

FNDC Rezoning Submissions Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin, S530 and Andre Galvin, S567

Hearing 17 - November 2025

FNDC Hearing Objectives – Pre Hearing Evidence Summary ---

1. Supporting Evidence References - Summary

- [1] FNDC PDP Strategic Direction (Hearing 1) – requires growth to be consolidated around serviced areas. Proposal at Haruru Falls aligns with this.
- [2] PDP Residential Zone Objectives & Section 32 Evaluation – support rezoning to meet housing supply.
- [3] FNDC Section 42A Report (Strategic Direction/Rezoning) – confirms alignment of rezoning with PDP objectives.
- [4] Northland Regional Policy Statement – Growth & Land Use policies encourage consolidation in serviced areas.
- [5] National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 – requires enabling of residential growth and choice.
- [6] Resource Management Act 1991 (ss32 & 75) – requires efficient, effective, and sustainable zoning.
- [7] Civil Engineering Report – confirms services are available with managed connections. Water and hazards are manageable.
- [8] Traffic Assessment Report – demonstrates safe access via SH11 and local network with the correct mitigation.
- [9] Landscape Assessment Report – effects are acceptable and mitigatable at Haruru Falls.
- [10] Consultation Records – Archaeological report confirmed no historical sites of any significance on the property.

2. Submission Details

Below is a summary of the rezoning submission for the Haruru Falls property Lot 1 DP53506 under submission numbers 530 and 567.

The property is 6.99 hectares of mixed terrain and vegetation. It borders residential zoned properties and the Waitangi Estuary on the edge of the Haruru Falls township.

Current Property Zones

- Operative District Plan (ODP) - The property is currently zoned General Coastal
- Proposed District Plan (PDP) - The property proposed zone is Rural Production.
- Requested Submission – General Residential rezone for a portion of the property and high natural character (HNC) boundary change to mirror the General Residential zone change.

Submissions Lodged

Two submissions were lodged with council in 2022 as part of the wider Far North District Plan review and changes.

- 530 filed by Creative Intentions – Requested General Residential Zone change per diagram and HNC boundary change to mirror General Residential Zone change
- 567 filed by Metro Planning – Requested Settlement Zone

Final Submission Request

After the round of council consultation in the ‘Opt-in’ process and the expert evidence provided our final submission request is summarised below.

- Rezone a portion of the property to General Residential as per the diagrams 1 and 2 below with exact lines to be agreed and drawn.
- Rezone the remainder of the property to Rural Residential
- Modify the high natural character overlay to match the Rural Residential zone
- Gift a public walkway at the water’s edge of the property around the estuary through to the property boundary near Causeway Road. To reach Causeway Road would need further conversation with Council as the property doesn’t quite meet Causeway Road.

The above final proposal is largely the same as our first submission 530 with the main difference coming from Council’s original feedback that it was unlikely the property will remain Rural Production in the ODP where council indicated it could change to Rural Residential as the baseline.

We have provided evidence and mapping aligned to Council’s Strategic Direction and Planning Objectives in later sections in this document.

This adheres to the request in minute 14 and criteria set out in Minute 1 - [FNDC-PDP-Minute-14-Rezoning-Criteria-and-Process-Final-V2.pdf](#)

Submission 530

- Rezone a portion (see diagram 2) of the property to general residential from rural production as is currently proposed in the PDP
- Modify the high natural character boundary line to mirror the revised residential rezoning boundary line.

The diagram below was included in Submission 530 to the FNDC. The intention of the diagram was to provide an indication of the proposed residential rezone and HNC boundary line change. The area in light green represents the proposed changes. The house lots, community storage, Eco-Centre and board walk are in for concept only and not deemed relevant at this stage.

Diagram 1 – Initial Submission



Submission 567 request to change the property zone to a Settlement zone. This is not deemed suitable by council planners and we do not want to follow through with this submission

The Far north District Council offered a pre-hearing process where submitters could provide expert evidence to support their respective submissions to be discussed in a consultation period with Council planners pre-hearing. We agreed to 'opt in' to the pre-hearing in preparation for hearing 15C and submitted expert evidence in the following areas. All reports have been submitted to council and are available on the Councils Website per below.

