



Form 34  
Notice of appeal to Environment Court (general)

To The Registrar  
Environment Court  
Auckland

We, David Fred & Patricia Ann McCrary, appeal decisions made for our submissions to Auckland City District Plan Hauraki Gulf Islands.

We received notice of the decisions on May 4<sup>th</sup> 2009.

The Chairperson hearings panel Auckland City made the decisions.

The following are 9 points on decisions to our submissions that we are addressing.

1. Rejecting Commercial firewood harvesting, Forestry & Multiple dwellings as permitted uses 10a.4.5 Rules – activity table.
2. Rejecting multiple dwellings as permitted uses 10a.4.6 Rules – standards and terms for multiple dwellings.
3. Rejecting Commercial firewood harvesting, Forestry & Multiple dwellings as permitted uses 10a.6.5 Rules – activity table
4. Rejecting Commercial firewood harvesting, Forestry & Multiple dwellings as permitted uses 10a.7.5 Rules – activity table.
5. Rejecting Commercial firewood harvesting, Forestry & Multiple dwellings as permitted uses 10a.8.5 Rules – activity table.
6. Rejecting changes to 10c.1 Development controls-landforms 1-7 to allow reasonable and existing uses.
7. Rejecting the need to change the annual amount of firewood harvesting to a level that meets the needs of island residents who depend on firewood as a main energy supply in 10c.1.1.
8. Rejected retaining Provision 8.10.1 (c) of the former District Plan.
9. Rejecting requested changes to Planning Map Outer Islands Map 2 56 (56-4).

Points 1, 2, 3,4 and 5: Firewood, domestic and commercial harvesting, multiple dwellings.

The reasons for the appeal is as follows: Firewood, many people live on sections which are too small to provide a firewood supply, much of the Kanuka/Manuka is well past it's prime and dying, removing Kanuka/Manuka enhances other native tree growth. Firewood

harvesting creates employment for island residents. Firewood has been a traditional fuel on Great Barrier Island since the island was first settled. Kanuka/Manuka burns clean in modern wood burning appliances. We find that residents using firewood for cooking, water heating and space heating annually need at least forty cubic meters. Residents should be able to use firewood for wood gas a producer, which helps reduce the demand for fossil fuels. Kanuka/Manuka as fuel reduces greenhouse gases, whereas while rotting it creates methane gas, which is over 20 times more harmful to the environment than burning wood in efficient appliances. Continuous canopies of Kanuka/Manuka create immense potential for wild fire. In recent years wild fires in areas that have had no thinning have been disastrous in the western part of the United States and Australia. Firebreaks and access are the best defense against wildfire.

Forestry: provides a source of employment for residents as well as future employment, There should be a means of harvesting existing pine lots. Forestry of small lots of specialized timber will provide good returns and can be developed by families as partial use of their land.

Multiple dwellings: dwellings for extended family will help keep the young people on the island, provide dwellings for agriculture workers and visitor accommodation staff. The idea that additional dwellings will bring pressure for more subdivision any more than visitor accommodation which this district plan encourages by making it a permitted use in most of the rural landforms is unfounded. Visitor accommodation is over done at present since occupancy is under 25%. There is no more chance of subdividing with domestic dwellings than visitor accommodation as subdivision in itself has controls.

Points: 7, 8 and 9.

Permit a greater area of earthworks, increase building coverage, retain 20 meter (not increase to 40 meters) coastal (MHWS), reduce wetland and water bodies to 10 meters.

Retain provision 8.10.1 (c) from the former District Plan by adding under 12.6.6 as follows: 12.6.6.1 Lots divided by road formation. Where part of a lot is cut off from the balance of the lot by the formation of a public road, the Council may approve a subdivision to enable that severed part of the lot to be subdivided. This may occur if the lot does not comply with the minimum area rules for the relevant landform. This is subject to all other relevant rules being met. This provision is an excellent tool for acquiring land for public road formation. If a road subdivides a property one should at least have a chance to obtain separate titles. We have two lots that fall into this category.

**Maps Outer Islands Map 2 56 (56-4) Change the Landform designations of Regenerating Slopes and Forest and Bush Areas to Productive Land on Lots 1,2,3,4 and 6 DP 136276 previously Allot SE 113 & Allot Pt 111. We have owned and lived on this land since 1973. Over the years we have kept stock, planted exotic trees for timber, planted hundreds of native trees and orchard trees, kept large vegetable gardens, milled lumber and built with it, used and harvested both domestic and commercial firewood, selling locally and mainland.**

We seek the following relief: Include Commercial firewood harvesting, forestry and multiple dwellings as a permitted uses as applicable, 10a.4.5, 10a.4.6, 10a.6.5, 10a.7.5 and 10a.8.5. Modify Development controls – landforms 1-7 10c.1.1. Change the landform designations Planning Map Outer Islands Map 2 56 (56-4). Add to 12.6.6.(1) Land divided by formation of a public road

David Fred & Patricia Ann McCrary

*D. F. & P. A. McCrary*  
Signature of appellant Wednesday, May 06, 2009

*P. A. McCrary*  
Address for service of appellant: RD1 210 Schoonerbay Rd, Tryphena Gt Barrier Island  
Telephone: 09-4290503  
email: schoonerbay@gmail.com  
Contact person: David or Patricia McCrary

We attach the following documents/information to this appeal:

- (a) Decisions from Auckland City to our Submissions
- (b) Addresses of submitters we have notified by NZ Postal Service or email:
  - 1. Auckland Regional Council: Private Bag 92012 Auckland
  - 2. Department of Conservation: Private Bag 68908 Newton, Auckland 1145
  - 3. Federated Farmers of New Zealand Ltd. Private Bag 92066 Birkenhead, Auckland
- (c) Submissions by David & Patricia McCrary to Auckland City District Plan

\*These documents must be attached and lodged with the notice in the Environment Court. The appellant does not need to attach copies of these documents to copies of the notice served on other persons if the copy served lists these documents and states that copies may be obtained on request from the appellant.

---

### 10a.4.5 Rules - activity table

The panel consider that providing for more than one dwelling per site in the landform 3 (alluvial flats) is likely to lead to subsequent pressure for subdivision as separate titles are sought for each dwelling. It is for this reason that, in general, the multiple dwelling provisions seek to ensure that no more dwellings are provided for than would occur if the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 and one dwelling was located on each site.

It is acknowledged that the difference between the effects of the of such visitor accommodation and of a dwelling are not easily discernible. However, the reason that the Plan provides for visitor accommodation is to allow landowners to develop an alternative income source to the primary production activities. This is also in recognition of the need to

provide a range of types of accommodation for tourists, as they are a key contributor to the economy of the islands. It is therefore recommended that the submissions be rejected.

We objected to SA56-4 in general and specifically Lots 1,2,3,4 and 6 DP 136276 previously Allot SE 113 & Allot Pt 111. and want as a permitted activity.

The activity of forestry involves not only the planting of trees, but also their removal and therefore the panel note that it is important to consider all aspects of the process when considering an application for a forestry activity. While the panel recognize that the planting of trees, and in particular indigenous species is generally viewed as beneficial, the impacts on the environment of the removal of these trees once they reach maturity can result in adverse effects which require consideration. It is therefore recommended by the panel that the discretionary activity status of the activity remain and that the submission be rejected

Domestic firewood harvesting

It does not include other activities associated with the milling or processing of trees or the sale of firewood.”

