



**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 (mandatory information)

Full Name of individual or organisation making further submission:	Michelle Leanne Little and Bevan David smith as trustees of the Helno holdings Trust		
Contact Person (if different from above)			
Email address:	grislittle@gmail.com		
Preferred method of contact: (select one)	Email: ☒ Post ☐		
Submitter contact phone number:	021 650 551		
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

(for further information on this go to [RMA Schedule 1, Clause 8](#))

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:

(For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups.

OR

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 am a lot owner at Lot 1 Te Wairoa lane or newly named 16 Little Lane in the Kauri point Farm Park which is for residential use alongside 28 other residential lots- an existing title and lot which falls within the 500m buffer zone proposed by Atlas Quarry Ltd and Hukatere Quarries Ltd.

My property has an existing dwelling and plans are to extend the dwelling at a later date which would involve adding another black modular designed pod to enlarge and finish a project that has always had the ability to "add on" and develop on my 1 acre plot.

The proposal outlined by the company stated above would limit me hugely from achieving this without considerable effort and costly restrictions due to this proposal.

Value wise it is impacting with having this buffer zone changed on plans for re sale which limits options for selling the property if and when that occurs.

I am really disappointed this has not been presented earlier to residents directly affected in fact I

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
<u>Example</u> 123.45	<u>Example</u> John Smith	<u>Example</u> Support	<u>Example</u> I support this because....
152.2	Atlas Quarries Ltd and Hukatere Quarries Ltd	OPPOSE FS120.1	I 100 percent oppose this proposal of the 500m buffer zone. Why should private residents be restricted with future activities on their own property ? The Quarry should remain within its existing jurisdiction- if it wants to add additional stipulations ie a buffer zone it needs to purchase the land it is seeking the buffer zone on.
152.2	Atlas quarries Ltd and Hukatere Quarries Ltd	FS120.2	The quarry has an obligation under the sections 16 and 17 of the RMA to manage impacts of its own outputs and should be made to continue along the existing rules, not moving burdens to private surrounding properties owned by rate paying individuals. My interest has a priority greater then the the general public to listen.
152.5	Atlas Quarries Ltd and Hukatere Quarries Ltd	OPPOSE FS120.3	I am positively opposed to making "sensitive activities" - your suggested amended definition non complying within the proposed buffer zone. This will hugely affect my property and its value and the ability to even build a minor dwelling without massive impingements put upon me, so this is legally and morally wrong on so many

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