

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
FOR FAR NORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER Submissions and further submissions in relation to the
proposed Far North District Plan (Hearing Stream 15C)

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MARCUS HAYDEN LANGMAN ON BEHALF OF
LUCKLAW FARM LIMITED (#551, FS373), TRUSTEES OF THE TARANAKI
TRUST (#552) AND GRACE ANNE STURGESS (#553)**

Dated: 2 October 2025

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Marcus Hayden Langman. I am an independent planning consultant engaged by Lucklaw Farm Limited,¹ Trustees of the Taranaki Trust² and Grace Anne Sturgess³ to provide expert evidence on the on its submissions on the proposed Far North District Plan in relation to rezoning of land at Rangiputa and Puwheke. My experience and qualifications are set out in my primary evidence dated 9 June 2025.
2. I would like to introduce the team in order who can respond to questions from the Panel on the evidence presented to date:
 - (a) Mr Gavin Sole (Wastewater)
 - (b) Ms Bridget Gilbert (Landscape)
 - (c) Ms Melanie Dixon (Ecology)
 - (d) Mr Deane Scanlan (Traffic)
 - (e) Myself (Planning)
 - (f) Mr Sturgess (As the primary Submitter)
3. Mr James Blyth has presented evidence on hydrological matters, and unfortunately Mr Blyth isn't available for the hearing today, but if there are any questions from the Panel in relation to his evidence, we would be happy to provide a response in writing.
4. We have had the opportunity to listen to the concerns of further submitters on the hearing, and evidence presented to date. We highlight some of the key matters in response to some of the issues raised and are happy to respond to questions from the Panel in relation to those matters. Mr Stuart Ryan, Barrister for Lucklaw Farm Limited, has provided a brief legal response to issues raised, and I have copies of Mr Ryan's response available for the Panel.

Position

5. My rebuttal evidence sets out the position for the submitters, alongside the rezoning request. Essentially, the proposal seeks the insertion of a

¹ Submission #551

² Submission #552

³ Submission #553

masterplan to enable a comprehensive approach for the restoration and enhancement of the land that is the subject of submission, through the insertion of a masterplan as the Puwheke Development Area Chapter in the Far North District Plan (**FNDP**). We have maintained our best efforts to provide for clear development of the site for Rural Lifestyle Zone (**RLZ**), General Residential Zone (**GRZ**) and Mixed Use Zone (**MUZ**) development across the sites.

6. The zoning request in submissions does include land not owned by the submitters, in particular the blocks in Area A of the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Initial consultation was undertaken with the owners of this land, indicating that the area to be included covering these areas was proposed to be rezoned RLZ. We understand they may file a formal position on this to the Hearing Panel. However, from a planning point of view, it is my position that a logical RLZ extension across this land makes sense, due to the smaller block layout of those sites. If the owners would prefer Rural Production Zone as notified being retained on those blocks, this does not impact on the request on the balance of the rezoning sought.
7. I consider the proposal to take into account mātauranga Māori principles through DEC-PWK-P4 through subdivision, land-use and enhancement and restoration activities, and implementation through information requirements under DEV-PWK-R5 for subdivision and resource consents provides a significant, and novel approach to enable input for mana whenua. Mr Sturgess is happy to receive information if there are any particular issues with the merits of what is proposed through the development area plan in relation to cultural values, as well as receiving information through the consenting process.
8. I note that the proposal as set out includes sensitive colour requirements, provision for ongoing animal and plant pest management (for subdivision), which can address pet ownership, and significant restoration. In addition, the proposal seeks to protect and enhance natural freshwater systems, and where possible improve water quality. This will have beneficial outcomes for the waterbodies located within the farm, both in terms of the lakes, as well as stream.
9. In relation to infrastructure, the best outcome is for wastewater is for development of a system to be vested with Council, including improvement for the existing Rangiputa Wastewater Treatment Plan as outlined in the

evidence of Mr Sole. An option has been included should the Council not wish to take on an improved system, through provision of a private system. We remain happy to work with FNDC on the best outcome for both Rangiputa and the Puwheke Development Area.

10. In relation to the rebuttal traffic statement from Mr Collins, we are happy to incorporate appropriate provisions into the Development Area provisions. We are also happy to undertake any further discussion with Council officers to provide an agreed statement back to the Panel through expert conferences, if that will assist the Panel, should the Panel be minded to approve the request.
11. Should the proposed requested rezoning not occur, the land will revert to Rural Production Zone as notified. In my opinion, this is an inferior outcome for biodiversity values, and will retain the status quo in terms of limited farming activity, and remove significant restoration and enhancement opportunities, and the ability to fund the outcomes sought through the rezoning request.

Marcus Hayden Langman

Date: 2 October 2025