

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, A SUBMISSION ON NPDC'S NOTIFIED PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 Resource Management Act 1991

To: New Plymouth District Council
Address: Private Bag 2025, New Plymouth 4342
Email: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Further Submitter Details

Name of further submitter: Ngati Rahiri Hapu o Te Atiawa (Taranaki) Soc Inc.....
Contact person (if different from above) Keith Holswich
Postal address: PO Box 132, Waitara 4320
Email address for service: ngatirahirihapu@gmail.com
Phone number: 027 555,4394

The Council will serve all formal documents by email. Where there is no email address provided, the documents will be posted to the postal address stated above.

I am: (please tick relevant box)

- a) A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
(In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- b) A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest of the general public.
(In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category); or
- c) The local authority for the relevant area.

Please state the grounds as to why you come within the category selected above:

I represent Ngati Rahiri Hapu in this matter

Council Hearing (please tick relevant box)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission? Yes No

If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing? Yes No

Submission

The submission points, support or opposition, reasons and decisions sought are set out in the attached document.

Note: Any attachments to your submission should only be supporting information, not the submission.



Signature of the person making further submission
or the person authorised to sign on behalf of the
person making further submission

24 August 2020
Date

Name of Further Submitter _Ngati Rahiri Hapu o Te Atiawa (Taranki) Soc Inc

My specific further submission(s) are as follows:

(Please only insert one further submission point per line. Add further sheets as required)

<p>I support/oppose the submission of: <i>(State the submission no., name and address of the person making the original submission)</i></p>	<p>The particular part of the submission I support/oppose are: <i>(State the Submission No./Point no. of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)</i></p>	<p>The reasons for my support / opposition are: <i>(State the nature of your further submission, giving reasons)</i></p>	<p>I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed: <i>(Give precise details of the decision you want the Council to make)</i></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

126 – Taranaki Fish & Game	126.15	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
126 – Taranaki Fish & Game	126.7	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
126 – Taranaki Fish & Game	126.9	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
284 – Z Energy	284.5	Oppose	All	There have been numerous occasions when previous earthworks have not been monitored and artifacts have been discovered during subsequent works. This rule is a security back up for such situations and must remain.	Do not allow this submission
297 – Heritage Taranaki	297.136	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.11	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.118	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.20	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.25	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission

459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.26	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.262	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.27	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.28	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.339	Support	All	The submitter supports this matter but wishes to clarify the properties that have been identified by Te Kotahitanga on behalf of Ngati Rahiri Hapu as per the attached supporting documentation	Amend the MPZ / Mapping to include the following properties <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parts Ngatirahiri 1A Blocks being Titirangi Urupa, Waipapa Urupa and Waipapa Pa 2) Part Ngatirahiri 3E Blocks being Te Koutu and Puketuakura Urupa 3) Ngatirahiri 4Y Block being Puketapu Urupa 4) Part Ngatirahiri 4 Block being Roadway 5) Ngatirahiri 6C Block being a Reserve 6) Ngatirahiri 6G Block being Kowhangamoku Urupa 7) Ngatirahiri 7C Blocks being Waiau and Kaiateahi Urupa
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.344	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.6	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.7	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission

459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.8	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 - Te Kotahitanga	459.9	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 – Te Kotahitanga	459.153	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 – Te Kotahitanga	459.165	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 – Te Kotahitanga	459.182	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 – Te Kotahitanga	459.350b	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
459 – Te Kotahitanga	459.350d	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
487 – Forest & Bird	487.32b	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
487 – Forest & Bird	487.33	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
504 - NP Airport	504.39a	Oppose	All	This request is ambiguous and could mean that any new marae that requires little or no noise will be a non-complying activity.	Do not implement this change
514 – Kiwi Rail	514.61	Oppose	All	Including “unreasonable” noise in the definition opens up a can of worms	Do not change proposed plan
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.1	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.102	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.104	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.107	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.11	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.113	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission

520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.12	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.13	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.18	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.19	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.28	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.29	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.3	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.34	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.68	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.70	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.78	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.83	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.88	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.89	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
520 – Ngati Mutunga	520.97	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
522 – Heritage NZ	522.17	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
522 – Heritage NZ	522.70	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission