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

For office use  
Submission N

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

**10a.4.5 Rules - activity table**

**Commercial firewood harvesting**

**Forestry**

**Multiple dwellings**

We oppose and seek amendment to

**Commercial firewood harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka should be a PERMITTED USE activity because it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.**

**It is the most environmentally friendly source of energy for home heating, hot water heating and cooking.**

**Managed woodlots replace the use of fossil fuel and reduce greenhouse gases. Many Manuka & Kanuka stands on Gt. Barrier Is. are aging and have many dieing and dead trees. These decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times more harmful than CO2 as greenhouse gas. Wood burned in controlled combustion environments gives off only CO2 and water vapor.**

**New Zealand needs to have alternatives to using fossil fuel, and as in past times, firewood from Great Barrier could help Auckland with its heating energy needs.**

**Using firewood for fuel also helps with personal health for it is more exercise intensive to use than other types of fuel and this holds true for both producer and consumer.**

**Great Barrier Island is at least 70% Department of Conservation. It would be safe to say no commercial firewood will be harvested on Department of Conservation Land.**

**According to the District Scheme NO FIREWOOD WILL BE HARVESTED on Reserves, covenanted land, wetlands, sand dunes, sand flats, residential, commercial, developed farms & orchards, Coastal Cliffs, Indigenous Bush, (excluding Manuka & Kanuka,) not mention areas that are inaccessible. This means less than 5% of the balance of land outside Department of Conservation's 70% would ever have firewood harvested. If one considers all of Great Barrier Island, this amounts to a maximum .15% used for Commercial Firewood Harvesting.**

### **Forestry**

**If Commercial Firewood harvesting were allowed in the district scheme as a permitted use the amount of land that would be available for Forestry on Great Barrier Island would be a portion of the .15% after firewood is harvested. Small-scale Forestry operations of high value trees will help the economic viability for property owners and the community.**

**Forestry in general benefits the environment by sequestering carbon during years of growth, which extends until the forestry products are destroyed. High quality wood products are often in use for decades if not centuries. Managed Forestry lots are carbon-natural, unlike many of the aging and unhealthy stands of Manuka and Kanuka stands on Great Barrier Island. Decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times worse than CO<sub>2</sub> as a Greenhouse Gas.**

**In perspective, encouraging forestry is a much better way to protect the environment than allowing growing trees to begin rotting before harvesting. This is a loss of good wood, even for firewood, as well as detrimental to the environment.**

**On Gt. Barrier Island we are not building more motorways and energy hungry buildings as is happening at record levels in Auckland City, nor has it ever been our goal.**

**We ask that Auckland City permit Great Barrier Island residents' reasonable opportunity to develop sustainable environmentally friendly projects without payment of crippling Resource Management Application charges. If this district plan removes our rights to develop the land, is Auckland City also going to reduce our rates accordingly?**

### **MULTIPLE DWELLINGS**

**Additional dwellings should be a permitted use when worker accommodation or more family homes are needed for agricultural based production on Landforms 3-5-6-7 on Great Barrier Island. The District Plan is limiting environmentally sound agricultural production rather than promoting it.**

**Additional dwellings for agricultural production should be encouraged to help return population to working the land.**

**The proposed district scheme allows holiday accommodation as a permitted use without resource consent, yet holiday accommodation requires more development (more bedrooms, bathrooms, parking, drainage, etc.) and amenities than a family home or workers cottage.**

**When questioned about this a city planner used the excuse that allowing a workers cottage, or other family homes to be built, will open up the property for subdivision is not valid, for building holiday accommodations would do so well.**

**Much is said in the Proposed District Plan about undesirable visual impact, by contrast a look at Auckland City with Goggle Earth shows what devastation of the earth's surface Auckland City has done.**

---

**Relief sought from Council:**

**Commercial firewood harvesting:**

**Forestry :**

**Multiple dwellings:**

**permitting use in Landform**

**permitting use in Landform**

**permitting use in Landform**

## **Decisions regarding 10.4.5 above and 10.4.6 below**

### **147-3DRIandform 3 App**

#### **4.4 Submissions about clause 10a.4.5 Rules – activity table, clause 10a.4.6 Rules – standards and terms for multiple dwellings and clause 10a.4.7 Rules – development controls.**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 60/1, 254/1, 512/3, 1069/1, 1078/1, 1089/1, 1093/26, 1250/20, 1250/21, 1524/1, 1524/3, 1528/4, 1531/1, 1538/1, 1543/4, 1524/2, 1547/1, 1547/2, 1547/3, 2554/5, 3045/3

##### **4.4.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 512/3, 1524/3, 1547/3, 1531/1, 1538/1, 2554/5 seeks that multiple dwellings be provided for as a permitted activity within the land unit.

##### **4.4.2.3 Submissions 512/3, 1524/3, 1531/1, 1538/1, 1547/3, 2554/5 – multiple dwellings**

The submitters seek amendment to the activity table to allow for multiple dwellings as a permitted or controlled activity within the land unit.

It is therefore recommended that the submissions be rejected and that multiple dwellings remain as a discretionary activity within clause 10a.4.5.

Submissions 1524/1, 1528/4, 1543/4, 1547/1 seek to provide for commercial firewood harvesting as a permitted activity within the land unit.

Submissions 1524/2, 1547/2 seek to provide for forestry as a permitted activity within the land unit.

#### **4.4.2.8 Submissions 1524/1, 1528/4, 1543/4 and 1547/1 – commercial firewood harvesting**

The submitters seek to provide for commercial firewood harvesting as a permitted activity within the land unit. The panel note that currently, commercial firewood harvesting is provided for as a discretionary activity within the landform 3 land unit. Part 14 of the Plan defines commercial firewood harvesting as:

**“Commercial firewood harvesting** means the harvesting of manuka, kanuka or any exotic species for the production and sale of firewood. It does not include other activities associated with the milling or processing of trees.”

Commercial firewood harvesting has been addressed in the decision reports for landforms 1-7 (general). As discussed in this report it is considered by the panel that the discretionary status of the activity allows the Council to assess each application for commercial firewood harvesting on a case by case basis. It is considered by the panel that the most efficient way of ensuring that firewood harvesting is sustainable is to ensure that all commercial operations are required to obtain resource consent. This way, the Council is able to monitor the total quantity of firewood being harvested and ensure that harvesting is kept to a sustainable level. It is considered that a management plan should be required with each application for commercial firewood harvesting so that matters such as the phasing and amounts of felling are addressed and can be considered by the council. The specific assessment criteria which relate to commercial firewood harvesting (clause 11.4.1) outlines that any application will be assessed on whether an appropriate management plan has been provided. The panel consider that the requirement for a management plan should be something stronger than an assessment criteria. As a result of this it is recommended that the definition of commercial firewood be amended as follows:

**“Commercial firewood harvesting** means the harvesting of manuka, kanuka or any exotic species for the production and sale of firewood. ~~The harvesting must occur in accordance with a management plan.~~ It does not include other activities associated with the milling or processing of trees.”

