

Richard Alspach
2185 Pukehuia Road
RD 4 Dargaville 0374

tel: 094395133

30/6/2025

Submission on KDC District Plan'

Preamble:

Question: What is the collective noun for Bureaucracy?

Answer: An "obstruction" of bureaucracy.

As I have opined many times before, it doesn't really matter how well a District Plan is worded, or conceived, if it is going to be administered as a wall rather than a door, then it will be of no use to anybody.

With that in mind I would like to submit on the following few points:

- PC 81 & 82 and the issue of affordable housing.
- Protecting our "Wild West" character.
- Securing access to Pouto/Mt Wesley cnr and the NW River.
- Maintaining our precautionary approach to field released of GMO

PC 81 & 82:

The recently gazetted Plan change at the Race Course and the one in town (PC 81 & 82) were included in the proposed plan as they are, but submissions can be made on those provisions and Council must decide on the merits of any submissions made thereof.

I would submit that given the millions spent on planning and guiding those two plan changes through the labyrinthine process of Council, and in the case of the Race Course, further scrutiny by the environment court; they should both be left substantially, if not totally, intact.

There are other factors too; In the case of the Race Course, Govt put in a substantial amount of money through the PGF. Govt is currently accusing Local Govt of inhibiting house development (not totally fair). They might not be too pleased if additional controls were put on either PC 81 or PC82.

The proposed District Plan puts a lot of emphasis on lifestyle development as a means towards providing more housing. Which is fair enough as far as it goes. Lifestyle development, almost by definition is not "affordable housing". So where are the workers to live?? At least with PC 81 & 82 there is potential for some "affordable housing" in the Matrix.

So leave the rules and provisions in those two areas as they are. The ongoing question of "where are the workers going to live", is an issue still to be dealt with by Council (in fill housing alone won't cut it)

It would probably be helpful also if you indicate of the maps that there is a designated "Light industrial area in PC 81, and link the designated area to the one proposed in the plan stretching along SH 14.

Protecting our "wild west" character:

Councils much vaunted recent release of it's updated Website, makes much of the Wild West Character, and it's desirability. Fair enough. So don't stuff it up. For example; Ripiro Beach is part of that character, being able to walk/run/ride along that beach without intrusion of overlooking housing is one of it's charms and attractions. Any housing along that beachfront, outside of existing settlements, should be discreet and well set back.

Securing access to Pouto:

If the road at Mt Wesley corner becomes impassable for any reason, then Pouto will be cut off, and all that economic benefit will be marooned. Access down the beach will still be possible, but that is not much good to Milk Tankers

This is not fanciful. Council for reasons unknown removed the legal status for Segedin Road, the only gazetted legal alternative route to points south. It needs to be reinstated. There is considerable potential for lifestyle development up what used to be Segedin Road, currently access is now by a series of ROWs, which is a bit of a mess, and is a contingent liability on Council.

Wesley Corner could go. The River is long overdue for decent study and a strategic plan (NRC WDC and KDC have finally started, action is a long way off). The banks are demonstrably unstable, and tidal forces are strong. The Council closed a section of River Road circa 2000, because they couldn't stop the pressure of heavy traffic from pushing the road into the river. The Kaihu River used to come out over that section of road. It's unstable.

I am not suggesting forming Segedin Road, just re gazette it, so that you can do something if necessary. The necessity is probably inevitable sometime. I would opine that the necessity will become reality before we are confronted with half metre sea level rises.

GMOs

Council used to have a precautionary approach to field releases of GMOs, along with the other Councils in the North (I was the KDC's representative on the joint committee). We have a lot to lose if things go wrong.

For instance: one of the obvious proposals for release would be "round up ready rye grass". Sounds good, but what happens when that grass gets into the water ways of the Raupo Drainage Scheme? There is already enough problems with Millet that won't respond to glyphosphate, we don't need any more.

I know the Government is introducing legislation, which is intended to free up the use of GMOs, but it is pertinent to note that the organizations which actually market our produce, Meat companies, Fonterra, Horticulture, even Forestry companies seeking environmental accreditation, are all taking a precautionary approach. Being GMO free is one of our competitive advantages, and it is protected by 1200 Ks of ocean. We would give that advantage up at our peril.

I can not see any advantage in KDC opening itself up to the field release of GMOs, particularly if our neighbours continue with the agreed precautionary stance. We should do the same.

We have not proven ourselves particularly adept at handling foreign incursions from unwanted pests, no matter what their source, or how they were introduced. Why invite more problems? Stick with the precautionary approach.

I do wish to be heard in support of this submission

signed

Richard Alspach

emailed 1430 hrs 30/6/2025