

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)	JOHN DRUMMOND for	
or Organisation (if relevant)	TAIRUA ENVIRONMENT SOCIETY	
Email Address	jakk@xtra.co.nz	
Postal Address	15 MOTUHOA ROAD	
	TAIRUA	
Phone no. <small>include area code</small>	07 8648397	Mobile no.

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 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:

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
- 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

TAIRUA ENVIRONMENT SOCIETY

10 March 2014

Submission on Proposed TCDC District Plan

Tairua Environment Society (TES) is a local environmental group working on issues that affect the environment. These issues include: Forestry, Mining, Harbour, Wastewater Treatment and Disposal, Subdivisions, District and Regional Plans, Planting Programmes, Stoat and Possum Control, etc. We have been active since 1987 and have approximately 100 members.

Issues:

Maps

Generally we do support the zonings and overlays as shown in the maps in our immediate area except where our submission identifies otherwise.

The Marina Services Zone shown at the base of Paku should be removed as the MSZ Zone does not follow the Structure Plan that was granted for this area. The Structure Plan is an important document which specifies rules for buildings and activities which can be carried out in this particular area. The Structure Plan and its underlying zone should be retained.

The Gateway Zone shown in the Tairua Main St should be removed and replaced with Commercial Zone. This area is not suitable for the Gateway Zone activities.

We do support the extent of the Extra Density Residential Zone for Tairua and do not support any additional areas. The existing EDRZ is sufficient for future development.

We do not support the change from Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone for all that area south of the existing Industrial Zone at Red Bridge Road. Red Bridge Road is the natural southern extent of Residential development in Tairua. There is sufficient Low Density Residential Zoning to the north which is not yet built on. Also we do need to confirm that Red Bridge Road is the southern boundary for residential development for Tairua.

We do not support any Coastal Living Zones.

Coastal Living Zone

We do not support the joining of the Coastal Residential Policy Area and the Coastal Village Policy Area into the new Coastal Living Zone.

Paku (CVPA) and Pumpkin Hill (CRPA) are very different and require very different rules e.g. 600m² as the minimum lot size is suitable for Paku, but 1000m² is far too small for Pumpkin Hill.

We are also concerned there may be a number of other unknown issues that will arise out of this joining. We were all surprised by the sudden allowance for subdivision down to 800m² at Te Karo bay after the last District Plan process, and the huge cost to the Council, the community and the environment.

Coastal Environment

We support an overlay method for the Coastal environment (CE). However, the objectives and policies for the CE are very weak and need strengthening.

The Plan needs to recognise the significance of the CE for the Coromandel Peninsula and the Nation. We need rules that give effect to NZCPS and RMA and protect the CE.

Coastal Environment / Rural Zone

We are concerned that the zoning away from the existing Coastal Zone to Rural Zone will have a detrimental effect on the new CE Zone.

Activities are far more permissive in the Rural Zone e.g. Earthworks, subdivision, etc.

Where a lot has both Rural and CE Zoning we suggest the whole lot takes the most demanding Zone rules.

Structure Plans

We do not support the removal of Structure Plans from the District Plan. Structure plans have been granted for specific locations, often as a result of Council hearings or Court Decisions. To strike these out and rely on the general zoning rules will remove local decision making and long term planning from this plan. We ask that all Structure Plans are retained in this Plan.

In particular we do not support the removal of the following Structure Plans:

Tairua Marina

Reichmuth – Pumpkin Hill

Hot Water Beach

Mining

We do not support any mining activities on the Coromandel Peninsula. The environment is too special, the risks too high and the returns too poor to allow mining.

Section 14. We do not support the Objectives and Policies for mining. They are weak and require strengthening.

Section 37. Delete 37.3.

Section 37. Table 1 37.4. Prohibit all mining activities in all zones.

OL/NC/Amenity Overlays

We support the overlay method to describe these values.

Much work has been done to accurately describe and locate Outstanding Landscapes, High Natural Character and Amenity Landscapes on the Coromandel. These values are important to us all and they are required to be protected. They are matters of National Importance identified in the RMA. Effective objectives, policies and rules are required to protect them. Unfortunately, the proposed District Plan does not give sufficient protection to these values. We do not support the objectives, policies or rules generally and ask for them to be rewritten in a way that does protect these values and places.

Biodiversity

Biodiversity is an important value on the Coromandel. It is recognized through an overlay to the plan. The RMA also recognizes its importance. Generally we do not support the Objectives, Policies or Rules in Sections 6 and 29 and ask for them to be rewritten in a way that does protect biodiversity.

Comprehensive Residential Development

We do not support CRD without public notification.

Settlement Development and Growth

There is no reference to the Blueprint process which recognized that Thames, Whangamata and Whitianga would be the areas targeted for growth. There are no rules which would allow this to happen, and no rules which would limit growth outside these three towns. We ask that Objectives, Policies and Rules are written that would reflect the Blueprint, encourage growth in the big 3 towns, and contain growth in other towns and areas.

Policy 10 – Tairua Character. This is a very watered down version of what is in the existing plan. We do not support Policy 10 as it stands but would support an enlarged version of it for Tairua as well as the addition of Paku, Te Karo Bay and Pumpkin Hill Character areas.