Following expert evidence can be found on the Council's website below

Link - [Hearing 15C - Rezoning General - Urban and Rural | Far North District Council](#)

Section - Victora Yorke and Andre Galvin, S530 and Andre Galvin, 567

Civil Engineering

- D Simmonds - Vision Consulting Engineers – Engaged to provide a high-level engineering assessment
- Their brief was to provide a high-level civil engineering assessment for a proposed 13 residential lots.
- Conclusion - The report considered the development of the property could address the management of natural hazards, geotechnical, Internal Access, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. Each would require detailed design.

Traffic Management

- Peter Kelly - Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd - Engaged to assess and prepare the traffic management report.
- Their brief was to provide a traffic report for a higher density development than proposed in the rezoning submission. The brief was to cater for traffic volume and movements of 44 dwellings, café and a visitor centre.
- Conclusion - It is considered the site could be accessed via Puketona road SH11 subject to appropriate remedial measures undertaken and approvals as part of the standard resource consent application.

Landscape Architect

- Stephen Brown from Brown NZ Limited was engaged to assess the impact on the landscape for rezoning a portion of the property as per submission 530.
- Conclusion – Stephen’s preliminary assessment provided support for a partial residential rezoning on the property. The property currently borders a residential zone and concluded it is acceptable to move the residential boundary line down the ridge without significant adversary impacts on the current ridge and skyline.
- Diagram 2 below was prepared by Stephen highlighting areas of proposed rezoning in light brown. This is largely in-line with diagram 1 above provided in the original submission.

Diagram 2 – Landscape Architect view of the rezoning potential



3. Criteria Supporting Evidence

1. Criteria Evidence Summary

This submission includes a table under the section 'General Guidance Criteria for Rezoning Submissions'.

Each criterion in the table has an Evidence Reference code (e.g., [1.1–1.5], [2.1–2.4]) entered in the Evidence Reference Column. These codes correspond to the detailed evidence points listed in the 'Supporting Evidence References' section 5 in this document.

General Guidance Criteria For Rezoning Submissions

Criteria	Matters to be addressed	Evidence Reference
Strategic direction	How the rezoning request is consistent with the PDP strategic direction (refer Hearing 1).	[1.1–1.5]
Alignment with zone outcomes	When rezoning request relates to existing PDP zone, an assessment of how the request is aligned with the objectives, policies and intended outcomes for the zone.	[2.1–2.4]
Higher order direction	How the request 'gives effect to' higher order documents in accordance with section 75(3) of the RMA. Consideration of all relevant national policy statements, the national planning standards, and the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	[3.1–3.3]
Reasons for the request	The reasons for the rezoning request, including an assessment of why the notified zoning is not appropriate for the subject land.	[4.1–4.4]
Assessment of site suitability and potential effects of rezoning	Assessment of the suitability of the land for rezoning, including an assessment of: - Effects from natural hazards (refer Part 2 – District Wide Matters and the Northland Regional Policy Statement).	[5.1–5.5]

Additional Rezoning Guidance

Criteria	Matters to be addressed	Evidence Reference
Infrastructure (three waters) servicing	How the rezoning request (including subdivision and development potential enabled by the request) will be supported by adequate infrastructure servicing. This should set out: - Any proposed connections to existing infrastructure systems. - Any outcomes of discussions with infrastructure providers and assumptions	[6.1–6.3]

	about infrastructure servicing/ sequencing or capacity, including demands from other plan-enabled development. - Any on-site provision of infrastructure. Note: If the rezoning request would result in substantive demand on Council's infrastructure or alternative bulk solutions, applicants should engage with Council's Infrastructure representative via the PDP generic email.	
Transport infrastructure	How the rezoning request will be supported by existing or proposed transport infrastructure, including how new or upgraded infrastructure is required. Note: If the rezoning request includes any access to a State Highway, engagement with Waka Kotahi is strongly encouraged, and outcomes of that engagement should be recorded.	[7.1–7.2]
Consultation and further submissions	Any consultation undertaken with key stakeholders or tangata whenua in relation to the rezoning request. A list of any further submissions and responses to them.	[8.1–8.3]
Section 32AA evaluation	How the rezoning request is a more appropriate, effective and efficient way to achieve the PDP objectives (compared to the notified zoning) in accordance with section 32AA of the RMA.	[9.1–9.3]

