

My name is Graeme McMillan and for my sins I am the Chair of the Rangiputa Community Incorporated Society. I am appearing before the Committee regarding the submissions lodged by Lucklaw Farm Limited, S551, FS373, Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, S552 and Grace Anne Sturgess, S553. I have been invited by Mr Morse to present in conjunction with their submission on the proposed rezoning at Rangiputa.

I can confirm that I support the recommendation made in the Councils Section 42a Planning report that the submissions not be supported and the rezoning requested be rejected, and that the land in question should remain Rural Production Zone.

Me and my wife have a property at 734 Rangiputa Road which we have owned for 22 years and like many other people who have properties here, our children will take over the property so that they can ensure Rangiputa retains its uniqueness.

Rangiputa is a small isolated coastal village of considerable character. The village and surrounding areas offer both residents and holiday makers quiet enjoyment of the highest quality. There are around 125 properties in the village which is an enclave wedged between the harbour frontage and extensive areas of rural coastal land. The surrounding area is largely undeveloped and rural which adds to the character of the village.

In addition, Rangiputa has only one road access which is a dead end and at times of high traffic it is difficult for safety vehicles such as fire engines and ambulance to get through.

Disruption to such quiet enjoyment by development of the surrounding lands would greatly diminish the overall attractiveness of the area. That disruption would be caused by additional traffic, demand for services, increased noise and amenity effects, and a loss or change of the surrounding rural area which gives the village its unique sense of place.

The proposal (based on the proposed zoning and likely lot yield), would effectively double the size of the existing village allowing for an additional 130 – 140 residential and rural lifestyle lots and extend it into areas that should not be developed. With no apparent Council support to service this scale of development, and the likely adverse effects on existing residents, this cannot be supported.

In the FNDC Proposed District Plan it talks about how the plan needs to not “detract from the amenity of the area” and also the “detrimental impact on the amenity of the area” and “negative impact on the neighbourhood” and “causing undue detriment to the amenity of the area”.

Over the years the Rangiputa community has made all efforts to ensure that we adhere to these plans.

Examples of this include:

- In 2004 the community a big part in stopping the proposed logging port in the Rangaunu Harbour. And if this had gone ahead we wouldn't be talking about rezoning as we would all be down on the beach picking up bark.
- In 2002 the community got together to fund and build the fire station and community hall across from Motutara Drive.

- When cyclone Gabriel hit, the community rallied and organised a huge clean up that went on for days. Following the clean-up we approached the Mayoral Relief Fund and received \$30,000 to rebuild the seawall. This was very much appreciated but it soon became obvious that further funding was needed to build up the wall to the required standards under our NRC 26 year consents to manage and repair the wall. As a result of this the community dug into their pockets and put in \$52,000 to ensure the wall was up to standards. While the seawall mainly impacts on the beach front properties, it also impacts on everyone who visits Rangiputa, because without the wall there would be no beach.
- Last year the community voted to become an incorporated society which would help us with funding for projects such as putting in new security cameras.
- The community recently worked with the FNDC to put in new, and wider boat ramp as the previous ramp had broken up.
- The White Sands Motel has new owners and as part of this they have set up a small shop that is well used by the community and visitors.
- We also worked with DOC to repair the dirt ramp at the other end of the beach and open up the reserve for more parking of cars and trailers. For many years the reserve was mowed and cared for by one of Rangiputa's property owners, Dave Wilkinson who recently passed. His efforts were acknowledged recently and area is now named the Dave Wilkinson Reserve.

While these efforts have helped ensure that Rangiputa can maintain its uniqueness there are clear signs that the popularity of the area is showing infrastructure strains.

Over the years, televised and internet fishing shows have resulted in a wave of new anglers heading to Rangiputa. Along with great fishing in the area, the anglers realise Rangiputa is the only boat ramp that is sheltered from easterly winds and they can launch their big boats on the beach.

Even on calm weekdays right through the year it is not uncommon to have 20 or more cars and boat trailers parked along the road.

As a result, there are periods of the year when Rangiputa is barely able to service the needs of the local community, holiday makers, day trippers and fishermen with roading, parking, services, beach access and general amenities.

The committee of the Rangiputa Community Inc have emailed the community with the proposed plans put forward by Lucklaw Farms Limited, The Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess.

As a result, we have had 40 responses from property owners at Rangiputa and all of them have requested that the proposal be rejected.

The reasons for rejecting the proposal include:

While the proposed submissions and plans references tangata whenua and cultural values they haven't even consulted with local iwi / hapu for such a large proposed development site – this is a significant shortcoming. Given the history of cultural concerns and involvement of Ngati Kahu in development on the Karikari peninsula, this should have been front of mind and suitably addressed before now.

No efforts have been made in the development plan to improve accessibility or public access to the coastal margins in the proposal as per Policies 18 and 19 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy 2010.

Policy 6(1) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement is pretty central to any decision on the proposal.

It states that In relation to the coastal environment: It must recognise that the provision of infrastructure, the supply and transport of energy including the generation and transmission of electricity, and the extraction of minerals are activities important to the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities;

It must consider the rate at which built development and the associated public infrastructure should be enabled to provide for the reasonably foreseeable needs of population growth without compromising the other values of the coastal environment;

It must encourage the consolidation of existing coastal settlements and urban areas where this will contribute to the avoidance or mitigation of sprawling or sporadic patterns of settlement and urban growth;

It must recognise tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae and associated developments and make appropriate provision for them;

It must consider where and how built development on land should be controlled so that it does not compromise activities of national or regional importance that have a functional need to locate and operate in the coastal marine area;

It must consider where development that maintains the character of the existing built environment should be encouraged, and where development resulting in a change in character would be acceptable;

It must take into account the potential of renewable resources in the coastal environment, such as energy from wind, waves, currents and tides, to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;

It must consider how adverse visual impacts of development can be avoided in areas sensitive to such effects, such as headlands and prominent ridgelines, and as far as practicable and reasonable apply controls or conditions to avoid those effects;

It must have set back development from the coastal marine area and other water bodies, where practicable and reasonable, to protect the natural character, open space, public access and amenity values of the coastal environment

I ask that the Commissioners carefully consider what the Policy Statement requires as it relates to the subject site. Myself and many other residents believe that the proposal cannot possibly achieve what these policies require.