522 – Heritage NZ	522.72	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
522 – Heritage NZ	522.90	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
544 – Trust Power	544.116	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
548 – Greymouth Petroleum	548.107	Oppose	All	Once a site has been identified, it must stay in the register even if it has been damaged, destroyed or desecrated. This may be in some cases, the only record of sites that ever exists. Of course, once a site has been destroyed, some consent conditions will no longer be applicable, but these can be sorted out on a case by case basis	Do not delete the site/s in question
548 – Greymouth Petroleum	548.108	Oppose	All	Once a site has been identified, it must stay in the register even if it has been damaged, destroyed or desecrated. This may be in some cases, the only record of sites that ever exists. Of course, once a site has been destroyed, some consent conditions will no longer be applicable, but these can be sorted out on a case by case basis	Do not delete the site/s in question
548 – Greymouth Petroleum	548.109	Oppose	All	Once a site has been identified, it must stay in the register even if it has been damaged, destroyed or desecrated. This may be in some cases, the only record of sites that ever exists. Of course, once a site has been destroyed, some consent conditions will no longer be applicable, but these can be sorted out on a case by case basis	Do not delete the site/s in question
548 – Greymouth Petroleum	548.110	Support	All	Makes sense but sites should also be searched for by number as well	Amend as per submission

548 – Greymouth Petroleum	548.112	Oppose	All	Once a site has been identified, it must stay in the register even if it has been damaged, destroyed or desecrated. This may be in some cases, the only record of sites that ever exists. Of course, once a site has been destroyed, some consent conditions will no longer be applicable, but these can be sorted out on a case by case basis	Do not delete the site/s in question
549 – TRC	549.5	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
550 – DOC	550.30	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
551 – The Oil Companies	551.111	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
551 – The Oil Companies	551.112	Oppose	All	There will always be a practicable alternative for avoiding a SASM so this wording must be opposed.	Do not allow this submission
551 – The Oil Companies	551.123	Oppose	All	A security buffer around all sites must be maintained	Not supported
563 - Kainga Ora	563.140	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
563 – Kainga Ora	563.140	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
563 – Kainga Ora	563.152	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
563 – Kainga Ora	563.168	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
563 – Kainga Ora	563.169	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
566 – NZTA	566.82	Oppose	All	Including “unreasonable” noise in the definition opens up a can of worms	Do not change proposed plan
582 - NPDC	582.36	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission

582 – NPDC	582.18	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.28a	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.28b	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.29	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.30	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.31	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.32	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.33	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.34	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.35	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.35	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.37a	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.37b	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.42	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.43	Support	All	Makes sense	Amend as per submission
582 – NPDC	582.57	Oppose	All	Site ID 635 is NOT a Ngati Rahiri site. We have been in contact with Otaraua hapu to find out the significance of this site to them as they have their name on it, but we continue to get no response. We have	Do NOT place Ngati Rahiri Hapu name on this site. Contact Otaraua hapu and find out what this site is and why it is significant to them or remove it.

				advised NPDC on numerous occasions that this is not a Ngati Rahiri site	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Noise	The noise submissions are confusing, so we simply oppose any submission that wishes to increase the proposed noise levels
Noise	We are unable to determine where this matter should be commented on, so we oppose any attempts to impose a noise contour over Ngati Rahiri Hapu reserved lands

Note to Further Submitter

This further submission on the Proposed District Plan must be received by the New Plymouth District Council by **5pm on Tuesday 25 August 2020**.

To get your further submission to us, either:

Post to: New Plymouth District Council, Reply Paid DX, DX Box NX10026, New Plymouth.

Attention: District Planning Team

Deliver to: Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth
or to library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood or Waitara

Email to: districtplan@npdc.govt.nz

Visit our website: newplymouthnz.com/eplan

A copy of your further submission MUST be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority. Contact details for all submitters can be found on our Proposed Plan page at newplymouthnz.com/eplan.

Please note all information provided in your submission, including your personal information, will be made publicly available.

Your submission (or part of it) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of it):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.