they gradually decrease in size, eventually ending up to a size of 1 metre and less in diameter.

On the land the boulder bank is a habitat for Slipper species lizards, skinks, many protected species of coastal birds nesting, turns, NZ dotterils, variable oyster catchers.

In the sea the boulder bank used to be home to many reef fish and shellfish and rock anemones, due to over fishing the reef fish and marine life is quite depleted.

Protect from rodent control on land with permanent fencing off from stock.

The south end has had some rocks removed - protection from removal of the boulder bank rocks as altering the landscape.

Recommend a protection area of the boulder banks and Marine Reserve status.

Sea Grass Meadows of Slipper Island. (Sub tidal, Zostera)

The sub tidal sea grass meadows of Slipper Island are rare. and are in world wide decline.

The sea grass Zostera grows in clear, shallow water up to 5m to 7 meters. The sea grass provides an important habitat for a nursery of juvenile fish, food source and shelter for fish including adult fish at night. Water clarity is an important factor for photo synthetic health

The Slipper Island offers clear water particularly in South Bay, to Home Bay. The sea grass beds are "healthy" noteworthy from NIWA. They are difficult to restore from anchors and moorings damage and studies are needed to understand what contributes to the maintenance of a healthy bed.

(section 7.1.2) states : **The District is a diverse area, with breath-taking scenery, dramatic landscapes, a nationally significant surf break and world-class beaches along its 400 km coastline.** The boulder beaches of the island are unique to the region and possibly the only one of its kind in New Zealand. In Nelson, NZ , is an example of a boulder bank, albeit of a different scale.

I note (section 7.1.2) states: **The Coastal Environment also contains indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are particularly sensitive to modification.** The boulder beaches on the island are the few remaining habitat areas suitable for lizards, in particular the lizard species *Leiopisma smithi*.

The sea grass meadows are subject to disturbance on the sea floor sensitive to modification.

I note (section 7.2.1) states: **The protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the special values and characteristics of the Coastal Environment need to be carefully balanced with meeting people's inherent interest in using the Coastal Environment as a place to work, live and play.** The north and south boulder banks and sea grass meadows of Slipper Island have merit to be included in the Coastal Planning Overlay.

I agree with and support **Objective 1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment:**

- **Maintains the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment.** Any earthworks related to farming activities or other uses, on the island must be with the intent to maintain the integrity, form and function of these significant coastal structures. Removal of any boulders must be prohibited.

- **Preserves the natural character, natural features and landscape values of the Coastal Environment.** Recognition of the natural landscape values, and role in the coastal environment, is required to give protection to the north and south boulder banks on the island.
- **Recognises the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment.** Local iwi.
- **Protects and enhances historic heritage values.** Natural coastal features are always at risk of intentional and unintentional damage, especially by humans desire to remould and develop the landscape. Every boulder removed from the boulder bank is a step towards its destruction. By including these boulder bank coastal structures in the coastal environment overlay provides them with protection.

I propose that the north and south boulder banks (beaches) on Slipper Island be included in the proposed District Plan Coastal Environment Overlay. (Planning Map: 30 Slipper Island)

I propose that sea grass meadows are also included above, as well as the boulder banks, and are put into Marine Protection Areas to protect marine habitats and ecosystems, and supported in a Marine Reserve.

I believe there should be an opportunity to go further into these submission points.

Hilary Needham.
Slipper Island.

P.O. Box 53180,
Auckland Airport. 2150.

hilly needham@gmail.com

Proposed Thames - Coromandel District Council Plan

Section 8 Historical Heritage***Introductory Comments***

There is clear and abundant evidence, principally in the form of artefacts, present on Slipper Island for significant levels of early settlement by Polynesians (particularly at sites U12/5, U12/9 and U12/12). Moreover, the archaeological remains and Maori traditional history show that occupation of the island was continuous until the late pre-European period, or even the early post-European. The landscape and the sites within it remain well-preserved, particularly compared to many areas on the mainland (especially at the Tairua harbour area). This gives the sites on the island, individually and as a group, a high level of significance, not only regionally but nationally. As a group the archaeological sites on Slipper Island form a significant cultural heritage landscape and so merit protection through the Thames-Coromandel District Plan.

“Archaeological deposits of such an early date have high archaeological values and are highly significant at a national level. Also, they have international significance for the information they contain about the settlement of Oceania.”(Gumbley and Hoffmann 2009)

Section 8.1 BACKGROUND

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.1.1) states: **The New Zealand Historic Places Act provides ‘blanket’ protection to all pre-1900 archaeological sites.** This protection did not prevent unauthorised works on Lots 16 & 17 site U12/9 in South Bay forming part of a recent proposed subdivision and a small investigation was required.

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.1.1) states: **The District Plan provides an additional layer of recognition and protection for “significant” archaeological sites and Sites identified on the Planning Maps.** The sites on Slipper Island (planning Map 30) require this additional layer of protection and preservation of the sites.

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.1.1) states: **Many parts of the District have not been surveyed and more information may become available in the future.** Archaeological sites at Slipper Island recorded by Atwell et al (1975), Rowland (1978) as well as archaeological investigations by others in the 1960’s and 1970’s have determined that this was a place of early Polynesian settlement. Apart from the Warren Gumbley report (2001) prepared for the Slipper Island subdivision RMA20010301, there has not been any further study on these significant sites. An updated site assessment stating the condition of the sites and identifying threats to all of the sites is critically required.