Additional guidance criteria for special purpose zone (SPZ) requests

Criteria	Matters to be addressed	Evidence Reference
National planning standards criteria	How the SPZ meets all of the following criteria for additional special purpose zones in the national planning standards (8.3), i.e., the activities/outcomes sought from the SPZ are: - Significant to the district, region or country; and - Impractical to be managed through another zone; and - Impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.	N/A
Relationship with Part 2 – District Wide Matters	How the SPZ is intended to interact with provisions in Part 2 – District Wide Matters, including matters requiring rules for overlay	N/A

	areas (e.g., coastal environment, natural features and landscape etc.).	
--	---	--

Special Purpose Zone (SPZ) – Additional Requirements

Criteria	Matters to be addressed	Evidence Reference
Consultation on the SPZ proposal	An assessment of parties directly affected by the SPZ proposal, any consultation undertaken, and any further consultation proposed.	N/A
SPZ provisions	The requested SPZ provisions (objectives, policies, rules, matters of control/discretion and standards), which should be consistent with other PDP zone chapters.	N/A
Section 32AA evaluation	A section 32AA evaluation that assesses (compared to the PDP provisions): - How the SPZ objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. - How the SPZ provisions are the most appropriate to achieve the SPZ objectives.	[9.1–9.3]

4. Supporting Evidence References

Section	Objective/Policy	Evidence Summary	Evidence Reference
1. Strategic Direction	1.1 Urban Growth Consolidation	PDP Strategic Direction seeks compact growth around serviced urban nodes; site adjoins Haruru Falls township and existing residential zoning; consolidation reduces sprawl.	[1] [M14] [S42A]
	1.2 Housing Diversity	Rezone enables a wider range of housing typologies and lot sizes in Haruru Falls, supporting choice and supply.	[1] [2] [NPS-UD]
	1.3 Community Wellbeing	Well-located housing close to existing community amenities improves liveability and access to services.	[1] [S42A]

	1.4 Resilience & Hazards	Rezoning focuses growth outside coastal hazard areas identified for high risk; detailed hazard management addressed at subdivision stage.	[1] [7] [S42A]
	1.5 Te Tiriti & Cultural Values	Proposed engagement with hapū and iwi during design and development phases; aligns with PDP direction to recognise Māori heritage values.	[1] [RMA s8] [RPS]
2. Zone Outcomes	2.1 Residential Outcomes – Variety	General Residential zoning provides for varied densities/lot sizes appropriate for a township edge context.	[2] [NatPlanStd]
	2.2 Consolidated Urban Form	Locates additional capacity contiguous with township, minimising infrastructure extension and reverse sensitivity to rural production.	[2] [S42A]
	2.3 Compatible Activities & Public Access	Walkway dedication along estuary edge improves passive recreation and wellbeing while remaining compatible with residential amenity.	[2] [10]
	2.4 Climate Change & Adaptation	Residential pattern supports mode choice and shorter trips; site servicing and water-sensitive design reduce emissions/impacts.	[2] [4]
3. Higher Order Direction	3.1 NPS-UD – Capacity & Well-functioning Urban Environment	Rezoning contributes to sufficient development capacity and a well-functioning urban environment with housing choice.	[NPS-UD] [RMA s75]
	3.2 RPS – Water Quality Policy 4.2.1	Design commits to water sensitive design and stormwater detention to improve/maintain water quality outcomes.	[RPS 4.2.1] [7]

