

Plan Change 26: Lot Coverage		
Submission Number	Relief Sought	Submitter Name
1	Incorrect Land Unit 2 applied to property involved at Gray Road, GBI. To re-address the problem.	Alan Hight Gray and Doreta Joyce Aldyth Gray
2	To turn down the proposed plan changes.	Cheryl Backstrom
3/1 3/2 3/3	I support reducing the amount of lot coverage in LU 8; I oppose the increase in lot coverage in LU 11 and LU 23. Plan Change 26 be withdrawn/postponed until the 'first in the pipeline' ""Essentially Waiheke"" is formalised within the HGI D Plan; Or ACity modify the proposed Plan Changes in favour of 'Variations' that reflect the community view.	Sue Fitchett
4	We oppose allowing more lot-coverage in Land Unit 23 as a permitted activity.	Matiatia-Oneroa Ratepayers and Residents Assoc. Inc.
5	The proposed Plan Modification is supported as it will provide for a reasonable level of development without any adverse effects on the environment. Approve proposed Plan Modification 26 as it relates to Land Unit 11.	L A Crowley and N A Doran
6	I oppose the inclusion of plan changes ... 26, Lot Coverage. The proposed changes are unenforceable.	Tim Knight
7	To reject the Plan changes in their present form.	Friends of the Okahuiti Wetlands
8/1 8/2 8/3	The following wording (or words to such effect) is suggested; <i>"6.23.4.1 Permitted Activities B. Particular Rules (b) Where activities on land within the boundaries of an area managed under the Conservation Act 1987, are consistent with the provisions of an operative Conservation Management Strategy or Plan, a resource consent shall not be required. "</i> Not setting a limit for lot coverage within Land Unit 23 (Conservation Islands) would also address the Department's concerns. That Plan Change 26 be amended to include the consequential amendment to the permitted activity provisions for Land Unit 23 outlined above; or That Plan Change 26 be amended such that there is no restriction for lot coverage in Land Unit 23.	Department of Conservation
9	No relaxation of laws that protect natural environments.	Rodger Scott
10	Delay consideration of these changes until the 2006 review of the District Plan.	Christopher John Braxton
11/1 11/2	I oppose this proposal as the existing 15% was imposed/agreed because of the problems of water run off, drainage, septic tank drainage and this was deemed an acceptable area. That the Council decline the proposal.	R K Fraser
12/1 12/2	We oppose the increase in the allowable lot coverage. Reject cluster subdivision on outer islands.	Susan and Kevin Smith
13	Lot coverage should include impermeable surfaces such as driveways.	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Of New

		Zealand: Hauraki Islands Branch
14	That the proposed amendments are cancelled.	Lynette Loris Reed
16/1	Great Barrier Community Board is very keen to support changes that reduce the overall cost of sustainable development and changes that are sympathetic to the traditional values and growth requirements of our communities.....	Great Barrier Community Board
16/2	Great Barrier Community Board request Plan Modification 26 be withdrawn.	
17	I oppose the adoption of this plan change for the following reasons: 1) Lot coverage must include all impermeable surfaces. 2) I would like to see a cap put on lot coverage. 3) LU 11 should remain at 15%.	Susan Washington
18	I oppose the increase of permitted lot coverage to 20% as this will change the nature of the area. That the lot coverage limit not be changed.	Stephen James Tetley
19/1	Retain the existing provisions (with suggested amendments)	Brian and Robin Griffiths
19/2	We oppose the lot Coverage Plan Change. Our reasons for opposing are as follows;	
19/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lot coverage definition should include impermeable surfaces as well as tanks, sheds garages and decks.</li> <li>ACC should retain and rigorously enforce the existing DP Lot Coverage. This must include especially the abandonment of the "restricted discretionary" category and overall no relaxing of the provisions for third party involvement.</li> </ul>	
19/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 500 sq m threshold needs to be thoroughly reviewed.</li> </ul>	
19/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definition should include impermeable surfaces.</li> </ul>	
19/6	ACC must do a better job next time around.	
20	This increase in lot coverage is not consistent with 6.Biii and 6.B 1.2.4 of the operative plan. Revert to the 15% coverage or treat LU 11 applications as Discretionary to enable flexibility on the few larger LU 11 sites.	Gordon Shirley Hodson
21/1	Reject proposals to increase lot coverage in any Waiheke Land Unit and	Lynnette Lawry Gilmore
21/2	Specify areas covered in impermeable surfacing (driveway, parking/turning as part of lot Coverage as currently limited.	
22	Keep lot coverage on Land Unit 11 at 15% and add provisions that force a minimum % of vegetation (of substance) on site as well.	Joan Kirk
23	These proposed changes to the District Plan do not go ahead.	Vanessa Pickering
25	That the 500m <sup>2</sup> threshold be lowered. We also request that the definition of "Lot Coverage" should include all impermeable surfaces.	Stacey Shuck and Simon Griffiths