It is therefore recommended by the panel that the submission be rejected and that the discretionary activity status be maintained for commercial firewood harvesting in landform

#### **4.4.2.9 Submissions 1524/2 and 1547/2 – forestry**

The submitters seek to provide for forestry as a permitted activity within the land unit.

Currently, forestry is provided for as a discretionary activity within the land unit.

Forestry is defined in Part 14 of the Plan as:

**“Forestry** means the management of land for commercial wood production including the extraction of timber.

It does not include any of the following:

- the milling or processing of timber
- commercial firewood harvesting.”

As discussed in the decision report for landforms – general, the panel consider that a discretionary activity status for forestry allows the Council enough discretion to be able to assess the suitability of each application for forestry on a case by case basis.

The activity of forestry involves not only the planting of trees, but also their removal and therefore the panel note that it is important to consider all aspects of the process when considering an application for a forestry activity. While the panel recognize that the planting of trees, and in particular indigenous species is generally viewed as beneficial, the impacts on

the environment of the removal of these trees once they reach maturity can result in adverse effects which require consideration. It is therefore recommended by the panel that the discretionary activity status of the activity remain and that the submission be rejected.

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Submission N

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236

Phone: 09-4290168

E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

The specific provision that our submission relates to is: **10a.4.6 Rules - standards and terms for multiple dwellings**

**We oppose and seek amendment to  
Additional dwellings should be permitted, as a permitted use, for  
immediate family or workers that work in permitted uses**

An application for multiple dwellings will only be considered as a discretionary activity where one or more of the following criteria are met:

1. The resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if the site were subdivided in accordance with the rules in part 12 - Subdivision applying to this land unit (with one dwelling per site).
2. An application is made at the same time for subdivision resulting in the amalgamation of sites such that the number of dwellings on the new site created would be no greater than that which could be achieved through locating a dwelling on each of the original sites

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

Signed David Fred McCrary  
November 28, 2006  
Patricia Ann McCrary

Dated

## **Decisions regarding 10a.6.5 Rules - activity table**

### **4.5 Submissions about clause 10a.6.5 Rules - activity table**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 59/1, 109/2, 109/5, 120/1, 121/1, 257/1, 329/1, 512/4, 1068/1, 1093/30, 1250/24, 1523/1, 1523/2, 1523/3, 1541/1, 1541/2, 1541/3, 1541/4, 1541/5, 1541/6, 1541/7, 1541/8, 1541/9, 1541/10, 1541/11, 1541/12, 1541/13, 1541/14, 1541/15, 1541/16, 1541/17, 1541/18, 1541/19, 1541/20, 1541/21, 1541/22, 1541/23, 1541/24, 1541/25, 1541/26, 1541/27, 1541/28, 1541/29, 1541/30, 1541/31, 1541/32, 1541/33, 1541/34, 1541/35, 1541/36, 1541/37, 1541/38, 1541/39, 1541/40, 1541/41, 1541/42, 1541/43, 1541/44, 1541/45, 1541/46, 1541/47, 1541/48, 1541/49, 1541/50, 1541/51, 1541/52, 1541/53, 1541/54, 1541/55, 1541/56, 1541/57, 1541/58, 1541/59, 1541/60, 1541/61, 1541/62, 1541/63, 1541/64, 1541/65, 1541/66, 1541/67, 1541/68, 1541/69, 1541/70, 1541/71, 1541/72, 1541/73, 1541/74, 1541/75, 1541/76, 1541/77, 1541/78, 1541/79, 1541/80, 1541/81, 1541/82, 1541/83, 1541/84, 1541/85, 1541/86, 1541/87, 1541/88, 1541/89, 1541/90, 1541/91, 1541/92, 1541/93, 1541/94, 1541/95, 1541/96, 1541/97, 1541/98, 1541/99, 1541/100.

Submissions 109/5, 1523/1, 1523/2, 1541/1 and 1541/2 seek that forestry and commercial firewood production should be allowed in the land unit as a permitted activity.

Submissions 120/1, 512/4, 1523/3, 1541/3 and 2554/6 seek that provision is made for multiple dwellings as a permitted or controlled activity within the land unit

It is therefore recommended that the submission be rejected as the panel consider that the issues raised by the submitter are already considered to be adequately provided for within the Plan.

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

For office use  
Submission A

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

**10a.6.5 Rules - activity table (productive land)**

**Commercial firewood harvesting**

**Forestry**

**Multiple dwellings**

**We oppose and seek amendment to**

**Commercial Firewood Harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka should be a PERMITTED USE activity because it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.**

**It is the most environmentally friendly source of energy for home heating, hot water heating and cooking.**

**Managed woodlots replace the use of fossil fuel and reduce greenhouse gases. Many Manuka & Kanuka stands on Gt. Barrier Is. are aging and have dieing and dead trees. These decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times more harmful than CO<sub>2</sub> as greenhouse gas. Wood burned in controlled combustion environments gives off only CO<sub>2</sub> and water vapor.**

**New Zealand needs to have alternatives to using fossil fuel, and as in past times, firewood from Great Barrier could help Auckland with its heating energy needs.**

**Using firewood for fuel also helps with personal health for it is more exercise intensive to use than other types of fuel and this holds true for both harvester and consumer.**

**Great Barrier Island is at least 70% Department of Conservation. It would most likely be safe to say that no commercial firewood will be harvested on Department of Conservation Land.**

**According to the District Plan NO COMMERCIAL FIREWOOD WILL BE HARVESTED on Reserves, covenanted land, wetlands, sand dunes, sand flats, residential, commercial, developed farms & orchards, Coastal Cliffs, Indigenous Bush, (excluding Manuka & Kanuka,) not mention areas that are inaccessible. This means less than 5% of the balance of land outside Department of Conservation's 70% would ever have firewood harvested. If one considers all of Great Barrier Island, this amounts to a maximum .15% which could be used for Commercial Firewood Harvesting.**

## **FORESTRY**

**If Commercial Firewood harvesting were allowed in the district plan as a permitted use the amount of land that would be available for Forestry on Great Barrier Island would be a portion of the .15% after firewood is harvested and other land that is in production in this landform (Productive Land).. Small-scale Forestry operations of high value trees would help the economic viability for property owners and the community. It is more than feasible that some products would be made out of wood from trees grown here and sold to the tourist. Also, many islanders like to plant native trees and this should be encouraged, along with planting good timber and fruiting trees to help the islanders support themselves and accommodate the tourist trade.**

**Forestry, in general, benefits the environment by sequestering carbon during years of growth and this benefit extends until the forestry products are destroyed. High quality wood products (homes, furniture, etc.) are often in use for decades, if not centuries, and the carbon remains locked up during this time. Managed Forestry lots are carbon-neutral, unlike many of the aging and unhealthy stands of Manuka and Kanuka stands on Great Barrier Island. The Manuka and Kanuka should be considered harvestable forest and maintained as such with only healthy trees standing. Decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times worse than CO<sub>2</sub> as a Greenhouse Gas.**

**In perspective, encouraging forestry is a much better way to protect the environment than allowing growing trees to begin rotting before harvesting. This is a loss of good wood, even for use as firewood, as well as detrimental to the environment.**

**On Gt. Barrier Island we are not building more motorways and energy hungry buildings as is happening at record levels in Auckland City, nor has it ever been our goal. It can be assumed that Auckland City is permitting this environmentally unfriendly kind of development for the people of Auckland City.**

We ask that Auckland City permit Great Barrier Island residents' reasonable opportunity to develop sustainable environmentally friendly projects without payment of crippling Resource Management Application charges. If this district scheme removes our rights to utilize and develop the land, is Auckland City also going to reduce our rates accordingly?

