

EVIDENCE 06  
TOPIC Papakāinga  
SUB# PC94B-Papakāinga  
DATE 21-11-2016

Hello,

My name is Gary Stables and I am a resident of Whangarei and live in the harbour area of Waikaraka .

I would like to talk to 3 issues relating to the District Plan change 94b Papakainga

### Issue 1

Submission Topic-Pka 1.2 Eligibility

PC94B-55 Amend PKA 1.2.2 to state

#### **The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to Papa-kainga developments**

It states at present- the underlying Environmental provisions shall not apply to Papakainga developments under certain provisions.

In this document many controls relating to the District Wide Rules and Resource Area provisions do not apply to Papakainga developments that apply to other developments.

Allowing an outright exemption from the underlying Environmental provisions could mean that intensive and commercial and Industrial activities are created in land that has outstanding natural landscapes and natural features.

The natural environments, especially sensitive coastal zones, should be given the highest levels of protection, regardless of the historic or current owner(s), be they the Crown, private or Maori. We are all New Zealanders and we all should be involved in protecting our land and the environment, yet these proposed changes do not do this.

EVIDENCE  
TOPIC  
SUB#  
PAGE

Unlimited housing / building and commercial developments as outlined as possible concepts in Plan change 94b could have adverse effects on the rural and coastal environment.

All community groups should have the same policies and rules to follow in putting in planning applications to council, the proposed plan change 94b provisions cannot guarantee preservation of existing environments, preservation of existing settlement or rural character.

This is why PC94B should read-

**The underlying Environment provisions shall apply to Papakainga developments**

## Issue 2

Submission Topic PC94B-55 –Effects on Neighbouring Properties

**Council reconsider PC94b-55 and include safeguards for property owners and communities alongside Maori Ancestral land that take into account all the requirements of the RMA**

## Issue 3

Submission Topic-Additional Controls –pc94b-55-PKA 1.5

**All controls need to be researched more thoroughly so that they fit the needs of a PLAN CHANGE 94B in a coastal, rural and residential environment.**

The last 2 issues have the same common theme.

At present we have a district plan which outlines guidelines for the usage of land which all landowners have to adhere to.

There are very good reasons why District plans exist , it is a document that provides a level playing field for the whole community and makes transparent any changes outside the district plan to the wider community. Maori land is available for development in a wide range of geographical positions in Northland. Some land is in residential areas and other land is in isolated communities. Developments in either of these environments could have potentially totally different effects on the local environment and neighbouring residents.

Under the current Plan change 94b the communities effected by proposed development would have very little to no input in the council decision to make a proposed development a permitted activity.

In reality only the people living in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development would have the knowledge of what actual effect the proposed development would have on the local community. A Papakainga Housing development could have very little effect on the local environment and community in a rural situation but in a residential zone, like Waikaraka it effects could be greater.

Local knowledge and input is very important in making council decisions that affect everyone, an example is the 70km/hr speed limit at Waikaraka. The traffic on the road has greatly increased in the last few years and so has the number of people living in this area. A 70km

speed limit is very dangerous for drivers , driving through a built up residential area. This is an issue that needs to be addressed, but only the locals know about this situation, and the council would only be made aware of this situation if Waikaraka residents informed council.

The question is would the council processes to assess Papakainga developments take local knowledge into consideration? Especially when the plan change PC94B seems to have a common theme of denying community involvement in making decisions relating to Papakainga developments and excluding residents or the community in the decision making processes.

It is also noted that in some cases where resource consents would be required applicants may request that the consent application be heard by a commissioner with suitable qualifications.

If this process is used how much local input will be used into making decisions about developments and what consultation processes will be used to make sure the rate payers effected by the commissioner decision have been heard. Would the commissioner have an appreciation of the impact of their decisions?

### Summary

I read on one newspaper report that a Greg Innes described the plan changes as- on Leading edge.

I also read another document produced by the Whangarei District Council that said-

The approach taken by the Whangarei District Council is to be as liberal as possible.

As a rate payer I am not interested in the council producing rules and regulations that are considered leading edge and liberal as possible. Other district councils like that Western Bay of Plenty have policy relating to Papakainga and we should be looking at these models and adding improvements.

The basic concept of having different rules and regulations for different land owners under one council jurisdiction is not fair or acceptable.

Current development not meeting the district plan needs a Resource consent while under Plan change 94 b this is not required, it is divisive and lacks transparency by the council in making community wide based decisions effecting the whole community

Why should Building and construction developers who produce development plans to the Whangarei District council not associated with Plan change 94b and do not meet the District plan, have to go through a resource consent process and other groups in the community with similar developments have the opportunity to bypass this process.

Any race should have the right to maintain and enhance their ancestral land, however other people and the environment should not be affected adversely effected by these developments without the use of a consultative process.

The Resource Consent process supports this concept.

An underlying issue with Plan change 94b is the fact that the land can be in a variety of different locations from a rural setting to a built up

urban environment. Any new Council guidelines to need to reflect these different situations and make sure a transparent process is in place to deal with community concerns.

Creating Council policy that tries to "fit all" does not work in this situation.

I would also like to comment on the development contribution fees paid to Whangarei District Council relating to developments under the council jurisdiction. After reading documents relating to Plan change 94b I believe that possibly the council could look at having a special fund set aside to subsidize the costs of development fees for developments under plan change 94b. Whangarei has many people in the community interested in creating developments in conjunction with the council that will need to pay development contribution fees. If the fees are considered a barrier for one section of the community then the fees should be lowered - so that all the community gains assistance.

The concept of rate payer's money subsidising one section of the community in contribution fees is unacceptable and does not provide a level playing field for all the community.

Sound and well thought out policy should meet the needs of the whole community, not just one sector.

Components of Plan change 94b in its current format do not meet the needs of the whole community.

Thank you.