Notification, Limited Notification

Much of the Plan allows for more permissive activities. While this often makes the paperwork less it can also lead to adverse effects on the environment. Notification and Limited Notification is an important part of the process where the community can have a say in what happens and how. We support Notification and Limited Notification for consents unless there are no adverse effects.

Subdivision Use and Development

Subdivision is allowed for in all zones in the District. We do not support this. We do support subdivision being Prohibited in ONL, NC, AL and CE Overlays.

2 Houses per Lot. There are new rules around 2 houses per lot and the subdivision of them that is much more permissive. We do not support the proposed rules.

Significant Trees

We support trees being identified for protection. That there are only 21 trees worthy of protection in Tairua, 20 of which are on Reserves, tells us that our method of identification is faulty. We support a better system being implemented or the existing system being upgraded to include more of these important trees.

Retaining walls

We support retaining Walls > 1.5m being a permitted use. However the proposed 2.5m high retaining walls is too high. Note that all walls > 1.0m require a barrier to give safety from falling. Therefore a 2.5 m high wall plus 1.0m railing is 3.5m high. We suggest retaining walls up to 2.0m be a permitted use. Also any Restricted Discretionary consent needs to consider adverse effects of the activity as part of the discretion.

Minor Units

We do not support Minor units as a Permitted Activity. This is infill housing. Our wastewater, water and stormwater resources will also suffer as a result.

In Summary

We believe that much work is required to be done to turn this Plan into one which will provide appropriate development for our towns and protect the special character of the Coromandel.

We suggest that public workshops for various topics with staff may help to enable all of us to understand the issues, the methods used, and see a way through to the next stages. Objectives, Policies and Rules are all in need of more input. This may reduce the amount of litigation that will probably result.

We make this submission as our first step in this important process.

**IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act
1991**

AND

**IN THE MATTER of submissions under
Clause 6 of
Schedule 1 of the Act**

**THAMES-COROMANDEL
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

14 MAR 2014

RECEIVED BY: Tui
8:35am

SUBMISSION OF KAIMARAMA TRUST LTD
ON THE PROPOSED THAMES COROMANDEL DISTRICT PLAN

Lawrence Cross Chapman & Co Ltd
Environmental Planners

Graeme Lawrence

Director

PO Box 533 Thames/ Tel 64 7 868 3315/ graeme@lcc-planning.co.nz

1. BACKGROUND

The Kaimarama Trust Ltd land ("the land") has been subject of consents and designations that provided for the Mercury Cemetery, boundary adjustment to rationalise land holdings and vesting of tidal margins in the Crown. As a result the land is held in 4 titles: one to transfer the cemetery land to Council; a second for sale as a lifestyle lot and the other two form the farm, farm forestry and farm conservation areas.

The land is elevated, well drained, free from flood hazards and coastal erosion. It is located close to Whitianga – one of the District's 3 major centres – with outlooks to the town and harbour.

In the proposed district plan the land is shown on the Planning Map 17 Overlays and Map 17 Zones. The zone is Rural.

The Overlays shown are:

- Public Work Designation for Whitianga Cemetery
- Coastal Environment
- Amenity Landscape
- Natural Character

The objectives and policies of the Proposed District plan seek protection and enhancement of the natural attributes of land within the overlays which will not be able to be achieved through usual rural productive activities alone.

The land has the attributes that will provide for genuine countryside living where productive land uses and rural character can be retained while active conservation measures are put in place for the natural character areas identified within the land to achieve the Plan's objectives.

SUBMISSIONS

- 1.0 Oppose the zoning of the Kaimarama Trust Ltd land as Rural Zone on Planning Maps 17 and seek the rezoning of the land to Rural Lifestyle Zone

Reason: The land contains the attributes to provide a quality rural countryside living experience.

Natural character areas can be ground truthed as part of the subdivision and protective covenants put in place for on going conservation by future owners.

The qualities of the coastal environment can be enhanced by replacing production forest as it is harvested with houses sites within pasture or re vegetation with indigenous species.

Cultural sites can be set aside as protected open space. Rural character will be preserved at the 2ha minimum net lot size density for the zone.

Decision Sought

Zone the land legally described as Lots 1 and 2 DP 351298 and Lot 1 DP 458622 as Rural Lifestyle Zone

- 2.0 Oppose the Discretionary activity status for subdivision in the Rural Area and seek an amendment to Restricted Discretionary Activity status where the standards for the zone are met.

Reason

Full discretionary activity status is not necessary as the discretions required to ensure appropriate environmental outcomes have been applied and tested and are already well understood.

Decision Sought

Add "Rural Lifestyle Zone" to Rule 7 subdivision creating one or more additional lots under 1 in 38.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities

- 3.0 Amend provisions for conservation or environmental benefit lots as they are formulated in the Proposed District Plan; provide for conservation lots in Rural Zone in accordance with the provisions as they currently apply under the Section 752 of the Operative District plan for Rural and Coastal Zones outside All Policy Areas

Reason

The conservation subdivision provisions in the operative plan have contributed to substantially to the protection of threatened animal and plant species and habitats, enhancement of biodiversity, active stewardship of land retired from productive use, management of plant and animal pests to assist the regeneration of native forests; and protection of under-represented ecosystems.