## **MULTIPLE DWELLINGS**

**ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS** should be a **PERMITTED USE** if the owner of the site needs worker accommodation or more family homes are needed for help with permitted uses production on Landforms 3-5-6-7 on Great Barrier Island.

\*\*\*\*\*

One could require a workers cottage or another dwelling for hired or family help with holiday accommodation during the busy tourist season.\*\*\*\*\*

The District Plan is limiting any environmentally sound agricultural production rather than promoting it. Additional dwellings for agricultural production should be allowed, as it would encourage the locals to stay and help return population to work the land. The short tourist season on Gt. Barrier Is. does not provide enough income for the whole year. This private land does not belong to Auckland City to use as a playground, we locals want to use it, and we live here.

The proposed district scheme allows holiday accommodation as a permitted use without resource consent, yet building, maintaining and running holiday accommodation requires more development (more bedrooms, bathrooms, parking, drainage, etc.) and amenities than a family home or workers cottage.

When questioned about this a city planner explained that allowing a workers cottage, or other family homes to be built, would open up the property for subdivision. This is simply not a valid argument. Subdivision has its own requirements and regulations whether it is allowed for a home or holiday accommodations.

Then, another explanation by a planner was that a dwelling would only be for a family who would not bring more tourist to the Island! Surly, tourists would require someone living here to provide the amenities. Also, a planner should remember that there are private property owners here who do not wish to cater to the tourists and these owners should be able to utilize their land in other ways without applying for consent.

Much is said in the Proposed District Plan about undesirable visual impact, yet there is room for many environmentally friendly developments without turning Gt. Barrier Island into a city like Auckland. Why stop us from building or ask us to pay for consent when it is not necessary? Why, really, would it be OK to

**build holiday accommodation without consent but not a dwelling? We want to remain rural but not poor.**

**Relief sought from Council:**

<b>Commercial firewood harvesting:</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>
<b>Forestry :</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>
<b>Multiple dwellings:</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>

---

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

---

**Signed David Fred McCrary** \_\_\_\_\_ **Dated**  
**November 28, 2006**  
**Patricia Ann McCrary** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Decisions regarding 10a.7.5 Rules - activity table 14-6DRLANDFORM 6App**

#### **4.3 Submissions about clause 10a.7.5 Rules - activity table**

##### **4.3.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 16/1, 111/4, 256/1, 285/1, 1525/2, 1525/3, 1540/2, 1540/3, 2538/1, 3104/2, 3788/2, 3791/2, 3794/2 raise matters in relation the provision of home and commercial firewood harvesting and vegetation clearance. Decisions requested by the submitters include:

- Home firewood harvesting, of an unrestricted size as a permitted activity
- Cutting of manuka under 6m for home use (wood burning stoves)
- Commercial firewood harvesting as a permitted activity
- Provide for firewood use of 10-20m<sup>3</sup> per year
- Permit harvesting of kanuka and manuka for domestic heating of 7 m<sup>3</sup> per annum
- Vegetation clearance of 20% of a total site on suitable slopes
- Reasonable bush clearance for economic activities as a permitted activity

Submissions 261/1, 1525/1, 1540/1, 3788/7, 3791/7, 3794/7 raise matters in relation to the construction and relocation of buildings and to the alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings. Decisions requested by the submitters include:

- Additions and alterations be provided as a permitted activity
- Removal of additions and alterations from the activity table or change to permitted
- Change of status for the construction and relocation of buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings from restricted discretionary activities to discretionary activities. Submissions 315/1, 512/5, 1176/1, 1176/3, 1176/5, 1186/1, 1186/3, 1276/1, 1276/3,

1276/5, 1525/4, 1540/4, 1523/3, 1541/3, 2554/7, 2648/1, 2648/3, 2648/5, 3618/1, 3618/3, 3618/5, 3061/76, 3788/5, 3791/5, 3794/5 raise matters in relation to multiple dwellings and caretakers cottages. Decisions requested by the submitters include:

- Multiple dwellings provided for worker accommodation or more family houses as a permitted activity

#### **4.3.2.2 Submissions 261/1, 1525/1, 1540/1 – alterations and additions to buildings**

The submitters seek that the following clause is either removed from the activity table or changed to a permitted status:

"Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. However this does not apply to minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 – Definitions.

Submissions 315/1, 512/5, 1176/1, 1176/3, 1176/5, 1186/1, 1186/3, 1276/1, 1276/3, 1276/5, 1525/4, 1540/4

dwelling per site is appropriate on all properties where they comply with the rules in part 12

–  
Subdivision. While the panel recognise that some sites may be suitable for more than one dwelling, a permitted activity status does not take into account the high amenity values and natural character for which characterise the land unit.

Retaining a discretionary activity status allows the council to use its discretion over the appropriateness of the proposal on a case by case basis, regardless of the size of the site and to ensure that any potential adverse effects from development can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.

It is therefore recommended by the panel that the submissions be rejected and that the discretionary activity status be retained for multiple dwellings.

#### **4.3.2 Panel's analysis and recommendations**

##### **4.3.2.1 Submissions 16/1, 111/4, 256/1, 285/1, 1525/2, 1525/3, 1540/2, 1540/3, 2538/1, 3104/2, 3788/2, 3791/2, 3794/2 – firewood harvesting and vegetation clearance.**

###### **Commercial firewood harvesting**

The panel consider that provision for commercial firewood harvesting could be accommodated within landform 6 (regenerating slopes) as this land unit contains extensive areas of regenerating bush in varying rates of regeneration. It is considered suitable to include commercial firewood harvesting in this land unit, as this is where vegetation is most abundant and therefore the impacts of vegetation removal are less. A number of submitter attended the hearings in support of the inclusion of commercial firewood harvesting in landform 6. The panel consider that the discretionary status of the activity will allow the Council to assess each application for commercial firewood harvesting on a case by case basis. It is considered that the most efficient way of ensuring that commercial firewood harvesting is sustainable is to ensure that all commercial operations are required to obtain resource consent. It is recommended by the panel that commercial firewood harvesting be included in landform 6 (regenerating slopes) as a discretionary activity.

# District Plan Submission Form

Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

For office use only  
Submission No.

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

**10a.7.5 Rules - activity table (regenerating slopes)**

**Commercial firewood harvesting**

**Forestry**

**Multiple dwellings**

We oppose and seek amendment to

**Commercial Firewood Harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka should be a PERMITTED USE activity because it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.**

**It is the most environmentally friendly source of energy for home heating, hot water heating and cooking.**

**Managed woodlots replace the use of fossil fuel and reduce greenhouse gases. Many Manuka & Kanuka stands on Gt. Barrier Is. are aging and have dieing and dead trees. These decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times more harmful than CO2 as greenhouse gas. Wood burned in controlled combustion environments gives off only CO2 and water vapor.**

**New Zealand needs to have alternatives to using fossil fuel, and as in past times, firewood from Great Barrier could help Auckland with its heating energy needs.**

**Using firewood for fuel also helps with personal health for it is more exercise intensive to use than other types of fuel and this holds true for both harvester and consumer.**

Great Barrier Island is at least 70% Department of Conservation. It would most likely be safe to say that no commercial firewood will be harvested on Department of Conservation Land.

