



# Proposed District Plan submission form

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991.

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

To: Central Hawke's Bay District Council

26-7-21

### 1. Submitter details

Full Name	Last	First
	PAIN	GERARD FRASER
Company/Organisation (if applicable)	N/A	
Contact Person (if different)	/	
Email Address	/	
Address		
Phone	Mobile	Home
		Work

2. This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for Central Hawke's Bay

3.  I could  I could not – gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick relevant box)

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete point 4 below:

4.  I am  I am not – directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition. (Please tick relevant box if applicable)

Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

5.  I wish  I do not wish – to be heard in support of my submission in person (Please tick relevant box)

6.  I will  I will not – consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)

UNDECIDED

7. Do you wish to present your submission via Zoom?  Yes  No

8. Please complete section below (insert additional boxes per provision you are submitting on):

The specific provision of the plan that my submission relates to:

SUBMISSION A possibly has a "foot" on key messages 1 to 4  
SUBMISSION B relates primarily to key message 5 (Protecting Our Unique Landscape)  
(See separate page)

Do you:  Support  Oppose  Amend (Please tick relevant box)

What decision are you seeking from Council?

Reasons:

SEE SEPARATE PAGE



Please note: All submissions will be treated as public documents and will be made available on Council's website. However, you may request that your contact details (but not your name) be withheld. If you want your contact details withheld, please let us know by ticking this box.



(by BERNARD PATEL  
26 July 2021)

SUBMISSION A

(i) I SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF PROTECTING PRODUCTION ZONE LAND FROM SUBDIVISION FOR HOUSING BUT IF AN APPLICANT CAN EASILY PRESENT COMPELLING EVIDENCE THAT A SMALL AREA WITHIN ENCOMPASSING LAND USE CLASSIFICATION 1, 2, OR 3 IS NOT THAT PRODUCTIVE (SAY FOR EXAMPLE IT IS FORMER CREEK OR RIVER BED) THEN I SUBMIT CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE ALLOWED FOR EXCEPTIONS.

(ii) Rumour ~~is~~ HAS IT THAT A PARTICULAR FARM IN THE ONKARANJA DISTRICT WAS INITIALLY PROPOSED TO BE SUBDIVIDED INTO SIXTY LIFESTYLE BLOCKS; OVER TIME, THE FIGURE ROSE TO 150; OVER FURTHER TIME, THE FIGURE ROSE TO 312 HOUSE LOTS FOR WHICH I HAVE ACTUALLY SEEN A PLAN

I SUSPECT THIS FARM IS IN THE LUC 12, OR 3 ZONE SO AM BEMUSED THAT EVEN A SIXTY-LIFESTYLE-BLOCK SUBDIVISION COULD BE CONSIDERED TO BE "PROTECTING OUR LAND RESOURCES" LET ALONE "PROVIDING SUSTAINABLE GROWTH", "(PROTECTING) RURAL TOWNSHIPS", OR "RECOGNISING OUR CULTURAL VALUES AND HERITAGE AREAS".

I TRUST THE RUMOUR IS JUST THAT.

IF NOT THEN I SUBMIT THE RESOURCE CONSTRAINT PROCESS NEEDS TO BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION.

SUBMISSION B

THERE IS MUCH "DISQUIET" IN THE RURAL COMMUNITY ABOUT WHAT CENTRAL GOVERNMENT IS ASKING US TO DO ON A NUMBER OF MATTERS.

ONE SUCH MATTER IS THE "HOSPITAL PASS" CENTRAL GOVT HAS GIVEN YOU LOCAL AUTHORITIES WITH REGARDS "SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS" (AND VARIOUS "LARGER BEINGS" SUCH AS "NATURAL AMENITY FEATURES")

I, PERSONALLY, AM ALL IN FAVOUR OF SUCH AREAS HAVING SOME RESTRICTIONS PUT ON THEM TO PROTECT WHAT IS



(2)

LEFT OF OUR INDIGENOUS FLORA AND FAUNA  
NOT PERSONALLY EFFECTED EITHER,

BUT THAT I AM

AS A "SWEETENER" TO THE RURAL LAND OWNERS WHO ARE  
EFFECTED, I SUBMIT THAT SUCH AREAS ARE DESIGNATED  
AS "RATES FREE" AREAS (LIKE IS AVAILABLE FOR QR-II BLOCKS)

SUCH AREAS ARE OF BENEFIT TO THE WHOLE COMMUNITY  
SO EVERYONE SHOULD SHARE THE BURDEN OF RATES NOT BEING  
LEVIED ON SUCH AREAS

I APPRECIATE THAT QR-II BLOCKS ARE LEGALLY SURVEYED  
WHICH WILL NOT BE THE CASE WITH MOST SNAs, NAFs, ETC  
BUT IN THIS DAY AND AGE WITH GPS TECHNOLOGY, IT WOULD  
NOT BE DIFFICULT TO WORK OUT THE AREAS INVOLVED THAT  
YOUR EXPERTS HAVE SIGNALLED.

AS AN ASIDE, I PERSONALLY KNOW SOME AREAS  
THAT YOUR EXPERTS HAVE SIGNALLED ARE EXTREMELY  
QUESTIONABLE - LIKE AN AREA OF WAIPAWA RIVERBANK  
THAT IS COVERED IN BLACK-BERRY AND WILLOWS -  
SO AN AVENUE FOR RURAL LANDOWNERS TO QUESTION YOUR  
EXPERTS' OPINIONS MIGHT ALSO HELP IN "WINNING" THEM  
OVER.