



Ruthenberg

Sep 16, 2025, 9:38 PM (8 days ago)

Dear Mac,

Thank you for sending this through. I am strongly opposed to the development proposal. I chose to move to Rangiputa precisely because it is remote, underdeveloped, and environmentally pristine. It would be a tragedy if this proposal were to proceed.

The unique character of Rangiputa will be permanently altered. Real estate values in the existing community are likely to decline, and the natural environment will suffer. Existing facilities—such as the boat ramp—will become overcrowded and deteriorate further.

It is clear that a few individuals may stand to profit from this project, but it would come at the expense of the wider community and the special qualities that make Rangiputa what it is.

Kind regards,

cheers adrian

Here is my more formal response:

## Introduction

I write in strong opposition to the rezoning proposal advanced by Lucklaw Farm Limited, Trustees of Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess, which seeks to rezone land around Rangiputa and Puwheke from the currently notified **Rural Production Zone** to a mix of **Mixed Use, Residential, and Rural Lifestyle zones**. I oppose this proposal for the following reasons:

---

## Grounds of Opposition

### 1. Protection of Outstanding Natural Character, Landscape, and Ecology

- The area in question includes significant landscape and ecological values. According to the proposal's own evidence, there are **wetlands, dune systems, heathland**, and indigenous vegetation and habitats of fauna. These are sensitive environments that risk being irrevocably harmed by intensification. [fndc.govt.nz/2](https://fndc.govt.nz/2)
- The coastal environment is fragile. Development—even if set back somewhat—inevitably increases pressures from human activity: erosion, introduced pests/plants, runoff, light and noise, and general disturbance.
- The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) requires *avoidance* (or where that's not possible, stringent remedy or mitigation) of adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and habitat. The proposal claims ecological effects are “relatively minor” and manageable by consent, but that underestimates cumulative effects and the risks of precedent. [fndc.govt.nz/](https://fndc.govt.nz/)

## 2. Failure to Adequately Address Infrastructure Capacity & Environmental Risks

- The existing wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in Rangiputa is not adequate for the proposed increase in load. The proposal acknowledges that a **new plant** or substantial upgrade is needed. That carries costs, delays, and environmental risk (especially during construction, failure, or overflow). [fndc.govt.nz](https://fndc.govt.nz)
- Stormwater, sediment runoff, and other pollution risks associated with increased impervious surfaces are downplayed. While “water sensitive design” is referred to, such mitigation often underdelivers in practice unless extremely well enforced. The possibility of nutrient leaching, sedimentation in waterways, impacts downstream in the coastal marine area are serious.
- Natural hazards are perhaps less of an issue for certain parts, but the proximity to coastal environment and dune systems means that changes in climate (sea level rise, increased storm intensity) could bring unexpected risk. The precautionary principle (which is required under NZCPS / NPSIB / RMA) suggests more caution. The proposal relies heavily on subdivisions and consents rather than upfront constraints.

## 3. Cultural, Heritage and Tangata Whenua Concerns

- The proposal identifies known archaeological sites in the marginal strip and elsewhere. Rezoning and development risk damaging such sites, either directly or through ancillary effects (access roads, earthworks etc.). Protocols for accidental discovery are helpful but do not replace the risk of loss of heritage. [fndc.govt.nz](https://fndc.govt.nz)
- Engagement with tangata whenua appears limited or preliminary. The cultural values, which may not have been fully mapped, could be compromised. The uncertainty around cultural values is acknowledged in the proposal evidence. It is not acceptable to proceed where there is possible risk to cultural heritage without full and robust engagement and mapping.

## 4. Inconsistency with Relevant National Policy Statements and Planning Objectives

- The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) requires protection of natural character, avoidance of adverse effects on landscapes, setting back development, and strategic planning in coastal environments. The proposal simply claims that many of the new urban components are outside the mapped coastal environment, but much of the Rural Lifestyle zoning is inside. That risks running counter to NZCPS policies on natural character, natural features, and visual amenity. [fndc.govt.nz](https://fndc.govt.nz)
- The NPSIB, as noted, requires avoidance or careful mitigation of effects on significant biodiversity values. The proposal’s approach of “ground-truthing” and doing assessments *after* rezoning introduces risk.
- The strategic direction in the Proposed Far North District Plan (pFNDP) likely contains objectives and policies designed to limit sprawl, protect rural production land, and preserve natural character. Rezoning may conflict with the intended outcomes of the notified Rural Production Zone, by enabling more intensive residential/commercial development.

## 5. Risk of Sprawl, Loss of Rural Production Land, and Unsustainable Growth Patterns

- One of the key values of Rural Production zoning is preserving productive rural land, buffer zones, ‘breathing space’ between settlements, and ensuring that growth is managed in strategic, sustainable ways. Rezoning will incrementally erode these buffers.
- Once rezoned, there is a strong incentive for further subdivision and development — especially for “lifestyle” properties — which tends to consume more land per dwelling, increase car dependence, and strain services.
- The growth may not be aligned with demand – the small population of Rangiputa (circa 100 in winter, ~400 in summer) suggests that demand might be seasonal, or limited. Overoptimistic assumptions about demand could lead to overdevelopment, underutilised infrastructure, or adverse environmental consequences. [fndc.govt.nz](https://fndc.govt.nz)

## 6. Uncertainty and the Precautionary Principle

- There remains considerable uncertainty regarding the actual extent of ecological, cultural, heritage, landscape, and infrastructure constraints. Rezoning is somewhat irreversible — once built, many effects cannot be undone.
- The RMA, NZCPS, and NPSIB all invoke a precautionary approach when effects are unknown or uncertain. Given that there is only partial mapping of SNAs, limited cultural values mapping, and vague masterplan elements, the proposal fails to demonstrate that the risks are fully understood or that there are robust mitigations in place.

## 7. Alternative Options Better Achieve Objectives with Less Risk

- Retaining the current Rural Production zoning would avoid or reduce many adverse effects. If some development is to occur, it could be better located, more limited in scale, more tightly constrained in terms of density, setbacks, environmental buffers, and so forth.
- If growth is needed, it might be better concentrated in existing urban settlement footprints, or infill, rather than expanding into sensitive rural/coastal lands.
- Any masterplan or zoning change should follow full engagement, detailed mapping and constraints analysis *before* rezoning decisions, rather than leaving many details to subdivision / consent stage.

---

## Requested Relief / Conditions If Rezoning Is Considered

I acknowledge that some submitters argue the rezoning could bring benefits (housing, commercial opportunities, etc.). If the commissioners are inclined to allow some form of zoning change, I request that you ensure the following stringent conditions are imposed to minimise adverse effects:

1. Full and independent ecological, landscape, and cultural heritage mapping and assessment **before** any rezoning decision, including ground-truthing SNAs, dune systems, wetlands, and all archaeological sites.
2. Robust consultation with tangata whenua and Māori groups, with specific mapping of cultural values, and binding heritage protections.

3. Strict density limits, minimum lot sizes, setbacks from dunes, coastlines, ecological zones, and from the WWTP, to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.
  4. Infrastructure capacity to be clearly proven *in advance*, including wastewater, roads, stormwater, water supply. Any new works to be designed to excellent environmental standards, with guarantees for ongoing maintenance, environmental protection, sediment control, etc.
  5. Require design controls, such as building envelopes, height limits, visual screening, landscaping, to maintain natural character and reduce visual impacts.
  6. Limit development in high-risk coastal or dune areas, and ensure climate change adaptation is embedded (sea level rise, coastal erosion, storm events, etc.).
  7. If Rural Lifestyle zoning is allowed, ensure that its scale is limited, and that dwellings are clustered rather than spread out, to preserve open space and reduce infrastructure burden.
  8. Strong monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, including financial bonds for restoration, pest control, ecological enhancement commitments, etc.
- 

## **Conclusion**

In summary, while some growth may be necessary or inevitable, the proposal as it stands represents too great a risk to the natural, cultural, ecological, landscape, and infrastructure values of Rangiputa and the surrounding area. The uncertainties and potential adverse effects are large, and insufficiently mitigated by the proposals.

I therefore urge the Commissioners to:

- Reject the proposed rezonings (Mixed Use / Residential / Rural Lifestyle) as they are currently presented; or
- If any rezoning is granted, severely limit its scale, impose strong constraints and conditions as above;
- Insist on further investigations, mapping, and consultation prior to any irreversible change.

Thank you for considering this submission.

**From:** Julie Borthwick

**Date:** 24 September 2025 at 9:58:29 am GMT+12

**To:** Alan Borthwick

**Subject: FNDC Submission:**

**FNDC Submission:**

Dear Far North Council,

I am writing to formally object to the proposal for development affecting Rangiputa Beach.

My concerns are really about a couple of issues:

Infrastructure and congestion of traffic albeit boats, trailers, cars, caravans and recreational vehicles.