According to the District Plan **NO COMMERCIAL FIREWOOD WILL BE HARVESTED** on Reserves, covenanted land, wetlands, sand dunes, sand flats, residential, commercial, developed farms & orchards, Coastal Cliffs, Indigenous Bush, (excluding Manuka & Kanuka,) not mention areas that are inaccessible. This means less than 5% of the balance of land outside Department of Conservation's 70% would ever have firewood harvested. If one considers all of Great Barrier Island, this amounts to a maximum .15% which could be used for Commercial Firewood Harvesting.

## **FORESTRY**

If Commercial Firewood harvesting were allowed in the district plan as a permitted use the amount of land that would be available for Forestry on Great Barrier Island would be a portion of the .15% after firewood is harvested and other land that is in production in this landform (Regenerating Slopes).. Small-scale Forestry operations of high value trees would help the economic viability for property owners and the community. It is more than feasible that some products would be made out of wood from trees grown here and sold to the tourist. Also, many islanders like to plant native trees and this should be encouraged, along with planting good timber and fruiting trees to help the islanders support themselves and accommodate the tourist trade.

Forestry, in general, benefits the environment by sequestering carbon during years of growth and this benefit extends until the forestry products are destroyed. High quality wood products (homes, furniture, etc.) are often in use for decades, if not centuries, and the carbon remains locked up during this time.

Managed Forestry lots are carbon-neutral, unlike many of the aging and unhealthy stands of Manuka and Kanuka stands on Great Barrier Island. The Manuka and Kanuka should be considered harvestable forest and maintained as such with only healthy trees standing. Decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times worse than CO<sub>2</sub> as a Greenhouse Gas.

In perspective, encouraging forestry is a much better way to protect the environment than allowing growing trees to begin rotting before harvesting. This is a loss of good wood, even for use as firewood, as well as detrimental to the environment.

On Gt. Barrier Island we are not building more motorways and energy hungry buildings as is happening at record levels in Auckland City, nor has it ever been our goal. It can be assumed that Auckland City is permitting this environmentally unfriendly kind of development for the people of Auckland City.

**We ask that Auckland City permit Great Barrier Island residents' reasonable opportunity to develop sustainable environmentally friendly projects without payment of crippling Resource Management Application charges. If this district scheme removes our rights to utilize and develop the land, is Auckland City also going to reduce our rates accordingly?**

## **MULTIPLE DWELLINGS**

**ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS should be a PERMITTED USE if the owner of the site needs worker accommodation or more family homes are needed for help with permitted uses production on Landforms 3-5-6-7 on Great Barrier Island.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**One could require a workers cottage or another dwelling for hired or family help with holiday accommodation during the busy tourist season.\*\*\*\*\***

**The District Plan is limiting any environmentally sound agricultural production rather than promoting it. Additional dwellings for agricultural production should be allowed, as it would encourage the locals to stay and help return population to work the land. The short tourist season on Gt. Barrier Is. does not provide enough income for the whole year. This private land does not belong to Auckland City to use as a playground, we locals want to use it, and we live here.**

**The proposed district scheme allows holiday accommodation as a permitted use without resource consent, yet building, maintaining and running holiday accommodation requires more development (more bedrooms, bathrooms, parking, drainage, etc.) and amenities than a family home or workers cottage.**

**When questioned about this a city planner explained that allowing a workers cottage, or other family homes to be built, would open up the property for subdivision. This is simply not a valid argument. Subdivision has its own requirements and regulations whether it is allowed for a home or holiday accommodations.**

**Then, another explanation by a planner was that a dwelling would only be for a family who would not bring more tourist to the Island! Surly, tourists would require someone living here to provide the amenities. Also, a planner should remember that there are private property owners here who do not wish to cater to the tourists and these owners should be able to utilize their land in other ways without applying for consent.**

**Much is said in the Proposed District Plan about undesirable visual impact, yet there is room for many environmentally friendly developments without turning Gt. Barrier Island into a city like Auckland. Why stop us from building or ask**

**us to pay for consent when it is not necessary? Why, really, would it be OK to build holiday accommodation without consent but not a dwelling? We want to remain rural but not poor.**

**Relief sought from Council:**

---

<b>Commercial firewood harvesting:</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>
<b>Forestry :</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>
<b>Multiple dwellings:</b>	<b>permitted use in Landform</b>

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

<b>Signed David Fred McCrary</b>	_____	<b>Dated</b>
<b>November 28, 2006</b>		
<b>Patricia Ann McCrary</b>	_____	

## **Dissensions regarding 10.8.5**

### **4.4 Submissions about clause 10a.8.5 Rules - activity Table**

Submissions 512/1, 512/6, 512/8, 1029/4, 1526/1, 1542/1 seek alterations to the activity table in relation to the status of the construction of new buildings and external; additions and alterations to existing buildings.

Submissions 512/10, 1243/73, 1526/3, 1542/3 seek that forestry be provided for in the land unit as a permitted activity

Submissions 512/6, 512/11, 1526/4, 1542/4 seek to allow multiple dwellings as a permitted activity within the land unit.

#### **4.4.2.2 Submissions 512/1, 512/8, 1029/4, 1526/1, 1542/1 – construction, relocation, alteration and addition of buildings**

Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings, along with the construction of new buildings are restricted discretionary activities within the land unit. Restricted discretionary activities allow the council to reserve discretion over matters, which are considered by the panel to be particularly important for the land unit.

#### **4.4.2.5 Submissions 512/10, 1243/73, 1526/3, 1542/3 - forestry**

The submitters seeks the inclusion of forestry as a permitted activity within the land unit. Some of the submitters attended the hearing and spoke further on their submissions in relation to forestry. Federated Farmers sought that forestry be provided for in all landform

land unit with an appropriate set of performance standards. The panel considers that in land units made up of sensitive natural areas, such as landforms 1, 2, and 4, it is not appropriate to include such activities as the potential for adverse effects on the natural environment is high.

#### **4.4.2.7 Submissions 512/6, 512/11, 1526/4, 1542/4 – multiple dwellings**

The submitters seek a permitted status for this activity to allow them to provide for worker accommodation or additional family homes (multiple dwellings) to accommodate staff over busy tourist periods.

## **6.0 Recommendations**

For the reasons set out in section 4.0 of this report:

1. Reject submissions 111/3, 512/1, 512/6, 512/8, 512/9, 512/10, 512/11, 1029/1, 1029/2, 1029/3, 1029/4, 1176/2, 1176/4, 1176/6, 1186/2, 1186/4, 1227/1, 1243/73, 1276/2, 1276/4, 1276/6, 1327/1, 1327/2, 1526/1, 1526/2, 1526/3, 1526/4, 1542/1, 1542/2, 1542/3, 1542/4, FF Support ARC Oppose

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

For office use of  
Submission No

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

### 10a.8.5 Rules - activity table (forest and bush)

Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. However this does not apply to minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 - Definitions!

