


**DISTRICT PLAN FURTHER SUBMISSION FORM
IN SUPPORT OF OR IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSIONS**

PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF ISLANDS SECTION 2006



To: Auckland City Council
The Manager
City Planning
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley Street
Auckland 1036
Fax 09 3077395

2893

Further Submission on: Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Name of Submitter: Craig Turner

Address: PO Box 29190
Greenwoods Corner
AUCKLAND

Telephone: (09) 3729266
Mobile: 021 587272
Email: craig.nicole@xtra.co.nz

These are further submissions both in support of and opposition to a number of submissions on the Proposed District Plan as described above. The further submissions are contained on the attached sheets.

The Submitter wishes to be heard in support of its further submissions.

The submitter would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission.

Signature Craig Turner **Date**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Anja Zillig	126/1	Support	Clear integration of waste water, waters and catchment management, with landscape provisions and protection with explicit linkages and relationships shown.	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Anja Zillig	126/3	Support	Definition of significant landscape/view shafts with clear linkages to rules to protect them	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Susi Newborn	303/6	Support	Appropriate provision for ONLs (outstanding natural landscapes).	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Graeme D'Arcy	1758/7	Support	Waiheke Island should not be a suburban extension of the Isthmus.	The submitter agrees that special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.
Anja Zillig	126/3	Support	Miscellaneous submissions about the natural environment. Definition of significant landscape/view shafts with clear linkages to rules to protect them	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Frances B A Waters	770/1	Support	Whole Plan: That Auckland City reviews and modifies the operative Plan in line with legitimate community representations and with proper input from affected property owners, development professionals and the well-documented aspirations of community groups.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	1243/1	Support in part	Withdraw the proposal, and comply with the requirements of section 32(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 in the preparation of a new Proposed Plan.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	1243/2	Support in part	Incorporate the requests made in this submission into the Proposed Plan, treating the Proposed Plan as a discussion document, withdraw and renotify the Proposed Plan.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.
Susi Newborn	302/7	Support	The introduction into the Plan of appropriate landscape protection and enhancement methodologies	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Susi Newborn	302/8	Support	The linking of these issues (regarding coastal amenity areas and landscape concerns) with a new additional sustainable management part of the Plan.	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Auckland Conservation Board	3574/2	Support	Wishes to see provisions in the Plan which will retain rather than detract from the intrinsic value of the Hauraki Gulf Islands, in terms of conservation of the natural form, protection of vegetation, wetlands, coastal form, ecology and habitat of wildlife, and amenity value.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.
Susan Washington	3400/4	Support	All issues to be linked with a new additional sustainable management part of the plan.	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Leith Duncan	3702/1	Support	The formulation of Objectives, Rules and Policies to provide protections for the islands ecology and communities from the trends of globalization eg. population increase and mobility, peak oil, sea level rise, global warming.	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA. The Council should plan for these major events.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Western Coasts Beaches Protection Society Incorporated	2942/1	Support	That the Plan be reassessed and objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria be developed to recognize and provide for and implement the threshold limits arising from that inquiry and to set and maintain the upper limit on development that it is determined can be accommodated in the islands of the Gulf. Change the Plan (particularly at parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10a, 10b, 10c, 11, 12, 13 and 14) to implement the reassessed thresholds.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A suburban intensity of development would not be appropriate.
Robin and Brian Griffiths	3294/1	Support	1.6.3.3 Where appropriate throughout the plan, make reference to, and explain fully, all matters relating to the notification of discretionary activities.	This is important to provide certainty to the public and applicants.
Auckland Conservation Board	3574/15	Support	3.3 Supports the intent of the Plan not to promote more large scale development on the eastern or western sides of Waiheke.	A substantial increase in development in the eastern and western parts of the Island would detract from its unique character.

Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Further submissions – C Turner

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
David Parkinson and Dee Crawford	618/29	Support	<p>3.3.4 Policy 3 of clause 3.3.4 needs amending as it is inconsistent with a) Essentially Waiheke and b) determines a growth strategy direction outside of those matters being addressed in the Plan (which is a deficiency in terms of achieving the purpose of a Plan review per se).</p> <p>There is no specific analysis in the Plan that identifies the validity or otherwise of future village settlement at the eastern end including the Ngati Paoa land or a satellite at Orapiu for example much less a debate on the appropriateness of discrete cluster of settlement as a appropriate growth management strategy.</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A substantial increase in development in the eastern and western parts of the Island would detract from its unique character.</p>
Michelle Titchener	1720/9	Support	<p>10a Include statements in the objectives and policies of all land units that medium and high density residential development on or adjacent to beaches and coastal areas is highly undesirable</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate controls apply to coastal development.</p>
The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/83	Support	<p>Traditional Residential 10a.9 The overriding consideration that applies to Island Residential 1 (traditional residential) is that the land unit does not contain provisions which permit development / subdivision that is contrary to maintaining the essential character and heritage of the island and the type, style and scale of buildings recognised within that character and island scale in particular.</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A suburban intensity of development, even in the traditional residential zone, would not be appropriate in the submitter's view.</p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Onetangi Beach Ratepayers Association Incorporated	541/1	Support	10a.9.3.3 Seeks amendments so that there is no relaxation in favour of intensive apartment developments on residential sites near the coast (with specific reference to clause 10a.9.3).	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate controls apply to coastal development. Intensive or high density residential development adjacent to coastal areas would detract from the qualities of the coastal environment.
Anne Woodley and Peter Muir	3299/1	Support	10a.9.3.3 Wants it clearly stated in clause 10a.9.3.3 that beach areas are protected from apartment and substantial developments.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate controls apply to coastal development. Intensive or high density residential development adjacent to coastal areas would detract from the qualities of the coastal environment.
O'Grady Family Trust	1127/14	Oppose	10a.9.5 Provision as a restricted discretionary activity in clause 10a.9.5 should be made for minor dwellings up to a 75m2 footprint.	The concept of minor units or granny flats is opposed because it would result in an increase of density on residential sections and could lead to adverse effects on the environment.
O'Grady Family Trust	1127/19	Oppose	10a.9.5 Residential activities should be provided for as permitted activities.	It is appropriate that a resource consent should be required for residential dwellings in order that the effects can be appropriately assessed and suitable conditions of consent imposed.
The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/84	Support	Bush Residential 10a.10 The over-riding consideration that applies to Island Residential 2 (bush residential) is that the land unit does not contain provisions which permit development / subdivision that is contrary to maintaining the essential character and heritage of the island and the type, style and scale of buildings recognised within that character and island scale in particular.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A suburban intensity of development would not be appropriate in the submitter's view.

Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Further submissions – C Turner

