

RUSSELL PROTECTION SOCIETY (INC)

P O Box 154
Russell, Bay of Islands
rps.org.nz

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

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

Further submitter details:

Full name of individual/organisation making further submission: Russell Protection Society

Contact person (if different from above): Bob Drey, Chairperson

Email address: russellprotectionsociety@outlook.com

Postal address: PO Box 154, Russell

Postcode 0242

Preferred method of contact: Email

Phone contact: 09 403 8147 Daytime: Mobile: 021 081 00590

2. Eligibility to make a further submission

We are: A group representing a relevant aspect of the public interest and a group who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has. Our reasons for selecting the categories above are:

The Russell Protection Society (RPS) was formed in 1986 by a group of enlightened ratepayers with the specific purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds. The RPS has been directly involved in the process of ensuring that the Far North District Plan and the Northland Regional Coastal Policy give proper recognition and support to protecting those historic, cultural and environmental values that make Russell such a unique place. In 2013 the RPS was recognised by the Environment Court as having an interest greater than the general public.

3. Request to be heard at hearing

Yes, We wish to be heard at the hearing in support of our further submissions

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

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



_____ Date:

The specific submission(s) on the Proposed Far North District Plan that this further submission relates to are:

Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	We seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
John Andrew Riddell	431	431.001 – 431.170	Support	Submission aligns with our values	Whole FS332.001 - FS332.170
Russell Landcare	276	276.001-276.019	Support	Submission aligns with our values	Whole FS332.171 - FS332.187
Pacific Ecologic	451	451.001-451.026	Support	Submission aligns with our values	Whole FS332.188 - FS332.213
Living Waters	303	303.001-303.003	Support	Submission aligns with our values	Whole FS332.214 - FS332.216
Groundswell NZ	465	465.001	Oppose	Contrary to RMA	Whole FS332.217
Thomson Survey	195	195.001	Oppose	Threshold of 1000m2 necessary to protect environment, esp in coastal areas	Part FS332.218
Thomson Survey	196	196.001	Oppose	Threshold of 500m2 necessary to protect coastal bush escarpments	Part FS332.219
Thomson Survey	198	198.001-198.002	Oppose	Making farming a discretionary activity in coastal areas is entirely appropriate	Part FS332.220 FS332.221
Thomson Survey	206	206.001	Oppose	Subdivision of SNA should be non-complying to avoid fragmentation of ecological units	Whole FS332.222
Lynley Newport	120	120,001	Oppose	Avoiding effects is preferable to remedying or mitigating these	Whole FS332.223
Lynley Newport	122	122.001	Oppose	Vegetation clearance in coastal SNA should be non-complying to protect vulnerable landscapes	Whole FS332.224
Lynley Newport	131	131.001	Oppose	Indigenous vegetation clearance controls in	Whole FS332.225

				PDP are entirely appropriate	
Lynley Newport	135	135.001	Oppose	Rural Lifestyle Zones should not be expanded in coastal areas	Part FS332.226
Northland Planning	502	502.018	Oppose	The Orongo Bay Zone is located in a highly visible coastal location and hence the 5m height control is appropriate	Whole FS332.227
Northland Planning	502	502.082	Oppose	In lieu of coastal zones, Rural Production zones provide for the necessary protection of vulnerable coastal areas, esp in the Bay of Is	Part – retain 40/8 ha min size for RPZ and 4/2ha for RLZ, with no RDAs FS332.228
Northland Planning	502	502.083	Oppose	Reducing minimum requirements for EBS would serve to undermine whole concept	Part FS332.229
Northland Planning	502	502.086	Oppose	Subdivision of SNA in coastal area should be non-complying	Part FS332.230
Federated Farmers	421	421.178	Oppose	RPZ minimum allotment size is appropriate at 40ha to avoid land fragmentation	Part FS332.231
Federated Farmers	421	421.180, 421.181, 421.182, 421.185, 421.186	Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas	Whole FS332.232 - FS332.236
Federated Farmers	421	421 204 - 208	Oppose	Subdivision of RPZ lands for lifestyle blocks should not be an automatic right	Part FS332.237 - FS332.241
Waitoto Developments	263	263.002	Oppose	All earthworks need to be controlled in this coastal site	Part FS332.242
Waitoto Developments	263	263.029	Oppose	Existing building/structure coverage rules are necessary for this highly visible coastal site	Part FS332.243
Waitoto	263	263,032,	Oppose	All of the Coastal	Whole

Developments		283.034, 263.35, 263.037		Environment rules should apply to this highly visible site adjoining Orongo Bay	FS332.244 - FS332.247
Robert Adams	149	149.001	Oppose	The rear sites at Long Beach are elevated and highly visible in this iconic landscape and hence are more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle	Whole FS332.248
Robert Adams	153	153.001	Oppose	Earthworks setbacks are important to protect adjoining property owner's rights	Whole FS332.249
Robert Adams	155	155.001	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is a commercial activity that requires separate access	Whole FS332.250
Omata Estates	548	548.001	Oppose	The correct zonings have already been applied	Whole FS332.251
Omata Estates	548	548.002	Oppose	The surrounding sites are also correctly zoned	Whole FS332.252
Omata Estates	548	548.003	Oppose	Rule CE-R1 is relevant for this coastal site	Whole FS332.253
Omata Estates	548	548.004	Oppose	Rule CE-S5 is relevant to this coastal site	Whole FS332.254
Omata Estates	548	548.005	Oppose	Rule NH-S1 is relevant to this coastal site	Whole FS332.255
Willowridge	250	250.003	Oppose	Allowing increase in GFA in hazzard areas increases risk of legal action for Council	Part FS332.256
Willowridge	250	250.006, 250.007, 250.008, 250.009	Oppose	The SNA rules and environmental protections in the PDP are entirely appropriate	Part FS332.257 - FS332.260
Willowridge	250	250.011	Oppose	Subdivisions in the CE should be discretionary	Whole FS332.261
Willowridge	250	250.012	Oppose	RPZ minimum allotment size of 40ha is appropriate in coastal areas	Part FS332.262
Willowridge	250	250.016	Oppose	As for 250.003	Part FS332.263
Willowridge	250	250.017, 250.018	Oppose	Existing controls are appropriate in this coastal area	Part FS332.264 FS332.265

Willowridge	250	250.020	Oppose	Limiting housing development in the RPZ is desirable, especially in coastal areas.	Part FS332.266
Willowridge	250	250.031	Oppose	The RPZ zoned land is unsuitable for RSZ and would allow over development of this sensitive coastal land	Whole FS332.267
Morrison	044	044.001	Oppose	These lands have already been subdivided from General Coastal and are important in defining the boundary between urban Russell and the natural coastal hinterland. These properties do not share the characteristics of the KRSZ and are not within the area serviced by the Russell Sewerage Scheme. This would serve to promote unwise development.	Whole FS332.268
Morrison	044	004.002	Oppose	This would serve to undermine the EBS concept	Part FS332.269
Shortland	315	315.001	Oppose	As for 044.001	Whole FS332.270



Bob Drey
Chairperson
Russell Protection Society

Address for Service: As above