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.1.2) states: **Historic Heritage Items have been assessed as meeting the “Criteria for Determining Significance of Natural and Cultural Heritage Resources for Protection” as set out in the RPS.** The sites on Slipper Island individually and as a group rate well against these criteria.

Section 8.2 ISSUES

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.2.1) states: **Inappropriate subdivision, use and development can destroy, damage or modify an archaeological site... and result in the loss of important historic and cultural heritage values...** The sites on Slipper Island are at risk as determined by the 2009 damage report of site U12/9 South Bay. Also by damage of potential earthworks associated with farming and/or damage by stock.

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.2.2) states: **Lack of knowledge or lack of recognition of the existence or value of an archaeological site; of a maori cultural site and result in the loss of important and cultural heritage values, adversely affecting the relationship of tāngata whenua with that area.** The early Polynesian settlement site U12/9 South Bay is also an urupa (Burial Ground). It has been recommended that all of the beach archaeological site U12/9 be placed under formal protection.

8.3 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Archaeological Sites; Maori Cultural Sites

I agree with and support Objective 1: **Historical and cultural values of archaeological sites and Māori cultural sites are maintained to retain the identity and integrity of the Districts' history and culture.** The sites on Slipper Island require additional forms of protection under the TCDC District Plan. I believe and agree with, the view of *Peter Johnston - Ngati-Hei Trust*, that the entire island needs to have an historic designation or status placed over it, to ensure the sanctity of all the sites regardless of where they are located.

I agree with and support Policy 1a: **Land disturbance activities shall be managed to avoid modification, destruction or damage to the historic and cultural heritage values of known archaeological sites, and Maori cultural sites.** It must be recognised that proposed Public Picnic Facilities and public use of Slipper Island Reserve Lot 3 DP 402362 Home Bay, and use of any other Esplanade Reserve areas at Slipper Island, potentially places significant archaeological sites at risk of damage by foot traffic and forbidden fossicking.

I agree with and support Policy 1b: **Any unidentified or unknown archaeological sites or Māori Cultural site, where land disturbances occurs, shall be managed in a way that avoids damage or destruction until the site or area's historic or cultural heritage value is assessed.** It is highly likely unrecorded sites of significant archaeological value on Slipper Island are at risk of unintentional and intentional disturbance and damage.

I agree with and support Objective 2: **Subdivision, use and development shall maintain the relationship of Māori with archaeological sites, and Māori cultural sites.** Local iwi are to be included in any management plan or restoration of sites planning, an example being beach midden sand dune replanting.

I agree with and support Policy 2a: **Subdivision, use and development shall provide for the protection of historic and cultural heritage values of archaeological sites and Māori cultural sites and the relationship of iwi and hapū with those sites.** Slipper Island subdivision RMA20010301 consent condition for three areas containing Maori pa sites (U12/2, U12/3 and U12/4) are subject to conservation covenant 6030870.4. However, monitoring and enforcement of this covenant is poor, moreover there is no reserve committee or management plan for these areas or the other reserves on the island.

I agree with and support Objective 3: **The District's historical identity is maintained and enhanced.** The sites on Slipper Island, individually and as a group, are not only highly significant at a regional level, are also significant on a national level. Currently, as events have shown, these are at risk.

8.4 NON-REGULATORY METHODS

I note the proposed District Plan (section 8.4.1) states: **The council will have an up to date heritage strategy.** I believe the TCDC must include the recorded NZAA sites on Slipper Island in schedule **A1.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES SCHEDULE Table 1 - Archaeological Sites** under the proposed District Plan to provide an up to date heritage data base.

A1.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES SCHEDULE

I agree with and support proposed District Plan (A1.1) that states: **Historic heritage cannot be replicated or replaced, as it is a result of past human activity, and consequently is susceptible to any physical change that may reduce or destroy the qualities that contribute to its significance. Landowners may unwittingly damage heritage values, such as through additions and alterations to buildings or siting fences on archaeological sites.** The settlement in Home Bay is build on and around the highly significant site U12/5 where evidence for early Polynesian settlement has been found. This area is under constant threat of being disturbed and damaged. An unrecorded minnow lure "*Te Taonga O Nora*" discovered by Slipper Island Resident Nora Needham, was as a result of earthworks around the vicinity of site U12/5.

Maori stone paved track (observed)

Located at Home Bay, south of wetland.

The entrance is paved out of stones.

This ancient track connects to Maori Pa's, located in the southern part of the Island.

The track runs from northern slope of the Home Bay hill above the wetland and precedes eastwards and turns south, in an easy walking gradient that enables the carrying of heavy loads to upper fortifications whilst still being able to observe approaches to the Island. This track connects to various Pa's and over to the Fortress Pa at the South of the Island, of South Bay.

In the vicinity of the track are stone walls. They were used around kumara cultivation areas.

My father, Abe Needham had discussed the origins of these walls and the ancient track with maori elders of his time.

I **propose** the following archaeological sites are included in the District Plan Archaeological Sites Schedule (Planning Map 30: Slipper Island):

Slipper Island New Zealand Archaeological Association site records:

NZAA site number: U12/1 Pa

Description of site: Ridge-crest pa at Fortress Point overlooking eastern Bay. L-shaped ditch, several undoubted pits and a number of terraces.

NZAA site number: U12/2 Pa (Conservation Covenant (D) (Lot 15))

Description of site: Headland pa at south end of South Bay. Single ditch system, central platform with terraces and possible pits.

