

**COROMANDEL PROPERTY OWNERS ALLIANCE INCORPORATED (CPOA)-PRESENTATION TO PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN SUBMISSIONS AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS HEARINGS PANEL-1400-1415 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

**ALL SECTIONS EXCEPT SECTION 32-EARTHWORKS**

**PART II-OVERLAY AREAS-SECTION 6-BIODIVERSITY**

ORGN NAME AND NO	ORIGINAL SUBMSN PAGE NO/ SUMMARY SUBMSN POINT NO	ORIGINAL SUBMISSION ISSUE FOR CPOA	CPOA REASONS FOR OPPOSITION OR SUPPORT AND REQUESTED OUTCOMES
GRUBB-568	2413/568.43	Objective 2 –Objective 1 in PDP. Policy 1a– “Subdivision, use and development shall:” Policy 1a b) – “Minimise earthworks within and adjacent to areas of indigenous vegetation”. Grubbs wish to change to “avoid” earthworks within and minimise earthworks adjacent to.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA considers that it is unnecessary and unworkable on many properties to avoid earthworks in areas of indigenous vegetation altogether.</li> <li>• CPOA believes that because the Council’s S32 report stated that the District has a biodiversity gain overall, and because of the very extensive coverage of indigenous biodiversity in this district, this proposal is considered excessive and violates S5 (2) and S85 of the RMA.</li> <li>• CPOA notes that the Staff Report for S6 Biodiversity, Point 20 which states-“<i>Submissions to Issue 1 seek amendments to clarify wording and make it clear that subdivision, use and development does not always have an adverse effect on biodiversity values. The amendments sought improve the clarity and intent of the Issue and are supported.</i>”</li> <li>• CPOA also notes that Policy 1a b) has been deleted.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this submission point from B and D Grubb be disallowed</i></p>

**PART VIII-ZONE RULES-SECTION 41-COASTAL LIVING ZONE**

EDS-320	1259/320.10	Coastal Living Zone R5 – Stricter Earthworks rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These proposals are a 50 and 60 percent reduction respectively from what is in the Proposed District Plan without any rationale given by EDS for this. They are not realistic.</li> <li>• CPOA also believes that EDS' proposed thresholds for activities 1a) to 1g) are not realistic.</li> <li>• CPOA notes that the Staff Report – S41 para 31 (18-20 Nov 2014) – points out that the current operative plan standards are for 50m3 and 100m3 respectively. However, in the Proposed District Plan the standards are effects-based in the management of silt and sediment, and therefore the thresholds in the Proposed District Plan are fair and reasonable.</li> <li>• CPOA also notes that the Staff Report rejects the EDS submission point and no change is recommended in the Proposed District Plan. CPOA concurs with this.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this EDS submission point be disallowed</i></p>
---------	-------------	---	--

**PART VIII-ZONE RULES-SECTION 43-CONSERVATION ZONE**

DOC-827	3765/827.34	43.4 R6 Earthworks, and 43.8 Table 5 – wants to add “where earthmoving plant and machinery does not contain soil and plant material from other locations”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA supports in part – this is good practice but needs to be two-way to stop spread to and from other locations.</li> <li>• CPOA considers that it could also be broadened to include other pests/diseases that could be spread through soil and machinery (i.e. Kauri die-back is only one example).</li> <li>• CPOA notes the Staff Report (S43, Para 40-44) – Rejects the DOC submission, stating that addressing Biosecurity issues through the Plan would be outside the scope of the Plan, would duplicate functions, and would be more appropriately addressed through the Biodiversity Strategy. Also that DOC could impose their own standards when undertaking earthworks to address this issue.</li> </ul>
---------	-------------	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA accepts the recommended approach in the Staff Report as being sensible, therefore while supporting the sentiment of DOC’s submission, we concur with the staff recommendation to disallow the submission point.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed.</i></p>
DOC-827	3766/827.37	43.4 R6 Earthworks - Suggest the Earthworks standards for outstanding natural landscape overlay may be more appropriate for Conservation zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA understands that not all Conservation zone land is in outstanding natural landscape and the standards are severely limiting (10m3/year).</li> <li>• Further, CPOA understands that some Conservation zone land is leased out and is utilised as productive farm land. In this situation a blanket outstanding natural landscape-level limit would make this activity unworkable.</li> <li>• CPOA notes that the Staff Report (S43, Para 22 and 23) – rejects the DOC submission point, stating that earthworks provisions would either be standard for the zone, or would utilise Landscape and Natural Character overlay rules where Conservation zone land is within one of these overlays.</li> <li>• CPOA supports this approach.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed</i></p>