Commercial firewood harvesting

Forestry

Multiple dwellings

Rural property management plan

### We oppose and seek amendment to

Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. This should be a permitted use for all activities that are permitted in this table.

Commercial Firewood Harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka should be a PERMITTED USE activity because it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.

It is the most environmentally friendly source of energy for home heating, hot water heating and cooking.

Managed woodlots replace the use of fossil fuel and reduce greenhouse gases. Many Manuka & Kanuka stands on Gt. Barrier Is. are aging and have dying and dead trees. These decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times

more harmful than CO<sub>2</sub> as greenhouse gas. Wood burned in controlled combustion environments gives off only CO<sub>2</sub> and water vapor. New Zealand needs to have alternatives to using fossil fuel, and as in past times, firewood from Great Barrier could help Auckland with its heating energy needs.

Using firewood for fuel also helps with personal health for it is more exercise intensive to use than other types of fuel and this holds true for both harvester and consumer.

Great Barrier Island is at least 70% Department of Conservation. It would most likely be safe to say that no commercial firewood will be harvested on Department of Conservation Land.

According to the District Plan **NO COMMERCIAL FIREWOOD WILL BE HARVESTED** on Reserves, covenanted land, wetlands, sand dunes, sand flats, residential, commercial, developed farms & orchards, Coastal Cliffs, Indigenous Bush, (excluding Manuka & Kanuka,) not mention areas that are inaccessible. This means less than 5% of the balance of land outside Department of Conservation's 70% would ever have firewood harvested. If one considers all of Great Barrier Island, this amounts to a maximum .15% which could be used for Commercial Firewood Harvesting.

## **FORESTRY**

If Commercial Firewood harvesting were allowed in the district plan as a permitted use the amount of land that would be available for Forestry on Great Barrier Island would be a portion of the .15% after firewood is harvested and other land that is in production in this landform (Forest and Bush).. Small-scale Forestry operations of high value trees would help the economic viability for property owners and the community. It is more than feasible that some products would be made out of wood from trees grown here and sold to the tourist. Also, many islanders like to plant native trees and this should be encouraged, along with planting good timber and fruiting trees to help the islanders support themselves and accommodate the tourist trade.

Forestry, in general, benefits the environment by sequestering carbon during years of growth and this benefit extends until the forestry products are destroyed. High quality wood products (homes, furniture, etc.) are often in use for decades, if not centuries, and the carbon remains locked up during this time. Managed Forestry lots are carbon-neutral, unlike many of the aging and unhealthy stands of Manuka and Kanuka stands on Great Barrier Island. The Manuka and Kanuka should be considered harvestable forest and maintained as such with only healthy trees standing. Decaying trees give off methane gas, which is 21 times worse than CO<sub>2</sub> as a Greenhouse Gas.

**In perspective, encouraging forestry is a much better way to protect the environment than allowing growing trees to begin rotting before harvesting. This is a loss of good wood, even for use as firewood, as well as detrimental to the environment.**

**On Gt. Barrier Island we are not building more motorways and energy hungry buildings as is happening at record levels in Auckland City, nor has it ever been our goal. It can be assumed that Auckland City is permitting this environmentally unfriendly kind of development for the people of Auckland City.**

**We ask that Auckland City permit Great Barrier Island residents' reasonable opportunity to develop sustainable environmentally friendly projects without payment of crippling Resource Management Application charges. If this district scheme removes our rights to utilize and develop the land, is Auckland City also going to reduce our rates accordingly?**

## **MULTIPLE DWELLINGS**

**ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS should be a PERMITTED USE if the owner of the site needs worker accommodation or more family homes are needed for help with permitted uses production on Landforms 3-5-6-7 on Great Barrier Island.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**One could require a workers cottage or another dwelling for hired or family help with holiday accommodation during the busy tourist season.\*\*\*\*\***

**The District Plan is limiting any environmentally sound agricultural production rather than promoting it. Additional dwellings for agricultural production should be allowed, as it would encourage the locals to stay and help return population to work the land. The short tourist season on Gt. Barrier Is. does not provide enough income for the whole year. This private land does not belong to Auckland City to use as a playground, we locals want to use it, and we live here.**

**The proposed district scheme allows holiday accommodation as a permitted use without resource consent, yet building, maintaining and running holiday accommodation requires more development (more bedrooms, bathrooms, parking, drainage, etc.) and amenities than a family home or workers cottage.**

**When questioned about this a city planner explained that allowing a workers cottage, or other family homes to be built, would open up the property for subdivision. This is simply not a valid argument. Subdivision has its own requirements and regulations whether it is allowed for a home or holiday accommodations.**

**Then, another explanation by a planner was that a dwelling would only be for a family who would not bring more tourists to the Island! Surly, tourists would require someone living here to provide the amenities. Also, a planner should remember that there are private property owners here who do not wish to cater to the tourists and these owners should be able to utilize their land in other ways without applying for consent.**

**Much is said in the Proposed District Plan about undesirable visual impact, yet there is room for many environmentally friendly developments without turning Gt. Barrier Island into a city like Auckland. Why stop us from building or ask us to pay for consent when it is not necessary? Why, really, would it be OK to build holiday accommodation without consent but not a dwelling? We want to remain rural but not poor.**

**Rural property management plan, developing a long term plan for rural properties should be encouraged not discouraged by requiring a RSM application and companying fee**

**Relief sought from Council:**

**Remove from activity table:**

**Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. However this does not apply to minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 - Definitions1**

**Commercial firewood harvesting:      permitted use in Landform**

**Forestry :      permitted use in Landform**

**Multiple dwellings:      permitted use in Landform**

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

**Signed David Fred McCrary      \_\_\_\_\_ Dated**  
**November 28, 2006**  
**Patricia Ann McCrary      \_\_\_\_\_**

## Decisions regarding 10c.1

### **4.12 Submissions about tables 10c.1-6 - indigenous vegetation clearance**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 254/2, 256/2, 257/2, 560/11, 1035/2, 1037/2, 1250/69, 1339/1, 1364/1, 1384/1, 1394/1, 1459/1, 1490/1, 1493/1, 1498/1, 1528/2, 1543/2,

Submissions 1528/2 and 1543/2 ask that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7 on Great Barrier be deleted. Submission 3104/5 asks that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance in landform 6 be increased or alternatively, allow for 1000m<sup>2</sup> clearance annually. Submissions 1035/2 and 1037/2 request that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance in landform 7 be increased to 1000m<sup>2</sup>.

#### **4.12.2.2 Submissions 1035/2, 1037/2, 1528/2, 1543/2, 3104/5 - limit on indigenous vegetation clearance (below 3m in height) in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7 on Great Barrier be increased**

These submissions request that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance (below 3m in height) in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7 on Great Barrier be increased or deleted. Submission 3104/5

asks that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance in landform 6 be increased or alternatively, allow for 1000m<sup>2</sup> clearance annually. Submissions 1035/2 and 1037/2 request that the limit on indigenous vegetation clearance in landform 7 be increased to 1000m<sup>2</sup>. The balance of submissions do not specify requested limits.

Therefore, the panel recommends that these submissions be accepted in part, and that the recommended amendments detailed in section 4.7.2.1 of this report be adopted in part 10c.