NZAA site number: U12/3 Pa (Conservation Covenant (F) (Lot 14) (Lot 4 DP402362))

Description of site: Headland pa, south end of Home Bay. Two transverse ditches and several terraces.

NZAA site number: U12/4 Pa (Conservation Covenant (E) (Lot 17))

Description of site: Headland pa, northern end of South Bay. Double ditch and bank system with inner terraces surrounding a central platform. One pit outside the outer ditch and a number inside. Shell midden and obsidian.

NZAA site number: U12/5 Midden/Workshop Area

Description of site: Inland of present sand dunes, covers and area of at least 1,700 sq.m, Non concentrated and dispersed. Shellfish, Mayor Island Obsidian and Tahanga basalts. Utilised bone, fishhooks and fishhook tabs.

Home Bay settlement of house and associated farm buildings partly cover the midden. Midden is exposed around the house, under fence lines and in the cattle race running from the house to Home Bay wharf.

NZAA site number: U12/6 Pa

Description of site: Ridge crest pa on western cliff face, northwest of North Swamp, overlooking Home Bay. Probably L-shaped ditch associated with terraces and pits.

NZAA site number: U12/7 Pa

Description of site: Pa at end of high spur, north end of crater Bay. Terraces and four pits plus two transverse ditches.

NZAA site number: U12/8 Pa

Description of site: Headland pa on south east portion of Island. Two transverse ditches, platforms, terraces, pit and midden.

NZAA site number: U12/9 Midden / Oven

Description of site: Shell midden extends along South Bay and sand dunes.

Page 4 of 4

NZAA site number: U12/10 Pit/Terrace

Description of site: Boulder strewn terraces on slope looking over south swamp

NZAA site number: U12/11 Agricultural / Pastoral

Description of site: Stone wall remains. Possibly European? Located to the east of swamp pa U12/17.

NZAA site number: U12/12 Midden / Oven

Description of site: Shell midden above boulder beach north of Home Bay.

NZAA site number: U12/17 Pa

Description of site: Possible swamp pa.

Conclusion comments

This group of archaeological sites on Slipper Island form a significant cultural landscape at a regional and national level.

I **propose** the above listed NZAA sites, that have clear and abundant evidence of early Polynesian settlement, are included in the TCDC proposed District Plan Archaeological Sites Schedule. This is to provide an additional layer of recognition and protection.

I believe that there should be an opportunity, including the subsequent hearing, to go into these submission points in more detail.

I wish to be **heard** at the hearing.

References

Atwell E.G., J.R.H. Spencer, G.F. Puch and P.R. Moore 1975. Archaeological site survey of Shoe Island and the Slipper Island Group. *Tane*, 21: 21-90

Gumbley. W (2001) An appraisal of archaeological issues relating to the proposed subdivision of Slipper Island and an assessment of affects on archaeological values. *Heritage Resource Management Consultant*.

Gumbley W. and Hoffmann A. 2009. Site damage report: U12/9, South Bay, Slipper Island. *CFG Heritage Ltd*.

Rowland, M.J. 1978. Investigations of two sites on Slipper Island. *New Zealand Archaeological Association Newsletter*, 21(1): 31-52

Conservation Covenant 6030870.4 pursuant to Section 77 Reserves Act 1977

Submitter

Hilary Needham Needham.
Slipper Island

P.O. Box 53180
Auckland Airport. 2150.

hillyneedham@gmail.com

Section 9 Landscape and Natural Character

Preservation of the natural character of the Coastal Environment, Slipper Island.

Introduction

The landscape and natural character of the Coromandel Peninsula are some of its most important values that require protection and preservation. Islands in particular provide unique opportunities to become breeding sanctuaries for many native flora and fauna. Slipper Island has its own unique marine eco-system and biodiversity. The use and development by humans (from early Polynesian settlement, historical Māori occupation, and more recent Europeans) on Slipper Island have modified, degraded and altered the appearance of naturally functioning ecosystems, especially rare and vulnerable ecosystems such as its coastal wetlands and sand dunes.

Overlay and Planning Maps

I note (section 9.1.2) states:

Outstanding Landscapes

Section 6(b) of the RMA identifies “the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development” as a matter of national importance. The RPS also has policy and methods to identify and protect this. Landscape values are a reflection of both the biophysical environment and people's perception of that environment. Slipper Island has been rated “Outstanding Landscape” Landscape Unit:76 East Coast Islands.

I note (section 9.1.4) states:

Natural Character

Section 6(a) of the RMA identifies “the preservation of the natural character of the Coastal Environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development” as a matter of national importance. Slipper Island should also be assessed and rated with “Natural Character”. This is provide an additional layer of protection of its Coastal Environment.

I note (section 9.1.4) states:

The Natural Character Overlay in the Plan encompasses areas with outstanding and high natural character....Additional policy is included to address opportunities for restoration and enhancement of these areas. An opportunity to address the restoration and enhancement, and protection of the island's Biodiversity is critically required.

I note (section 9.1.4) states:

The ecological assessment of high natural character was described in the report: Graeme, J., Dahm, J., Kendal, H. January 2010. *Coromandel Peninsula Ecological Assessment of Natural Character*. Natural Solutions Contract Report 09/087. Focus Resource Management Group. High natural character was assessed in terms of both ecology (the viable functioning of natural processes) and experience (the attributes of 'naturalness'). It included identification of sand dunes, gravel and boulder beaches, coastal wetlands, coastal forest, inland wetlands and rivers that have strong natural functioning. This report most likely did not include Slipper Island due to lack of available data and remoteness from the mainland.