It is appropriate that where areas of natural character, outstanding landscapes or amenity landscape, heritage or cultural sites are placed under protective covenant and actively conserved, additional lots can be created.

Decision Sought

Provide for conservation lots in Rural Zone applying the same or similar provisions as those set out in Section 752 of the Operative District plan.

Amend Section 24.1 Policy 1c to read as follows:

“Subdivision in the Rural Zone shall be provided for where areas within the natural character, outstanding or amenity landscape overlays are restored or enhanced with pest management in place and legally protected.”

- 4.0 Support Policy 7b in Section 24 .3 under Objective 7 with amendment

Reason

Rural Lifestyle subdivision and development in the coastal environment provides an opportunity to enhance the rural character of the coastal environment as well as actively protect the qualities found in the natural character and landscape overlays.

Decision Sought

Amend Policy 7b to provide for subdivision so that it reads:

“Subdivision and development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone in the Coastal Environment shall provide opportunity for rural living while retaining a sense of open space and the character of the Rural Area.”

5.0 Consequential amendments or other relief

Decision Sought

Any other consequential amendments or relief required to give effect to the submitters concerns.

6.0 In the Alternative a Site Development Plan

Reasons as set out in the Kaimarama Trust Ltd written submission dated 25 January 2012 to the Council on the Draft Plan Provisions.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.
If others make a similar submission we will consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.

We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Lawrence Cross Chapman & Co Ltd



Graeme Lawrence
Director

On behalf of Kaimarama Trust Ltd

Dated 13 March 2014

Proposed Thames-Coromandel District Plan



Submission Form

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

THAMES-COROMANDEL
DISTRICT COUNCIL

14 MAR 2014

RECEIVED BY: *JMI.*
11:13am

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) Mr LEE SVEISTRUP

or Organisation (if relevant) _____

Email Address _____

Postal Address 213 MACKAY ST THAMES

Phone no. 07 8686931
include area code

Mobile no. _____

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)

44.4 PERMITTED ACTIVITIES
 RULE 1.1 VISITOR ACCOMMODATION IS A
 PERMITTED ACTIVITY

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:

UNDER REGULATED

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 D.P. Stewart Date 13-3-2014

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

Trade Competition

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

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

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

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that –

- a) adversely affects the environment; and 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 on Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

The Chief Executive
Thames Coromandel District Plan
Private Bag
Thames 3540

Attention – Manager Planning

Email: customer.services@tcdc.govt.nz

Submission on: Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

Name: Chris McCartney, Andrea McCartney and McCartney Motel Limited

Address: C/- Stuart Ryan
P.O. Box 1296
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140

Phone (09) 357-0599

E-mail: stuart@stuartryan.co.nz

The Specific Provisions Which This Submission Relates To Are:

1. All provisions (including without limitation issues, objectives, policies, overlays, rules, methods, assessment criteria, definitions and mapping) regulating or relating to:
 - a. flood hazard mapping;
 - b. coastal hazard mapping;
 - c. The properties 1013, 1015 and 1017 Tararu Road;
 - d. Natural hazards;
 - e. River flooding;
 - f. Coastal erosion;
 - g. Flood defences overlay;
 - h. Beach front yard overlay;
 - i. Designation WRC1;
 - j. Including in particular (without limitation):
 - i. Section 3 – Definitions
 - ii. Section 10 – Natural hazards
 - iii. Section 34 – Natural hazards

Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

iv. Maps 31A – Tararu.

Reasons for Submissions:

2. The submitter opposes the provisions to which this submission relates (“the provisions”) in their entirety.
3. The provisions:
 - a. Are contrary to Part II and other provisions of the Act;
 - b. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - c. Will not enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing;
 - d. Are otherwise contrary to the purposes and provisions of the Act and other relevant planning documents;
 - e. Are inappropriate and inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Act.
4. Without limiting the generality of the above, the provisions:
 - a. Adopt an inappropriate approach to the management of risk that does not reflect the environment as it exists;
 - b. Do not have sufficient regard to the benefits of flood defences;
 - c. Fail to consider likely failure modes of flood defences and associated overland flow paths;
 - d. Fail to properly provide for ‘hard’ defence structures;
 - e. Fail to properly consider the costs and benefits of proposed natural hazard provisions. It is denied that council has carried out an adequate section 32 assessment of the proposed provisions;
 - f. Fail to implement the settlement agreement between C and A McCartney, McCartney Motel Limited, Tararu Flood Protection Committee (appellants) Thames-Coromandel District Council (respondent) and Waikato Regional Council (section 274 party) in respect of Plan Changes 3 Natural Hazards: Flooding;
 - g. Do not reflect acceptance of risk;
 - h. Do not adopt a reasonable approach to rules for building setbacks from defences or building platforms and related development controls which recognize the existing and future built environment;
 - i. Fails to specify a Current Coastal Erosion Line for all coastal property;
 - j. Does not recognize lawfully constructed reclamations and existing use rights;
 - k. Do not provide for reasonable use of defended land;

Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

- I. Lack a proper evidential basis.