2. Accept submissions 23/1, 24/1, 26/1, 63/1, 72/1, 129/1, 130/1, 132/1, 172/1, 237/1, 241/1, 242/1, 243/1, 244/1, 255/1, 270/1, 271/1, 272/1, 274/1, 275/1, 352/1, 464/1, 465/1, 943/4, 1035/2, 1037/2, 1128/1, 1243/76, 1243/77, 1405/14, 1405/17, 1406/14, 1406/17, 1409/1, 1409/3, 1467/1, 1528/1, 1528/2, 1543/1, 1543/2,

#### **4.22.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 754/96, 859/96, 1093/46, 1093/47, 1101/35, 1101/36, 1125/8, 1282/11, 1287/41, 1287/42, 1289/42, 1289/43, 1528/6, 1543/6 and 2733/7 seek a general increase in the area of earthworks permitted to be carried out on a site.

Submissions 176/3, 176/4, 1329/4, 1330/8, 1528/5, 1543/5

Therefore, the panel recommends that these submissions be rejected.

#### **4.23.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 176/5, 560/14, 1528/7, 1528/8, 1543/7, 1543/8 and 3725/1 seek that the coastal, wetland and water body protection yards in landforms 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2 be reduced.

#### **4.23.2.1 Submissions 176/5, 560/14, 1528/7, 1528/8, 1543/7, 1543/8, 3725/1 - reduce yards in landforms 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2**

The above submissions request that the coastal, wetland and water body protection yards in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2 be reduced.

The Plan requires a coastal protection yard of 40 metres and a wetland and water body protection yard of 20 metres in each of these land units. These land units are often located in areas of high natural value which require protection. The panel considers that the yards afford this protection whilst providing for a variety of general horticultural/agricultural activities to operate. Therefore, the panel recommends that these submissions be rejected

#### **4.5 Submissions about forestry, firewood harvesting and vegetation clearance**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 22/1, 129/4, 130/4, 132/4, 172/4, 176/2, 237/4, 241/4, 242/4, 243/4, 244/4, 270/4, 271/4, 272/4, 274/4, 275/4, 1528/4, 1543/4,

It is therefore recommended by the panel that the submission be rejected.

**4.5.2.2 Submissions 129/4, 130/4, 132/4, 172/4, 176/2, 237/4, 241/4, 242/4, 243/4, 244/4, 270/4, 271/4, 272/4, 274/4, 275/4, 1528/4, 1543/4,**

**Oppose ARC**

#### **4.19 Submissions about tables 10c.1-6 – Building coverage**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 47/2, 81/2, 85/1, 85/2, 95/1, 95/2, 176/1, 263/1,

299/2, 358/8, 439/1, 446/3, 518/3, 560/9, 582/4, 753/3, 753/4, 821/2, 821/3, 821/4, 821/5, 835/1, 1035/1, 1035/1, 1037/1, 1091/11, 1093/52, 1093/56, 1093/60, 1093/66, 1100/4, 1190/3, 1190/4, 1190/7, 1199/1, 1250/80, 1267/1, 1267/2, 1325/2, 1329/3, 1330/7, 1528/3, 1543/3,

**4.19.2.1 Submissions 47/2, 81/2, 85/1, 85/2, 95/1, 95/2, 176/1, 263/1, 299/2, 439/1, 446/3, 518/3, 560/9, 582/4, 753/3, 753/4, 821/2, 821/3, 821/4, 821/5, 835/1, 1035/1, 1037/1, 1091/11, 1093/52, 1093/56, 1093/60, 1093/66, 1190/3, 1190/4, 1199/1, 1267/1, 1325/2, 1329/3, 1330/7, 1528/3, 1543/3, 1550/4, 2001/35, 2042/4, 2101/1, 2202/4, 2553/1, 2553/2, 2677/2, 2682/2, 2683/2, 2686/2, 2689/2, 2694/2, 2709/2, 2733/6, 3094/4, 3094/11, 3264/1, 3518/4, 3552/4, 3566/2, 3570/2, 3583/3 - building coverage limit in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7, commercial 2, 4 and 5, rural 1, 2 and 3, recreation 1 and 3 and in tourist complex areas be increased.**

#### **4.22.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 754/96, 859/96, 1093/46, 1093/47, 1101/35, 1101/36, 1125/8, 1282/11, 1287/41, 1287/42, 1289/42, 1289/43, 1528/6, 1543/6 and 2733/7 seek a general increase in the area of earthworks permitted to be carried out on a site.

Submissions 176/3, 176/4, 1329/4, 1330/8, 1528/5, 1543/5

Therefore, the panel recommends that these submissions be rejected.

#### **4.23.1 Decisions requested**

Submissions 176/5, 560/14, 1528/7, 1528/8, 1543/7, 1543/8 and 3725/1 seek that the coastal, wetland and water body protection yards in landforms 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2 be reduced.

**4.23.2.1 Submissions 176/5, 560/14, 1528/7, 1528/8, 1543/7, 1543/8, 3725/1 - reduce yards in landforms 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2**

The above submissions request that the coastal, wetland and water body protection yards in landform 3, 5, 6 and 7 and rural 2 be reduced.

The Plan requires a coastal protection yard of 40 meters and a wetland and water body protection yard of 20 meters in each of these land units. These land units are often located in areas of high natural value which require protection. The panel considers that the yards afford this protection whilst providing for a variety of general horticultural/agricultural activities to operate. Therefore, the panel recommends that these submissions be rejected.

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

For office use of  
Submission No.

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

**Table 10c.1: Development controls - landforms 1-7, island residential 1 and 2**

**Building coverage**

**Indigenous vegetation  
removal (below 3m in height)**

**Building coverage**

**Earthworks on land with a  
slope >1 in 6**

**Earthworks on land with a  
slope <1 in 6**

**Protection yards:**  
- coastal (MHWS)  
- wetland and water bodies

**We oppose and seek amendment to**

**Bulk and location of buildings:**

**Building coverage**

**Conservation and amenity:**

**Indigenous vegetation  
removal (below 3m in height)**

**Earthworks on land with a slope >1 in 6**

**Earthworks on land with a slope <1 in 6**

**Protection yards:**

- coastal (MHWS)
- wetland and water bodies

**A 20m strip cleared around all buildings should be permitted for fire safety.**

**These development controls are too limiting to allow reasonable development for horticulture, home occupations, general storage, firewood harvesting, seaweed harvesting and most types of farming. Great Barrier must develop many eco-tourist-organic-products if it is to become an eco-tourist attacking destination.**

**Relief sought from Council:**

**Permit a 20m strip cleared around all buildings for fire safety**

**Remove (Under 3m in height) to read:  
Landforms 3-5-6-7 Great Barrier Island only  
Indigenous vegetation removal**

**Building coverage increased for Landforms 3-5-6-7 as permitted in Landform 5**

**Addition of Firewood Harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka on Landforms 3-5-6-7**

**Earthworks on land with a slope >1 in 6 on Landforms 3-5-6-7 increased to 100m<sup>2</sup>**

**Earthworks on land with a slope <1 in 6 on Landforms 3-5-6-7 increased to 800m<sup>2</sup>**

**Protection yards:**

- coastal (MHWS)
- wetland and water bodies

**Landforms 3-5-6-7 reduce to 20m  
Landforms 3-5-6-7 reduce to 10m**

---

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

**Earthworks on land with a slope >1 in 6**

---

**Earthworks on land with a slope <1 in 6**

**Protection yards:**

- coastal (MHWS)
- wetland and water bodies

**A 20m strip cleared around all buildings should be permitted for fire safety.**

**These development controls are too limiting to allow reasonable development for horticulture, home occupations, general storage, firewood harvesting, seaweed harvesting and most types of farming. Great Barrier must develop many eco-tourist-organic-products if it is to become an eco-tourist attacking destination.**

