

Further Sub No. **2885**

FURTHERS SUBMISSIONS

AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL	
WAIHEKE COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP	
28 MAY 2007	

from

**THE WAIHEKE ISLAND COMMUNITY PLANNING
GROUP INCORPORATED**

on

**THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN - HAURAKI GULF
ISLANDS SECTION - 2006**

to

AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL

28th May 2007

To the Manager
Islands, City Planning
Auckland City Council
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley Street,
Auckland 1036.

Further submissions

The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated [WICPG], P.O.Box 49, Oneroa, Waiheke Island. Phone/ Fax and e-mail c/o Secretary 372 9541, e-mail c/o ccwragge@ihug.co.nz. Hereby tenders the following further submissions to Council in regard to the HGI Proposed Plan [the Plan].

Introduction: In the interests of sustainable use of paper resources WICPG have elected to record the further submissions from the group in a single document. To satisfy the requirement in **Clause 8A** Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA a copy of this collected set of further submissions will be sent to each submitter who has a submission referenced in it, identifying the response to their submission. This approach assists WICPG to reach an overview position having analysed the body of submissions initially presented on the HGI Proposed Plan. In terms of this analysis we record our appreciation of the amazing work by members and supporters in carrying out a comprehensive analysis of 3,853 submissions in a very short time frame. We also record our concern that despite requests to do so neither Council nor the Waiheke Community Board was able to arrange or facilitate workshop meetings to assist further with community input.

In terms of an overview position after analysis of submissions we have concluded that the stance, thrust and conclusions in the original WICPG remain valid and correct. Common statutory references are abbreviated to initials.

Further Submission 1.

We support the submission of the **Gulf District Plan Association Incorporated**, Submissions **666** and **1132** to the effect that the Plan should be scrapped.

We seek that the whole submission be allowed.

Reasons: This group more than any other in the Waiheke Island community have a long and intimate history with the District Plan, how it is viewed by the community and how it needs to function. We support this position because of the fundamental omissions in the Plan in key areas such as Transport and Economic Development / Growth, and strong community dissatisfaction in submissions across most of the Plan. For example in relation restructuring of the operative Plan, aspects of the Heritage provisions, Part 11 Matiatia, in regard to Water and

Waste water, in regard to the failure to effectively embed the HGMPA, inadequate provision for protection of Coastal amenity and the lack of a provision for and commitment to Sustainability. As a result the Plan fails to meet the core requirements of Section 5 of the RMA. We note a large body of submissions from Great Barrier Island residents to like effect.

Further Submission 2 and 3.

We support the submissions of the **Waiheke Island Sustainable Development Group**, Submission **3715** and **Leith Duncan**, Submission **660** in regard to inadequate provision in the Plan in relation for Sustainability and Climate Change. And the need for a separate, comprehensive Part of the Plan for this purpose.

We seek that these submissions be allowed in these regards.

Reasons: The Plan is supposed to provide direction and vision for resource issues facing the island in the future. It consummately fails to do so in these key areas. WISDG has played a significant role in representing these issues in response to the Mayoral Task Force Report on Sustainable Development before Council's USAG Committee, and to the ARC and Hauraki Gulf Forum. We note a significant body of support for this position in the submissions.

Further Submissions 4, and 5.

We support the submissions of the **Auckland Regional Council** [in regard to Part 2 of the Plan], Submission **3521** and **Bill Brownell**, Submission **2656** in relation to provision for the HGMPA within the Plan.

We seek that these submissions be allowed in these regards.

Reasons: The plan is simply deficient in this area particularly in terms of specific assessment criteria relative to proposed activities in the coastal areas and catchments of the island. Mr Brownell is an ikon in the Hauraki Gulf, his leadership and vision via such projects as the 'Muddy Feet' research projects exemplify everything Council does not provide. We note a significant body of support for this position in the submissions and arising from the earlier work of the Sustainability Focus Group during the Review leading up to the Plan.

Further submissions 6,7and 8.

We support the submissions of **Allen Davies**, Submission **579**, **Ron Walden**, Submissions **2935 to 2941** and of **Cycle Action Waiheke** Submission **3849** in relation to the Transport [called 'Connectivity and Linkages'] section of the Plan.

We seek that these submissions be allowed in these regards.

Reasons: Again in this area the Plan lacks any vision, is fundamentally incomplete and does nothing to foster alternatives or alternative approaches. We note a number of submissions along similar lines and again in terms of community feedback, see linkages to the Transport Focus Group work.

Further submissions 9,10,11 and 12.

We support the submissions of **Richard Wedekind**, Submissions **745/6, 749 to 752 and 2113/5**, **Phee Phanshell** Submission **3720** and **Anna Ripper** Submission **609** and **oppose** the submission of **Helitrantz** Submission **966**, in regard to the Noise provisions in the Plan and in particular in regard to noise specific to special [temporary] events and activities and from Helicopter use.