I note (section 5.1) of **Coromandel Peninsula Ecological Assessment of Natural Character (2010)** states:

*The Ministry for the Environment and Department of Conservation have identified four ‘National Priorities for Protecting Rare and Threatened Native Biodiversity on Private Land’ (DoC & MfE, 2007). These priorities will help identify those critical areas of existing high natural character which require the most urgent attention:
4 Critical = those ecosystems that fall within the national priorities for protection (DoC & MfE, 2007) or are identified as local priorities by council.*

TCDC Natural Character – Ecological Assessment 40

National Priority 1:

Indigenous vegetation associated with land environments, (defined by Land Environments of New Zealand at Level IV), that have 20 percent or less remaining in indigenous cover.

Page 2 of 4

National Priority 2:

Indigenous vegetation associated with sand dunes and wetlands; ecosystem types that have become uncommon due to human activity.

National Priority 3:

Indigenous vegetation associated with 'originally rare' terrestrial ecosystem types not already covered by priorities 1 and 2. Ecosystems relevant to the Thames-Coromandel district include coastal systems, such as coastal turf and coastal rock stacks.

National Priority 4:

Habitats of acutely and chronically threatened indigenous species.

While this is not an ecosystem-focused priority, threatened species are often linked with threatened ecosystems (≈habitat). Habitat protection is essential for the ongoing protection of threatened species.

An assessment to identify critical areas of existing high natural character on the island is urgently required. This is for long term preservation, protection and restoration of the islands natural and unique eco-system. I believe that an opportunity to go further into this point is required.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Objective 1: Outstanding Landscapes remain outstanding and their values and characteristics are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and resulting adverse cumulative effects.** Slipper Island is rated *Outstanding* on Landscape Unit 76: East Coast Islands.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Objective 2: The qualities and characteristics of Amenity Landscapes are maintained or enhanced and continue to contribute to the pleasantness, aesthetic coherence and cultural and recreational values of the landscape.** Preservation and protection of the island is critically required to uphold its amenity.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Objective 3: The natural character of the Coastal Environment, wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins is protected and enhanced.** Slipper Island has been farmed for over 100 years. Over this time wetlands have been drained, natural coastal forest areas removed, earthworks carried out, and wildlife disturbed and dwindled in numbers. A restoration policy and plan is needed for the island.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 3a:**

Subdivision, use and development shall be avoided where it will damage, diminish or compromise the natural appearance, functioning, biodiversity or ecological resilience areas within the *Natural Character Overlay*, especially (but not limited to) adverse effects from the following activities in the following areas: Slipper Island, Planning Map:30

a) Gravel and boulder beaches: landform modification, seawalls, indigenous vegetation clearance, coastal reclamation, roads, gravel extraction, man-made structures.

b) Coastal cliff/escarpments: earthworks, indigenous vegetation clearance, roads, man-made structures.

c) Sand dunes: landform modification, seawalls, indigenous vegetation clearance, seawalls; buildings; plant and animal pests, man-made structures.

d) Inland and coastal wetlands: indigenous vegetation clearance, drainage, stop banks, earth infill, reclamation, stock access, animal and plant pests, increased sediment runoff from subdivision and development;

e) Coastal forests: indigenous vegetation clearance, stock browsing, animal and plant pests;

f) Rivers: indigenous vegetation clearance, man-made structures.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 3b:**

Significant adverse effects on natural character in the *Coastal Environment* within the *Natural Character Overlay* shall be avoided and other adverse effects shall be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Slipper Island is remote and away from public environmental watchdogs. Protection policies are more favourable than retrospective mitigation action.

Page 3 of 4

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 3c:**

Buildings and other structures shall be located and designed to integrate with the surrounding Natural Character overlay, with adverse effects on Natural Character. Boffa Miskell report: *Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (2001)*.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 3d:**

The enhancement of the Natural Character Overlay in the Coastal Environment, wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins shall be promoted. This may include (but is not limited to): Slipper Island is required to be included in the Natural Character Overlay to promote protection of its wetlands. Current practice of farm dumps close to swamp areas need to be addressed. Wetland areas need to be fenced off and restored. Recognition of all wetland areas on the island critically need to be identified to aid in providing legal protection and covenants.

- a) Permanent stock exclusion; and
- b) Removal of plant and animal pests; and
- c) Encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species; and
- d) Planting species appropriate for the ecosystem using local genetic stock where available; and
- e) Creating or enhancing indigenous habitat and/or habitat for threatened or at risk indigenous species, including raising the water level for wetlands; and
- f) Legal protection for indigenous ecosystems; and
- g) Reducing or eliminating discharge of contaminants; and
- h) Removing redundant, unnecessary or inappropriate man-made structures, provided they have minimal historic heritage or amenity value; and
- i) Restoring long-term natural functioning of physical processes and features over a 100 year timeframe, particularly dunes, wetlands and intertidal saltmarsh; and
- j) Protecting geological features; and
- k) Rehabilitating historic landfills and other contaminated sites which are, or have the potential to, leach material into the coastal marine area; and
- l) Redesigning structures that interfere with natural character processes, such as perched culverts that prevent migratory fish access.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Objective 4: The natural character of the Coastal Environment, wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins is maintained, enhanced or restored.** Slipper Island wetlands.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 4a:**

Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment, outside of the Natural Character Overlay, shall avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on other natural character values. Monitoring of existing subdivision to enforce preservation of Natural Character of the island.