**Relief sought from Council:**

**Permit a 20m strip cleared around all buildings for fire safety**

**Remove (Under 3m in height) to read:  
Landforms 3-5-6-7 Great Barrier Island only  
Indigenous vegetation removal**

**Building coverage increased for Landforms 3-5-6-7 as permitted in Landform 5**

**Addition of Firewood Harvesting of Manuka & Kanuka on Landforms 3-5-6-7**

**Earthworks on land with a slope >1 in 6 on Landforms 3-5-6-7 increased to 100m<sup>2</sup>**

**Earthworks on land with a slope <1 in 6 on Landforms 3-5-6-7 increased to 800m<sup>2</sup>**

**Protection yards:**

- coastal (MHWS)
- wetland and water bodies

**Landforms 3-5-6-7 reduce to 20m  
Landforms 3-5-6-7 reduce to 10m**

---

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

---

**Signed David Fred McCrary  
November 28, 2006**

**Patricia Ann McCrary**

**Dated**

## **Decision regarding 12.6.6**

### **.47 Submissions about Clause 12.6.6 (Sites that are split between settlement areas 4 or land units).**

**Submissions dealt with in this section:** 618/113, 1288/112, 619/60, 2670/59, 618/114, 1288/113, 619/61, 2670/60, 754/70, 859/70, 754/71, 859/71, 754/72, 859/72, 754/73, 859/73, 839/2, 2740/2, 2737/2, 859/69, 754/69, 895/2, 1127/24, 1545/1

Submission 1545/1 requests the following:

*Retain the provisions of part 8.12.1(c) in the operative plan by amending the heading of clause 12.6.6 to read:*

*“Sites that are split between settlement areas or land units, or lots divided by roads”, and adding a new*

*subclause (3) to clause 12.6.6 as follows: “3. Where part of a lot is cut off from the balance of the lot by the formation of a public road, the council may approve a subdivision to enable the severed part of the lot to be subdivided. This may occur if the lot does not comply with the minimum area rules for the relevant landform. This is subject to all other relevant rules being met”*

#### **4.47.2.5 Submission 1545/1**

Submission 1545/1 requests an amendment to clause 12.6.6 which provides for sites that are divided by roads to be subdivided so that severed part of the site is contained in one freehold

estate. This may occur if the site does not comply with the minimum site size for the relevant land unit.

This request has already been addressed in section 4.25 above whereby it was concluded that subdividing areas which are separated by a formed or unformed legal road and which do not meet the minimum site size for the land unit, can increase the building coverage above what would have been permitted had the site not been subdivided. This increases the modification of the environment, through additional built forms, earthworks and vegetation removal and can lead to adverse amenity effects which detract from the character of the environment and undermine the resource management strategy and objectives and policies for the land unit.

For the same reason noted in section 4.25.2 above, the panel consider that submission 1545/1 should be rejected.

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary  
Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236  
Phone: 09-4290168  
E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

For office use of  
Submission No.

The specific provision that our submission relates to is:

### **12.6.6 Sites that are split between settlement areas or land units**

1. Where any proposed site in a subdivision application includes more than one land unit, the subdivision rules which apply to the proposed site are the rules for the land unit which forms the greatest part of the proposed site.
2. Where part of any site falls into a settlement area, that part of the site that is located in the settlement area may be subdivided out as one site provided it meets the minimum site size for the settlement area. That part of the site that is not located in the settlement area must also meet the minimum site size for the relevant land unit.

We support and seek amendment to 12.6.6

**In the existing District Plan under (8.10.1 (c) (Where part of a lot is cut off from the balance of the lot by the formation of a public road, the Council may approve a subdivision to enable that severed part of the lot to be subdivided. This may occur if the lot does not comply with the minimum area rules for the relevant landform. This is subject to all other relevant rules being met.) Addition of 12.6.6(3) will be a useful tool for Auckland City Works to realign steep or hazardous formed and unformed public roads on Great Barrier Island.**

Relief sought from Council:

Retain provision 8.10.1 (c) as in the exiting District Plan by adding under 12.6.6 as follows:

**12.6.6 Sites that are split between settlement areas or land units, (add) or Lots divided by roads(add) 3. Where part of a lot is cut off from the balance of the lot by the formation of a public road, the Council may approve a subdivision to enable that severed part of the lot to be subdivided. This may occur if the lot does not comply with the minimum area rules for the relevant landform. This is subject to all other relevant rules being met.**

---

**Decision regarding Planning Map Outer Islands Index 56 Map 2 (56-4)**

56-4 3139/1

**Objects to SA 56-4 in general & specifically Lots 1,2,3,4 and 6 DP136276 previously Allot SE 113 & Allot Pt 111.**

We were unable to contact this landowner despite several emails and phone call attempts. Phone appears to be cut off. Based on visit to neighbouring properties SA 56-4 meets the criteria for significance and therefore should not be removed as requested by submission.

Reject N/A

# District Plan Submission Form

## Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Full names: David Fred McCrary & Patricia Ann McCrary

Address for correspondence: 210 Schooner Bay Rd RD1 Tryphena  
Great Barrier Island, Auckland 1236

Phone: 09-4290168

E-mail address: schoonerbay@gmail.com

For office use or  
Submission No

**The specific provision that our submission relates to is:**

**Planning Map Outer Islands Index 56 Map 2 (56-4)**

**We object to and do not support Heritage Area 56-4 in general and specifically Lots 1,2,3,4 and 6 DP136276 previously Allot SE 113 & Allot Pt 111.**

There is one group of Kauri Trees in this area, which are in various sizes from seedlings to 15 plus meters. In addition all these trees over 3 meters are protected. We have protected these trees and will continue to protect this group of Kauri. Many of the group were seedlings which we have watched develop into strong young trees over the years.

Much of the area is Pine Trees which we intend to remove. All Indigenous Bush over 3 meters is protected. We have used our above-identified property for cattle and grazing horses, gardens and orchard. When we first purchased this property approximately 50% was in grass. We have harvested and marketed manuka and kanuka firewood from our property. Education for our children and commitments to our extended family required us to have caretakers on our property for several years. Our caretakers continued to harvest firewood and graze stock to a lesser extent. We have managed the property as a woodlot that we have always intended to harvest and subsequently bring easy contoured areas into horticultural production and grazing for horses.

**Relief sought from Council:**

**Change the Landform designations of Regenerating Slopes and Forest and Bush Areas to Productive Land Lots 1,2,3,4 and 6 DP136276 previously Allot SE 113 & Allot Pt 111**

**We wish to be heard at the council hearing.**

**Signed David Fred McCrary** \_\_\_\_\_ **Dated**  
**November 28, 2006**

**Patricia Ann McCrary** \_\_\_\_\_