We seek that these first three listed submissions be allowed in these regards and that the Helitrantz submission be disallowed in its entirety.

Reasons: In broad terms the standards applied to noise provisions in the Plan are isthmus standards. As the submissions very ably articulate they are not appropriate for Waiheke Island its community and its residents. Helicopters are now a significant noise nuisance on the island and their use an area requiring urgent and effective regulation. We note a significant number of submissions along similar lines.

Further submissions 13 and 14

We support the submissions of **Pirihira Kaio** Submission **1324** and **Kato Kauwhata**, Submission **2683** in regard to Mana Whenua - Ngati Paoa, Tangata Whenua - Taura here / Piritahi Marae issues respectively.

We seek that these submissions be allowed in their entirety.

Reasons: Council's performance in these areas is embarrassingly deficient and lays open to question any real commitment to an effective Treaty based relationship with Tangata Whenua. These are priority issues if Maori are to be accommodated properly within the Waiheke Island community.

Further submissions 15,16 and 17

We support the submissions of the **Waiheke Island Community Board**, Submission **1055**, **Phee Phanshell**, Submission **1240** and **Leith Duncan** **360** in regard to Subdivision and other provisions in the Plan, specific to protection of Coastal amenity.

We seek that these submissions be allowed in these regards.

Reasons: Protection of Coastal amenities is a critical issue on the island with coastal areas under siege from potential subdividers and developers. Community interests tend to get lost or marginalised in these processes, as case examples demonstrate. This area interfaces with the need to provide adequately and effectively for the HGMPA within the Plan.

Further submissions 18 and 19

We support the submission of **Gordon Hodson**, Submission **613** and **oppose** the submission of **Metrowater** Submission **519** in regard to the Application for Designation for the Owhanake Waste Water Treatment Plant.

We seek that the Hodson submission be allowed and the Metrowater submission be disallowed.

Reasons: The designation and Metrowater's support for it are seen as a back door attempt to facilitate reticulation of the island contrary to existing Council policy. Mr Hodson has considerable knowledge and experience in this field and is recognised as a legend in our community. We note a significant body of submissions in support of this position.

Further submissions 20 and 21

We support the submissions of **Chronicle Writers Limited** Submission **589** and **Gulf Vision Limited** Submission **1596** in regard to the provisions in the Plan under Part 11 Matiatia - mixed use.

We seek that these submissions be allowed.

Reasons: The articulations in these submissions in opposition to these provisions in the Plan are consistent with ongoing community views in this regard as found in a significant body of similar submissions and in community feedback on concepts that were put forward as part of Council's Matiatia Design initiative.

Further submission 22

We support the submissions of the **Gulf District Plan Association Incorporated**, Submissions **1137, 1142, 1146, and 1149 to 1150** in regard to the re-structuring of SMAs and Land Units in the Plan from what is in the Operative Plan, in relation to Land Unit 20 OP in particular.

We seek that this submission be allowed in its entirety.

Reasons: This re-structuring is not supported by the community, undermines well understood and valued aspects of the OP that have critical strategic functions within the Plan, as based on flawed research analysis [Hudson report] and a

knee jerk reaction to the ECourt decision in the Isola case. The latter could have been better accommodated by ring fencing the Isola Estates property and re-zoning it appropriately. We note a body of submissions consistent with this position.

Further submissions 23,24,25 and 26

We oppose the submissions of **Huruhe Station Limited** Submission **528**, **Thumb Point Station Limited** Submission **526**, **Man-o-War Station Limited** Submission **527** and **South Coast Station Limited** Submission **539** with regard to activities / uses on and subdivision of rural land within Land forms 4 & 5.

We seek that appropriate parts of these submissions be disallowed accordingly.

Reasons: We oppose unrestricted use of helicopters and minimum site areas for subdivision as per the OP as sought. In regard to those parts of the submission 3a to 3f and 3l to 3n we are of the view that alternative planning approaches are needed to these issues that better meet the needs of the owners and the local and wider community interests in these important areas. Such as tools being evolved in the Proposed Plan of the Far North District Council which faces similar issues / pressures. These will also allow better provision fro the HGMPA within coastal areas and catchments.

Further submissions 27 and 28

We support the submission of the **Gulf District Plan Association Inc.** Submission **1152** and support in part the submission of **Arthur Harris**, Submission **340** in relation to the Heritage provisions in the Plan and in regard to the Rocky Bay Conservation Area proposal in particular.

We seek that the former be allowed and the latter allowed to the extent that it is consistent with this submission.

Reasons: The Heritage provisions in the Plan are comprehensive but suffer from a number of limitations such as incompleteness in coverage [see Paul Monin's submissions] and in terms of accuracy of site definition - see NZHPT submission. In regard to the RBCA a number of residents in that community have put in pro forma submissions [the one filed by Arthur Harris is an example] seeking it be removed entirely. We do not support this proposed action, but believe it should be comprehensively reviewed, with full community consultation, to address the identified shortcomings.