I agree with and support (section 9.3) **Policy 4b:**

The restoration or enhancement of natural character in the Coastal Environment, wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins outside of the natural character overlay shall be promoted. This may include (but is not limited to): Future preservation and protection plan of Slipper Island.

- a) Permanent stock exclusion; and
- b) Removal of plant and animal pests; and
- c) Encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species; and

Page 4 of 4

- d) Planting species appropriate for the ecosystem using local genetic stock where available; and
- e) Creating or enhancing indigenous habitat and/or habitat for threatened or at risk indigenous species, including raising the water level for wetlands; and
- f) Legal protection for indigenous ecosystems; and
- g) Reducing or eliminating discharge of contaminants; and
- h) Removing redundant, unnecessary or inappropriate man-made structures, provided they have minimal historic heritage or amenity value; and
- i) Restoring long-term natural functioning of physical processes and features over a 100 year timeframe, particularly dunes, wetlands and intertidal saltmarsh; and
- j) Protecting geological features; and
- k) Rehabilitating historic landfills and other contaminated sites which are, or have the potential to, leach material into the coastal marine area; and
- l) Redesigning structures that interfere with natural character processes, such as perched culverts that prevent migratory fish access.

Conclusion

I propose that the proposed that the Natural Character Overlay of the proposed District Plan includes Slipper Island: Planning Map 30.

I believe that there should be an opportunity to go into these submission points in more detail.

Sand Dunes - Home Bay, South Bay and Stingray Bay
Volcanic crater and vents

Submitter

Hilary Needham.
Slipper Island.

hillyneedham@gmail.com

Page 1 of 2

Proposed Thames - Coromandel District Council Plan

Section 11 Significant Trees

Abe's Tree at Abe's Point, Slipper Island, is a magnificent Pohutukawa specimen, that holds it's own in stature. The tree, when in flower, embraces the southern end of Home Bay in a brilliant hue of red. It is highly significant in amenity to this part of the island. The tree holds high historical values in that it is a remnant of coastal forest vegetation that existed on the island pre-historic Maori occupation.

This tree is located on the southern boundary of Slipper Island Reserve Lot 3 DP 402362 Home Bay and on the northern boundary of conservation covenant 6030870.4 (*Lot 4 DP402362*), Planning Map: 30 Slipper Island.

I note that (section 11) states: **The Significant Tree Schedule identifies trees that significantly contribute to public values such as heritage, amenity or as a landmark.** Abe's Tree fits this criteria.

I also note that (section 11) states: **The significance of the tree primarily relates to the condition and amenity of the tree, but significance may also come from the tree's stature, or the historic or scientific values it holds.** Abe's Tree fits this criteria.

I propose to include **Abe's Tree** located at Abe Point, Slipper Island, in the Proposed District Plan Significant Tree Schedule, Planning Map: 30 Slipper Island. This is to identify, recognise and protect this tree in the Recreation Area Lot 3 DP 402362 Slipper Island.

11.1

I believe that Abe's Tree should be included in the Proposed District Plan, Appendix 3, Significant Tree Schedule, based on the information that it can be identified to fit the following selection criteria:

1. Notable significance – the tree is of a significant age or exemplifies significant stature, vitality or form. This tree is highly likely to be remnant of the Coastal Forest that covered the island pre-Maori occupation.

2. Botanical or scientific significance – the significance of the tree because of its rarity, its representativeness, its value as a native tree or its unusual genetic form. Magnificent Pohutukawa specimen.

3. Historical significance – the tree is associated with historic events, people and significant periods in the development of the District. Highly significant Historical Coastal Forest.

4. Cultural and spiritual significance – the tree has significant customary or spiritual value to a particular group of people. Needham Family - Remembrance of Mr. Abe Needham, father of 14 Children, and our Mother Mrs. Nora Needham, who brought Slipper Island in 1971 and brought up their young children out there.

5. Landmark significance – there are visual and spatial qualities which make the tree an important landscape feature of a particular area. See attached photo.

6. Functional significance – the tree has a significant physical and ecological function which may include amenity or climatic benefits (e.g. shade, screening, shelter and temperature control). Size of shade shadow large - only shade on the reserve and people flock to get in its shade. Potential damage to roots and lower branches.

7. Amenity values - the qualities and characteristics of a tree that contribute to people's appreciation of it. Abe's Tree is a truly magnificent specimen of a healthy happy tree growing in its chosen spot.

11.2 ISSUES

I note that (section 11.2.1) states: **Significant trees are at potential risk from land intensification, subdivision and land use activities. The removal, modification or degradation of a tree can result in a reduction of amenity values, the quality of the environment and in some cases, the irreversible loss of important historical or cultural values.** The eminent development of Public Picnic Facilities at the Slipper Island Reserve, Home Bay will expose this tree to greater visitor numbers than ever before. There is the risk of damage and breakage of low slung branches from persons walking along the branches.

Conclusion

I propose to include Abe's Tree in the TCDC Proposed District Plan Significant Tree Schedule.

I believe that there should be an opportunity to go into these submission points in more detail. I intend to submit a further submission on these submission points.

There are other groups of significant trees on the island that should also be included in the proposed district plan.