WE currently have severe limitations facing us with traffic congested and boat parking especially at peak holiday times. It was never envisaged that such a small community like Rangiputa would ever have large volumes of traffic let alone even greater volumes as anticipated with this proposed development. Our roads can barely keep up with volumes as it is without overloading them further and restricting access to the beaches which is the sole reason we are all there in the first place.

I don't want to sound like a NIMBY or someone who has their own slice of paradise and does not want to share it. These issues with congested traffic of all kinds along with the inability of the current infrastructure to support more housing and commercial development need to be addressed.

Surely there are other places apart from Rangiputa that would suit such a development so much better.

We use the small retail outlets on the Peninsula as much as we can and anyone can see there is a limited requirement to extend and or expand commercial entities out this way. We do not have the permanent population to make any new commercial endeavour viable.

So yes I am opposed to there being any further commercial development at Rangiputa.

I implore the council to consider the views of the home owners at Rangiputa, the permanent residences, the holiday makers and the semi permanent residences like ourselves.

Thank you for consideration of my objections and I trust the council will see fit to take on board the serious concerns we have and actively work toward a positive solution.

Warm regards,

Alan Borthwick

## **Council Hearing Submission Lucklaw Farm Ltd/Taranaki Trust Zone Change Proposal**

Our family owns a property in the Rangiputa village - 722 Rangiputa Rd.

I write to express our concern regarding the re-zoning application submitted by the above parties in relation to the farm property directly behind Puwheke Beach and adjacent to Rangiputa village.

I have read the Lucklaw Farm Ltd re-zoning application and FNDC initial response.

My concerns are set out below.

Infrastructure in the Rangiputa area 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. I can't see that a development of the nature and scale of that proposed would serve the community in this regard.

In addition the applicants don't appear to have engaged with the wider community in preparing and making their application for re-zoning.

I object to the proposed land re-zoning.

Alan Bond

24th September 2025

Bernice Smith 25 Motutara Drive, Rangiputa

This letter is in response to the application by Marcus Hayden Langman on behalf of Lucklaw Farm Limited, the Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess to rezone Puwheke from Rural status to a mixture of mixed use, residential and rural lifestyle.

### **Submission in Opposition to Rezoning of Puwheke**

We, Bevan and Bernice Smith, have owned our property at 25 Motutara Drive since 1994 (31 years). One of the key reasons we purchased our slice of paradise in Rangiputa was the assurance that the surrounding land was zoned as rural. This rural zoning offered a unique combination of beach lifestyle and untouched farmland—a balance that we believed would be protected from further subdivision or development.

We wish to formally record our strong opposition to any application to remove the rural zoning that currently applies to the Puwheke area.

One of our primary concerns is the proposed access to the development via Motutara Drive. When we purchased our property, we understood that Motutara Drive would remain a dead-end road, limiting traffic and helping ensure the safety of our pets, children, and elderly residents. Turning it into a thoroughfare would significantly alter the character and safety of the road, which is already operating at capacity during peak holiday periods.

It would be unjust for a rural landowner to seek private financial gain by enabling development that undermines the integrity of our community—especially when ratepayers were previously levied to seal the road into Rangiputa for the benefit of existing residents.

There are also serious environmental concerns. Rangiputa has a reputation for caring deeply about our environment and local wildlife. Any further residential development would inevitably threaten the native bird and animal life in the area, and this risk should not be underestimated.

In addition, it is unclear whether current sewage and wastewater infrastructure could support an expanded residential footprint. The potential strain on services must be fully assessed and transparently addressed before any consideration of development proceeds.

Finally, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no clear or transparent consultation with Rangiputa residents regarding this proposal. We strongly believe that any changes of this nature should require comprehensive community engagement.

For all these reasons, we oppose the proposed rezoning and associated development of Puwheke.

Sincerely,

Bernice Smith - On behalf of myself and Bevan

25 Motutara Drive,

Rangiputa

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

The following submission is made on behalf of Joel and Brenda Sigalove, 14 Kohunga Place, Rangiputa.

Rangiputa is treasured by many people, as one of the Far North's particularly special environments.

The community's residents and ratepayers are constant, many for three generations. Visitors are also regulars from throughout the Far North, who come for family outings or to fish. Many have connections with the residents and are welcome visitors throughout the year.

The reason for mentioning this is that for many months of the year, particularly in summer and on public holidays the infrastructure is sorely stretched to cope.

The proposed addition of so many additional residents and the associated commercial areas and activities would call for a major upgrade of all infrastructure.

The geography of the location dictates that there is a limited capacity to accommodate cars, trailers and boats. Rangiputa Road from the fire station down to the beach would be grid locked by the additional traffic this development would create.

Importantly, the nature of the geography makes it impossible to overcome this issue, not to mention all other aspects of infrastructure that would need to be upgraded.

In addition, the beach and sand dunes at Rangiputa are fragile. The residents are working with advisors and the Far North District and Regional councils to protect the environment which does not lend itself to such an influx of new residents and facilities.

For these reasons we are opposed to this development and request the Council to stand firm in not allowing one of the Far North's gem to be compromised for residents of the Far North who respect and protect it.

Joel and Brenda Sigalove

Sent from my iPhone

**Brenda Baldwin**  
Chairman

|



**From:** Bryce Bacon

**Sent:** Wednesday, 1 October 2025 8:10 am

**To:**

**Subject:** Re: FW: Re-Zoning Submission

Morning Graeme,

After reviewing the information available I would object based on the following .

1. The pressure applied to the current infrastructure which is already struggling to be fit for purpose, particularly during holiday seasons.
2. The use of Motutura Drive as a construction zone/route particularly due to onerous traffic management conditions .
3. Uncertainty around potential lag of land development time frames for civil construction and with civil operations generally aligning with seasonal holidays .An eye sore for the community if the development is not completed in a timely manner.
4. Unsure if there is really a need for more housing in Rangiputa particularly if the infrastructure is not prepared .

Regards Bryce Bacon

## **To Whom It May Concern**

This submission is made on behalf of Carolyn McKenzie, a resident of Rangiputa.

I have been visiting Rangiputa for the past ten years and living here for the last two and have witnessed a significant increase in visitor numbers over this time. During peak periods — particularly summer and public holidays — the existing infrastructure struggles to cope with demand.

The proposed development, which includes a substantial increase in residential dwellings and commercial activity, would place immense pressure on already limited infrastructure. While assurances have been made that infrastructure within the development will be installed and maintained, the broader reality is that Rangiputa has only one access road via the peninsula. This road is already under strain and would be severely compromised by additional traffic.

The geography of Rangiputa presents further limitations. There is minimal capacity to accommodate the influx of vehicles, trailers, and boats that such a development would bring. Rangiputa Road, particularly the stretch from the fire station to the beach, would become gridlocked — a situation that cannot be resolved due to the physical constraints of the area. Moreover, even the Council has acknowledged that the peninsula is not a priority area for long-term infrastructure investment.

Given these factors, I strongly oppose the proposed development and urge the Council to protect one of the Far North's most treasured and idyllic holiday destinations from irreversible change.

To Far North District Council

I am writing to express my objections to the proposed re-zoning and development of Land on Puwheke

Beach and directly affecting Rangiputa and its Residents.

I have read the Lucklaw Farm Ltd re-zoning application and the FNDC initial findings and have grave

concerns with Lucklaw's disregard for both the afore mentioned areas.

The suggestion that Rangiputa would be able to accommodate this proposal is simply preposterous

1. The infrastructure of Rangiputa itself has no more capacity to accommodate the additional traffic flow up and down the very narrow, sloping, and quite frankly dangerous road down to the beach and properties below.

2. During peak season in Rangiputa the sewage ponds are already overflowing to the 2 nd and 3 rd

holding ponds and in high summer that is an environmental hazard without adding any more users to it.

3. The power grid capacity on the KariKari Peninsula cannot accommodate the amount of power usage this new development will require. A new more powerful transmission system will be required to accommodate a much higher demand capacity, this will in turn, again detract from the environmental, local iwi's kaitiakitanga and residents through such high demand.

4. I am also acutely aware that the principals of the above development Company, have in recent

years, been championing the environmental effects of the, half a dozen or so, surfers that come to the end of Puwheke beach to surf. If you could add all their complaints of destruction of the dunes by said surfers then they must agree that a development on the back of the dunes would be an enormous threat to the wildlife and dune protection they have been so passionate about.

In conclusion, I would ask the FNDC to reject the proposed development application.

Regards

Chantel Preece

**To the Rangiputa Community Inc  
& Far North District Council**

Homeowner - Cherie & Evan Jones 27 Motutura Drive, Rangiputa

**Re-Zoning submission –Plan/Proposed-District-Plan/Hearing-1/hearing-15c-  
rezoning-general-urban-and-rural**

We purchased our property at 27 Motutura Drive back in 1994. One of the key reasons we purchased in Rangiputa was the assurance that the surrounding land was zoned as rural. This rural zoning offered a unique combination of beach lifestyle and untouched farmland.

