



**Proposed Kaipara District Plan:
Form 6 - Further Submission**
Clause 7 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

**If you require any assistance with completing this form,
please contact the District Planning Team:**

Phone: 0800 727 059

or

By Email: districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz

Privacy Act Note

All information provided in your further submission is considered public under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and may be published to progress the process for the private plan change and may be made publicly available.

1. Further Submitter Details <i>(mandatory information)</i>			
Full Name of individual or organisation making further submission:	Luciana Orr		
Contact Person <i>(if different from above)</i>			
Email address:	luciana.orr@gmail.com		
Preferred method of contact: <i>(select one)</i>	Email: ☒		
	Post ☐		
Submitter contact phone number:	0221896496		
Do you have an Agent acting on your behalf?	Yes ☐		
	No ☒		
Agent name and email address:			
Who is all correspondence to go to?:	Submitter only ☒	Agent only ☐	Both ☐
2. Request to be heard at hearings			
☐ Yes, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission			
☒ No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission			
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing	Yes ☒		
	No ☐		
3. Eligibility to make a further submission <i>(for further information on this go to RMA Schedule 1, Clause 8)</i>			
I am (select ONE of the following options:			
☐ A person representing a relevant aspect of public interest.			
☒ A person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has.			
☐ The local authority.			
4. My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are:			
<i>(For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups.</i> OR <i>Any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has is likely to include owners of land and users of resources directly affected by plan provisions. It is also likely to include iwi and hapu where their interests are directly affected.)</i>			
I am a land owner in the proposed 500 meter zone, near the Hukatere Quarry. I am responding to the Atlas Quarry submission, when I write oppose or amend. Locals in the 500m proposed zone were notified in writing on 25 August 2026, by Environmental Consultants Boffa Miskell, of their submission on the PKDP, on behalf of their client Atlas Quarries, which effects landowners and their rights in our area. I am not responding to the Brynderwyn Quarry recommendations. I am not a lawyer so please excuse me if I have not responded correctly. I have not been able to gain further information in layman's terms so I can full understand the implications of what is being proposed. I have called Boffa Miskell, who are not able to comment and spoke with council staff who outlined a few possible implications. I do question why we were not notified by Boffa Miskell in June 2025, when their submission was sent to council. This would have given our community time to discuss it together and understand the potentially relevant impacts, and respond in a timely manner.			

5. Further Submission/s for submission/s being notified on 24 February 2026 on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan:

Submission Point Number:	Submitter Name	Support OR Oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing
<i>Example</i> 123.45	<i>Example</i> John Smith	<i>Example</i> Support	<i>Example</i> I support this because....
152.1	Luciana Orr	oppose/amend	I oppose the proposed change that adds 'lawfully activities that could be expected within that location.' I'm reading this as further restrictions to landowners, to manage or develop their properties around the Hukatere site. I suggest new builds, small land subdivisions and activities that do not impact the quarry to be allowed without any consultation with the quarry or council. The standard consents to KDC eg. new build consent, remain the same. FS118.1
152.2	Luciana Orr	oppose/amend	If minerals need to mapped further that's up to council to respond to the current resource management act. I oppose adding a ~500m zone setback from all identified regionally significant mineral resource, around the HUKATERE site. This infringes on the rights of the public, to develop their properties, as this restriction aims to impose additional cost to a property owner who may want to make a new build dwelling, or subdivide their property. I understand large subdivisions may not be appropriate close to the Hukatere quarry and don't have issue with restricting large developments. This buffer zone is unfair for smaller subdivisions, as current property owners have not been informed of the impact, which will devalue their properties. This 500m zone is also not well planned at Hukatere, as it cuts halfway through our neighbours property, misses all the houses on the ridge beside the historic St Michaels church, and the hilltop house on the corner of Summer Rd and Tinopai rd. There are many other properties in this zone which would be negatively impacted, if restrictions were pursued. Everyone can hear the quarry noise, when the crusher is in use. This was located down at Werewere Point for years, which kept the noise right down as it was buffered by the valley walls. Perhaps this could be moved back to ensure less complaints. We were told by quarry staff when we bought the property, that it was located down at the point because it was a legal requirement. FS118.2
152.4	Luciana Orr	amend	The proposed provisions may not adequately address cross-boundary issues. I understand that this point may not initially relate to the Hukatere quarry which is the area in question throughout this submission. I do oppose increasing of noise. see 152.2 Use Werewere Point as a solution to reducing noise in this small rural community. Over the last 10 years, we have had a good relationship with Atlas, who used to contact us if they were blasting, which was short and infrequent. The crusher now in the north eastern location, is very loud (when in operation) and can be heard a lot further away than the projected 500m buffer zone, as it echo's everywhere being on top of a hill. FS118.3
152.5		oppose/amend	Atlas seek for it to be a non-complying activity for development of sensitive activities within the quarry buffer area and a discretionary activity for development within 500m of a lawfully established quarry operation. This is sought in all zones with the relevant policy framework sitting within a minerals chapter and rural or residential chapter. Covered in points above. What exactly is a sensitive activity? I oppose our land being devalued by restrictions, or to incurring additional charges to gain a special discretionary consent to build a house or run a business which does not impact the quarry activities. Sensitive activities should be specified so ratepayers understand what they are. In addition... I oppose Atlas seeking to be a non-complying entity, enacting sensitive activities themselves within the quarry buffer zone and their proposed ability to override the rights of local rate payers in the 500m proposed zone. I understand that this point may not be well written, but the current govt is fast tracking lots of bills, including those which open up mineral exploration. I object to any re-zoning in our area that negatively impacts property owners. FS118.4

YOU ARE WELCOME TO PROVIDE THE REQUIRED INFORMATION ABOVE OR EXTRA INFORMATION ON A SEPARATE PAGE IF YOU WANT TO

Please return this further submission form and any attachments by:

Post to: Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville 0340

OR

Email: districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz

OR

Hand-deliver this further submission to:

Kaipara District Council, 32 Hokianga Road, Dargaville or

Kaipara District Council, 6 Molesworth Drive, Mangawhai

IMPORTANT!