These trees can be listed in a further submission.

eg, Pear Tree and palm tree 1880

Pohutukawa tree: located Northern boulder bank, orchard, lot 3, Pa sites, memorial tree, cliffs

SUBMITTER

Hilary Needham.
Slipper Island

P.O. Box 53180,
Auckland Airport. 2150

hillyneedham@gmail.com





Sent: Friday, 14 March 2014 12:08:48 p.m.

To: TCDC General Mail Address

Subject: Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Name

Clive Monds

Address

1 Arthur Rd, Ngarimu Bay, RD5
Thames 3575
New Zealand

[Map It](#)

Phone

021 309 123

Email

cmonds@ihug.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 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 remain astounded that Councillors still pursue the myth of wealth creation and jobs from gold. Wealth in the Coromandel is primarily generated from out tourism, fishing and aquaculture industries. All of which depend on our clean environment and will be threatened by gold mining.

The last gold mine we almost got in 1987, the Monowai mine, would have only provided 17 jobs of which only 6 would be locals. That was admitted by Spectrum Resources Ltd at the Planning Tribunal hearings on the Monowai application.

Many more jobs from the above mentioned industries would have been threatened not to mention the impact on communities, our environment and the firth of Thames

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,

Clive Monds

Date

14/03/2014

Form 5
Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To Thames-Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES 3540
Attention: District Plan Manager

customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz (subject: Proposed District Plan Submission)

Name of submitter: Trevor Barrett
c/- Planners Plus Limited
PO Box 218
WHITIANGA 3542

Phone: (07) 867 1087
Email: info@plannersplus.co.nz

This is a submission on the following proposed district plan:

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Trevor Barrett's submission relates to the area of land comprising the Pauanui Airfield. The relevant Proposed District Plan planning map is **Map 29M Airfield Height Restriction Overlay (Pauanui Airfield)**.

Trevor Barrett's submission is as follows:

Undertake any necessary amendments to Map 29M Airfield Height Restriction Overlay (Pauanui Airfield) so that it takes into account the correct survey information in the Topographical Survey of Pauanui Airfield (13 December 2012).

A topographical survey that was commissioned by the Thames Coromandel District Council in 2012 (please refer to **Attachment A**), shows a 10 metre separation between the northern edge of the Pauanui Airfield runway and the northern boundary of the Airfield. The Operative District Plan used an incorrect measure of 6 metres which is an 'error in fact', which simply needs correcting.

Trevor Barrett seeks clarification on this matter and that Council undertakes any necessary amendments to Map 29M Airfield Height Restriction Overlay (Pauanui Airfield) to ensure the most correct and up to date information regarding the Airfield is used.

The submitter considers that the 10 metre separation distance is an important factor in the safe and efficient operation of the Airfield in that:

- Service vehicles monitoring the wastewater installations (on the northern side) are currently forced to drive on the runway when passing the concrete placements within the

6 metre runway setback. This would be corrected with the 10 metre setback as described in the topographical survey prepared by RMS Surveyors.

- The 10 metre buffer as described in the attached topographical survey allows for a safer buffer situation and lesser Council liability where people walk alongside the runway (albeit illegally). The buffer also provides an extra separation distance for children and pets living adjacent to the runway.
- More aircraft owners now own properties on the northern side of the runway with a greater number of parked aircraft at peak times. The 10 metres is required for the safe accommodation of these aircraft.

Trevor Barrett seeks the following decision from the Thames-Coromandel District Council:

- Undertake any necessary amendments to Map 29M Airfield Height Restriction Overlay (Pauanui Airfield) so that it takes into account the correct survey information in the Topographical Survey of Pauanui Airfield (13 December 2012).

Trevor Barrett wishes to be heard in support of his submission.

If others make a similar submission, Trevor Barrett will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

T.M. Lamason
.....

Signature of submitter
(or person authorised to sign
on behalf of submitter)

14 March 2014
.....

Date

Address for service of submitter:

Telephone: (07) 867 1087

Fax/email:

info@plannersplus.co.nz

Contact person: Tracey Lamason
(Planners Plus Limited)

ATTACHMENT A

TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY



PLANNERS PLUS LIMITED



Project No. F6954
Drawing No. Rev. T1 A

Callum Stewart
120 Box 21, Shepparton, VIC
Ph 03 445 8880
Fax 03 445 8881
RPS@CALSTEWART.COM.AU

RMS
SURVEYORS
Land & Engineering Surveyors & Property Management Consultants & Appraisers

Drawn	Date
CTS	
Designed	Date
Verified	Date
Approved	Date

TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF PAUANUI AIRFIELD
LOT 2 DPS 24077, SEC 2 SO 58159 & LOT 3 DPS 27688
THAMES COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL

Date:	13 December 2012	Scale:	1:2500 @ A3
No.		By	Ver / App
1	01/12/12	Callum Stewart	
2			
3			

NOTES:

1. Survey carried out by Callum Stewart - Registered Professional Surveyor.
2. Survey Date: 12 December 2012.
3. RM = Runway Marker (3m x 1m concrete pad, flush with ground, painted white).
4. VP = Valve Pit (1.7m Ø steel chamber 0.25m - 0.35m above ground).
5. Runway widths shown to inside edge of Runway Markers.
6. Valve Pits are clear of Runway by 5.0m - 5.5m to the North West. (clearance between line of inside edge of Runway Markers to extent of circular chamber).
7. Runway distances rounded to nearest metre.