I am writing to express the concern I and my family have regarding the re-zoning application submitted by the above parties in relation to the farm property directly behind Puwheke Beach and adjacent to Rangiputa village.

I have read the Lucklaw Farm Ltd re-zoning application and FNDC initial response.

**My concern**

Rangiputa is a small coastal area with lots of unique character. Rangiputa and surrounding areas offer both residents and holiday makers a quiet an enjoyment of the highest quality. Disruption of this by development of the surrounding lands would greatly diminish the overall attractiveness of the area. During the holiday period's the village is already very congested with residence's, day goers, and boating families. A subdivision of the nature described would not withstand the added people, vehicles, boats etc.

Infrastructure in the Rangiputa area is already under strain, servicing the needs of the local community, holiday makers, day trippers and fishermen with roading, parking, services, beach access and general amenities. A development of the nature and scale of that proposed would affect the community. There is a very real danger that a development would increase the risks of excessive storm water run-off and adverse wastewater disposal issues thus adversely affecting the ecology of the area.

The applicants don't appear to have engaged with the wider community in preparing and making their application for re-zoning.

We object to the proposed land re-zoning.

Kind regards

Cherie Jones

**From:** chris purdie

**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 September 2025 10:56 am

**To:**

**Subject:** John Sturgess Rezoning

Maca

It was with utter disbelief when I heard that the FNDC was entertaining an application from Sturgess interests on a non notifiable basis to rezone land for housing at Rangiputa.

Where was the likes of Bill Subritsky and Toss Kitchen. Were they muzzled by council.

My wife and I have owned a holiday home at Rangiputa directly opposite the boat ramp for 15 years. The council needs to come and view the chaos that is happening over the Xmas and Easter holidays. Vehicles with boats approach the ramp from four different directions and all want to use the ramp at the same time. At times there are queues up past the "fire station". Another 140 odd residences trying to use ramp would not work for those three to four weeks. In fact all holiday weekends and school holidays would be stretched.

Council is also well aware of the hill slips on both sides of road going down hill to the ramp.

How is an ambulance going to get to the bottom houses with the road jammed up with boats over busy times.

Hopefully the council will decline Sturgess.

Independent Hearing Commissioners  
Far North District Council  
Private Bag 752,  
Kaikohe 0440

19 September 2025

Dear Hearing Commissioners,

**Re: Application to the FNDC by Lucklaw Farm Ltd - SECTION 42A REPORT Hearing  
15C: Rezoning Submissions**

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa Beach in its entirety.

My concerns are centred around two significant issues: the lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, including local residents and Iwi, and the current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development, particularly concerning traffic management and boating facilities.

Firstly, the consultation process has been non-existent. Effective communication with the community and local Iwi, who hold a deep connection and responsibility toward the land, is essential for any development that affects them. Many ratepayers have expressed their distress over being left out of the conversation regarding such an impactful development. It is vital that we prioritize transparency and inclusiveness to ensure that all voices are heard and respected.

Secondly, regarding infrastructure, the proposed development does not seem to account for the current limitations we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach. With our roads already struggling to handle existing traffic, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, and it is unclear how the council plans to manage the inevitable influx of additional boats and visitors.

For these reasons, I urge you to reconsider this development. It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and way of life.

Thank you for considering my objections. I hope the council will prioritize the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Danny Ingliss', written in a cursive style.

Danny Ingliss  
763 Rangiputa Road  
Karikari Peninsula 0483  
Ph: 0274 734 101

Far North District Council C/- Rangiputa Community Inc Dear Far North District Council, We are writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa and surrounds.

Our main concerns are around two significant issues: the lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, and the current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development.

Firstly, there has been no consultation. Effective communication with the community, who hold a deep connection and responsibility toward the area, is essential for any development that affects them. As a ratepayer and a property owner directly adjacent to the proposed land rezoning and development it is deeply concerning being left out of the conversations regarding such an impactful development. It is vital that we prioritise transparency and inclusiveness to ensure that all voices are heard and respected. Secondly, regarding infrastructure, the proposed development does not seem to account for the current limitations we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach, launching boats and parking. Also lack of footpaths and safety of people with more traffic movements in the area. With our roads already struggling to handle existing traffic, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult and dangerous. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, and it is unclear how the council plans to manage the inevitable influx of additional boats and visitors.

It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and safety within the Rangiputa area. Thank you for considering these objections. I hope the council will prioritise the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community and does not put more pressure on an area that is already strained. Sincerely,

Darren & Joanne Mason



22 September 2025

Rangiputa Community Incorporated Society

Attn: Graeme McMillan, Chairman

**Subject:** Submissions and further submissions in relation to the proposed Far North District Plan; 15c Rezoning and Lucklaw Farm Limited

Thank you for providing information regarding the matter above.

Upon reviewing the information at hand:

☒ The proposal's scale constitutes an existential threat to our community, fundamentally eroding the natural character and welfare we exist to protect.

☒ New infrastructure demands would overwhelm amenities and contradict our constitutional purpose of promoting improvements. The existing wastewater plant lacks the necessary capacity.

☒ The development's unacceptable risks to wetlands and dunes directly undermine our environmental preservation mandate. Restoration claims are speculative and unproven.

☒ Proposed new access will irrevocably damage our public recreation reserve, destroying a valued community asset. This loss is simply unacceptable.

Regards

Don Mann

738 Rangiputa Road

Rangiputa

Karikari Peninsula

Independent Hearing Commissioners

Far North District Council  
Private Bag 752,

**Kaikohe 0440**

19 September 2025

Dear Hearing Commissioners,

**Re: Application to the FNDC by Lucklaw Farm Ltd - SECTION 42A REPORT Hearing**

**15C: Rezoning Submissions**

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa Beach in its entirety

Our concerns are centred around three significant issues: firstly, we do not note any significant reference to or consideration of, the Rangiputa community and the Rangiputa beach environment in the submission Secondly, the lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, including local residents and Iwi, and thirdly the current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development, particularly concerning traffic management and boating facilities.

In addition , regarding infrastructure, the proposed development does not seem to account for the current limitations we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach. With our roads already struggling to handle existing traffic, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, and it is unclear how the council plans to manage the inevitable influx of additional boats and visitors.

For these reasons, we urge you to reconsider this development. It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and way of life.

Thank you for considering my objections. We hope the council will prioritize the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community.

With respect, as very concerned longtime residents and ratepayers,

Sincerely

Doug and Lenore Donaldson

741 Rangiputa Rd

-----Original Message-----

From: Didier Poot <

Sent: Wednesday, 24 September 2025 8:15 am

To: Clinic Mill

Subject: Rangiputa

To whom it may concern

Re: proposed development by Lucklaw Farm Ltd in Rangiputa.

I would like to hereby formally object to this proposed re-zoning and development.

There are 3 areas of concern:

1: the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the existing character and attractiveness of the isolated quiet costal village that is Rangiputa. Residents and visitors have invested time and money in this area because of its current character and this proposed development does not align with it.

2: The proposed development will severely negatively affect the infrastructure around the area. Boat ramp, access road and services (including wastewater, etc) can barely cope with the existing number of properties and visitors.

3: the sensitive ecological and cultural nature of the area needs to be considered and protected. I believe there is a failure to do so

Considering these factors, I believe that this proposed development clearly doesn't sit well in this area, and I would like my opposition noted.

Dr Didier Poot

774 Rangiputa Road

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Helmut Gottschalk  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 September 2025 10:19 am  
**To:** r  
**Subject:** Opposal

From:

Helmut Gottschalk

39 Motutara Drive

Rangiputa

To the Rangiputa Community Inc

I'm privileged to live here since 4 years.

I write to express my concern regarding the re-zoning application submitted by the above parties in relation to the farm property directly behind Puwheke Beach and adjacent to Rangiputa village.

I have read the Lucklaw Farm Ltd re-zoning application and FNDC initial response.

My concerns are set out below.

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. Disruption to such quiet enjoyment by development of the surrounding lands would greatly diminish the overall attractiveness of the area.

Infrastructure in the Rangiputa area 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. I can't see that a development of the nature and scale of that proposed would serve the community in this regard.

There is a very real danger that a development would increase the risks of excessive storm water run off and adverse waste water disposal issues thus adversely affecting the ecology of the area.

The applicants don't appear to have engaged with the wider community in preparing and making their application for re-zoning.

I object to the proposed land re-zoning.

Regards, Helmut Gottschalk

**From:** Jacqui McCabe  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 September 2025 12:33 pm  
**To:** Graeme McMillan  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed development Rangiputa Beach.

