

SUBMISSIONS IN OPPOSITION

Submission No.	Name	Address
12-2	Akuhata Trust (David Benson)	38 Findlater Street Matamata
<p>Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes plan change. Council should look at all subdivision (Urban) rules. This is a patch up job; Existing town houses (Matamata) are slow to sell. <p>Decision Sought from Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decline - Review existing subdivision rules. 		
Submission No.	Name	Address
12-3	Wolfgang Goldbach-Faber	40 Shakespeare Street Te Aroha
<p>Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed subdivision rules do not serve this town and the general public well! People move out of crowded inner cities and come here to have space. It can only serve developers. It may foster property speculation as well. No truly beneficial reasons are given by the proposal. <p>Decision Sought from Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decline - The whole process, especially this one contravenes the spirit of the Local Government Act 2002; we are presently in the process of creating a new LTCCP - This must come first, i.e. the public must have a say first. The RMA is still subject to zoning, etc outcomes and rules in any LTCCP. The public (and I) are disadvantaged by the current process. 		

SUBMISSIONS IN SUPPORT/OPPOSITION WITH AMENDMENTS

Submission No.	Name	Address
12-1	Noel Harvey-Webb	18 Millar Street Te Aroha
<p>Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some development is good. However often beauty as seen by developers is in the fold of the wallet, and may have little consideration for the wider picture. At the meetings discussing the future of Te Aroha and the LTCCP one of the concepts bandied about was precinct planning so that the ambience and appearance of areas was retained, and from this it's desirability as a tourist destination, and for existing inhabitants who have purchased into such areas because of existing features. Smaller section sizes within existing built up areas do in some part destroy the amenity value of the remaining larger sections. 		

Matamata-Piako District Plan

Proposed Plan Change 12- Proposal to Amend Urban Subdivision Rules

Summary of Submissions

- Council should look at designated areas of high density housing on green and brown field sites such areas will have fewer neighbour problems. Apartments or office to apartment conversions could take place for instance on the power board site. There is nonsense in having the potential sites confined to a ring around a given area. I would be looking at establishing a new commercial area on the West Side. The establishment of such a commercial area would justify a new "ring" and make a nonsense of earlier planning decisions and restrictions.
- "Cross leases" can make nonsense of minimum section size so we have a section size of just over 200m². If Council wishes to retain a minimum section size it needs to restrict cross leases. Terrace housing is an attractive feature of some areas, and the effective section size could be as low as 100 m².
- One reason given for having smaller section sizes is to avoid urban sprawl across farm land. Not all farm land is equal, and if the goal is to maintain farm production, then development should be encouraged on lower rather than higher value farming land.

While it may be simple and fashionable to put a ring around industrial commercial areas, there should be a rule that smaller section sizes should not further intrude into what should be "precinct" areas of the town, and that planning in general needs to be handled with more subtlety than appears in the council's proposals.

Submission No.	Name	Address
12-4	Environmental Futures Incorporated (Martin Wallace)	RD2 Morrinsville

Submission

- Opposes in part the proposed change:
 1. Consultation for a plan change with significant effects has been very limited. The effects on amenity and urban character are of great interest and the plan change has not been publicly aired but should have been. The method of defining which areas should be allowed to be in-filled is very arbitrary and does not take account of the character of the areas in question. The proposal should be subject to a well publicised consultation process with the community before such a change is contemplated.
 2. Should any rule allowing infill be based on a set distance from for example the Business/Residential zone boundary, then it should refer to "sites whose parent lot is entirely 300m or less from a Residential/Business zone boundary..." and those where it does not apply be described as "Sites that are entirely or in part greater than 300m from a Residential/Business zone boundary..." Such a change would add clarity and prevent distortions in cases where large lots exist at the boundary of the infill area. Following effective consultation it may be better to prescribe such allowable infill areas more geographically by reference to street names and the like.

Decision Sought from Council

- Withdraw the plan change and conduct a full consultation with the public or put the plan change on hold pending consultation, and analysis of the responses and possible variation to the proposed change if required.