

# District Plan Further Submission Form

in support of or in opposition to a submission  
Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Please print clearly	For office use only
Full name: SUSAN WASHINGTON	Submission No.
Organisation: (if the submission is on behalf of an organisation)	1436
Agent: (if applicable)	CITY DEVELOPMENT 28 MAY 2007 AUCKLAND CITY
Address for correspondence: 11 OSTEND RD	
Phone: (business) (home) 372-8150 (fax)	
e-mail address:	

Please use a separate form for each separate matter for submission

I / We support  / oppose  the submission of:

(name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available) #1233

S PHEE PHANSELL  
P.O. Box 177 OTEROA

Submission number

The particular parts of the above submission which I / we support  / oppose  are:

(clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)

ENTIRE SUBMISSION

The reasons for my / our support or opposition to the above submission are:

IT IS A NATURAL BOUNDARY BETWEEN RURAL & RESIDENTIAL, (RURAL I SHOULD RETAIN LANDSCAPE PROTECTION OF LU20), RURAL BUFFERS MUST BE MAINTAINED PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

- I / We seek
- the whole submission be allowed
  - the whole submission be disallowed
  - part of the submission be allowed
  - part of the submission be disallowed

I / We wish to be heard at the council planning hearing

Yes

No

I / We would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission

Yes

No

Signed

*Susan Washington*

Date

26-5-07



Auckland City

A few years ago, a notification appeared for an application of consent for development of a block of land in Land Unit 20 (rural landscape protection, buffer zone). This land borders on a residential land unit.

There were several submissions in opposition to the proposed development, and after we put our submissions in we heard no more about it, and it remained a rural designation.

When the Proposed District Plan (PDP) came out, I happened to notice that this same piece of land was changed from rural to residential. By making this change in the PDP, it neatly avoided any difficulties which the original submitters opposing this could have presented in requiring the developer to go through the DMA process, hearings, and possibly the Environment Court. And further, the likelihood of one of the original submitters looking into this particularly unfriendly PDP to discover that ACC had changed the land unit from rural to residential; was almost zero.

I, however, did notice this change in the PDP, and in looking over some of the 3800 submissions, there were several in support of this part of the plan. I was curious about their reasons. What I found was that not only did several of the submitters have similar reasons, their wording was also similar. I don't believe many, if any, of these people supported this as a notified application a few years ago. I also doubt that many, if any, of them had a look over the whole PDP, and then simply "found" this and decided that they wanted to support it. But I think that if we honestly and gently scratch below the surface, we would find that some of those supporters have relationships with the present and/or past owners of this block of land. There are some questionable implications resulting from this.

In a notified application, for an applicant to get support from friends and associates is reasonable and expected. But for this support to have happened for the PDP makes me wonder about how (several of) these people were alerted to make their submissions. I am NOT questioning their right to make submissions or to have their opinions - I am wondering about the process.

It is common knowledge that ACC rarely turns down a development proposal, and wants to increase the population on Waiheke, against much local public opinion. It's also evident that a developer wanted to develop this land.

Could it be the case that when submissions were made opposing the original resource consent a few years ago, the Council decided to wait and simply change the designated land unit in the PDP. I can't help but wonder if the developer was privy to the change in the PDP, and then got friends and associates to submit in support of the PDP. And with the change in the PDP, he can now develop.

Instead of a sincere attempt at consultation to support the democratic process, I am left thinking that ACC and the developer are simply getting what they want by going through the back door.

I support Phee Phanshell's submission with this cross submission and ask that this land unit remain a rural land unit, non-residential and non-industrial.

CC: PM Helen Clark  
Mayor Dick Hubbard  
Judith Tizard, MP