

C

HEARINGS NOTES-GR AND GJ READY-PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN ORIGINAL SUBMISSION-1OCTOBER 2014

SUBJECT FOR HEARINGS	SBMSN PAGE NO/SUMM NO	ISSUE , POINTS AND REQUESTED OUTCOME
Part III S15-Settlement Development /Growth	3550/ 799.19  3551/ 799.20	<p>Part III 15.3-Policy 6a. Issue-Apart from words-“potentially erodible slopes, and high class soils,” this statement is similar to the statement in Policy 6b. <b>Original Outcome requested</b>-Amend Policy 6b accordingly and delete Policy 6a in the PDP We note the Staff Report comments at Point 112, R15.12 reason f) and Appendix 2 <u>and concur</u></p> <p><b>Policy 7b</b> Issue-The statement “Development should be ‘future proofed’ to allow retreat and/or relocation of structures and buildings where there is a potential future hazard risk.” <b>Reasons</b> Does this mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Portability is built into the design?</li><li>• Special construction occurs in the foundations/under floor area to permit this?</li><li>• There are sites identified on higher ground to move to? If so who pays for them?</li><li>• Is there a system of rails to permit movement?</li></ul> <p><b>Original Outcome requested</b>-Delete Policy 7b in the PDP or rewrite it so that it can be understood We note the Staff Report Point 124,R15.14 f) g) rejects our submission. We disagree with the comment “ that the policy specifically does not give examples of retreat and relocation to allow for individual circumstances and technology.” We consider that to ensure the intent of the policy is clearer, indicative rather than definitive examples can be given to ensure readers of the plan are clear on what is meant by this. <b>New Outcome requested</b>-Include some indicative examples to illustrate the policy. “Indicative” examples will still allow for individual circumstances and technology.</p>



<p><b>Objective 10</b>          “The unique characteristics of each settlement are recognised and guide settlement development and growth in the District.”  <b>Policy 10a Cooks Beach, Ferry Landing</b>          Cooks Beach and Ferry Landing should retain their existing rural and</p>	<p>3351/ 799.23</p>	<p>growth anywhere? If so that is setting up a dual consent process alongside council. If that is the case then uncertainty will be created for anyone wishing to settle and develop anything anywhere in the Coromandel which will affect an already fragile economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maori Cultural Sites or Sites of Significance to Maori (as defined in the RMA) need to be clearly identified in the Plan so that existing owners and prospective buyers have certainty. No-one in any community in a democracy should have the right to only declare such a site after a resource consent has been lodged. All owners should know these things before outlaying between \$1100-1500 for a resource consent. Such a policy creates uncertainty for everyone.</li> <li>• Coastal marine areas, natural environment and water bodies are everywhere. This policy again implies that Iwi authorities will have a say in just about every resource consent application that is lodged for those areas. Is that the intent? If so, the text needs to be clear so that everyone understands the implications ahead of time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Original Outcome requested</b>-Carefully re-word this policy 8b so that both Iwi authorities and other cultures throughout the community have certainty and so that expectations, that were not intended, are not drawn by all concerned.</p> <p>We note the Staff Report Point 132, R15.15 b) and the subsequent rejection of our submission. We would argue that for the reasons just outlined (bullet points above) greater clarity is required around the extent of “Iwi involvement .” What does it mean; what are its limits; what are its effects on the wider community? If that clarity is not there, then misinterpretation could occur leading to unreasonable expectations and misunderstandings throughout all our communities. The intent must be transparent.</p> <p><b>New Outcome requested</b>-Rewrite the policy as per our original requested outcome.</p> <p><b>Objective 10</b>  <b>Policies 10a to 10r</b>  <b>Issue</b>-The policies as written.  <b>Reasons</b>          The policies appear to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unreasonably restrict normal growth that can occur over time.</li> <li>• Seems to be based on the Coromandel Blueprint which “focussed” development on Thames, Whitianga and Whangamata. We understand that there may have been a</li> </ul>
---	-------------------------	---