26/1	Please include in "lot coverage" ALL impermeable surfaces (concrete drives, car-turning and parking areas etc).	Lyndsay Lee Meager
26/2	I want Auckland City to undertake a vigorous information campaign about the contribution of impermeable surfaces to the degradation of coastal waters and to provide incentives for using eg cobblestones instead of solid concrete for driveways	
27	I oppose the following proposed plan changes: Increase in lot coverage in Land Unit 11 from 15% to 20%. Retain the existing lot coverage in Land Unit 11. Definition of lot coverage should also include all impermeable surfaces.	Ann Jocelyn Kinghorn
28	That the plan change be withdrawn. I would like the Council to withdraw the plan change in favour of the status quo. My preference is for a policy which encourages the minimal lot coverage.	Janet Hunt
29/1	The increase to 20% of lot coverage may be too great a permitted covered area to leave sufficient land area for adequate disposal of water. The areas of ground covered by impermeable surfaces eg. free standing water tanks, tennis courts, swimming pools and concrete driveways and manoeuvring areas should be included as lot coverage	Ostend Ratepayers and Residents Association
29/2	It behoves any Councillors selected for these hearings to do a considerable amount of research into the background of the HGIs, and their present Operative District Plan, along with the document "Essentially Waiheke" before tackling their very difficult task. They will need to bring to it a mindset that is far removed from the City Urban Development approach that surrounds them in their normal work.	
29/3	To retain the provision of the Operative District Plan (HGI) and require a maximum 15% lot coverage in Land Unit 11.	
29/4	To redefine lot coverage to include ALL impermeable surfaces associated with the building, accessory buildings and their access ways.	
30/1	Include all impermeable surfaces in definition of lot coverage.	Isobel Hawley
30/2	Strictly enforce the 15% of coverage in Land Unit 11	
31/1	The particular parts of the Proposed Plan Change that are opposed are: The proposed amendments to Land Unit 11 Stormwater Matters It is noted that while the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan contains restrictions in relation to lot coverage, there appears to be no restrictions in relation to maximum impermeable surface areas on lots. This is of concern as lot coverage only relates to those areas of a lot covered by buildings or part of buildings, and therefore does not include accessways and other impermeable surfaces on a site. Auckland City Council should look at whether the increase in impermeable surface areas as a result of the increase in permitted lot coverage results in additional stormwater within some of the residential catchments,	Auckland Regional Council: Environmental Management

