

BROWN

CITY DEVELOPMENT
28 MAY 2007
AUCKLAND CITY

2905

Auckland City
Council

The Manager, City Planning

28-5-07
5045

Allan-Waheke
P. Riddell
Submission

Submission Form
Submission letter

1
4



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: <u>Ross Allan on behalf of the Allan Family Trust</u>		Submission No.	
Organisation: (if the submission is on behalf of an organisation)			
Agent: (if applicable) <u>Brown and Pemberton Planning Group</u>			
Address for correspondence: <u>PO Box 1467 Queenstown</u>			
Phone: (business) _____ (home) <u>(03) 409 2258</u> (fax) _____			
e-mail address: <u>philippa@brownpemberton.com</u>			
Please use a separate form for each separate matter for submission			
I / We support <input type="checkbox"/> / oppose <input type="checkbox"/> the submission of: <small>(name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available)</small>			
<u>please see attached</u>			
			Submission number
The particular parts of the above submission which I / we support <input type="checkbox"/> / oppose <input type="checkbox"/> are: <small>(clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</small>			
<u>please see attached</u>			
The reasons for my / our support or opposition to the above submission are:			
<u>please see attached</u>			
I / We seek <input type="checkbox"/> the whole submission be allowed <input type="checkbox"/> the whole submission be disallowed <input type="checkbox"/> part of the submission be allowed <input type="checkbox"/> part of the submission be disallowed			
I / We wish to be heard at the council planning hearing			<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
I / We would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission			<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Signed <u>Philippa</u>		Date <u>28-5-07</u>	



Auckland City

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991
FURTHER SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE
TO THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN – HAURAKI GULF ISLANDS SECTION 2006**

TO: AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL
The Manager, City Planning,
Private Bag 92516,
Wellesley Street,
AUCKLAND 1036

FROM: ROSS ALLAN ON BEHALF OF THE ALLAN FAMILY TRUST
C/- Brown & Pemberton Planning Group Ltd
P O Box 1467
QUEENSTOWN

Attention: G Pemberton / P Riddell

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan – Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 2006.

SUBMISSION

2. I have been a land and home owner on Waiheke Island since 1998. My property is vested in a family trust. The site is located at 1 Korora Road, Waiheke Island and is legally described as Lot 1 DP183454 held in Certificate of Title NA1148/586. The parcel of land is semi-rural, with a coastal outlook, currently used for residential purposes.
3. The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to are:

Part 12: Subdivision
Part 10: Development Controls

Code	Decision Requested	Submission No.	Further Submission
12	Reclassify the land around Owhanake within DP's 183454, 183455 and 183456 as a sub-area within Rural 2 to which special rules under Part 12 apply specifying the minimum site area for subdivision as 5ha.	520/3	<p>The proposed plan change re-classifies the landscape category, to which my property is subject. We consider that this zoning is too broad in many cases. We concur that those properties surrounding Owhanake Bay, that lie within the Rural 2 zone, form part of a sub-zone, within the Rural 2 zone.</p> <p>The sub-zone rules for subdivision should not have a minimum site area (lot size). We favour the existing bonus density provisions. These provisions provide for a density of up to 1 lot per 1.5ha of gross land area of the site, and encourage discretely located clusters and buildings located in a manner that will not detract from the character of the coastal landscape.</p>

12	The protection and enhancement, of landscape and view shafts (relative to vantage points at sea and on the land) and coastal and rural amenity, must be given effect to within part 12 of the Plan. This must include specific reference to the HGMP Act in all sections to do with Resource Management Issues, Objectives and Policies.	3700/1	<p>Special regard should be given to maintaining view shafts from public and private property. As part of the sub-zone rules referred to above, I propose that site and zone standards are applied to allow for multiple building platforms, provided they are appropriately located within the site and of a size and shape that maintains the visual amenity values of the landscape.</p> <p>Further, the plan should encourage the establishment of discrete/aggregated access and underground services.</p>
12	Amend the subdivision provisions for all rural zones (including non-conservation islands) to incorporate more flexible and diverse opportunities for land use and development outside of the proposed strategic limitations imposed by the proposed focus on concentrating development within existing settled areas with limited subdivision and use options elsewhere.	1284/9	We concur that the provisions for subdivision should also allow for diversity in land use activity and development in the Rural 2 zone, such that development is not solely concentrated within existing settled areas. More specifically for visitor accommodation and home stay activity.
12	There should be a rule in the Plan that bridle paths are put in.	832/6, 1190/34, 1191/6	<p>There is a community desire to provide connectivity between public areas by way of paths and trails. It may seem appropriate to ensure that where land is not vested in the Council as a reserve, that public access is established through the creation of easements at the time of subdivision. However, 'through' access may not always be appropriate in every case, due to existing activities on site, and sensitive archaeological areas.</p> <p>Any such proposal should be undertaken on a Council/applicant collaborative basis. We generally support this approach however the requirement for bridle paths should be considered on a case by case basis.</p>
12	Subdivisions must be notified so that possibilities for access and reserve land contributions are not overlooked as is too often the case now.	1281/2	We consider it unnecessary to provide a blanket such that all subdivisions are notified. As above, the requirement for notification should be assessed at the time of application. Further, public participation through notification for every consent application for subdivision is not desired under the purpose of the Act.