<p>natural character backdrops and the low key, Beach village built form.  <u>Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.</u>  <b>Policy 10b Moehau Peninsula</b>  The Moehau Peninsula should retain its undeveloped, remote character.  <u>Development and growth shall not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.</u>  <b>Policy 10c Coromandel Town</b>  Commercial, industrial and marine service growth in Coromandel Town should be encouraged and residential growth with wastewater reticulation should be located between Whangapoua Road and Rings Road.  <b>Policy 10d Hahei</b>  Hahei should retain the existing rural and natural character backdrops and the low key, beach village built form. <u>Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.</u>  <b>Policy 10e Hikuai, Coroglen, Whenuakite</b></p>		<p>decision issued from the Environment Court regarding the WPRPS which allows Council the option of considering development outside those three hubs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policies appear to create uncertainty for folk wishing to purchase land and settle in these areas. Is Council going to institute a system of warning the public when settlement development/growth is reaching capacity? If so what will be the effect of this on the local economy?</li> <li>• How does one measure against the statement “Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure “which appears in policy statements of 11 separate areas in this Section of the PDP? What is the effect of this on the existing economy and any initiatives for economic growth in the future? Will guidelines on this be available to private and commercial buyers wishing to settle or establish a business in these areas so that they are aware of such thresholds before they commit funds to purchase and submit resource consent applications?</li> <li>• Such policies need to be balanced in accordance with the definition of environment in the RMA- a definition that includes people, culture, social and economic needs as well as natural and physical issues. This will ensure that existing and potential residential and commercial people have certainty regarding their future in such areas. Potentially stifling any growth in such a way, may cause residents/potential residents to leave or lose interest in coming here.</li> <li>• Our district economy needs certainty.</li> </ul> <p><b>Original Outcome requested</b>-We request please that these policy directives be objectively and independently validated with a view to amending the PDP accordingly.  We note the Staff Report-Point 149, R15.7 g) and the rejection of our submission.</p> <p>We disagree for the reasons outlined. We consider that there has to be a better balance in achieving environmental protection with measured ongoing growth. Our district economy needs this.</p> <p><b>New Outcome requested</b>-Our concerns outlined previously (above bullet points) be taken into account in a review of the text.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Commercial, industrial and commercial services should be provided for; however multilot Settlement scale subdivisions should not be established. <u>Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.</u></p> <p><b>Policy 10f Hikutaia, Matatoki, Puriri, Colville</b> A diversity of small scale community, commercial, industrial and residential activities should be encouraged.</p> <p><b>Policy 10g Hot Water Beach</b> Hot Water Beach should have no industrial, residential or commercial expansion except for home businesses, self-serviced lots of a rural character and small scale retail activities servicing beach visitors. <u>Development and growth shall not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.</u></p> <p><b>Policy 10h Kuaotunu</b> Kuaotunu should retain a mix of small scale community and commercial activities that add to the settlement's low key, beach village built form, but should avoid larger scale activities. <u>Development and</u></p>		
---	--	--

growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, storm water and roading network infrastructure.

**Policy 10i Manaia**

Development and growth that is good for the wider community shall be provided for (e.g. employment, education, self-sufficiency, environmental enhancement, health and safety, affordable housing).

**Policy 10j Matarangi**

Matarangi's growth should be consistent with Section 27.3 Matarangi Structure Plan, and any intensification of residential, community, commercial or industrial activities should be near the existing Commercial Area.

**Policy 10k Onemana**

Onemana should retain the existing rural and natural character backdrops and the lowkey, beachvillage built form. Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, stormwater and roading network infrastructure.

**Policy 10l Opito,**

Otama, Matapaua Bay  
Opito, Otama and Matapaua Bay should retain the existing rural and natural character backdrops and the

lowkey, beachvillage built form. Commercial and industrial activities shall not establish unless they are mobile or part of residential buildings.

Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, stormwater and roading network infrastructure.

**Policy 10m Opoutere and Ohui**

The natural character areas, key vistas, built form nestled among trees and unbroken skylines shall be retained and the settlement shall not be intensified. Development or growth shall not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, stormwater and roading network infrastructure.

**Policy 10n Pauanui**

Development and growth should maintain Pauanui's existing built character, particularly building height, lot site, site coverage, few impermeable surfaces, pedestrian connectivity and public open space.

**Policy 10o Tairua**

The scale and design of development and growth should retain the existing beachvillage built form, particularly by locating multidwelling

buildings away from the coast and retaining views of and access to the coast.

**Policy 10p Thames**

**Coast settlements**

Thames Coast settlements should retain their existing rural and natural character backdrops and their lowkey, small coastal village built form. Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, stormwater and roading network infrastructure.

**Policy 10q Thames**

**(Tararu to Kopu)**

Innovative higher density Mixed use development of residential, commercial, community and light industrial activities should be provided for. Greenfield development and growth should be consistent with Section 27.2 Kopu to Thames Structure Plan.

**Policy 10r Whangamata**

Concentrated development through intensification and consolidation should be directed to the Extra Density Residential Zone and Commercial and Industrial Area to retain the existing beachvillage built form in other zones.