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Waihangā Kainga Trust	358/3	Oppose	10a.10.5 The residential activities (listed as the first and second activities in clause 10a.10.5) that meet the development standards be reclassified as controlled activities in the island residential 2 (bush residential).	It is important that the Council retain discretion to decline applications where this is justified having regard to the adverse effects of the activity, therefore a Discretionary activity status is appropriate.
John W Bell	2191/14	Oppose	10a.10.5 Insert the following activities into Clause 10a.10.5. Activities Status Dwellings up to a maximum floor area of 200m ² = P Dwellings with a floor area between 200m ² and 350m ² = RD Dwellings with a floor area over 350m ² = D	It is important that the Council retain discretion to decline applications where this is justified having regard to the adverse effects of the activity, therefore a Discretionary activity status is appropriate. The suggested approach using floor area is imprecise and bears no correlation to the actual or potential adverse effects of the activity on the environment.
The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/85	Support	10a.11 The over-riding consideration that applies to Commercial 1 (Oneeroa village) is that the land unit does not contain provisions which permit development / subdivision that is contrary to maintaining the essential character and heritage of the island and the type, style and scale of buildings recognised within that character and island scale in particular.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island.
Progressive Enterprises Limited	2733/9	Oppose	10a.11.5 A base status of controlled activity be applied to commercial activities on business land within commercial 1 such as table 10a.11.5 being amended to provide for the construction and alteration of buildings (activity 1 and 2 in table 10a.11.5) as a controlled activity.	It is important that the Council retain discretion to decline applications where this is justified having regard to the adverse effects of the activity, therefore a Discretionary activity status is appropriate.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Kristin Lewis	1250/40	Oppose in part	10a.11.7.1 Change clause 10a.11.7.1 to provide a building setback for all sites fronting Ocean View Rd.	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to buildings along Ocean View Road in recognition of the unique character of Oneroa Village. It is not clear that a building setback is warranted or would protect this special character.
Nigel W Marshall	602/1	Support	10a.11.7.5 Clarification that only single story buildings are allowed on the northern side of the street as in operative Plan and that view shafts are mandatory (specifically in regards to clause 10a.11.7.5).	It is important that buildings do not form a barrier to block views down to Oneroa beach from the village. Retention of a single story form of development on the northern side would be an appropriate scale.
Michael O'Shea	516/10	Support	10c.4.7 That the provisions for rural 1 (rural amenity) and 2 (western landscape) are strengthened with regard to managing the scale, density, location and appearance of buildings to minimise visual impacts, particularly within the significant ridgelines areas by applying controls on the colour of buildings within 100m of significant ridgelines and associated changes to clause 10c.4.7.	It is important that the special landscape character and ridgelines are protected.
Anja Zillig	127/1	Support	Matiatia Mixed Use 10a.18 That clause 10a.18 is amended in its entirety to reflect the Community Feedback included in A VISION FOR MATIATIA – Stage two design brief, especially but not limited to; 1. Residential use should be minimal 2. Retail should be kept to a minimum 3. Matiatia should be different in character than the mainland. Additionally, that the permitted development scale is too large	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Anja Zillig	127/2	Support	10a.18 That "Mixed use" be withdrawn from clause 10a.18 in its entirety.	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted.
Anja Zillig	127/4	Support	10a.18 That clause 10a.18 is further amended in its entirety to give effect to the HGMPA 2000 sections 7, 8 and 32.	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted.
Eileen Boghurst	671/5	Support	10a.18 Development at Matiatia should be restricted to allowing it to function as a gateway to the island, and not become a destination in itself.	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted. The requirement for retail, residential and other non-transport related activities to establish at Matiatia is opposed.
Eileen Boghurst	671/6	Support	10a.18.5 The first priority should be facilities to give access to forms of transport, both to, from, and within, the island, which provide for the needs of regular commuters, residents and seasonal visitors.	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted. The requirement for retail, residential and other non-transport related activities to establish at Matiatia is opposed.
Judith G M von Madarasz	899/7	Support	10a.18.9.1 There must be a Matiatia transport plan and a comprehensive island-wide transport plan before any development proceeds at Matiatia. These two plans must be approved and operative and should be made to underpin the associated provisions in the new Plan (ref clause 10a.18.9.1)	The function of Matiatia is transport and given the community's reliance on ferries and buses a complete review of the proposed provisions is warranted.
Anja Zillig	127/3	Support	10a.18.6.4 That the development threshold of aggregate gross floor area (gfa) should be reduced from 10,000m ² to 5000m ² (clause 10a.18.6.4)	The Proposed Plan approach for Matiatia does not reflect community desires or needs and a complete review is warranted.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Auckland Regional Council	3521/100	Support	Recreation 1 Local Parks and Esplanade Reserves 10a.22 Amend clause 10a.22 Recreation 1 (local parks and esplanade reserves) to recognise that esplanade reserves also contribute to landscape outcomes, natural character outcomes and are useful for hazard mitigation.	It is important that there is appropriate provision for esplanade reserves and coastal walkways in the Proposed Plan.
David Parkinson and Dee Crawford	618/65	Oppose	Development Controls Ridgelines 10c.4.7 The ridgeline provisions in clause 10c.4.7 should be deleted.	This is contrary to the purpose of the RMA.
Thumb Point Station Limited	526/7	Support in part	10c.5 Remove the control over exotic trees from the Plan.	It may not be necessary or justified in resource management terms to apply a blanket protection to all species of exotic trees.
Gulf District Plan Association Incorporated	1143/4	Support	Development Controls Noise 10c.5.4 Abandonment of an across the board increase in noise levels.	The absence of noise is a key component of the special character of Waiheke Island.
Garth Spencer	518/17	Support in part	Development Control Table – Yards 10c.2T For commercial 1 (Oneroa village), propose each site to have one 2.4m minimum side yard to ensure vistas to the sea.	It is important that buildings do not form a barrier to block views down to Oneroa beach from the village. Retention of a single story form of development on the northern side, with provision for views between some buildings, would be appropriate.
John Evans	669/2	Oppose	Subdivision Table 12.1 Objects to the council setting a minimum site size for residential development of 2000m ²	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A minimum site size of less than 2000m ² would not be appropriate.
PRT and D Taylor	1094/7	Oppose	Table 12.1 Reduce the minimum site area in island residential 2 (bush residential) (table 12.1) to either 500m ² , or such other area (less than 2000m ²).	The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. A minimum site size of less than 2000m ² would not be appropriate.

Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Further submissions – C. Turner

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Susi Newborn	298/7	Support in part	<p>A1b Subject to full consultation with owners, schedule buildings / structures that represent the remnants of old maritime culture, namely the old wrecks – the Rahiri is in the ARC's jurisdiction but others such as the Patiki at the Causeway. The old boatsheds, especially the Matiatia Kayak Sheds, and those at Oneroa, Mawhitipana Bay, and Rocky Bay. The remnants of the old wharves eg on the Esplanade, end of Wharf Rd etc. The old public buildings namely the old Post Offices in Oneroa, Surfdale and Ostend [Wharf Rd] and the community halls at Oneroa (MORRA), Blackpool, Surfdale, Ostend including the ORRA Hall, Palm Beach. Shops such as the Oneroa Fruit & Vege Shop and Jewellers, the old butchers shops at Oneroa and Surfdale. The Beach Shops at Little Oneroa, Rocky Bay, Palm Beach, Onetangi. The special / significant places and buildings such as the Alison Homestead and Coach house – Matiatia, Janet Frame's cottage (If it still exists), the Red Cross (Oneroa), the Red Shed (Palm Beach), and the Library and Artworks. Examples of the old baches and cottages.</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned to ensure that appropriate planning controls apply to land on Waiheke. Special provisions and a different approach is needed to planning in recognition of the unique character of Waiheke Island. It is important to protect elements that are important in defining the character of Waiheke.</p>
Kristin Lewis	1250/42	Support	<p>Oneroa Design Guidelines A12 Retain appendix 12 but include provision of public access to views of the beach and ocean from the buildings.</p>	<p>It is important that buildings do not form a barrier to block views down to Oneroa beach from the village. Retention of a single story form of development on the northern side, with provision for views between some buildings, would be appropriate.</p>

Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006

Further submissions – C Turner

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose or Support	Part of Submission	Reasons
Richard Wedekind	3187/1	Support	15 (a) The introduction of a Part 15 into the Text titled - Sustainable Management Operational Methodologies 15.1 Introduction 15.2 Resource Management Issues 15.3 Resource Management Strategy 15.4 Coastal Landscape & Amenity Protection and Enhancement 15.5 Rural Landscape & Amenity Protection and Enhancement 15.6 Wetlands Management & Protection and Enhancement 15.7 Integrated Wastewater, Waters & Catchment Management and Enhancement 15.8 Community Outcomes Protection and Enhancement 15.9 Gulf and Inner Islands Interrelationships Management and Enhancement 15.10 Energy Management 15.11 Noise Management 15.12 Climate Change (b) Additional appropriate linkages to other RM issues, objectives, policies and rules.	This is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.