

District Plan Submission Form

Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Please print clearly

Full name: O'Shea Sean Jeremiah

Organisation: (if the submission is on behalf of an organisation)

Further Sub E: ... 4 2805

Agent: (if applicable)

Address for correspondence: PO Box 9 Clevedon

Phone: (business) (home) (fax)

e-mail address:

For office use only

Submission No.

2717

CITY DEVELOPMENT

11 DEC 2006

AUCKLAND CITY

Please use a separate form for each separate matter for submission

The specific provision that my submission relates to is:

Note: clearly identify the particular paragraph, objective, policy, rule or map.

Subdivision

CITY DEVELOPMENT

28 MAY 2007

AUCKLAND CITY

lot sizes RS zone
FB zone
PL zone

I Colleen O'Shea support this
submission
C O'Shea

continued on reverse



Auckland City

1 / We support / oppose / seek amendments to the plan. The reasons for my ~~own~~ views are:
 Note: if you generally support the plan but seek some amendments to it you should tick both the "support" and the "seek amendments" box. If you oppose the plan but seek amendments as an alternative to deleting the specific provision, you should tick both the "oppose" and the "seek amendments" boxes.

There is little Subdivisional Opportunity in Bark Zones
 PL RS FB need to have some relaxation not
 Construction.

Special Purpose lots to be available as they
 do not seem to be at present and they should override
 the land use minimum size. There needs to be a public
 interest like halls, clubs, nurseries, old folks homes,
 4000m² even 2000m² for such activities.

1 / We seek the following decision from the council (give precise details, and clearly identify the amendments you seek)
 Note: the decision requested from council should only relate to the content of the plan. Any matters raised which do not directly relate to the plan will be treated
 as being not "on" the plan or "outside the scope" of the plan and will not be considered.

~~Greater~~ Greater opportunity to subdivide in R0, RS
 and PL

* Protection of Significant Environmental Feature
 should be non vested on discretionary application
 with all ways attract objection.

lots of Glen or more should be able to be
 realised if good land use attributes can be proven
 eg horticulture or grazing of animals.

There is really very little potential for growth in the
 Settlement! covers much of it but natural
 limitations regimes sandstone even conservation owner
 SHIP. Brown land has little need to be in the District plan
 There's no partitions to let this land become tradeable

I have attached additional information

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

Signed

Signature on
 submissions

Date

2711-2719

Rkings