Relief

5. Delete the provisions.
6. Re-write the provisions to reflect the reasons for the submissions.
7. Delete reference to residual risk in the defended area. Any residual risk is addressed by civil defense measures.
8. Re-run flood hazard simulations and re-draft the flood hazard mapping for Tararu to address:
 - a. the environment as it exists;
 - b. likely failure modes; and
 - c. overland flow paths.
9. Re-draft the flood hazard provisions to reflect community risk acceptance.
10. Uphold rule 34.10 Assessment Standards, Matters and Criteria, Table 1, Standard 9,

“This setback does not apply if an easement, or other legal instrument, for the purposes of access to or maintenance of the flood defence has been registered on the title and the proposed buildings or building additions do not encroach over or impede that easement or legal instrument.”
11. Fully implement the settlement agreement between C and A McCartney, McCartney Motel Limited, Tararu Flood Protection Committee (appellants) Thames-Coromandel District Council (respondent) and Waikato Regional Council (section 274 party) in respect of Plan Changes 3 Natural Hazards: Flooding;
12. Specify a Current Coastal Erosion Line for all coastal property or where there is no coastal erosion, due to hard or soft defences, record this in mapping.
13. Expressly recognize existing reclamations.
14. Provide for reasonable development of properties in defended areas.
15. Make any consequential amendments to give effect to this submission, including such amendments as required to the rules, objectives, policies, assessment criteria, reasons provisions, definitions, other matters, maps and any schedules/appendices of the proposed plan to give effect to this submission or any part of it.

Request to Be Heard

16. The submitter **does** wish to be heard in support of these submissions.
17. If others are making a similar submission, the submitter would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District Plan

Dated: 14 March 2014

Chris McCartney, Andrea McCartney and McCartney Motel Limited by their counsel:



..... S J Ryan

Address for Service:

C/- Stuart Ryan
P.O. Box 1296
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140

Phone (09) 357-0599

E-mail: stuart@stuartryan.co.nz

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) Brian Sharp & Sue Edens

or Organisation (if relevant) _____

Email Address brian@sharpparchitecture.co.nz

Postal Address 56 Lund Road, RD2, Katikati 3178

Phone no. include area code 07-549 3443

Mobile no. 0275 632126

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)

18 separate submission - numbered ~~ref~~ ref 1 to 18
Attached

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:

Attached

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

Retained Deleted Amended as follows:

Altered as recommended.

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 pp Saeth 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



Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens

ref 1

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 9 – Landscape and Natural Character.

Reason – Landscapes are dynamic and forever evolving. Natural landscapes can absorb some development but care is required. The areas identified as amenity landscapes are generally rural. Rural land use is a business and like any business must always evolve to changing business needs. Section 7© of the RMA is only one of many sections in the RMA and has many meanings. The economic and social well-being is also a consideration and any restrictions on rural land simply for amenity cannot be justified when there is no proof that an alternative may not be as good in some eyes.

This section appears to be a generalised planners perspective using wording borrowed from other territories. For example where are there lakes in this district.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove Amenity landscape classification from district plan.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP SA Edens 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens

ref 2

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 9.3 – Landscape and Natural Character – objectives and policies.

Reason – Does not relate to objective.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove 9.3 policy 1a j) and 2a e)

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP Saedus 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Sue Edens and Brian Sharp

ref 2

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 9.3 – Landscape and Natural Character – objectives and policies.

Reason – Does not relate to objective.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove 9.3 policy 1a j) and 2a e)

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Sa Edens 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 3

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 9.3 – Landscape and Natural Character – objectives and policies 4b.

Reason – The Proposed District plan does not include any mechanism to offset significant improvements to the areas related to this objective.

Decision I seek from Council

Add policy to state

To allow for a higher level of subdivision where areas of land will be set aside to provide restoration or enhancement of the natural character in accordance with policy 4b a to l)

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Sharp 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 4

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 15.3

Reason

Many of these policies are written based on the fact that council is a service provider and is confusing its role as a regulator.

It is generally not feasible to consolidate or redevelop existing towns.

Policy 1g relies on the traditional concept of industries and there are no commercial ports in this district.

Policy 2a Business and economic growth can also be a result of residential development.

Policy 2b ignores tourism as an industry and that it needs to be located in these zones.

Policy 2c is against all principals of not using the RMA to restrict competition.

Policy 2e limits any development in Thames and Thames contradicts this policy.

Policy 3a does not recognise that any development will change the scale, character or density of a settlement. Where would we be if this policy had been adopted 50 years ago.

Policy 3b The identified Coastal Environment is quite a limited area and generally is not the best place for intensive development.

Policy 10

These policies are inconsistent in that some towns are permitted to develop where others are only permitted to develop if they do not impact the roading network. It should be

councils job to identify which roads may be effected by growth and apply appropriate development impact fees to cover such growth possibilities.

Missing objective and policy.

The district is attractive as a place to live but due to high value of land due to a natural shortage of coastal land to develop the supply does not meet demand. Such a shortage is in part due to restrictive planning rule and economics of subdivision and uniform section requirements. Limited zoned land for development and the practice of land banking the zoned land all add to a reducing amount of affordable houses within the district.

Decision I seek from Council

Modify Objective to add “ or provide required infrastructure.

Remove policy 1a.

1b Add “or provide for it.”

1e needs to be re-worded to allow for connection to services and roads that do not require public investment to upgrade. A note should also be added that this does not include upgrades that are already proposed and are not as a result of the proposed development.