----- Original Message -----

From: Jacqui McCabe  
To: Graeme McMillan , [Richard McCabe](#) Date: 23/09/2025 11:51 NZST  
Subject: Proposed development Rangiputa Beach.

The Far North District Council

As a long term resident of Rangiputa I am concerned about the size of the proposed development of this area.

My objections are as follows.

1. During the passing years the increase of traffic and boating rigs has been very evident and the size of boats and trailers have increased proportionally; they park as near to the launching ramps as possible, with chaotic results during the high seasons, and the risk to pedestrians is considerable as there are no footpaths. This state of affairs will remain until the council provide footpaths to this area and then the road size will be further reduced!
2. As a past member of the Rangiputa Fire Force I note that there are times when it would be very difficult, if not impossible to get to get a Fire Engine through the congestion, and the owners are out of contact fishing. A very real hazard.
3. We have very limited sewage facilities as they were only made to contend with the Rangiputa waterfront Drive and Motutara Drive residents, and even then there seem to be constant problems being dealt with in this area.

I hope you will take note of these considerations and concerns, and that I object to the proposed land re-zoning.

Jackie McCabe

753 Rangiputa Road.

My Husband bought the property at 730 Rangiputa road, some 30 years ago.

It is with considerable consternation, that late in the process I have been made aware that applications are well underway in the process to re-zone rural property to residential.

Application submitted by the above companies, affecting the areas adjacent to the Puwheke Beach area, and Rangiputa village.

I wish to add my concerns following The FNDC initial response to the Lucklaw Farm proposal.

The villages capacity to cope with, holiday makers and day visitors, cars and boats, at peak holiday periods is already overwhelmed.

Additional tolls to, roads, boat ramp, sewage systems, and parking, which at times leaves the area gridlocked. Would be pushed to a standstill.

The extensive development proposed would completely overwhelm the natural and inherent beauty of the area. Relegating this special place to another over commercialised tourist destination, with predictable atmosphere, and presentation.

It is also disappointing that the applicants seem to have failed to engage in consultation, consideration, or engagement with the community.

I object to the proposed land rezoning.

Jan King.

730 Rangiputa road.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jeanne Harrison**

Date: Tue, Sep 23, 2025 at 12:11 PM

Subject: Fwd: Proposed re-zoning Application affecting Rangiputa Beach

To:

TO: THE RANGIPUTA COMMUNITY INC. AND FAR NORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL

I am writing to object to the proposed development to the farm property behind Puwheke Beach and adjacent to Rangiputa Village.

I own a Bach at 18 Motutara Drive which my family and I have enjoyed over the past 17 years.

My first concern and annoyance is that there was no adequate consultation and notification to those who would be most affected by this development.

Secondly, that this will impact hugely on the tranquil environment that residents and holiday makers currently enjoy.

I also feel Rangiputa's infrastructure is already at capacity when catering for residents, holiday makers, day fishermen/divers and those just there to enjoy the beach, therefore it does not have sufficient room to sustain a development of that nature and size.

It would be such a shame to see the beauty of this unique beach affected by such a plan.

Therefore I object to the Proposal and trust the Council will take these concerns into consideration.

Regards

Jeanne Harrison

**Jim Powell**

Sun, Sep 21, 7:16 AM (1 day ago)

to me

Graeme,

Thanks for your email. I appreciate your efforts, and I would strongly appose this rezoning effort at Rangiputa. The beach and surrounding area are already seeing more activity than the existing infrastructure can handle. Adding more would compound the problems that already exist at Rangiputa.

We are still overseas, but we give you our proxi to speak on our behalf to appose this resizing effort.

Sincerely yours, Jim & Gail Powell

Jim Powell

80 Creightons Rd



Independent Hearing Commissioners  
Far North District Council  
Private Bag 752,  
Kaikohe 0440

18 September 2025

Dear Hearing Commissioners,

**Re: Application to the FNDC by Lucklaw Farm Ltd - SECTION 42A REPORT Hearing  
15C: Rezoning Submissions**

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa Beach in its entirety.

My concerns are centred around two significant issues: the lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, including local residents and Iwi, and the current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development, particularly concerning traffic management and boating facilities.

Firstly, the consultation process has been non-existent. Effective communication with the community and local Iwi, who hold a deep connection and responsibility toward the land, is essential for any development that affects them. Many ratepayers have expressed their distress over being left out of the conversation regarding such an impactful development. It is vital that we prioritize transparency and inclusiveness to ensure that all voices are heard and respected.

Secondly, regarding infrastructure, the proposed development does not seem to account for the current limitations we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach. With our roads already struggling to handle existing traffic, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, and it is unclear how the council plans to manage the inevitable influx of additional boats and visitors.

For these reasons, we urge you to reconsider this development. It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and way of life.

Thank you for considering my objections. We hope the council will prioritize the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Bongard', with a large, looping initial 'B'.A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Bongard', with a large, looping initial 'B'.

John & Diane Bongard  
765 Rangiputa Road  
Karikari Peninsula 0483  
Ph: 021 947 922

Hi Graeme

While in principle we are against this subdivision due to the extra load it will put on all of the Settlements services ie roads, beach, ramps etc by the literature that we have been sent indicates that the applicant must have deep pockets and has involved every expert he can to negate any objections to the development.

The last email sent with all the expert information and maps is a bit beyond my expertise even though I have been building all my life and been on the other side of the fence regarding subdivisions in general.

Please put my name forward to any group objection that may be submitted.

Regards

John Whitlow

773 Rangiputa Road

Dear Far North District Council,

The Cookson family is writing to formally object to the proposed rezoning and residential development affecting Rangiputa.

Our concerns centre on four key issues: the lack of adequate consultation with those most affected, the inability of current infrastructure to support the proposed growth, the negative environmental consequences for our marine ecosystem, and the profound impact on the character of our small coastal community.

#### 1. Consultation and engagement

The consultation process to date has been inadequate. Local residents and iwi, who hold a deep connection and responsibility to this land and coastline, have not been meaningfully engaged. Effective communication is essential when developments of this scale are being considered. Many ratepayers feel excluded from the process, and this undermines trust in council decision-making. Transparency and inclusiveness must be prioritised.

#### 2. Infrastructure limitations

The current infrastructure in Rangiputa is already under significant pressure. Traffic management in and around the beach is challenging even in the quieter winter months, and during summer it becomes heavily congested. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are also at capacity, creating safety risks and frustration for both residents and visitors. Doubling the population through further subdivision and lifestyle block development will exacerbate these issues dramatically, with no clear plan for how the council intends to manage these impacts.

#### 3. Environmental impacts

The ocean and marine life are central to the identity and wellbeing of our community. An increase in recreational fishing activity from a larger population will place further strain on already pressured fish stocks and marine habitats. More boats and fishing effort will inevitably contribute to depletion of local resources, reduced biodiversity, and greater disturbance to the coastal environment. Sustainable management of our marine ecosystem must be a core consideration in any development decision.

#### 4. Loss of community character

Rangiputa is a small, close-knit coastal settlement with a unique beach-town character. Rapid expansion through rezoning risks eroding this identity. Doubling the population would

transform Rangiputa from a quiet, community-focused beach settlement into a congested and overdeveloped area, undermining the very qualities that make it special.

For these reasons, I urge the council to reconsider this development. Any future planning must begin with genuine community consultation, a realistic assessment of infrastructure capacity, and a commitment to protecting both our natural environment and the distinctive character of Rangiputa.

Thank you for considering our objections. We trust that the council will prioritise the long-term wellbeing of residents, iwi, and the environment over short-term development pressures.

Sincerely,

Justin, Tina, Jamie & Willis

45 Motutara Drive

Justin Cookson

**From:** Nancy Underwood

**Sent:** Sunday, September 21, 2025 10:42:58 AM

**To:** [rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com](mailto:rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com) <[rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com](mailto:rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Objection to re zoning submission of Lucklaw Farms

We strongly object to the submission by Lucklaw Farms Ltd to change the zoning of their land.

There has been no consultation or transparency with the community or neighbours regarding this submission..

There are multiple serious concerns and ramifications for our community should this proceed.

Ken and Nancy Underwood

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Independent Hearing Commissioners  
Far North District Council  
Private Bag 752,  
**Kaikohe 0440**

24 September 2025

Dear Hearing Commissioners,

**Re: Application to the FNDC by Lucklaw Farm Ltd - SECTION 42A REPORT Hearing  
15C: Rezoning Submissions**

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa Beach in its entirety.

Our concerns are centred around two significant issues: the lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, including local residents and Iwi, and the current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development, particularly concerning traffic management and boating facilities.

Firstly, the consultation process has been non-existent. Effective communication with the community and local Iwi, who hold a deep connection and responsibility toward the land, is essential for any development that affects them. Many ratepayers have expressed their distress over being left out of the conversation regarding such an impactful development. It is vital that we prioritize transparency and inclusiveness to ensure that all voices are heard and respected.