Submission on Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan

TO: Thames Coromandel District Council

FROM: New Zealand Petroleum & Minerals
PO Box 1473
Wellington 6140
04 474 2881
Rob.Robson@mbie.govt.nz

Name of submitter: NEW ZEALAND PETROLEUM & MINERALS (NZP&M)

1. This is a submission on the Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan (**PDP**).
2. The specific provisions of the PDP that this submission relates to are set out in Appendix 1.
3. NZP&M could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. NZP&M's submission is set out in Appendix 1.
5. NZP&M seeks the decisions from Thames Coromandel District Council (**TCDC**) set out in Appendix 1, or such similar and consequential relief as necessary to address the submissions in Appendix 1.
6. NZP&M wishes to be heard in support of its submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, NZP&M will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

DATED 14 March 2014

Rob Robson

NEW ZEALAND PETROLEUM & MINERALS

APPENDIX 1 – NZP&M SUBMISSION

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. NZP&M manages the New Zealand government's oil, gas, mineral and coal reserves, known as the Crown Mineral Estate. It allocates permits to prospect, explore or mine Crown-owned minerals; it establishes and advises on operational regulation; and promotes investment in the mineral estate. NZP&M is a branch within the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (**MBIE**).
- 1.2. MBIE's purpose is to grow New Zealand for all. We do this by helping business to become more productive and internationally competitive, and by increasing opportunities for all New Zealanders to contribute to the economy. The Ministry of Economic Development, a government agency now restructured into MBIE, actively participated in the TCDC's previous planning proposals.

2. HIGH LEVEL CONCERNS

Outstanding natural landscapes and natural character

- 2.1. NZP&M does not support the extent of identification of outstanding natural landscapes and Natural Character areas in the PDP.

Mining

- 2.2. Mineral extraction should not be treated any differently from any other earthworks in the overlay areas. While the areas of outstanding landscape are now better known, the mineralisation within the District is not known with certainty and so it is necessary to ensure an appropriate planning framework within which prospecting, exploration and mining of minerals can be undertaken.
- 2.3. The cumulative effect of the broad overlays is to create an unwarranted consent gateway for underground mining (does not align with the effects, scale, and location of such activities) and to prevent any prospect of surface mining in more than 75% of the District, including much of the District south of the Kopu-Hikuai Road. This area includes numerous known centres of gold mineralisation where the likelihood of making new discoveries and/or proving-up new mineable resources is considered high (e.g., the Neavesville district).
- 2.4. The proposed *non-complying* (underground mining) and *prohibited* (surface mining) activity classifications are inconsistent with the manner in which the PDP proposes to regulate activities for other industries with similar effects, including primary production industries. For example, wind turbine developments and/or subdivision, which potentially involve large scale surface earthworks (new roads, turbine platforms, etc.) on a scale similar to or larger than surface mining, would only have *discretionary* and/or *non-complying* status for the new Outstanding Landscape overlay.

- 2.5. NZP&M consider that *discretionary* status for underground mining and *non-complying* activity status for surface mining within the overlays of Outstanding Landscape and Natural Character will provide the appropriate balance between land scape values, natural character, and mineral potential, use and development.

Waste rock / tailings storage & Mineral Processing

- 2.6. The broad *prohibited* status for Mineral processing and Waste rock/ tailings storage over most of the district that will arise from application of the new Outstanding Landscape, Amenity Landscape and Natural Character overlays.
1. The effect of the broad overlays is to prevent any prospect of these activities occurring in more than 75% of the District (in all but a small areas of land outside of the overlay areas, these activities are also prohibited).
 2. The proposed *prohibited* activity classifications are inconsistent with the manner in which the PDP deals with activities for other industries. For example, for the Outstanding Landscape overlays, similar scale earthworks – subdivision - would have *non-complying* status; and hazardous substances' management (a hazardous facility) is seemingly *discretionary* at most.
- 2.7. Mineral processing and Waste rock/ tailings storage should not be treated any differently from any other primary productive industries in the overlay areas. District Plan rules are meant to manage environmental risk. Modern methods of mineral processing and waste rock/tailings storage have known, demonstrated ability to manage risks and as such, require no more stringent activity status than a water supply dam, for example. The widespread application of *prohibited* activity status (a form of absolute risk-avoidance where it is thought that unacceptable environmental risks exist) is out of all proportion with the track record of modern mining/minerals processing operations.

Summary comment

- 2.8. When it comes to exploration and mining, the PDP is unnecessarily activity focussed rather than being effects based. Where the environmental risks of different activities are similar, then the activity status applied to the different activities should be the same. Common sense and fairness dictates that local authorities have a duty to administer their function of environmental management even-handedly.
- 2.9. The process of mineral extraction is not complex, and the risks are predictable and able to be well managed. On that basis, *prohibited* activity status is not needed for much of the District, and even *non-complying* activity status need be no more widespread than for other forms of primary productive activities that have the potential to alter landscape values, or involve large-scale earthworks.