You must serve a copy of your further submission on the original submitter **within five (5) working days after it is served** on Kaipara District Council. You will find the submitter's contact address on their submission.

To Whom it May Concern,

On **25th of August 2026**, a letter dated 6 August 2026 was received by post.

This was sent by Environmental Consultants **Boffa Miskell** who were employed by Atlas Quarries to prepare a submission on their behalf. This letter was apparently sent out to all people in the proposed Buffer area of 500m, which surrounds the Atlas Quarry - Hukatere, on Tinopai Rd.

This letter is attached.

The letter concerns a **Notice of Proposed Mineral Extraction Zone and Buffer Area**.

A KDC Form 5 submission which this letter outlines, was submitted to council **Monday 30th June 2025** for inclusion into the current Proposed Kaipara District Plan. This is submission 152 in council records.

See attached. I have highlights points in this document which reflect my further comments.

This letter states:

"We are now notifying neighbouring property owners within the buffer area. The independent Hearings Panel for the Kaipara District Council will advise on any further notification periods should this matter be progressed further for inclusion within the PKDP."

If you have any questions about the PKDP, and the hearings process, please contact KDC directly."

I phoned Boffa Miskell 25/8/26 to find out more.

The letter was signed by Geoff England – Planner/Senior Principal. I was advised by the receptionist that they could not speak on any details, had prepared this submission on behalf of Atlas Quarries, and to contact KDC.

I then phoned KDC, spoke to reception, who tried to find the right person to speak with. She checked with several people from the Monitoring and Compliance team, who didn't know anything about this.

Meagan Walters made contact. I spoke with her and emailed a copy of the letter.

Venessa Anich called me on 26/8 and advised that the submission period was now closed.

However she suggested I make a submission, which may be able to be considered by the panel as a late submission.

CONCERNS

How can the public respond if we are not notified? There has been no timely notification from Atlas to the 20+ properties that are located in this buffer zone.

Some of the following issues were discussed with Venessa. I'm not a lawyer so have done my best to understand what these documents mean and their impact.

I've still no clear answer on the actual proposed changes to the quarry site and future use of the quarry being mined.

I have noted a huge amount of pine has been planted on quarry land, so this may be a longer term consideration...or perhaps they are not looking to increase mining.

Below are a few big concerns that I'm sure our neighbours will be worried about too.

1) The restriction of any new builds within the 500 meter buffer zone. An additional pre-building consent would need to be obtained by the property owner at their expense.

2) Sub-division of property would not be accepted as this would increase the number of people who could complain about any issues and noise from the quarry.

3) A potential to expand the quarry without having to get further KDC consent. Is this what they are proposing? (3.7)

4) Devaluing and holding property prices down. (5.3)

I've also noted that the crusher/mobile processing plant has been moved from the Werewere Point location to the Northeastern blocks location. (2.10)

When it was down at the point, the hillsides of the valley kept the noise contained. With the plant now at the top of the quarry, it roars loudly across the harbour and people well outside the 500m zone have commented on this to me. Thankfully they don't currently operate this continuously.

It would have less impact if they moved it back down the hill, then Atlas may not have to worry about people complaining. I understand KDC have provision to protect people on the land from excess noise.

We have owned this property for nearly ten years. We've had a good relationship with the quarry.

They used to message us when they were doing a blast. No problem, as this is not very often.

I do object to people in the 500m area having property devalued, or incurring additional costs to build a home. We are behind the hill, so mostly protected from quarry business. Should we even be included in the 500m zone? I can understand new subdivisions being restricted next to the quarry, but it seems unfair to penalise locals who just want to build a home. Many people in this area have made investments in land and may not have built a house yet.

HOWEVER...IF this restriction is already in place, we were not notified in any way, nor was there any reason for us to seek it out when we bought the land.

I also noted that the Hukatere Reserve was shown on the map key (attached to the letter) as a '*Natural Open Space Zone*'. This reserve is considered one of the last remaining pristine forests in the Kaipara,

with significant Kauri and other species. Should this be mapped as '*Outstanding Natural Character Areas*', as indicated in the key?

OUTCOME

Please could someone from the council kindly explain what is being proposed in laymans language, so it is clear. We as a community need to be better informed about all proposed changes, so we can come together to discuss this, and make comment as a group.

Please can the concerns below be submitted as a late consideration?

- 1) Please can the 'devaluation of land' and 'additional pre- building consent assessment' be removed for property owners who want to build a consented dwelling.
- 2) Please can property owners still be allowed to subdivide their land if they wish to, but perhaps have larger housing developments only restricted.
- 3) If the quarry gets bigger and we can't sell our land because of restrictions, or the price remains artificially low, are there legal ramifications for the council who collect our rates? Will our rates be reduced or waived?
- 4) Will there be compensation to property owners who pay rates and should have their rights protected.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Kind regards,

Luciana Orr