Secondly, regarding infrastructure, the proposed development does not seem to account for the current limitations we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach. With our roads already struggling to handle existing traffic, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, and it is unclear how the council plans to manage the inevitable influx of additional boats and visitors.

For these reasons, we urge you to reconsider this development. It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and way of life.

Thank you for considering our objections. We hope the council will prioritize the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community.

Sincerely,  
Leisel and Veronica Inglis  
763 Rangiputa Road

As a recent resident of Rangiputa I would like to voice my objections to the Lucklaw Farm Ltd., development proposal.

One of the main reasons I purchased a property in Rangiputa was for the serenity and unique environmental landscapes that surround this area. I fear this would be absolutely ruined, with a development of this size.

You cannot say with absolute certainty that this will leave the landscape, flora and fauna unaffected in an area so untouched by man thus far. We also have a deep connection to the whaitua which should not be used for financial gain of a few individuals at the expense of all.

These people who are proposing this development, have consistently used threatening behaviour towards locals trying to use the surf end of the beach and I am sure they will continue with that behaviour to try to gain exclusivity of the beach if granted the proposed development. All beaches are for all people. No one has the right to deny someone access to a beach here in New Zealand.

I would therefore like you to accept my rejection of the proposed Development.

Regards

Leone Patterson



Lesley McCormick

44 Gillies Road

Rangiputa.

20 September 2025

Hi Graeme

FNDC: Proposed District Plan;

Lucklaw Farm Limited, the Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess.

General:

I am concerned that the overall proposal to rezone the above farm property to mixed use and residential does not consider the impact on the existing communities wellbeing and infrastructure.

The proposed residential lots will essentially double the current size of the village with no provision for additional community facilities.

Consultation:

This application to rezone will have significant effects on the existing village and the cultural heritage of Puwheke beach/dune and environs yet there has been no specific consultation or notification undertaken with either the community representative group (Rangiputa Community Incorporated) or the local Iwi.

Current Infrastructure:

Wastewater Treatment Plant and Disposal.

The current system is at capacity for the existing development of Rangiputa. Any future development must be designed for peak flows, not average household flows. This will ensure the upgraded or larger or new system can meet summer peak demands while still operate efficiently during off peak times.

Boat Launching Facilities

Currently there is one formed (concrete) ramp and one gravel ramp that provide for beach access to launch and retrieve boats at Rangiputa. There is minimal trailer parking currently. The existing village has inadequate facilities during summer to cope with the demand on these public facilities.

The proposed development makes no provision for boat access for launching and retrieval so one can only assume the proposed 350 (?) residents will want to use the existing overcrowded facilities.

## Reserves and Coastal Walkway

We have a Rangiputa spatial plan that shows a walkway around the point from Rangiputa beach cliff top to Puwheke Beach to link with existing beach walks and cycling routes.

The boundary to this coastal reserve needs to be clearly identified.

Any wetlands on a separate title with a management plan. Maybe vest in FNDC or an environmental society that can seek funding maintain and enhance it to ensure environmental protection.

## Coastal Setback

A further coastal setback is recommended. There has been no provision made in this plan to extend the coastal setback along Puwheke beach rather development immediately behind the existing dunes.

Experience across NZ coastal settlements proves original survey boundary's to be inadequate and must be extended. Such further setback provides for coastal erosion, Coastal inundation, global warming and general loss of the dunes.

This extension should be vested with DOC or FNDC as scenic or historical reserves not recreation reserves. This difference provides for appropriate management as defined by the Reserves Act.

The whole aim is to preserve and enhance the public benefit and access.

## Community Hall

The community contributed to and assisted the building and development of the Rangiputa Rural Fire Force and Community Hall. Since all Rural Fire Force brigades, were restructured this facility has been unavailable for the community as the facility was taken over solely by FENZ (Fire and Emergency NZ) for Fire training and development.

This proposal to double our community, makes no reference to community wellbeing nor does it take the opportunity to set aside an area as a community Hub.

## Commercial Zoning

The village has a current commercial activity of Accommodation which in also provides for retail outlet. In addition, there is a second property along Rangiputa beach with a Commercial overlay providing accommodation. Therefore, there is no need for a commercial zone rather development controls as per resource consent.

Morning Mac,

Thankyou for bringing what is currently happening within Rangiputa to mine & the wider communities attention.

I am trustee / owner of 751 Rangiputa Rd and a literal lifelong resident of Rangiputa (36 years).

I would like to voice and have the record state my strong opposition of all the rezoning proposed by the of Lucklaw Farm Limited, the Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess under any circumstances.

As a life long resident of Rangiputa I have no doubt the proposed re zoning will have an adverse ever lasting detrimental effect on the community.

It's is obvious to most that the infrastructure within the community is already at bursting point. There is no parking, the boat ramps are falling apart, there is substantial beach traffic on the beach where my kids are supposed to play and we all ready have issues with waste water.

It would simply be unsafe & crazy to intensify Rangiputa to the degree that is being proposed.

I am a third generational owner at Rangiputa and had every intention of passing this down our land to my children. This is something I would question doing should these changes progress.

These proposed changes takes very little consideration to the adverse effects on the beach, and wider community whilst solely focusing on the immediate effects of the physical land looking to be rezoned.

I would happily formally oppose this re-zoning given the opportunity / would have done so should I been made aware of what was being undertaken earlier on.

Please do don't hesitate to reach out and please do keep my up to date with how this is progressing.

Kind Regards,

**Lewis Watson**

Director

CBRE | Industrial & Logistics | Leasing & Sales | Auckland

Central Park, Building 14, 660 Great South Road, Ellerslie, Auckland, 1051

Follow CBRE: [cbre.co.nz](https://cbre.co.nz) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#)

CBRE (Agency) Limited, Licensed Real Estate Agent (REAA 2008) | [Complaints & Dispute Resolution Procedures](#)

Notice to recipient: This e-mail is only meant for the intended of the transmission and may contain information of CBRE that is confidential and/or privileged. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Details about the personal data CBRE collects and why, as well as your data privacy rights under applicable law, are available at [CBRE – Privacy Policy](#).

To: Far North District Council

Re: Submission opposing - Proposed re-zoning of land at Rangiputa and Puwheke

Dear Councillors Planning Department,

I am an owner of property in Rangiputa, at 757 Rangiputa Road

Environment -

I am concerned that the request for re-zoning the land at Rangiputa and Puwheke by Lucklaw Farm Ltd will be detrimental to archaeological sites, the wetlands and dunes, causing considerable damage to these which can never be replaced once destroyed or damaged by the process of the proposed development.

Wastewater -

My understanding is that the wastewater plant does not have enough capacity for the proposed development and if the plant is upgraded it will be an added burden on the rate payers.

Traffic -

There will be a lot of additional traffic during construction and there will be ongoing extra traffic. The boat ramps will be very congested, there is very little parking for vehicles and trailers now. There will be additional holiday traffic as well, I am concerned about the safety of pedestrians and I am also concerned that emergency vehicles may find it hard with access to properties if congestion worsens.

Having holidayed in Rangiputa for the past 50 years I have seen the traffic change considerably, to the point that it is almost impossible to drive down our road with cars and trailers parked on either side making it almost impossible for another car to drive past.

I ask that the request for re-zoning is rejected.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Lonaye Cattermoul

757 Rangiputa Rd

RangiputaTo: Far North District Council

September 24, 2025

Attn; Far North District Council

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development by Lucklaw Farm Ltd and rezoning affecting Rangiputa Beach.

My property bounds land owned by Lucklaw Farm Ltd, or directors thereof. I am extremely concerned about the impact this development and the associated outcomes will have on our own way of life and that of the wider community. My concerns are based around the serious lack of consultation and the current infrastructure's ability to support the increased population, particularly concerning the volume of traffic, parking and boating facilities.

The proposed development does not appear to account for the current infrastructure challenges we face, especially relating to traffic management at the beach. Our roads are already struggling to handle current traffic volumes, adding more housing in this area will exacerbate congestion, making safe access to and from the beach increasingly difficult, if not impossible. The boat launching facilities at Rangiputa Beach are already heavily congested, specially over the summer months we face long delays, trailers being parked in ludicrous locations or in designated no parking zones; that further congest safe access to the boat ramp. Currently as a family, we are limited to launching our vessel at certain stages of the tide due to road and ramp congestion. Reducing our boating hours and enjoyment from days out on the water.

It is absolutely crucial that the council undertakes extensive community engagement regarding developments that will have such a serious impact on communities. As the owner of a neighbouring property to this proposed development, I am extremely concerned how we have not been consulted or notified of this submission. A development posing such a significant impact to our property, community and way of life should never be discussed behind closed doors.