3. MINING

Section	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Section 14 – District-wide Issues, Objectives and policies – Mining Activities			
14.1 Background	Support in part	NZP&M supports the fifth paragraph statement that reads <i>“while mining can have economic benefits to the District, mining operations also have the potential to adversely affect the natural and built environment, unless carefully managed. These impacts depend on the sensitivity and importance of the area, the scale of the operation, and how well the operation is managed.”</i>	Retain the fifth paragraph.
14.2 Issues	Support in part	NZP&M generally supports the issues identified, except for the inclusion of <i>Mineral exploration</i> in Issue 2. There is a low probability that minerals exploration can ever result in the stated impacts and its specific inclusion in issue is unjustified.	Retain except as specified below: Amend issue 2 as follows: “Minerals exploration , extraction and processing can result in contamination of the environment and has the potential to adversely affect the health and safety of communities. “
14.3 Objective 1a Objective 1b	Support	NZP&M supports Objective 1a and Objective 1b	Retain Objective 1a and Objective 1b
14.3 Policy 1a	Oppose in part	This policy excludes <i>“remedy, mitigate”</i> and is inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to read “Mining activities shall avoid, <u>remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on the Outstanding Landscape Overlay, Natural Character Overlay , and areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of Indigenous fauna.”
14.3 Policy 1b	Support in part	This policy excludes <i>“avoid”</i> .	Amend to read “Mining activities shall <u>avoid</u> , remedy,

			mitigate or compensate adverse effects on the existing natural values within the Coastal Environment. "
14.3 Policy 1c	Support	NZP&M supports Policy 1c	Retain Policy 1c
14.3 Policy 1d	Support in part	NZP&M supports the intent of this policy but considers the words "... <i>and able to be reused</i> " are vague.	Amend to read "Sites of mining activities shall be fully rehabilitated and able to be reused. "
14.3 Policy 1e	Support	NZP&M supports Policy 1e	Retain Policy 1e
14.3 Policy 1f	Support in part	NZP&M supports the intent of this policy but considers the words " <i>mitigate</i> " should be inserted for consistency with Part 2 of the Act.	Amend to read "Where avoidance is impractical, mining activities shall remedy, <u>mitigate</u> or compensate for the adverse effects on the environment."
14.3 Policy 1g	Support in part	NZP&M supports the intent of this policy but considers the words " <i>mitigate</i> " should be inserted for consistency with Part 2 of the Act.	Amend to read "New mining activities should not locate near existing incompatible activities where adverse effects cannot be avoided, or remedied <u>or mitigated.</u> "
14.3 Objective 3	Support	NZP&M supports Objective 3	Retain Objective 3
14.3 Policy 3a & Policy 3b	Support	NZP&M supports both Policy 3a & Policy 3b. These Policies complement.	Retain Policy 3a & Policy 3b.
Section 37 –Mining Activities			
37.1 Background	Support	NZP&M supports Background statement.	Retain 37.1 Background statement.
37.1 Rule 1 & Rule 2	Support	NZP&M supports both Rule 1 & Rule 2.	Retain Rule 1 & Rule 2.
37.1 Rule 3	Support in part	NZP&M generally supports Rule 3, except for the <i>Prohibited</i> status for <i>Waste rock / tailings</i>	Amend Rule 3 to provide <i>Waste rock / tailings storage</i> in Table 1 with Non-complying

		<p><i>storage</i> in Table 1 in respect of the Conservation Zone. Depending on location and design, adverse effects related to this activity may be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and an overall judgement under Part II of the Act may occur. <i>Prohibited</i> status is therefore unwarranted.</p>	<p>status in respect of the Conservation Zone.</p>
<p>Section 9 – Landscape and Natural Character</p>			
<p>9.3 Objectives and Policies</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>NZP&M generally supports the objectives and policies listed at 9.3, except for Policy 1a, which excludes the words, <i>remedy or mitigate</i> and are inconsistent with the Act.</p>	<p>Retain the objectives and Policies in 9.3 (except Policy 1a).</p> <p>Amend Policy 1a to read “Subdivision, use and development shall avoid, <u>remedy or mitigate</u> adverse effects on Outstanding Landscapes.....”</p>
<p>Section 32 – Landscape and Natural Character Overlay</p>			
<p>Rule 1 & 2</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>NZP&M generally supports the limitations.</p>	<p>Retain Rules 1 & 2</p>
<p>Rule 7</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>NZP&M opposes the <i>non-complying</i> status for underground mining. There is little justification for such status where underground mining, by its very nature, cannot impact on landscape values to an extent more than minor.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 7 to provide for underground mining as a <i>discretionary</i> activity.</p>
<p>Rule 8</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>NZP&M opposes the <i>prohibited</i> status for mineral processing, quarrying, surface mining and waste rock/tailings storage.</p> <p>The effect of the broad overlay is to prevent any prospect of these activities occurring in about 75% of the District (in all but a small areas of land outside of the overlay areas, these activities are also prohibited). The proposed <i>prohibited</i> activity classifications are inconsistent</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8 to provide for mineral processing, quarrying, surface mining and waste rock/tailings storage as <i>non-complying</i> activities.</p>

		with the manner in which the draft deals with activities for other industries.	
Rule 13	Support	NZP&M supports the discretionary status for surface mining and underground mining.	Retain Rule 13
Rule 14	Oppose	NZP&M opposes the prohibited status for waste rock / tailings storage and mineral processing.	Amend Rule 14 to provide for mineral processing and waste rock/tailings storage as <i>non-complying</i> activities.
Rule 17	Oppose in part	NZP&M opposes the <i>non-complying</i> status for underground mining. There is little justification for such status where underground mining, by its very nature, cannot impact on natural character to an extent more than minor.	Amend Rule 17 to provide for underground mining as <i>discretionary</i> .
Rule 18	Oppose	NZP&M opposes the prohibited status for waste rock / tailings storage and mineral processing.	Amend Rule 18 to provide for mineral processing and waste rock/tailings storage as <i>non-complying</i> activities.