Further submission 29

We oppose the submission of **Federated Farmers NZ** Submission **1243** in regard to proposals involving farming activities under the Plan. The particular

parts of the submission we oppose are 1243/75, 1243/76, 1243/78 and 1243/83 (refers to Parts 10c.5.1 and 10c.5.8).

We seek that these parts of the submission be disallowed.

Reasons: The exceptions that are proposed relate to land used for farming purposes. The proposed exceptions include farm buildings to be allowed on ridgelines, the unlimited removal of indigenous vegetation under 3ms in height, the removal of exotic trees above 8ms in height, and earthworks within coastal, wetland and water body protection yards. If such provisions were to apply to Waiheke Island they would be contrary to best practice where the achievement of a sustainable future for the island and its people is concerned.

Further submissions 30,31 and 32

We oppose the submissions of **Ridgeview Estates Limited** Submissions **146,147 and 150** in regard to amendments sought in regard to its property at Carsons Road. We oppose the proposed changes to Parts 4.5.3.2.a,c and f of the PP specific to the frequency and length of temporary activities, festivals and temporary events.

We seek that the submissions be disallowed to this extent accordingly.

Reasons: Some catchments, such as the Onetangi Valley already have many existing venues, with more planned. Temporary Activities events usually have associated adverse effects, which are more than minor. Such adverse effects result from the consequent noise pollution of partying congregations of people, and loud music, and loud cars and helicopter noise. While we generally support the contribution that winegrowers and olive growers bring to Waiheke, we have major concerns about the adverse effects, which are more than minor that result from unconstrained vertical integration of their industry. See also further submission 9 - 12 above.

Further submission 33

We oppose the submission of **NZ Winegrowers**, Submission **1093** in regard to noise, temporary activities and toxicity issues.

We seek that the submission be disallowed within the scope of our objections.

Reasons: While we generally support the contribution that winegrowers and olive growers bring to Waiheke, we have major concerns about the adverse effects which are more than minor resulting from unconstrained vertical integration of

their industry. We oppose the impact of event noise and of helicopter intrusion upon the amenity values of often adjacent residential properties which is already a consequence of such vertical integration. (See 3.1(c) of their cover letter). We especially oppose their support of Temporary activities. We oppose their opposition to "Hazardous facilities and contaminated land" and rather submit that the Waiheke Winegrowers should be more encouraged / regulated to become more pragmatically organic, and that more associated monitoring of runoff waterway toxicity, and spray-drift toxicity, be undertaken. Industry / community feedback is that Waiheke wine growing is not as toxicity free as it would have us believe. The vertical integration of the future of wine growing on Waiheke requires balance with other community and amenity values. Especially as outlined in Essentially Waiheke and as further supported by the "well-being & enhancement" references of Sections 7, 8 of the HGMPA 2000, and by the community well-being references in Section 5 of the RMA and the LGA 2002

We submit that much of the visual amenity of wine growing / olive growing on Waiheke is due to residential - rural juxtaposition. It is because of this residential proximity that the adverse effects are opposed.

Further submission 34

We oppose the submission of **Waiheke Island Airpark Resort Limited**, Submission **1100**, in regard to paragraphs 3c,d,e, and g in particular on the basis that Appendix H in the OP makes adequate provision in these areas. We oppose all activities in excess of those as outlined in Appendix H of the Operative Plan.

We seek that the submission be disallowed to the extent of our opposition.

Reasons: The operating conditions outlined in Appendix H of the Operative Plan are sufficient. And that the adverse effects of light aircraft and helicopter operations are more than minor and that no expansion of operations beyond that in Appendix H should be agreed to without a further Consent process and hearing. We especially oppose any visitor accommodation and/or dwellings and/or maintenance hangars, and/or more than minor aircraft or helicopter maintenance.

Further submissions 35 and 36

We support the submission of the **Gulf District Plan Association Inc.** Submissions **1135 and 1139** and the submission of **Jay Clarke Submission 3380** in regard to the accuracy of the Planning Maps produced as part of the Plan in

terms of definition of ridgelines and Sites of Ecological significance.

We seek that the submissions be allowed in full.

Reasons: The maps are inaccurate in relation to definition of ridgelines and completely wrong in regard to the definition of the boundaries of the Okahuiti SES. Ridgelines are very significant both ecologically and in terms of visual landscape. The planning maps should therefore be ground-truthed and all ridges, but especially skylines when viewed from both off the island and public places, protected from built structures. Wording such as the following would provide certainty: *Significant ridgeline area* means an area adjacent to any significant ridgeline as identified on the planning maps. For the purpose of the development control rules, the significant ridgeline area includes all land falling within the 100m-wide strip shown on the planning maps by way of a dotted line notation parallel to each defined ridgeline.

We wish to be heard on these submissions at the Council hearings.

We would be prepared to present our case along with others making similar submissions.

Signed: Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Inc

Chairman : [Mr Pita Rikys]

Secretary : [Mr Christopher Wragge]