Many of the people I know purchase property at Rangiputa to enjoy peaceful and relaxing retirement or holidays away from the day to day treadmill. Serene beaches, clear waters and time with family and friends. Our community does not need, cannot support and will strongly oppose any development, by any person or organisation that will have a significant impact like these proposed plans will.

I implore you reconsider this development.

Yours Sincerely

Mark Underwood

# FNDC Proposed District Plan Submission

The following is further to the submission (FS98) made by Michael Morse of 32 Motutara Drive in relation to the zoning change proposals submitted by Lucklaw Farms Ltd/Trustees of the Taranaki Trust/Grace Anne Sturgess ( 551,552,553,FS373).

The submissions by the above relate to the rezoning of existing Rural Production zoned land behind and adjacent to the coastal settlement of Rangiputa to General Residential/Mixed Use (area A), Rural Lifestyle (area B), Rural Production (area C). There is also reference to a “Master Plan” which contains further alternatives including such things as a “bike park”, “lodge” and “commercial activities”. This however does not appear to form part of the current submission but obviously indicates further intended development and intensification.

## My key concerns are:

- Rangiputa is a small coastal settlement, this being its main appeal. Intensification (further subdivision) will result in placing significant unnecessary pressure on existing services (boat launching/parking facilities), parking and infrastructure. Rangiputa is already under severe pressure, particularly at peak holiday times, without the addition of potentially a further 100 -150 sections (almost doubling existing). Costs of alleviating this situation will fall on FNDC/the ratepayer.
- Whilst capital cost of wastewater infrastructure will (should) be born by the developer **ongoing** operational/maintenance costs will fall on FNDC and therefore the ratepayer. This at a time when annual rate increases are significant and the demand for Council funding is needed elsewhere.
- There is absolutely no need for a Mixed Use zone (commercial) as the settlement is principally a holiday destination and adequately serviced by existing basic needs at the motel, and wider needs at Whatuwhiwhi/Kaitaia/Doubtless Bay).
- Development will result in clearance of extensive areas of scrubland, habitat to a variety of fauna/flora already under pressure. Stormwater runoff will have a detrimental effect on Lake Rotokawau and the surrounding wetlands. This, together with an increase in cats/dogs, will further endanger already critically endangered Matuku (Australasian Bittern).
- There appears to have been a complete lack of engagement by the submitter with the residents of Rangiputa, the people who will be most affected by the proposed rezoning. Until recently, the majority have been completely unaware of what has/is being proposed. Greater engagement is required.

## **Recommendations**

If the Council sees fit to adopt the requested Plan changes that at the very least:

1. Close engagement and consultation with the existing Rangiputa property owners be undertaken
2. The submitter be required to provide adequate, formed parking for vehicles and boat trailers in an easily accessible location immediately opposite the fire station
3. Clearance of scrublands is minimised with any lifestyle blocks created permitted a maximum cleared area of 2000 square metres
4. Titles of sites created, and including existing Titles, contain covenants prohibiting the keeping of cats
5. The submitter be required to implement a comprehensive predator control programme over all the land presently subject to the sought Plan changes

As a concerned property owner in Rangiputa I see no benefit to the community or wider district, or ratepayers in the Far North District and respectfully request that the Plan changes sought by Lucklaw Farms/Taranaki Trust/Grace Anne Sturgess, be rejected.



From: **Patrick**

Date: Sat, Sep 27, 2025 at 2:40 PM

Subject: Re-Zoning Submission

To: <[rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com](mailto:rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com)>

To whom it may concern

I am writing this letter to say I am totally against this submission by Lucklaw Farm Ltd.

There has been no communication with the locals and Iwi.

The infrastructure of the Far north Council is not that good! So why would it change for this one area?

Eg: Kerikeri Wastewater plant is only 3-4 years old and is already too small for the town. And they had been told that at the planning stage.

The roading is not adequate for the amount of traffic that uses Rangiputa at the moment. The intersection at Rangiputa Road and Motutara Drive at Christmas is very dangerous with the traffic at present . What will it be like with 120+ more vehicles?

Eg: Parking for the vehicles and boat trailers at the two boat ramps. Where do they propose to park these extra vehicles?

King Regards

Patrick Banks

To Rangiputa Community Inc

We are so privileged to own 2 properties in Rangiputa community at 28 Motutara drive and 35 motutara drive and moved up here for the unique place it is ...

Rangiputa is a small isolated quiet place and why we moved here.

I am writing to express our concern regarding the re zoning application by the above parties in relation to the farm property directly behind Puwheke beach and adjacent to Rangiputa village.

Infrastructure in the Rangiputa area is barely able to service the needs of the local community and holiday makers now.

I cant see the development of this nature and scale would serve the community

There is very real danger that a such development would increase the risks of excessive storm water run off and adverse waste water disposal issues that would adversely affect the ecology of the area...

IT would wreck the whole atmosphere of the community...

I am really concerned that the applicants don't appear to have engaged the wider community in preparing and making their application for re zoning...

We STRONGLY object to the proposed land re zoning or we will loose Rangiputa the place we love for its uniqueness

Regards Paul Alexander 28 motutara Drive

P K Alexander                      35 Motutara Drive

Tanya & Peter Nutsford  
771 Whangaparāoa Road  
**Whangaparāoa 0930**

Property Owner: 747 Rangiputa Road

23 September 2025

**To: The Independent Hearing Commissioners, Far North District Council**

Re: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning and Development at Puheke Beach / Rangiputa

Tēnā koutou,

We, Tanya and Peter Nutsford, are writing to strongly oppose the proposed rezoning and subdivision at Puheke Beach / Rangiputa. We own property at 747 Rangiputa Road and have been visiting and enjoying this special area for more than fifty years.

### **1. Loss of Natural Character**

The unique charm of Puheke Beach lies in its serenity, quiet, and natural beauty. It is one of the very few undeveloped beaches left in Northland. Allowing large-scale residential and visitor development would irreversibly damage this natural character, directly conflicting with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requirement to preserve the natural character of the coastal environment.

### **2. Sewage and Infrastructure Concerns**

The local wastewater network is already struggling. The rezoning documents acknowledge that the existing Rangiputa Wastewater Treatment Plant does not have the capacity for this scale of development, and that any upgrade would place further costs on ratepayers. This is unacceptable. Ratepayers should not have to shoulder the financial burden of infrastructure expansion required solely to enable private subdivision and tourism ventures.

### **3. Traffic and Boat Ramp Pressure**

Puheke itself is a surf beach and unsuitable for launching boats. However, the recent closure of the Matai Bay boat ramp has already pushed additional traffic and demand onto the Rangiputa ramp. This ramp is struggling to cope, especially during peak periods. Launching now often occurs directly alongside families with children on the beach, with no adequate parking for trailers and growing congestion. Allowing further development in the area will only make this situation worse, creating safety risks and degrading the recreational experience for existing residents and visitors.

### **4. Environmental Values and Risks**

Puheke is home to wetlands, a significant dune system, and threatened shorebird and plant species. Increased human activity, vehicle movements, and construction will degrade these fragile environments. Any suggestion that large-scale development can sit alongside restoration and protection of these values is simply not credible.

### **5. Community and Heritage Impact**

This proposal will change not just the landscape, but the very character of the Rangiputa and Puheke communities. For generations, families like ours have treasured the quiet, low-impact way of life here. This development would undermine that heritage and permanently alter the place for current and future generations.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons above — environmental, infrastructure, traffic, cultural, and community — we urge the Commissioners to decline this rezoning and subdivision application in its entirety. Puheke Beach should remain what it has always been: one of Northland's few untouched, natural treasures.

Ngā mihi,

Tanya & Peter Nutsford  
771 Whangaparāoa Road  
(Owners, 747 Rangiputa Road)

**From:** rosemary.l

**Sent:** Thursday, 18 September 2025 8:11 pm

**To:**

**Subject:** RE: Reply to Rezoning Application - URGENT

Phil Minehan - Rosemary Leveloff.

No change to zoned rural production: will have huge impact on a small community. Will put even more pressure on boat ramps and parking at Rangiputa Beach.

Roading will have negative effect on property values on Motutara Drive.

What ecological and land scape????

Waste water upgrade or new will only result in significant increase to already excessive high rates.

That is the best we can do from here.

-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Lehman

Sent: Wednesday, 24 September 2025 7:46 am

To: Graeme

Subject: Our submission for proposed rezoning

This email is for inclusion as our formal response from Susan and Robert Lehman as community member input from Rangiputa in response to the Lucklaw Farm proposal for zoning change in our community.

We are opposed this zoning change in its present form.

1) There has been an absence of engagement and consultation with the Rangiputa community that would be affected by the potential rezoning requested. Therefore, there has been no collaborative dialogue regarding the pros and cons of this proposal and the community vision. There is an incorporated Rangiputa Community Board that acts as a voice for community members.