	3.3 National Planning Standards Alignment	Requested “General Residential” aligns with National Planning Standards zone framework and terminology.	[NatPlanStd]
4. Reasons for the Request	4.1 Appropriateness vs. Operative/PDP Baseline	Operative zone is General Coastal (ODP). Council has indicated PDP baseline will be Rural Residential; both are less efficient at meeting urban housing needs on this serviced, township-edge site.	[Doc – Submission summary] [S42A] [RMA s32]
	4.2 Meeting Local Housing Demand	Adds feasible, serviced lots in Haruru Falls to address local demand, supporting Strategic Direction objectives.	[1] [2] [NPS-UD]
	4.3 Contiguity with Existing Residential	The site directly adjoins existing residential zoning and dwellings; a logical extension of the urban edge.	[Doc – Submission summary]
	4.4 Landscape Effects Acceptable	Landscape expert evidence supports shifting the residential/HNC boundary down the ridge with acceptable effects and mitigation.	[9]
5. Site Suitability & Effects	5.1 Engineering Feasibility	Expert civil engineering confirms feasible servicing (stormwater, wastewater, water supply), access and hazard management.	[7]
	5.2 Fire & Safety Interface	Managed interface with existing bush and residential areas through design standards and fire safety provisions at subdivision stage.	[7]
	5.3 State Highway 11 Access	Traffic assessment confirms safe access to SH11 subject to remedial works/approvals at resource consent stage.	[8]

	5.4 Landscape Assessment	Preliminary assessment supports partial residential rezoning; effects are acceptable/mitigatable for Haruru Falls context.	[9]
	5.5 Coastal/Climate Resilience	Managed retreat and minimum floor/ set-back responses available at consenting to respond to sea-level rise scenarios.	[7] [S42A]
6. Infrastructure	6.1 Potable Water	Rainwater harvesting and/or network connection feasible per engineering advice.	[7]
	6.2 Wastewater	Wastewater can be treated via new or upgraded WWTP or on-site solutions consistent with Council standards.	[7] [S42A]
	6.3 Stormwater	Detention and water-sensitive design can manage peak flows and quality prior to discharge to the estuary.	[7] [RPS 4.2.1]
7. Transport Infrastructure	7.1 Safe & Efficient Access	Access design to SH11 and local network is achievable with identified mitigation; engagement with Waka Kotahi/NZTA undertaken through process.	[8] [M14]
	7.2 Utilise Existing Network	Growth occurs where roads already exist, avoiding costly new corridors.	[8] [S42A]
8. Consultation	8.1 Pre-hearing Engagement	Participated in FNDC pre-hearing process and evidence exchange; submitter evidence lodged and available on FNDC website.	[10] [M14]
	8.2 Archaeology	Archaeological review found no recorded sites of historical significance on the property.	[10]

	8.3 Tangata Whenua Engagement	Commitment to ongoing iwi/hapū engagement through detailed design and consenting, including public space design.	[10] [RMA s8]
9. Section 32AA Evaluation	9.1 Efficiency	Rezone is more efficient than status quo zones at enabling housing capacity in a serviced, appropriate location.	[RMA s32] [1] [2]
	9.2 Effectiveness	Better achieves PDP objectives for compact, well-functioning urban areas and community wellbeing.	[1] [2] [NPS-UD]
	9.3 Benefits vs Costs	Public benefits (housing, access, environmental enhancement) outweigh costs; effects are mitigatable by design/conditions.	[RMA s32] [S42A]

5. References

This list provides the primary sources relied upon in the rezoning submission and supporting evidence and evidence mapping.

- [1] FNDC PDP – Strategic Direction (Hearing 1 materials)
- [2] PDP Residential Zone objectives & Section 32 evaluation
- [S42A] FNDC Section 42A Reports – Rezoning Overview / Hearing 15B/15C
- [M14] FNDC PDP Minute 14 – Rezoning Criteria and Process
- [RPS 4.2.1] Regional Policy Statement for Northland – Policy 4.2.1 Improving Overall Water Quality
- [NPS-UD] National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (updated 2022)
- [RMA s32] Resource Management Act 1991 – Section 32 (evaluation)
- [RMA s75] Resource Management Act 1991 – Section 75 (giving effect to higher order)
- [NatPlanStd] National Planning Standards (2019, updated 2022) – zone framework
- [7] Civil Engineering Report (Vision Consulting Engineers)
- [8] Traffic Assessment Report (Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd)
- [9] Landscape Assessment Report (Brown NZ Limited)
- [10] Consultation records including archaeology review and pre-hearing engagement

6. Contact Details

- Submitter - Andre Galvin – andregalvin@yahoo.co.uk Mobile 021 1952060
- Submitter - Victoria Yorke – victoriayorke88@gmail.com mobile 021 1952061
- Planner - Brian Putt – brian@metroplanning.co.nz mobile -021 902 744