	and the impact of this increase on these stormwater discharge applications.	
31/2	Declining the proposed amendments concerning lot coverage on Land Unit 11, and amending the provisions in a manner that addresses the concerns outlined in this submission.	
32	Definition should include impermeable surfaces and water tanks because these also reduce soakage area. Expand the definition of lot coverage to include impermeable surfaces and water tanks.	Ivan Kitson
34	Freeze the process. Go back into the field. Set up meetings with the many interested parties on the island. Do real consultation. Go out and reality check the draft ideas.	Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation
35	20% lot coverage is unacceptable. Leave lot coverage for Land Unit 11 as it is in the 1996 Operative Hauraki Gulf Islands section.	Dr. Lesley-Joan Stone
36	Proposal of lot sizes are still too large in some areas. Size should be subject to the type of land to be subdivided. Consider the proposal.	Charles George Blackwell
37	[Propose] 20% lot coverage on LU2 property ie Medlands Beach.	Sean O'Shea
39	We find the proposed changes acceptable and agree with the rationale behind the changes. Council accepts the proposed plan change 26.	Lance Dixon and Isabel Fordham
40	Scope, flexibility, power to the owner not the neighbour and their various cohorts.	Mickey O'Shea
41/1	The proposed changes should be withdrawn and public opinion sought at the end of the District Plan (HGI), operative time span. When the District Plan Hauraki Gulf Section comes up for review, Waiheke Island should have it's own separate district plan based on the wishes of the community outlined in ""Essentially Waiheke"" and submissions to the review.	Kristin Lewis
41/2	I support the proposed changes to lot coverage for land Units 2,5,6 and 8 for Waiheke Island. I agree that smaller sites have less area for onsite effluent disposal and lot coverage should therefore be reduced in these cases. The proposed changes to lot coverage for Land Units 2,5,6 and 8 for Waiheke Island should be adopted.	
41/3	I strongly oppose the proposed increase in lot coverage for Land Unit 11 for Waiheke Island. The proposed increase in lot coverage for Land Unit 11 should be rejected in favour of the existing lot coverage of 15% as outlined in the District Plan (HGI) (Operative1996)	
42	25 Hector Sanderson Road, Great Barrier Island. That the property be rezoned.	Charles George Blackwell
43	I wish to lodge the strongest objection to the proposed plan changes as I believe them to be.... in direct conflict with the objectives and principles of the Hauraki Islands Marine Park Act.	Auckland Regional Council: Michael Lee

44/1	The Cathcart Family, unless otherwise noted, conditionally supports the approach taken the Plan Modification if the increased leniency in some of the controls are coupled with mandatory responsibilities and obligations (in conjunction with the performance standards or conditions imposed in relation to activity applications) to reduce or completely alleviate the potential adverse effects of the relaxed controls. In particular, mandatory mechanisms that: (a) Recognise and provide for protection against the adverse effects of stormwater and sediment discharge stemming from increased lot coverage. (b) Recognise and provide for adequate and enforceable protection against the adverse effects of modification of the natural character of the landscape through increases physical effects, decreased lot sizes.	The Cathcart Family
44/2	Modify the plan change to account for integrated management principles and sustainable development in conjunction with an adequate section 32 analysis.	
44/3	Modify the permitted standards to make additional tanks, increased vegetation (or minimum levels of vegetation) and limits on impermeable surfaces (and other stormwater related design techniques) part of the permitted activity performance standards for relaxed lot coverage, particularly for hazard prone areas and land unit 11.	
44/4	Add specific related criteria to applications for discretionary activities that seek increases in lot coverage to control the potential adverse effects from stormwater.	
45	Revision of plan modifications that propose to impact on vegetation currently protected. Revision working party to include experienced arborists.	Greenscene Ltd.
46	Proposed plan modification 26 [is] not opposed...but I object to the provisions for lots on Land Unit 4. Great Barriers swamps should all be fully protected from any form of development. Any subdivision, vegetation clearance or earthwork on Land Units 1,2 and 4 should be discretionary and notifiable and only considered under exceptional circumstances.	Awana Catchment Group Great Barrier Island
47	We OPPOSE in their entirety, the Plan Modifications [26] that seek to replace most of the provisions for ...Lot Coverage... throughout most land units in the HGIDPlan. Should the ACity proceed with these Four Plan Modifications we seek that the Commissioners should decline the Plan Modifications 23-26 in their entirety.	Gulf District Plan Association Inc
48	I OPPOSE in their entirety, the Plan Modifications 23-26 that seek to replace most of the provisions for Earthworks, Lot Coverage, Subdivision and Vegetation Clearance throughout most land units in The HGI Plan. Should the ACity proceed with these Four Plan Modifications we seek that the Commissioners should decline the Plan Modifications 23-26 in their entirety.	Jay Clarke
49	That the proposed plan changes be disallowed and that the Council recognises the unique environment and lifestyle of Waiheke.	Jacqui Furniss