2) There is no concrete post zoning change proposal or details of a master plan, simply a request for zoning change. This provides a carte blanche for future development which is unacceptable.

3) There is no mention of potential benefits to the community such as recreational opportunities like walking and cycling trails, enhanced access to surrounding beaches and lakes, improved boat access for a much larger population, public parking or replanting of native vegetation. Again, this is aggravated by the absence of community engagement.

4) There is no consideration of future budgets and maintenance of infrastructure costs to the community.

5) There is no impact assessment for the community and the present natural environment of Rangiputa.

Respectfully submitted

Rob and Susan Lehman

Sent from my iPad

To whom it may concern

In relation to the submission by Lucklaw Farm Ltd – S551.001, Trustees of the Taranaki Trust – S552.001, where the re zoning of rural production land in Rangiputa is sort, we wish to object on the following basis.

Firstly we support the concerns and subsequent rejection as set out by the FNDC Consultant planner in objection to the rezoning.

Further-more

1. There has been no community consultation
2. We believe there has been no lwi consultation
3. The pressure on the community in terms of infrastructure, parking and access has not been thought through.
4. The presence of archilological sites in the areas proposed.
5. The impact of increased traffic on Motutara Drive
6. The ongoing costs associated with such a development

Kind regards

Rob & Jane Mitchell

73 Motutara Drive, Rangiputa

Independent Hearing Commissioners  
Far North District Council  
Private Bag 752,  
**Kaikohe 0440**

22 September 2025

Dear Hearing Commissioners,

**Re: Application to the FNDC by Lucklaw Farm Ltd - SECTION 42A REPORT Hearing  
15C: Rezoning Submissions**

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development affecting Rangiputa Beach in its entirety.

Our concerns are centred around three significant issues:

1. The lack of adequate consultation and notification with those who will be most affected, including existing local residents.
2. The current infrastructure's inability to support the increased housing development, particularly concerning traffic management and boating facilities. The continued infill of the current subdivisions on the Karikari peninsular has during the summer months and the limited boat ramp facilities in the area, has already stretched parking and launching facilities to its maximum and impacted for some of us accessing our properties.
3. With the proposed zoning change and the ability for up to at least double the existing population of Rangiputa, the proposal to either expand or build a new sewage treatment plant to service Rangiputa is a rating cost concern for the existing residents.

For these reasons, we urge you to reconsider this development. It is crucial that the council ensures proper community engagement and assesses the infrastructure capabilities before moving forward with any plans that may significantly impact our environment and way of life.

Thank you for considering our objections. We hope the council will prioritize the well-being of its residents and work towards a solution that truly benefits our community.

Sincerely,

Robert and Jackie Shearman  
761 Rangiputa Road  
Karikari Peninsula 0483



# Council Hearing Submission Lucklaw Farm Ltd/Taranaki Trust Zone Change Proposal

Further information to previous submission from Ross Morley of 26 Motutara Drive, Rangiputa on 04/09/23.

**Date:** 11 Sept 2025

**Reference** FS286 on S551.001

**Table Lay Evidence**

Dear Council Planning Dept and all present.

Apologies for not attending in person.

Please accept this submission to be read and considered at the upcoming council hearing starting week of the 29th Sept 25 concerning the proposed rezoning of land on the Rangiputa peninsula. I am submitting this document to express my views on the request ed zone change, which I believe will have a significant impact on this unique area.

Based on the simple rezoning to A, B C areas.

## Key Concerns

My primary concerns regarding the proposed zone change are as follows:

- The loss of regenerating bush would be a major set back to native wildlife in the area reducing native wildlife habitat and reducing the natural filtration/slowing of stormwater putting more pressure on downstream areas and with likely poorer water quality in the lakes and wetlands. Which are noted as High In Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features.
- The simple rezoning into three areas allows too much scope particularly in the mixed use/residential area. This is a small beach settlement, there is no need for any commercial development bringing trucks, industry, noise and rubbish, the current White Sands Motel shop supplies all the essentials needed down by the ramp.
- There has been no community engagement on the matter that I'm aware of. Certainly no attempt to reach out to the owners along Motutara Drive which are bordering the properties in question.

- The owners of the properties along Motutara drive purchased their properties knowing the land they overlooked was zoned Rural Production ensuring their properties had rural and bush outlook not looking into a subdivision of homes. Development along this face would be on the North side of these properties potentially giving loss of private space and winter sun/solar gain.
- More intensification of homes in this area will destroy the absolute small place charm of this settlement.

## Recommendations

I respectfully suggest the following recommendations for your consideration:

1. **That the zone changes be rejected in their current form:** For the reasons listed above. Any commercial/industrial requirements (if needed) would be better situated with the existing small industrial area 7km back at the intersection of Rangiputa road and Inland road. Housing should be of a lower intensification.
2. **Should there be "some" zoning change considered:**
  - Lower intensity than general residential
  - No commercial or industrial
  - The suggested new road starting from the sharp corner on Rangiputa road (just before the settlement) on Markus Langmans Option 3 be the only entry into the development for both Lucklaw and Taranaki properties. Preserving the tranquility of the current owners on Motutara Drive.
  - A development/building set back (green space) of 30m from the North face of properties along Motutara Drive.
  - No cat rules for home owners (to protect native animals).
  - Requirement for recessive darker colours for homes as the bright homes of Rangiputa do nothing for the coastal aesthetics so we should learn from this.
  - Single storey homes only.

## Conclusion

I am a realist, in that development does happen over time. However blanket zone changes aren't the right option for this unique coastal settlement in my opinion.

It is confusing that the report/option 3 from Markus Langman has some good points worth considering, addresses some concerns however is not officially part of the application from what I can see.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Ross Morley.

23 September 2025 Attention Rangiputa Community Incorporated Regarding Proposed Rezoning Puwheke

Dear Community Incorporated

This letter is in response to the application by Marcus Hayden Langman on behalf of Lucklaw Farm Limited, the Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess to rezone Puwheke from Rural status to a mixture of mixed use, residential and rural lifestyle.

As a property owner on Motutara Drive I wish the Rangiputa Community Inc to formally record my strong opposition to any application to remove the rural zoning that currently applies to Puwheke.

I base this opposition for a number of reasons, firstly one of the most important benefits when we looked at purchasing a property in Rangiputa was that the surrounding land was zoned as rural and therefore the mixture of a beach lifestyle and the surrounding farmland would remain untouched and further development outside of the developed sections at Rangiputa could not take place.

The following considerations were also very important when we made our decision in late 1999, that the road we bought in, Motutara Drive was a dead-end road and as such there would be limited traffic which provided very safe access for children and visitors to the beach.

My understanding is that part of the consent for the re zoning would be that access to the proposed development would be via Motutara Drive, this would severely impact on the current property owners on Motutara Drive.

Such a change was never envisaged and should not be contemplated for any reason. As nearly all the sections on Motutara Drive are now sold and the majority have dwellings on them, during holiday periods and over the summer months the road is operating at its maximum envisaged usage.

As a rate payer we were levied to seal the road into Rangiputa, it would be extremely unfair for a rural property owner to seek financial gain from developing the rural land that exists at Puwheke.

Rangiputa has a very good reputation for caring for the environment, and any bird or animal life that currently exists, any further residential development could only result in a negative outcome for the environment and any species that dwell in it.

It is uncertain whether the existing sewage and wastewater facilities could sustain any increased volumes that the proposed development would require. If the proposed development meant that new sewage ponds were required this is a further impact on the environment, which we do not support.

The Peninsula currently has an abundance of residential land for development and has many developed properties regularly available for purchase, there is no need for rural land to be rezoned which at best would be to provide a windfall profit at the expense of the existing community.

It was very clear that this land was rural zoning when purchased and to seek a highly controversial rezoning should not be entertained.

During the weekend, holiday periods and the summer months, the parking facilities for boats, picnickers and the general public are congested and a development as proposed would destroy

one of the most loved beaches and fishing grounds existing in the Far North. In summary I fail to see any benefit to the community at Rangiputa or to the community on the Peninsula in rezoning rural property that borders Puwheke, the benefit would be wholly for the current owner to resell land at a very large financial gain.

The Mayn family absolutely opposes any change to the rural zoning on or around Rangiputa, Puwheke or adjacent land blocks.

Yours Sincerely

Russell RM and Judith Mayn

11 Motutara Drive,

Rangiputa

----- Forwarded message -----

From:

Date: Sat, Sep 27, 2025 at 2:37 PM

Subject: Re-Zoning Submission

To: [rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com](mailto:rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com) <[rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com](mailto:rangiputacommunityinc@gmail.com)>

To whom it may concern

I am writing this letter to say I am totally against this submission by Lucklaw Farm Ltd.

There has been no communication with the locals and Iwi.