**PART VIII-ZONE RULES-SECTION 56-RURAL ZONE**

EDS-320	1264/320.14	R6 – Decrease thresholds for earthworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA opposes this proposal as it would severely restrict or stop viable farming activities.</li> <li>• CPOA believes that this proposal appears to demonstrate an apparent lack of understanding of normal farming practices.</li> <li>• We note that the Staff Report – Para 108 – rejects the EDS submission, stating that Staff consider the current Proposed District Plan provisions are set at an appropriate level, and stricter restrictions both in the Rural Zone and the Coastal Environment are not required. In addition, the Staff Report points out that the WRC also places controls on this activity, which</li> </ul>
---------	-------------	---	--

			<p>negate the need for any further restrictions in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA concurs with the Staff Report on this point.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this EDS submission point be disallowed</i></p>
EDS-320	1264/320.14	Earthworks not permitted within 20m of a stream or coastal marine area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPOA considers that this proposed change is unnecessary and unrealistic and would severely restrict current or normal farming practice.</li> <li>• CPOA would ask how do owners establish a culvert or construct and maintain farm tracks under these proposed restrictions.</li> <li>• CPOA would ask what is the rationale for 20m?</li> <li>• Further CPOA believes that this sort of arbitrary margin involves a potentially significant loss of land.</li> <li>• CPOA believes that the proposal breaches S85 of the RMA; reasonable use.</li> <li>• CPOA expresses its concern about the apparent doctrinaire approach that is being offered here without any evidence (robust science-based research statements or cited reports from credible experts) justifying why the proposal is required.</li> <li>• CPOA notes that the Staff Report – Para 108 - rejects the EDS submission, as outlined in the immediately previous discussion point under this S56.</li> <li>• CPOA concurs with the Staff Report on this point.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this EDS submission point be disallowed.</i></p>
DOC-827	3770/827.48	Rural Zone 56.4 R6 Earthworks – add to rule the requirement to ensure soil/plant material not spread to/from other sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As previously stated in this presentation under S43 discussion (DOC-827-3765/827.34), CPOA supports, in part, this DOC proposal.</li> <li>• CPOA notes that the Staff Report – does not address this point, (nor in Table 8 below). While CPOA supports the intention of DOC’s submission, for consistency of approach we concur with the Staff Report on S43 that advises that this issue is better covered by other mechanisms.</li> </ul>

			<i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed</i>
DOC-827	3770/827.50	56.8 Table 8 – offsite effects of earthworks – add category related to spread of Kauri die-back.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As previously stated in this presentation under S43 discussion (DOC-827-3765/827.34), and the immediately previous point under S56 (DOC-827-3770/827.48), CPOA supports, in part, this DOC proposal. However it does not fit in this category in Table 8 which relates to preventing off-site effects of the actual earthworks.</li> <li>Further, CPOA notes that the Staff Report – does not address this point. While CPOA supports the intention of DOC’s submission, for consistency of approach we concur with the Staff Report on S43 that advises that this issue is better covered by other mechanisms.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed.</i></p>

**PART VIII-ZONE RULES-SECTION 57-RURAL LIFESTYLE ZONE**

EDS-320	1266/320.13	Rural Lifestyle Zone R6-decrease thresholds for earthworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPOA considers that this proposal affects reasonable use of the land; prevents construction of culverts.</li> <li>CPOA believes that the proposed change does not appear to demonstrate a practical understanding of the activities that can occur on a normal rural lifestyle block such as small farming.</li> <li>CPOA notes that the Staff Report – Para 95, 97 and 108 - rejects the EDS submission, stating that Staff consider that the current Proposed District Plan provisions are set at an appropriate level, and stricter restrictions both in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Coastal Environment are not required. In addition the Staff Report points out that the WRC also places controls on this activity, which negate the need for any further restrictions in the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>CPOA concurs with the Staff Report in this point.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this EDS submission point be disallowed.</i></p>

DOC-827	3771/827.57	Rural Lifestyle 57.4 R6 – Earthworks, Kauri die-back	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As previously stated in this presentation under S43 discussion (DOC-827-3765/827.34), and under S56 discussion (DOC-827-3770/827.48 and DOC-827-3770/827.50) CPOA supports, in part, this DOC proposal. However, While CPOA supports the intention of DOC’s submission, for consistency of approach we concur with the Staff Report on S43 that advises that this issue is better covered by other mechanisms.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed.</i></p>
DOC-827	3771/827.58	57.8 Table 8 – offsite effects of earthworks – add category related to spread of Kauri die-back.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As previously stated in this presentation under S56 discussion (DOC-827-3770/827.50) CPOA supports, in part, this DOC proposal. However it does not fit in this category in Table 8 which relates to preventing off-site effects of the actual earthworks.</li> <li>Further, CPOA notes that the Staff Report – does not address this point. While CPOA supports the intention of DOC’s submission, for consistency of approach we concur with the Staff Report on S43 that advises that this issue is better covered by other mechanisms.</li> </ul> <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be disallowed.</i></p>