1g Remove

2a add residential after industrial.

2b should be re written to say that industry, commercial and tourism infrastructure should not be limited to any particular zone unless it will cause environmental issues within that zone.

2c be re written to say – That sufficient land shall be zoned to allow for the expansion of commercial activities in all the main settlements to avoid the costs and delays associated with new businesses adopting new business models from establishing in competition with existing commercial activity.

2e Should be re written to state that Council will not accept any claims for compensation or enter any discussions associated with reverse sensitivity in relation to any activity carried out on land appropriately zoned for the activity particularly in relation to new residential activities close to industrial, commercial and rural land.

3a Remove

3b Remove reference to coastal environment and replace with "within the district in appropriate locations.

Policy 10

Re write to say that where there is a lack of infrastructure then council will programme upgrades where growth is expected and through its financial contributions policy establish development impact fee catchment areas.

Also with many of these coastal towns many houses are being built with very large garages to accommodate boats which would be better stored in combined facilities in locations close to the launching sites to avoid the requirement for parking and congestion on the roading network. This could have the effect of reducing the demand for large suburban type development in these coastal villages.

A new policy introduced to encourage a verity of densities through the provision of a larger variation in section sizes in all subdivisions.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP Saedis 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 5

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 16 – Subdivision.

Reason – this section of the district plan should not be separate from the zones. Subdivision is the division of land into smaller lots to allow for more intensive activities to take place. The same issues do not arise in different locations and to have district wide policies that apply to subdivision for different purposes is not realistic.

You cannot keep the same and allow change so this background statement is derogatory to intensification and is opposed to the growth strategy encouraging intensification.

The comment about council investing in new utilities is confusing council's dual role. It should not be the purpose of the district plan to force people to use facilities that have been provided at excessive costs simply to assist in paying for them.

Decision I seek from Council

To move the policy issues relating to subdivision to the relative zones that they apply to.

Remove reference to utilising capacity in existing infrastructure as an issue for the district plan.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 6

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 16 – Subdivision

Reason – This section is not balanced and ignores the economic well-being of the rural community. This is typical of a generalised view of rural productive land as thought of by city based planning. The rural economy is always developing and changing and the instigation of standard uniform rules to this zone will on the Coromandel lead to the reduction of economic rural properties and the loss of both production and permanent population. Many of the rural properties scattered around the Coromandel do not contain enough good quality land to remain viable using traditional farming grass based practices. The land parcels required by the district plan are too large to diversify into more intensive use as it is both unproven in many localities and the costs of carrying the land are too great to attract appropriate investors to trial alternative uses.

Decision I seek from Council

To add the above statement as an issue.

16.2.6 needs re wording as council is not the only organisation that can manage sewage systems and the existing words imply that there will be a problem with any other operators.

16.3 1d Reword to maintain a low density character and amenity of a rural zone. Otherwise there is an implication of no change.

16.3 1e replace with a statement – Rural land that is on good quality soils shall not be subdivided to be below economic scale unless the area of good quality soils in both the subject site and those adjoining are not sufficient to achieve a potential 100Ha of contiguous farming land. Below this threshold it is expected that this land will be utilised for horticultural activity not requiring large land holdings.

16.3 1g can-not be achieved as it implies no change. Reword to say that development shall allow for a variety of section sizes but retain a roading pattern compatible with the existing character of the town.

Objective 3 policy 3a.

The purpose of providing reserves is for the inhabitants of a subdivision. It is not for any shortfall. Any proposed subdivision should either provide reserves or contribute to the provision of reserves. It should not be required to make up any shortfall unless the Council intends to provide compensation for the surplus provided.

Change to – Council reserves the right to co-ordinate the supply of reserves to achieve a balanced supply and network. Those wishing to carry out a subdivision should establish with council if any reserves should be included in a subdivision and the extent and position of such reserves if needed. Council operates a financial contributions policy for the supply of reserves. Compensation will be paid for reserves provided in excess of the need generated by the subdivision if reserves are required by Council.

Objective 7

This cannot be achieved if the existing is already pure water. Change and to or.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Saehs 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 7

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 20 – Commercial Areas

Reason – The Proposed District plan places too much priority on preserving the existing retail activity and therefore unduly restricts the introduction of bulk retail into the area. This has the effect of reducing competition and encouraging local people to either travel out of the area or use the more risky method of internet purchases to achieve the prices for goods that are common in the larger centre. This has the flow on effect of reducing towns such as Thames as a retail destination for the surrounding areas. The vitality of the existing shopping area will reduce if it cannot remain competitive. The competition will come from outside the area if it is not allowed to happen within the area. The existing retail areas may see some changes in a reduction of rental value for a transition period but will then adapt to a more pleasant pedestrian environment with lower traffic counts. Some of the outer extents may adapt to allow for accommodation but the town centres will still be there.

Decision I seek from Council

Change issue 20.2 – 1. To balance the item by saying that Traditional retail activity is being reduced in viability and that the district plan needs to allow for that change or risk everyone missing out on the ability to purchase a wide variety of goods in the district. It is not the purpose of the district plan to reduce competition and so areas of land are to be zoned to allow bulk retail in the three main centres.