50	That the plan change be disallowed and that Council upholds the principle of community involvement at all times.	Kanya Stewart
51	Lot coverage should include all impermeable surfaces including garages, tanks, sealed/concreted driveways etc.	Eve Harrison
52	I wish the Council to reject all four plan changes in their entirety.	Thomas Dietsche
53/1 53/2	The council reject the proposed plan change in their entirety. Refer to "Essentially Waiheke", the existing HGIDP and the HGMPA. I am strongly opposed to an increased lot coverage in LU 11.	Anne E Ripper
54	In "Essentially Waiheke" and the District Plan Waiheke residents expressly opposed lots smaller than 2000 sq m. I oppose any changes that undermine these values.	Jill Jackson
55/1 55/2	Retain existing controls. I strongly object to the reduction in minimum lot sizes to allow for more subdivision.	Liz Ross
56	Do not allow increased density of housing. Reject any proposed changes which don't fit with [this]	Yvette Hewlett
57/1 57/2	I support proposed changes to lot coverage permitted in LU 2, 5, 6, 8. I oppose proposed changes to lot coverage permitted in LU 11.	Hanne Sorenson
58/1 58/2	I support changes in LU's 2, 5, 6 and 8 which reduce the permitted Lot Coverage. I oppose the changes in LU11 and wish the rules to remain unchanged.	Robert Paul Morton
59/1 59/2	Land Units 2,5,6, 8: I support the changes to take into account different lot sizes with the exception of Cluster Housing where a lot coverage of 500sqm is permitted on a 2000sq m lot. Land Unit 11:I object to the increase to the increase in lot coverage and wish this to be retained as is.	Lynne Stewart
60	The current proposed changes must not be allowed.	Carol Handin and John Ball
61	If this increase eventuates it must include impermeable surfaces, eg driveways, patios,etc. We must protect as much natural environment as possible. Don't make it urban or suburban atmosphere with lots of concrete.	Carol A Handin
62	Turn down these changes.	Jill Yvette Robson
63	Not increase the amount of lot coverage in any land units	Rhonda and John Griffiths
64	No great changes for Great Barrier Island - should be revisited again! Object to Land Unit 23 - because it has been given preferential treatment over private land! That my objections be considered with fairness and justice thereby reflecting on the economy	BWR Sanderson and The Workington Trust
65	I reject the proposed plan modifications.	Susan Washington
66/1	Impermeable surfaces should be a fundamental factor in deciding lot coverage. Have guidelines for proportions of permeable to impermeable surfaces (including all	Judith Madarasz

	buildings, driveways etc.) for lots especially in Land Unit 11.	
66/2	I support the introduction of percentage or sq m. Lot coverage measures in Land Units 2,5,6 and 23.	
66/3	I oppose the change in Land Unit 11 to 20% coverage.	
67	Land Unit 11: I oppose the increase of permitted lot coverage to 20%. That lot coverage limit not be increased from 15%.	Ann Jillian Tetley
68	I oppose the proposed plan changes to part 6 of lot coverage. Leave the current standards for the above mentioned alone. Do not change them.	Kate Rowntree.
69	I oppose the proposed plan changes to part 6 of lot coverage. Leave the current standards for the above mentioned alone. Do not change them.	Gregory John Cantwell