The infrastructure of the Far north Council is not that good! So why would it change for this one area?

Eg: Kerikeri Wastewater plant is only 3-4 years old and is already too small for the town. And they had been told that at the planning stage.

The roading is not adequate for the amount of traffic that uses Rangiputa at the moment. The intersection at Rangiputa Road and Motutara Drive at Christmas is very dangerous with the traffic at present . What will it be like with 120+ more vehicles?

Eg: Parking for the vehicles and boat trailers at the two boat ramps. Where do they propose to park these extra vehicles?

King Regards

Sonja Ayers

**From:** Tess Halse

**Sent:** Friday, 26 September 2025 2:00 pm

**To:**

**Subject:** FW: : Re-Zoning Submission

I would like to thank the Rate Payers Association for providing the information in relation to the Lucklaw Farm Limited, the Trustees of the Taranaki Trust, and Grace Anne Sturgess proposal for re zoning. I would also like to join the Rate Payers Association if possible. Please provide details of how we can do this.

### **Our thoughts**

As residents we were unaware of the proposal, which is unfortunate as we have had very little time to review the original documentation and the rebuttal evidence which I note is dated 15 September and the hearing is on 29 September 2025.

We consider ourselves generally to be supportive of progress on the proviso it protects the local environment and enhances the lives and facilities of the local community or at a minimum does not negatively impact on either. We approached this from a positive starting point, however as we reviewed the initial proposal we became less and less supportive.

We apologise if our assumptions after reviewing the documentation are incorrect, but this could have been avoided with community consultation. I am aware of none.

Our initial reactions are as follows;

We are supportive of additional rural lifestyle zone with the conditions indicated in the updated Puwheke Development Plan provided in rebuttal evidence. In our opinion the addition of 16 -32 rural lifestyle blocks would have minimal negative impact on the local community and facilities. If done in accordance with Puwheke Development Plan the visual and environmental impact would also be limited. This is on the assumption that the sites would be serviced by onsite wastewater disposal and did not require connection to existing or new wastewater services. Such properties would also be more likely to attract permanent residents as opposed to holiday homes residents.

We are currently not supportive of the Lodge and glamping visitor accommodation. We would have liked to have seen the plan provide some additional public walking/cycling access to Puwheke and the beaches around the point as part of the plan. We note the provision of walking and cycling track around the existing wastewater ponds but do not feel this provides any real benefit to the community

We are not supportive of the residential rezoning for the following reasons:

1. The roundabout takes reserve land that is currently used for boat parking this is already a massive problem even outside traditional holiday periods.
2. There is no housing shortage on the Peninsular in so far as there are still vacant residential lots available at Tokerau Beach. This type of development is not going to provide affordable homes which there could be a shortage of.
3. This type of development would negatively impact current residents as there are insufficient existing services to accommodate this type of development, for example wastewater services (without upgrade). There is limited parking for cars and boat

trailers and limited beach accesses on this side of the Peninsula. There is also insufficient Parks/Reserve facilities, public toilets and boat launching. There is no public transport, no school facilities or medical facilities and very limited preschool facilities.

4. These homes will most likely be holiday homes. The proposal refers to the current increase of from 100 residents to 400 over holiday season. This would more than double to in excess of 800, based on their figures, if correct. The result being the negative impacts the community currently deals with over these periods are magnified.
5. The report mentions the value of the wild remoteness of the surrounding area, this is an important draw card in our tourism and should not be undermined by extensive residential development especially when there is no real demand.
6. Whilst the idea of a commercial centre sounds good, however, the population base even with the additional residential development would make it unlikely a commercial enterprise could survive.

**Kind regards**

**Tess & Alastair Halse**

**377 Rangiputa Rd**

**Re: Proposed Zoning at Puheke**

As a direct neighbour of the Lucklaw Farm Ltd and Trustees of the Taranaki Trust property, I strongly oppose the proposal to rezone Zone A as residential/mixed use. Such a change would place significant pressure on a fragile coastal environment that can only support a small community. I have mixed views regarding the rezoning of Zone B.

Rangiputa is a small, quiet community. Over the years, the available beach area has steadily decreased due to coastal erosion and climate change. At high tide, only small sections of the beach remain usable. Access to the small northern beach is also at risk due to erosion of the access road. These pressures are already creating competition for limited beach space, especially during holiday periods.

There are two boat ramps servicing the wider Karikari Peninsula, and Rangiputa is a common launching point. Parking and access are already stretched, with cars and trailers frequently lining the roads. A significant increase in population through additional housing would only exacerbate this problem and further strain the beaches, roads, and marine environment.

The proposed development also lacks the supporting infrastructure. Power, sewage, and wastewater systems are already under pressure and are inadequate to service additional residential sections and a commercial area. For immediate neighbours such as myself, the subdivision would also bring increased traffic, noise, and other disruptions to the quiet character of Rangiputa.

I also note on the provision plan that there is a narrow corridor of land extending along the existing adjacent sections which is being left in its natural state and this should remain rural and be separated from the remaining zone A.

If the subdivision is to proceed, it is essential that Puheke Beach be opened-up for public access—either via a direct road behind the sand dunes or through managed access along the beach itself. This would help distribute increased visitor pressure more evenly across the local coastal environment.

Finally, I am concerned that this development has been advanced without proper consultation with local residents and iwi. A decision of this scale requires full, transparent engagement with the community whose way of life and environment will be most directly affected.

Yours sincerely

**Tim Tasman-Jones**



To the Rangiputa Community Inc

Our family is privileged to own a property in the Rangiputa village - 766 Rangiputa Rd.

I write to express our concern regarding the re-zoning application submitted by the above parties in relation to the farm property directly behind Puwheke Beach and adjacent to Rangiputa village.

I have read the Lucklaw Farm Ltd re-zoning application and FNDC initial response.

My concerns are set out below.

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. Disruption to such quiet enjoyment by development of the surrounding lands would greatly diminish the overall attractiveness of the area.

Infrastructure in the Rangiputa area 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. I can't see that a development of the nature and scale of that proposed would serve the community in this regard.

There is a very real danger that a development would increase the risks of excessive storm water run off and adverse waste water disposal issues thus adversely affecting the ecology of the area.

The applicants don't appear to have engaged with the wider community in preparing and making their application for re-zoning.

I object to the proposed land re-zoning.

Regards

Tom Fox

September 2025

## RE-ZONING SUBMISSION BY LUCKLAW FARM LTD FOR RANGIPUTA FOR SUB-DIVISION

I have been a resident of Rangiputa for 30 years. I wish to put forward my concerns over this proposal of a new sub division /re zoning at Rangiputa by Lucklaw farms on the following grounds. The local infrastructure is already pressed well beyond its capabilities

1 With the seasonal influx 6-7 times the local population(100 locals living full time ) there is a huge increase of volume in traffic movements. People are driving to their holiday homes and houses. People are launching boats and then needing parking (Rangiputa only just copes with local boat and vehicles on a nice day) with very little parking for boats. There are also a lot of day visitors spending time on the beach. The reserve is full of boat trailers so not very safe or conducive for picnics as it was intended. Parking is on the narrow residential road or up a very steep hill. This causes congestion at the village with boats, cars, people and children – in other words , Rangiputa village can not accommodate extra people on a full time basis .

2 The three local medical centers books are full and closed to new patients. They have not been taking new enrolments for years due to the doctor shortage in the area. They can not cope with their own patients needs let alone another 1000 that would come from the large subdivision at Rangiputa. The hospital is already over stretched with long waiting lists for procedures and has limited bed spaces. The hospital is not big enough for the growing population. A lot of people are moving home to the area to retire and bringing their families.

3 Puheke beach is one of NZs few and beautiful pristine beaches. It is this way due to no development and little human interference. It is a very popular and a much loved beach to locals and holiday makers. It would be a national disaster to have any development and houses on it or visible from the beach and sea. There is only a small parking area, for about 15 cars. Its sand dunes, sand area and dune lakes are a vital part in nature. It is also an old Maori burial area. This beach should be legally protected from development.

4 The sewerage system at Rangiputa can not cope with the additional amount of sewerage it would receive. The water and grey water this sub division would use and create would be very detrimental to the ground and the water run off would end up in the sea eventually.

5 There is a lot of NZ native animals living on this land and having this development will impact on these too eg frogs, protected doterals. turkeys, hawks, native birds, ducks, insects, geckos, lizards, moreporks etc. By developing their habitat for human use will reduce their numbers further.

Only two people benefit from this proposal and that's purely for financial gain. The local community, other people and animals will be impacted negatively from this irreversible, detrimental land changing plan. The area of Rangiputa village cannot accommodate this large sub division. The pristine and unique landscape of Puheke will be ruined forever.

We feel very strongly against this subdivision and re-zoning proposal.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns.

Steve and Vanessa Goodwin  
Rangiputa