Remove objective 3 policy 3b as all main commercial areas are very close to final discharge and the costs of such a policy are not justified.

Re write objective 5 policy 5a to allow for bulk retail in the three main centres by appropriate zoning. The idea that the existing retail areas are large enough to allow for bulk retail outlets as well as the required parking would destroy the pedestrian nature of the existing centres.

Re zone most of Totara straight as a gateway zone with a requirement of limited entrances off the road – possibly include in the structure plan some roundabouts to control the intersections.

Whitianga has a gateway zone for this purpose

Whangamata could have some more area zoned around the supermarket.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP Saehs 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 8

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 21– Industrial Area

Reason – Industry can have many forms and scale and it is not possible to predict the environmental effects of modern industries. With the advent of metal 3D printing it would be possible to manufacture racing motorcycles in a garage in a residential zone without the neighbours even knowing. I constructed an aircraft in my garage where only those who had been into my house knew what I did in the evenings and weekends. It is a legacy of heavy industries that form a predetermined concept of what industry is.

Decision I seek from Council

Add issue to 21.2 to cover the above statement.

New policy under objective 2

Where industries are of a scale and do not create effects that do not reduce the amenity in the zone that they are carried out the district plan should not form an obstacle to their establishment.

New policy under objective 4

The industrial area may not provide the level of amenity for other activities and Council will not place restrictions on industries beyond the rules of the plan to benefit non-industrial occupiers of industrial zones.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

Brian Sharp.

pp SaEds 14/3/14

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brain Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 9

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 23 – Residential area

Reason – The Proposed District plan does not promote a variety of residential alternatives and affordable housing with undue restrictions on section sizes, no zones without arbitrary daylight angles and restrictive amounts of zoning for residential activity. There has been no consideration of different possibilities particularly with green-fields subdivision. The use of simply blunt tools in the district plan means that we have very suburban development in all of our towns and villages with a proliferation of houses derived from American city fringes of twenty years ago. They are not energy efficient, do not provide for a quality living environment and are creating a boring vehicle based suburban environment of uniform character. The introduction of fencing restrictions will only increase this effect.

Decision I seek from Council

Add policy to state that with green-fields development the general rules for the residential zones in regard to daylight angles, density and yards do not apply. Each new area will require the developer to provide for a variety of housing types and scales. It is only the margins of development that is required to integrate with the existing housing scale and densities.

Policy 1g is not correct in that there is no particular house type in these settlements and most of the small batches are being replaced with substantial suburban houses.

Objective 2 be removed as it says “more of what is there” which will not provide for the growth that can be expected or any innovation and only encourages the loss of our valuable land to suburbia.

Policy 2b remove the word “non” as they would not occur in a residential zone.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP Saeh 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian sharp and Sue Edens – ref 10

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 24 – Rural Area.

Reason – The Proposed District plan does not allow for the changing environment and evolution of farming. The principal of not allowing the loss of the productive capacity is an over simplification and cannot be applied to this area as an excuse to not allowing for diversification by policies and rules that can only be seen as a tool to prevent subdivision. Over the last 25 years of this philosophy we have seen a reduction of farming activity and profitability in this district. The result of on-going use of restrictive planning will result in the eventual total loss of farming north of Thames and Whangamata. Traditional farming has evolved from my Grandfathers farm Milking 40 cows less than a hundred years ago to now where farms of 500 plus cows are the norm. There are not many areas of the Coromandel that provide sufficient farmland to allow for this economic scale of farming. Those that are have a land value that deters owners from taking the risks of purchasing sufficient property to allow for it. Most of this section is founded on the premise that the rural character and production will be lost if the land is divided up into smaller blocks. A dairy farm will produce a gross income of up to \$10,000 a Ha. (Record high) Kiwi fruit is producing gross incomes of four times this for green and upwards of eighth times this for the gold varieties. These returns have been consistent for many years. The issue with horticultural activities such as Kiwifruit is that it is more capital intensive and requires about \$250,000 a Ha to establish from scratch. They have a huge benefit in that they are also labour intensive.

With the district plan minimum average block size of 20Ha to be converted to kiwifruit the capital outlay after land purchase would be in the order of 2.5 to 3.75 million. I would suggest that this would put most investors off and they would look elsewhere to invest.

Smaller blocks offer a more manageable proposition.

Sheep and beef returns have relatively dropped and much of the land traditionally used for this activity is marginal. Much of this land is near the coast and has increased in value even though production is dropping. Eventually it will be retired and lost from productive value.

This has more of a long term economic impact on the District than the loss of production that may or may not happen with the sub division of the more productive land. Also the parcels of productive land that are not of sufficient area to sustain traditional farming have not been addressed within the district plan.

Decision I seek from Council

Add to the background section to cover the above issues.

Issues 24.2a

Add that it may increase the diversity and profitability of land uses.

Issues 24.2b

Replace deteriorate to " Change the" as it is only a personal judgement that one rural environment has more amenity value than another. I Brian Sharp live in an area of horticultural production and have previously owned and lived on several rural farming properties as well as Life style blocks. The amenity that my existing property offers is higher than the earlier properties.

Issues 24.2c

Again a negative statement in that subdivision can provide an opportunity to improve the Districts natural and amenity values and does not change the history. Delete clause.