12	That the subdivision provisions applying to Rural 2 including Thompsons Point, if retained, include specific provision for comprehensive management plans as discretionary activities.	1287/28	For subdivision of no more than 3 lots, we consider this unnecessary. Landscaping to enhance overall amenity can be assessed at the time of subdivision and again at land use consent.
12	Amend clause 12.8.1(4) so that boundary adjustments are restricted discretionary in Rural 2 (western landscape) where change in areas is no more than 1 hectare.	3724/2	We consider that boundary adjustments should be a controlled activity in the Rural 2 area, provided there are no additional building platforms created, no non-compliances are created with development controls and each lot is held in a separate certificate of title.
12	Any minimum site areas for all land units (in Table 12.1) must be determined on the basis of recommendations (following debate and discussion) from working parties or committees comprising interested persons from each community within land units.	2769/1	We seek further explanation as to the justification of the minimum site size in the Rural 2 land unit. Table 12.1 states that the minimum site area for subdivision in Rural 2 is 25ha. This is a discretionary activity.
12.10.3	Clause 12.10.3 should be deleted and replaced with a rule that provides for any subdivisions not meeting minimum areas or variations there to such as significant environmental feature subdivisions or bonus density subdivisions as discretionary activities, but only within the context of an application for a comprehensive development approval which can be re-defined as a rural property management plan but with amendments to the proposed definition to include subdivision and land use activities. Any subdivision sought, not falling within such a comprehensive approach should be defined a non-complying activity.	2670/71	We support that subdivision that does not meet the minimum areas for subdivision in the Rural 2 area, should be a discretionary activity. Table 8.3 of the operative plan states that applications to reduce lot size in Land Unit 22 are non-complying activities, unless it meets the provisions within 8.7.4(b) Comprehensive Rural Development, or (c) Bonus Density Provisions for Land Unit 22. Rule 12.10(3) of the proposed plan also states that subdivisions that do not meet minimum areas for subdivision are non-complying however there are no provisions for a reduction in lot size, Comprehensive Rural Development or Bonus Density Provisions for Land Unit 22. We submit that the ability to reduce lot size is upheld for Land Unit 22, as per the operative provisions, Hauraki Gulf Islands Section – Operative 1996.
10c.4T	For the current building coverage to remain as 500 m2 within Rural 2 (western landscape) with no maximum footprint of any one building.	3711/1	We support the retention of retaining building coverage at 500m ² for Land Unit 22 in Rural 2. The proposed 50% reduction in permissible building area does not reflect the variable Lot sizes within the zone. Some Lots are much larger than others and may have

		<p>greater potential to absorb a greater area of built form.</p> <p>Limiting the building coverage to 250m² will encourage built form on more than one level; this in some cases having effects in terms of visual amenity and the ability to access significant view shafts within the landscape. Further, sites with height restrictions are unfairly disadvantaged.</p> <p>For these reasons, we seek for the current building coverage (500m²) to be upheld.</p>
--	--	--

We wish to be heard by the Council in support of this submission. If others make a similar submission we would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

ROSS ALLAN ON BEHALF OF THE ALLAN FAMILY TRUST



Signed on behalf of the Submitter
by Brown & Pemberton Planning Group Ltd

per G Pemberton/P Riddell

DATED the 28th day of May 2007

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

Ross Allan
C/- Brown & Pemberton Planning Group Ltd
P O Box 1467
Queenstown

Attention: G Pemberton/P Riddell

Tel: (03) 409 2258
Fax: (03) 409 2259

Email: gemma@brownpemberton.com
philippa@brownpemberton.com