



## Proposed Far North District Plan further submission form

**Form 6: Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission(s) on the notified Proposed Far North District Plan**

*Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To: Far North District Council**

This is a further submission in support of or in opposition to submission(s) on the Proposed Far North District Plan.

<b>1. Further submitter details</b> (mandatory information)	
Full name of individual/organisation making further submission:	Peter Malcolm
Contact person (if different from above):	
Email address:	—
Postal address:	P.O. Box 596, Kerikeri 0245 Northland
	Postcode
Preferred method of contact:	<input type="checkbox"/> Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post
Phone contact:	Daytime: Mobile: 0274 477211

**2. Eligibility to make a further submission** (for information on this section go to RMA Schedule 1, clause 8)

I am:

- A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- A person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- the local authority

My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are:

Family owns land in adjacent, multiple titles in rural production zone.

*For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups*

*Any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has is likely to include owners of land and users of resources directly affected by plan provisions. It is also likely to include iwi and hapu where their interests are directly affected.*

**3. Request to be heard at hearing**

- Yes, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission; or
- No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

- Yes       No

**Signature of further submitter:**

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of further submitter)

P. G. Malcol .

Date:

25.8.23

(A signature is not required if you are making your further submission by electronic means)

## **Further Submission re. Proposed FNDC District Plan**

Submitter – P.Malcolm, PO Box 596, Kerikeri 0245

I support submission S119 mentioning that boundary changes in rural production areas in the proposed FNDC District Plan are too restrictive / inflexible.

**Reasons** – In the proposed FNDC District Plan, rural boundary adjustments are permitted provided the minimum lot size is 8ha. Minimum lot sizes of 8ha are too large and do not cater for boundary adjustments between smaller existing titles. For example, two adjacent 6ha titles may wish to adjust their boundaries so that one ends up with 10ha and the other with 2ha.

Many farms consist of multiple, adjacent titles. The flexibility to adjust boundaries on such farms so that there are a number of smaller 1ha lots alongside a single, financially more viable, larger holding could be beneficial for many. Many older farmers and family members wishing to retire / slow down, would appreciate the opportunity to remain on the farm where they had spent much of their life. Instead of selling and moving away from the district, they could reside on a smaller, more easily managed title, thus retaining associations / connections with the area. Such a policy could well lead to greater investment in the larger title, thus enhancing rural productivity which in turn has beneficial consequences for the district / region.

### **I seek the following:**

Boundary adjustments among existing titles in rural areas should be permitted. However the minimum area for the smaller parcel should be 1ha, not 8 ha as suggested in the Proposed FNDC District Plan. This will mean that if two neighbours, each with existing 20ha titles so wished, they could have a boundary adjustment such that one ended up with 39 ha and the other with 1ha. Similarly neighbours, one with 1ha and the other with 50ha, might adjust their titles such that one ended up with 4ha and the other with 47ha. Such a policy would not result in additional titles and indeed could lead to diversification of local agricultural production, greater investment and thus enhanced rural productivity.

FS585.001