Add as another issue

The continued increase in land values as well as the isolated pockets of viable farmland in the district require a change to farm scale and intensity to remain economically viable on the Coromandel. Subdivision of rural land can introduce capital required to change farming systems.

And

The gradual loss of farming activity leads to a reduction of rural population and services further making farming less viable. Carefully planned subdivision can introduce more people and capital into these areas and reverse this trend.

Issues 24.3

Remove as there is no evidence that this has happened.

Issue 24.4

Add issue

This land tends to have the highest value and is under the most pressure to develop. If allowed to be subdivided with incentives of requiring large areas allowed to regenerate this would allow for a more natural backdrop to the coast. It would also increase the biodiversity and provide an ecological area for treatment of run off. By providing a low number of houses in this zone it would provide a population to care for the environment and provide an effective barrier to suburban sprawl along the coast line.

Policy 1f

Is this a joke if not it need to have a preface added to limit its consideration to in the catchment of Whangamata harbour.

Policy 2b

After high class soils add where there is an aggregate area of at least 200Ha.

Objective 4

Change "the" to "a" as any change will change the character and amenity but such change is not automatically a negative and is required to be able to adapt to changes in both farming techniques, economies and adaptation due to climate, demand and experience.

Policy 4a

As stated above the rural environment is not static. It needs to have added to it – unless there is capacity for the increase or appropriate improvements are proposed.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Saels 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 11

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 29 – Biodiversity.

Reason – The Regional policy Statement is not an operative policy statement and only applies to District council as it is not a regional plan. What may be a significant natural area on the outskirts of Hamilton city adjoined by almost endless farming land would not be significant when compared to the DOC estate in the Coromandel. Significant has to be significant and when almost half the district is covered in indigenous vegetation there has to be something that makes an individual stand: stand out.

There is no evidence that there is any reduction in indigenous vegetation in this area and most of us have witnessed a significant increase over our life times and it does not take much research to find that there has been an increase over a much longer period.

We should be patting our-selves on the back and looking for ways of improving the environment particularly along the coast where there is still a lack of coastal forest.

Decision I seek from Council

Revise Background to better reflect the reality. Remove reference to Regional Policy Statement.

Rule in this section relate to removal of indigenous vegetation and not to anything significant. The RMA only requires protection of significant vegetation. The rules go well beyond this and as there is no pressure to destroy large areas of native bush why are there such stringent rules.

Request re writing the rule to better reflect the reality that most of the indigenous vegetation within the district is not under threat and a no net loss policy is all that is

required. There would be significant gains if the rules relating to subdivision were better thought out.

Remove Rule 2.1b as this is simply an attempt to circumvent the law relating to not allowing a blanket protection of trees in urban areas. The existing rule will effectively catch all properties in the coastal living zones.

Allow for a higher level of subdivision where areas of marginal land will be set aside to provide restoration or enhancement of indigenous vegetation in the coastal environment.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP Saehs 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 12

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 38 – Subdivision.

Reason – The Proposed District plan has moved many subdivisions from controlled to restricted discretion. It has effectively removed the ability to create conservation blocks in all but a few areas and then imposed excessive size requirements that will only lead to an increase in costs and risks of carrying out subdivision in the rural areas.

The coastal living zone has an increase in minimum size which is a waste of a limited resource considering that most of these properties are holiday properties and do not require the same level of amenity as fully occupied properties. In effect it is a huge waste of land. I support the larger size where a reticulated sewer system is not available but the minimum lot size would be logically at twice the density when sewage is available to allow for the subdivision of the larger lots.

Decision I seek from Council

Change the minimum lot size in the coastal living zone to 400m² with an average of 500m²

Re introduce the conservation rules from the existing district plan to apply in the coastal environment area where this land is protected. The new sites created need not necessarily be in this zone but the protected area should be. In the case of wetlands and other under represented features there should be some incentive to provide protection. Buffer zones to waterways could also be recognised through this rule. We think that the plan has moved to control by restriction rather than to achievement with incentives.

The introduction of no set lot sizes for subdivision in the residential zone where the land being subdivided is greater than 2Ha and a buffer of sections is provided at the boundary of any existing developed residential properties at greater than the minimum required in table

2

Remove 15b from table 2 as it has no basis in the policies and is difficult to interpret how it applies.

Add a requirement in table 2 item 14 to require this to be where over 200 ha of high quality soils are contiguous or is in an outstanding landscape overlay. Otherwise 5Ha minimum average

The map figure 1 does not provide a colour for all land that is not public land ,Urban Area, land not zoned rural. Map needs to be redrawn.

The requirement to preserve such large areas to gain an additional lot is not justified in the plan.

Only the areas identified in red need identifying , All rural land not identified could be allowed 1 additional block per 4 hectares preserved, restored or enhanced.

A rule would need to be added that conservation areas are not permitted where it is proposed to retire good quality soils.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

PA Saedus 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 13

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 41 – Coastal Living Zone.

Reason – The rules in this zone for two houses per lot in rule 21 refer to minimum exclusive areas in table 5 but this does not exist.

