

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed plan change



About preparing a further submission on a proposed plan change

You must use the prescribed form

- Clause 8, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires further submissions to be on the prescribed form.
- The prescribed form is set out in Form 6, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003.
- This template is based on Form 6. While you do not have to use this template, your submission must be in accordance with Form 6.

Certain persons may make further submissions

- Under clause 8, Schedule 1 of the RMA the following persons may make a further submission, in the prescribed form, on a proposed plan to the relevant local authority:
 - any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
 - any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has
 - the local authority itself.
- You will need to explain why you meet one of these categories (space is provided in the form for this below).

Your further submission and contact details will be made publicly available

- Section 352 of the RMA allows you to choose your email to be your address for service. If you select this option, you can also request your postal address be withheld from being publicly available. To choose this option please tick the relevant boxes below.

Note to person making the submission

- 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 (Kāpiti Coast District Council).

Reasons why a further submission may be struck out

Please note that your further submission (or part of your further submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the further submission (or part of the further submission):

- 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.

To Kāpiti Coast District Council

Further Submission in Support of (or Opposition to) a Submission on Proposed Plan Change to the Operative Kāpiti Coast District Plan 2021

Plan Change Number: 1L

Plan Change Name: Maclean Park Paraparaumu Beach to rezone from Natural Open Space to Open Space Zo

Further submitter details

Full name of person making further submission: Glen Alan Cooper
Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): Glen Alan Cooper
Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA): [REDACTED]
Telephone: 0272719181
Electronic address for service of person making further submission (i.e. email): glen@gomana.co.nz
I would like my address for service to be my email [select box if applicable] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available [select box if applicable] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

State whether you are [select appropriate box]

a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>In this case, also please specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category</i> I am an affected party in an ongoing Resource Consent for the Kapiti Gateway RC210149. This 1L change has been given in evidence in public forum as part of the resource consent hearings of affected parties. Mr Davey being one of those submitters. The Gateway Resource consent application has huge public interest and as such this aspect of the 1L change has public interest as it directly affects the park and RC210149. Maclean Management Plan which had huge public interest was implemented in 2017 KCDC did not submit at that point for plan change of the park - There is no provision in the plan to change the designation. This has public interest
a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>In this case, also please explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category</i> I use the park daily and enjoy its amenities and natural open space, my child uses the park daily and enjoys its open space. I live with in site of the park on the southern end. Therefore as a result of the changes of the parks use I am a person who has a interest that is more than the general public
the local authority for the relevant area. <input type="checkbox"/>

Scope of further submission

I support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose <input type="checkbox"/> the submission of: [select the appropriate wording]
Original Submitter's Name and Address for Service: Frederick John Davey fdavey@actix.co.nz
Submission number of original submission: S2

Particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. While it is not a requirement, it would be helpful if you could state the submission point number as listed in the summary of decisions requested document.

I support this submission in its entirety as I specifically object to the following policies

Policy OSZ- R5

I object to the building increasing from 6 metres to 8 metres tall

I object to the maximum building coverage being increased from 2% to 5%

I object to the maximum gross floor area increasing from 350 square metres to 500 square metres

Policy OSZ-R8

Refer to attached appendix A

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

[give reasons]

Refer to attached appendix A

I seek that [select appropriate box]

The whole or part of the original submission be allowed disallowed

[describe precisely which part below]

I seek that KCDC undertakes a full community consultation process which is full complete and thorough to the standard of the Maclean Park Management Strategy consultation. If this cannot occur I request that Maclean Park designation remains as Natural Open Space and is withdrawn from this amendment
Hearing Submissions I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

Refer appendix A

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]


I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

If you wish to be heard, please tick one of the following

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.



Signature of person making a further submission
(or person authorised to sign on behalf
of person making further submission)

06.10.2022

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Email your further submission to district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz or
post/deliver to:

Attn: District Planning Team
Kāpiti Coast District Council
175 Rimu Road
Paraparaumu 5032

For office use only
Further submission No:

3

Appendix A

This submission supports Mr Davey submission in the following ways

Extensive consultation and the development of the Mclean Park Development Plan made no mention of changing and degrading the status of the park. This plan was only completed in 2017 and is intended to be reviewed in 10 years after the approval!

The time to discuss the changing the parks status therefore should be at the time of the review presumably 2027.

There is no valid reason to change the status outside the Mclean Park Management Plan scope especially as it has only just been signed off.

Development of the park is planned and agreed there for the reasoning of KCDC is not valid as plans for the development are in the plan.

In developing this plan KCDC went through a detailed and extensive public consultation process

“Te Ātiawa and Ngāti Toa as partners of Kāpiti Coast District Council have been involved with the review of the management plan throughout.

