

COROMANDEL PROPERTY OWNERS ALLIANCE INCORPORATED (CPOA)-PRESENTATION TO PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN SUBMISSIONS AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS HEARINGS PANEL-TIME BLOCK-0915-0945-THURSDAY 12 MARCH 2015

PART VIII-ZONE RULES-SECTION 43-CONSERVATION ZONE

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
DOC-827	3766/827.38	43.4 R10 1.e. – regarding public access to farm – DOC wants to add “ <i>where appropriate</i> ” (some leases have provisions to limit public access).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPOA supports this proposal as working farms leased by private interests need a level of safety and security. • CPOA notes that the Staff Report – para 24 – rejects this submission point, stating that ‘<i>providing “opportunities” for public access is not saying there must be public access at all times,</i>’ and that public access should be managed, including restrictions on access, as part of normal farm management. • CPOA disagrees with the Staff Report for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any District Plan is a prescriptive regulatory document; therefore leaving the word “opportunities” unqualified in any sense implies that it is “opportunities” alone that the Plan will underline and potentially enforce. The qualifying words stated in the Staff Report- <i>...”is not saying there must be public access at all times,</i>’ and that public access should be managed, including restrictions on access, as part of normal farm management.” will certainly, in CPOA’s view, not be in the Plan.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The responsibility for health, safety, security, integrity and economic viability of the farming operation rests with the Lease-holder and he/she is accountable for ensuring that the first three (Health, safety and security) of these are complied with. ○ CPOA considers therefore that DOC is recognising that the Lease-holder must have some regulatory provision, allowing him or her to make the decision when it is or is not appropriate for such public access to occur. ● CPOA therefore considers that the DOC request for the inclusion of the words, “where appropriate” is reasonable and practical in terms of the responsibilities that Lease-holders have. We therefore recommend that the DOC proposal be accepted. <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be allowed.</i></p>
DOC-827	3767/827.41	43.4 Permitted activities – DOC wants to add “restoration” as permitted activity in Conservation Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CPOA has assumed that DOC has requested this permitted activity to be inserted into the Proposed District Plan to avoid being placed into a situation in the future whereby a normal DOC activity such as “restoration” in the Conservation Zone may be the subject of a resource consent. CPOA supports this. ● CPOA notes that the Staff Report – para 10-18 – recommends rejecting the submission point, as this activity is already provided for as being consistent with the conservation management strategy, and therefore does not require a rule in the Proposed District Plan. CPOA concurs with this. <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be allowed.</i></p>
DOC-827	3767/827.41	Want to add “wild animal control” and weed/pest control as Permitted activities, including in Coastal Environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CPOA considers that this would depend on scale, e.g. aerial 1080 drop, and other similar activities that can affect the general population, farms and waterways. ● CPOA therefore considers that “permitted” would be reasonable for land-based wild animal control and weed/pest control, provided it did not involve contamination of waterways.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, CPOA considers that “Discretionary” may be more appropriate for aerial operations because of the potential for spread of the poison outside targeted areas during application. • CPOA notes that the Staff Report – para 10-18 – recommends rejecting the submission point, as this activity is already provided for as being consistent with the conservation management strategy, and therefore does not require a rule in the Proposed District Plan. CPOA concurs with this, apart from our comments above about aerial pest control operations, that may have an effect beyond the Conservation Zone boundary, including in waterways. <p><i>CPOA requests that this DOC submission point be allowed in terms of land-based operations but disallowed for aerial operations.</i></p>
DOC-827	3767/827.41	43.4 – wants to add “visitor centres, workshops, depots, staff accommodation” as Permitted Activities in Conservation Zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPOA opposes this proposal in part. • CPOA considers that these activities should have the same status as in private land with regard to overlays e.g. outstanding landscapes, natural character and the Coastal Environment. • We also believe that for visitor centres, workshops, and depots, there should be limited notification for immediate neighbours and those potentially affected by noise and traffic. • CPOA notes that the Staff Report – para 10-18 – recommends rejecting the submission point, as this activity is already provided for as being consistent with the conservation management strategy, and therefore does not require a rule in the Proposed District Plan. • CPOA disagrees with the Staff Report, due to our concerns as above regarding potential effects within overlays, and on other potential affected parties. • CPOA also notes that the Staff Report-para 14 states that in general, “Public Conservation Land” is managed under other Acts, i.e. Conservation Act 1987, and that the aim is to avoid duplication “where there are adequate planning processes

			<p><i>already in place</i>". While this is accepted, the District Plan provides a direct reference regarding regulations affecting the people of this District. It can therefore be beneficial to ensure that provisions regarding consultation with affected parties and the application of landscape and natural character overlays are seen to be consistent and equitable for both the people of this District, and, central government and/or regional government agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPOA therefore recommends adoption of the DOC proposal subject to CPOA's concerns above in this submission point being taken into account. <p><i>CPOA request that this DOC submission point be allowed provided it is modified in accordance with CPOA concerns outlined.</i></p>
DOC-827	3769/827.45	43.7 R 18 – certain activities not listed then would default to non-complying status – requested to make provision as permitted activities: cycleway/walkway, hazardous facilities, helipad, pest control, road formation, road maintenance, vehicle parking, wastewater treatment, waste disposal, water treatment plant, water reservoir.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPOA supports in part, in that required activities need some provision. Cycleway/walkway should be permitted. • CPOA opposes in part in that some activities should not have permitted status where there is potential for adverse effects on nearby people/communities/ environments. E.g. Large scale pest control, road formation, waste disposal, water reservoir. • CPOA considers that it is reasonable to expect that activities on DOC land should not be treated any differently from activities on private land. Given the "effects based" nature of the RMA, the same controls should apply to DOC, as compared with the Rural Zone, and the appropriate overlays. • CPOA notes that the Staff Report– para 30-33 – recommends rejecting this submission point, as many of the activities listed are covered either by District-wide rules, or the Waikato Conservation Management Strategy, and therefore are provided for. CPOA concurs with this in part; however we are unclear of the management of DOC land in relation to landscape and natural character overlays, and the Coastal Environment. We believe that if this is not adequately

			<p>addressed through the conservation management strategy then the activities should be controlled through the District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further, CPOA considers that our comments in this document, in part, under the immediately preceding DOC submissions point (DOC-827-3767/827.41) are also relevant here and are repeated for ease of reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>“.....the District Plan provides a direct reference regarding regulations affecting the people of this District. It can therefore be beneficial to ensure that provisions regarding consultation with affected parties and the application of landscape and natural character overlays are seen to be consistent and equitable for both the people of this District, and, central government and/or regional government agencies.”</i> <p><i>CPOA requests that these DOC submission points be allowed in part and disallowed in part consistent with CPOA comments above.</i></p>