The introduction of fence restrictions may increase the amenity of pedestrians by allowing them to look into living areas or watch husbands hang out their wives nickers but does nothing to provide for the amenity of those who have paid to live in the property. Half of properties are either on the north side of the road or south so need high fence to provide privacy to either outdoor living areas or service areas. There are many areas in this world where high fences and walled gardens are the norm and the still provide a reasonable amenity to pedestrians. The introduction of this rule simply shows that community rights out way those of the land owner. This would be expected in countries that place more importance of governance than personal rights.

Decision I seek from Council

Introduce the minimum exclusive area to table 5

Remove fence height restriction from table 5

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP SaEds 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 14

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 42 – Commercial zone.

Reason – The rules in this zone in relation to fencing and light spill are inconsistent with the purpose of the zone. Many commercial properties operate after dark and by nature have goods stored outside. For security and protection fences may need to be both higher than 2m and light is required to illuminate both signage and under verandahs as well as in display windows. To unduly restrict this will make the centre of towns rather dim.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove fence restriction from table 3

Change the lux levels to 100 lux.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Sue Edens 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 15

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 44 – Extra Density Residential Zone.

Reason – The rules in this zone in relation to fencing and outdoor space are not realistic.

With an increase in density privacy and security become more critical. Also with any residential property there is a need to be able to orientate windows to the north and retain privacy. With a quarter of properties on the south side of the street not being able to provide the outdoor space on the northern side of a house will ensure they will be cold in winter and overheat in summer. To put people continuously on display does not allow for their well-being.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove restriction in rule 12.1b from outdoor space being in front yard.

Remove fence rules from table 5

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

pp Saeb 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 16

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 54 – Residential Zone.

Reason – The rules in this zone for two houses per lot in rule 19 refer to minimum exclusive areas in table 5 but this does not exist.

The introduction of fence restrictions may increase the amenity of pedestrians but allowing them to watch your TV through your front windows or while sitting out in the sun to have lunch does nothing to provide for the amenity of those who have paid to live in the property. Half of properties are either on the north side of the road or south so benefit from high fences to provide privacy to either outdoor living areas or service areas. There are many areas in this world which high fences and walled gardens are the norm and still provide a reasonable amenity to pedestrians. The introduction of this rule simply shows that community rights out way those of the land owner. This would be expected in countries that place more importance of governance than personal rights. Many existing properties do not meet this rule and there has been no public demand for their removal. Not being allowed the outdoor living area on the north side of a house when the house is on a small section is also not the best when trying to create energy efficient houses that provide good amenity for the owners.

Decision I seek from Council

Remove reference to where outdoor space shall be from rule 11-1b).

Introduce the minimum exclusive area to table 5

Remove fence height restriction from table 5

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BS SA Ehs 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 17

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 56 – Rural zone.

Reason – The rural zone covers a large portion of the privately owned land in the district. Much of it is the business possession of the owners and to maintain the land they need income in excess of expenditure derived from the land. The proposed district plan reduces the ability to gain income from visitors by reducing the farm-stay guest allowance from 12 to 6 and puts a restriction in place that they must be accommodated in either the house or the 50 square meter minor unit. By nature the farm dwellings are isolated and do not have close neighbours. The risks of having strangers stay within your house is much greater than in urban areas and the previous rules allowed for them all to be in what is now considered minor units. To retain limited buildings in this zone the site coverage could be reduced as a permitted activity but to place the same number of dwellings per property as residential sections is unreasonable.

Table nine does not exist as referenced in rule 12.

To avoid the creation of excessive buildings in this environment it is better to reduce the permitted site coverage and not limit the number of buildings for residential accommodation so as the 12 guests can be accommodated as in the operative district plan.

The list of materials and colours limit buildings to high maintenance claddings.

Decision I seek from Council

Reduce the site coverage in table 6 to 2% as permitted, 5% controlled and 10% Restricted discretionary with control and restricted discretionary be related to visual imposition of non-rural activity buildings, Screen landscaping and locality of buildings in relation to landscape and view from public places.

Change rule 3- 1a) to 12 tariff paying visitors and

b) The activity occurs in the Dwelling, minor units or accessory buildings.

Alter rule 12

Minor unit one per lot unless for visitor accommodation then up to six per lot.

Note at least one visitor accommodation unit must be accessible.

Minor Dwellings need not be attached to the dwelling.

Include natural stone and unpolished concrete in list of permitted materials in table 7.

Include natural coloured clay products in list.

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

BP SA Esb 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.

Proposed Thames Coromandel District plan

Submission

Submission by Brian Sharp and Sue Edens – ref 18

brian@sharparchitecture.co.nz

56 Lund Road RD2 Katikati 3178

07 5493443 or 027 5632126

Specific provision of Proposed District Plan we oppose

Section 57 – Rural Lifestyle zone.

Reason – The rural living zone

The use of materials is limited to non-durable because of the colour restriction and materials specified. Rule 18 states that two houses are restricted discretionary with a minimum exclusive area in table 6 but this does not exist.

Decision I seek from Council

Include natural stone and unpolished concrete and brick in list of permitted materials in table 7. Include natural coloured clay products in list.

Include minimum exclusive area in table 6

The submitter wishes to be heard on this submission.

The submitter will not gain in trade competition through this submission

This submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Signed

PP Sa eds 14/3/14

Brian Sharp.