**Policy 10s Whangapoua,**



<p><b>Te Rerenga</b>  Any development or growth should enhance natural character, particularly on headlands and along the Pungapunga River and should not stretch along the coastline. <u>Development and growth should not occur where it increases demand for additional water, wastewater, stormwater and roading network infrastructure.</u></p> <p><b>Policy 10t Whitianga</b>  Whitianga should retain the existing rural and natural character backdrops, and should not develop and grow south of the Mercury Bay Golf Club. Concentrated development through intensification and consolidation should be directed to the Whitianga Commercial Area and Waterfront Zone.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Part II S8 Historic Heritage</p>	<p>3548/799.10</p>	<p><b>8.3 Archaeological Sites; Maori Cultural Sites</b></p> <p><b>Issue 1-</b> We consider that the term “Maori Cultural Site” does not adequately reflect the intent of the RMA.</p> <p><b>Original Outcome requested-</b>That the term “Maori Cultural Sites” be replaced throughout the PDP with the term “Sites of Significance to Maori” as it is defined under Historic Heritage in the RMA.</p> <p>We note the Staff Report, Point 29, R8.2 i) that has rejected our submission point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point 29 in the Staff Report states “that the term 'Māori Cultural Sites' notes that the site has played a significant part in Māori culture.”</li> <li>• In Section 3 of the PDP Maori Cultural Site is described as meaning a “place that has significant cultural value to one or more iwi or hapu. This may include historical sites, wāhi tapu (sacred sites) and wāhi tupuna (ancestral sites). “</li> <li>• Historic Heritage in S2 RMA includes the term “sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu.”</li> <li>• Is the RMA term, enshrined in environmental legislation, the definitive term?</li> <li>• If both terms are relevant, which term is relevant to what circumstances when readers of the PDP are trying to ascertain meanings and potential effects?</li> </ul> <p><b>New Outcome requested-</b>That the circumstances when the new term “Maori Cultural Sites” applies and when the RMA term “Sites of significance to Maori” applies so that readers of the PDP have clarity regarding interpretation and application.</p>
	<p>3548/799.11</p>	<p><b>Issue 2.-</b> Further we consider that all such “sites” must be of such significance that they are clearly identifiable as such. Once identified, all such significant sites must be included in the PDP.</p>

		<p><b>Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The significance must be such that it can reasonably be understood and accepted to be such by all members of our communities.</li> <li>• All owners throughout all our communities must have transparency.</li> <li>• We fully understand that Iwi may not wish to publicise such sites on land that they own.</li> <li>• However, the record of these sites cannot be held anywhere outside the PDP (as the definitive regulatory document once it becomes a District Plan) where they affect other property owners.</li> <li>• Affected owners and intended owners cannot have such sites “hidden” from them .</li> <li>• Transparency is critical to avoiding misunderstandings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Original Outcome requested</b>-That the PDP be amended to reflect our concerns above.</p> <p>We note the Staff Report Point 36, R8.2 i) that our submission has been accepted in part. However when perusing the tracked changes relating to Objective 8.3 we cannot locate any change or part change relevant to our request. Perhaps we are misinterpreting the meaning of “accepted in part?” Or it is possible that we simply have overlooked any change.</p> <p><b>New Outcome requested.</b> That we be assisted in clarifying what part of our submission Point 799.11 has been accepted and how is that shown? That if such clarification is not possible, our original concerns and request remain.</p>
<p><b>Part VI</b>  <b>S31 Historic</b>  <b>Heritage: Archaeological Sites;</b>  <b>Māori Cultural Sites; Historic</b>  <b>Heritage Items and Historic Heritage</b>  <b>Areas Overlay</b></p>	<p><b>3556-</b>  <b>3567/799.32-</b>  <b>799.33</b></p>	<p><b>31.4.2 Accidental Site Discovery Protocol</b></p> <p>We note the Staff Report Point 111, R31.6 a) and b) and the rejection of our submission points by both the Staff and HNZ in their Further Submission.</p> <p>It therefore is not our intention to repeat here the detail that is contained in our original submission.</p>

	<p>However, we consider that it is worthwhile to highlight a few key points from one part of S31 of the PDP which are at the core of our concern.</p> <p><b>Extract from The PDP:</b>  <b>" 31.4.4 Assessment of Environmental Effects to include</b></p> <p>a) An outline of the values for which the site, area or item is scheduled; and  b) Discussion on how the proposed changes will impact on the values of the site, area or item; and  c) A discussion of alternatives and why the proposal is the best option; and  d) If applicable, a copy of a specialist report carried out by a suitably qualified person"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term "values" is a broad term and can be interpreted by different people to mean different things. This needs to be tightened with specific criteria applied. Costs could escalate unless there is clarity about this assessment.</li> <li>• Specific points of measurement are required on the effects of proposed changes on the site, area or item. Again, the present text is open to different perspectives being applied with potential escalation of costs.</li> <li>• We question the need for the preparation for discussion of possible alternatives and why the desired option is the best one. Reports take much time and cost to prepare. Surely, one soundly based and logical report is sufficient for discussion and any necessary modification thereafter.</li> <li>• The terms "specialist report" and "suitably qualified person" and the circumstances that would meet the qualifier term "if applicable" all need to be clarified otherwise costs could be limitless.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome requested-</b>That these concerns, in particular, be re-examined so that there are better implied constraints around costs written in to the PDP.</p>
--	--