

Submission ID: 64169

Submission Date: 2023-02-08
15:11:41

Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991

To: Matamata-Piako District Council

Submitter's Details

Name (individual/organisation):

Thomas Bougher

Contact person (if different from above):

Thomas Bougher

Address for correspondence:

19 Anzac Avenue,

Email:

bougher@in2net.co.nz

Phone Number:

0274916780

This is a submission on Plan Change 54: Papakāinga

The specific provisions of the plan change that my submission relates to are:

Precinct 1 and Precinct

My submission is:

Please see attachment.

I seek the following decision from Council:

Accept the plan change with the following amendments

Suggested amendments:

Please see attachment

I wish to be present at the council planning hearing:

Yes

I would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with others making a similar submission:

No

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

No

Please complete the following:

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of this submission that—

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

Upload additional info (if necessary):

[63e304dd1eb0c-Submission Continued.docx](#)

Notes:

- The submission and decision you wish Council to make should only relate to the contents of the proposed plan change.
- Submissions close at **4.30pm, Monday 13 February 2023.**
- I accept that by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public. After the closing date, all submissions received will be available for public viewing.
- [Click here to view MPDC's Privacy Policy](#)

Submission Details:

I agree in principle with the aims of the plan change which I interpret as making it easier for Maori Land Owners to make use of their land in a way that better meets their needs.

RE: Precinct 1.

Spacing of dwellings.

However I do have comments concerning the spacing of these proposed dwellings: The wording as I see it creates an overall density but not an actual spacing between dwellings.

It would therefore be possible to have all 10 houses jammed all together somewhere in a 50,000 Sq M. area.

This set up would fail on a number of counts.

1. All the Sewage and Storm water which has to go back into the ground would be concentrated in one place. It would be more than the ground could handle with probably unpleasant bogginess, especially in winter and possibly smell if any of the septic tank systems fail to work well.

If the land is on a significant slope then land movement is a possible outcome as we have seen in recent storms when water gets between the layers of soil.

2. I believe that it is good for families to have their own space. Within the proposed set up there is a great opportunity to create a spacious environment where family groups will be close enough to interact if they want to and far enough apart to enjoy privacy when they need it.

For people to live together in harmony it helps if everyone has their own space. To live in. To grow food on. To have a few chickens etc.

3. I believe every house should also have at least 1 vehicle garage and a decent sized storage and workshop area. It helps people care for their possessions and keep the area around their house tidy and attractive.

4. I would strongly suggest that all homes should be new builds. It keeps maintenance to a minimum plus insures proper insulation and construction standards that meet current wind & earthquake bracing requirements. (earthquake is quite relevant at present).

Comment: There are so many good possibilities that could come out of these proposals.

Security of Tenure.

It helps peoples overall wellbeing if they feel that where they live is theirs. That nobody can dispossess them on a whim or some point of disagreement or argument.

That it is worth their while to establish a garden and plant fruit trees and have chickens etc.

There does need to be good management systems in place, with proper agreements duly signed.

That is agreements that specify rights and responsibilities.

My Comment:

The People living in these proposed houses would appear to be closer to having a “Right to Occupy” than a rental or lease agreement.

Roading and Access

I believe good well-built and well maintained access for all these proposed houses is essential.

This is a common sense safety consideration.

RAPID numbering considerations. Good access for emergency services is a must have.

This means having well-constructed and maintained ROW or other legal access. Fire engines are large vehicles! Ambulances are only 2 wheel drive.

Houses will need to be properly numbered. The government has decreed that there can only be 5 houses on a ROW . Beyond that it apparently has to become a Named Road, which can then have its own number series.

Council Indemnity:

Because of the multiple ownership models for Maori Land problems can arise when all owners are not of one accord.

I know of situations where Councils have got caught in the middle of a disagreement and all too often the next part of the discourse starts with: “The Council Should Have etc.”

If the Council does not already have something in place that will indemnify them in this type of situation I would suggest it would be worth considering.

Rates

Will the increase in the number of house be regarded as increasing the overall value of the property and thus bring an increase in Rates revenue. After all the roads that will service these houses with a consequent increase in traffic volume will have to be maintained.

Precinct 2:

Some of the comments previously made Precinct 1 also apply apply.

i.e. Garages and sheds.

Preferably new builds.

Good access.

Regards

Tom Bougher