

## Submission Form (Form 5)

# Submission on Proposed Kaipara District Plan

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed District Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

**Return your signed submission by Monday 30 June 2025 via:**

**Email:** [districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz) (subject line: Proposed District Plan Submission)

**Post:** District Planning Team, Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville, 0340

**In person:** Kaipara District Council, 32 Hokianga Road, Dargaville; or  
Kaipara District Council, 6 Molesworth Drive, Mangawhai

If you would prefer to complete your submission online, from 28 April 2025 please visit:

[www.kaipara.govt.nz/kaipara-district-plan-review/proposed-district-plan](http://www.kaipara.govt.nz/kaipara-district-plan-review/proposed-district-plan)

All sections of this form need to be completed for your submission to be accepted. Your submission will be checked for completeness, and you may be contacted to fill in any missing information.

**Full name:** Elizabeth Peterson

**Phone:** 0212323826

**Organisation:** n/a

(\*the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of)

**Email:** e.peterson@auckland.ac.nz

**Postal address:** 12B Arron St, Ellerslie

**Postcode:** 1051

**Address for service: name, email and postal address (if different from above):**

189 Takahoa Drive, Kaiwaka

## Trade Competition

Pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Please tick the sentence that applies to you:**



I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or



I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

**If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:**



I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission



I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Elizabeth

**Signature:** Peterson

Digitally signed by Elizabeth Peterson  
Date: 2025.06.29 16:18:00 +1200



**Date:** 6/29/25

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission.)

**Please note:** all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.



I **do not** wish to be heard in support of my submission; or



I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,



I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

<b>(1)</b> The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan that my submission relates to are:		<b>(2)</b> My submission is that: <i>(include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views)</i>		<b>(3)</b> I seek the following decisions from Kaipara District Council. <i>(Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)</i>
Chapter/Appendix/ Schedule/Maps	objective/policy/rule/ standard/overlay	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages

# **Submission on Proposed District Plan Change**

## **Objection to the rezoning of Oneriri Road, including Takahoa Bay and Hinamoki Estates**

**From Elizabeth Peterson, 189 Takahoa Drive, Kaiwaka**

The Council proposes to rezone parts of Oneriri Road, including Takahoa Bay and Hinamoki Estates, from *Rural Zone* to *Rural Lifestyle Zone* (RLZ).

This proposed change includes the location of my house.

I object to this change for several reasons.

### **Unsuitability for high density housing**

The proposed change would see the minimum lot size to reduce from 12 hectares to 0.4 hectares. The idea presumably is to increase the number of housing units in this area, but the area is unsuitable for higher density housing for a number of reasons:

- Access from Oneriri Road onto SH1 is difficult, if not dangerous, especially if turning right across two lanes. Wait times here can be long and this will only increase if the number of residents increases.
- There is only a single road in which is winding and already struggles with wear and tear from traffic and land movements.
- At one point in the road is a single lane bridge which is prone to flooding.
- It seems strange to have high density housing at least 8km from the nearest township.

### **Impracticality of further development**

The plan states:

“Many of these areas are also suitable for further rural lifestyle development because they are already fragmented and are not anticipated to be needed (or are not suitable) for urban growth in the future.”

In practice, it would not be possible to subdivide sections in the Takahoa Bay Estate. Rules and covenants restrict further subdivision and there are practical obstacles for example the need to change every title in the estate every time there was a new subdivision, or an owner being unable to assure any purchaser of a newly subdivided lot that they will ever have any right to erect anything on that lot because it would require the permission of the Society to do so.

### **Infrastructure could not support growth**

The private infrastructure such as roads, stormwater and waste water were designed to cope with the current planned level of residents. Intensification through smaller lot sizes would put

undue strain on that infrastructure which would require expensive upgrade or risk environmental degradation as well as a decrease in liveability.

### **Lack of necessity**

The plan proposes intensification of housing, yet there are already many properties for sale and they are slow to sell. The west coast lacks the appeal of many potential buyers that the east coast of the district offers. This area does not therefore seem to be a target area for residential growth.

### **Environmental and heritage impact**

The Kaipara Harbour is already a threatened marine environment. Increasing population on its shores will increase the risk to waterways from run off, silt and land slip. Silt will only increase with increased construction. Birds and fish which live in this area will be at increased risk of silt and human disturbance.

Increasing population density on a flood-prone, single-access peninsula with poor emergency access does not seem to be the actions of a council which is committed to resilient climate action. Not only that, but the proposed changes would lead to further strain on infrastructure and risks to the environment, which have been noted above.

There has been no consultation on these proposed changes. They seem poorly thought through.

There are a number of Maori heritage sites in this area. Further development would risk **damaging these sites of cultural significance.**

### **Rates increase**

The potential for subdivision would likely increase the rateable value of the land even if it were not practically possible to subdivide it. This would have an adverse impact on existing residents as they would have to pay more for no extra value, and property prices would likely increase to, which would dissuade new buyers, therefore making it even harder to sell property in the areas.

### **Summary**

In summary, I object to this proposed rezoning aimed at intensification of residential properties because:

- The infrastructure of public and private roads, stormwater and waste water does not support further intensification;
- It increases the risks to the environment and the sensitive and at risk Kaipara Harbour in particular;
- It increases risk to heritage and cultural sites;
- Is unnecessary because there is no high demand for existing lots;

- Is unnecessary because further subdivision would not be permitted or would be practically impossible under estate rules and covenants and title deeds;
- Would increase rates because of theoretical land value increases which would not be realised.

I urge you to decline to implement these proposed changes.