Community engagement was led by the Paraparaumu-Raumati Community Board and facilitated by a consultant and consisted of:

- Hui with Te Ātiawa rangatahi
- Paraparaumu-Raumati Community Board and Council engagement at Paraparaumu Beach Market Day
- 1,000 participants at the ‘The Maclean Park Experience’ event
- 600 postcards distributed
- 269 online and paper surveys
- 192 park ‘wishes’
- 149 interviews with over 300 people
- 49 Create-a-Park designs
- 14 workshops with key stakeholder groups
- Archaeological site assessment

“The engagement planning included a review of historical documents, stakeholder mapping and analysis and engagement plans. Contributors submitted comments and recommendations on the future of the reserve. Contributors included local residents, businesses and organisations from Kāpiti, as well as non-local users of Maclean Park who had an interest in the future management of the reserve and its surrounds”.

“Three draft development plans were designed based on feedback from the first stage of engagement. Stage two of the engagement process included a one month consultation on the three draft development plans. As a result of the feedback received during stage two, one final draft development plan was designed for inclusion with the draft management plan.

The draft management plan was written based on feedback from stage one of consultation and was approved for public notification by the Kāpiti Coast District Council in accordance with section 41(6) of the Reserves Act 1977. Submissions on the draft plan closed on 3 October 2017. A total of 105 submissions were received, 68 of which were on a pre-written form form which was prepared by a member of the community.

Of these, 13 submitters spoke at the hearing in support of their submissions. The key submission topics were:

- *No development should happen*
- *Allow space for a gateway/Kapiti Island visitor centre on the south side of Tikotu Stream*
- *Do not move vehicle access to northern end of park*
- *Upgrade the entire Tikotu Stream (not just the edges) 18 | Page • Suggestions for the Skatepark and older persons area*
- *Strong pedestrian linkages (within the park and to local businesses) Lack of acknowledgement of recreational boating / Coastguard / Kapiti Underwater Club and the Kapiti Marine Reserve*
- *Remove the kiosk = 1*
- *Retain the kiosk = 2*
- *Retain / develop the pond (or water feature of some kind) = 7*
- *Reduce / remove the pond = 3 • Ideas about specific design elements such as*
- *making the walkways timber not concrete*
- *having more rubbish bins and toilets • less concrete and car parking • how visitor information could be managed*

From this we can see that Mclean Park is important to Kapiti Coast residents and it does have a special nature and that should be protected in the current zoning.

A place where the processes and systems of the natural environment are supported and enhanced"

"Macleans Park Management Plan 2017"

KCDC did not make a submission for a plan change and redesignation from Natural open space to open space during the consultation process or in signing off on the Maclean Management plan in fact I would argue that the plan codified the park as Natural Open Space.

I would expect the same consultation process for arguably the biggest change in status in the park's history! But the change proposed is hidden amongst a host of other changes. Simply the public have no idea that the changes to this park are even being considered.

We have seen the reaction by the public with issues around the park when consultation with the public was poorly handled. (Gateway) there has been no consultation on this proposed change.

There has been no consultation with the public about the changes in Mclean Park from Natural open Space to Open Space and as such degrading the level of the park.

Changing the status without appropriate consultation goes is contrary to the Mclean Park Management Plan P25 *"Mana 8.3.1 Work collaboratively with the community and local Iwi to achieve the aspirations of the Plan"*.

"8.4.1 The open space natural character of the reserve is conserved and enhanced through appropriate landscape development" – By allowing further building up to 5% this would be inconsistent with 8.4.1

"The natural qualities of the park and the layout and configuration of key infrastructure inform the way different areas of the park are valued" 9.2 (P29) – Allowing 5% building development is inconsistent with 9.2

"Ecology A place where the processes and systems of the natural environment are supported and enhanced" (P32) – Lowering the designation of the park which allows for 5% development is not consistent with the Mclean Park Management Plan.

Importantly to note the District Plan was fully considered at the time of the Plan being developed and the reasoning for the change to the designation (2) *"The Issues"* P5 Section 32 Evaluation report on proposed plan change does not warrant the change to Mclean Park considering the District Plan was fully reviewed in the plan.

There are no reasons given by KCDC in this document what has changed or why Natural Open Space designation is no longer fit for purpose and no longer reflect the intended use for the land and how open space designation would enhance or be a more appropriate designation for this park.

It has not been described how changing the designating achieves DO-04 and why Natural Open Space cannot achieve this. Apart from allowing more building development on the park which I would argue goes against DO-04.

How is DO-08 achieved by changing the designation of the park or is that being achieved now as a Natural Open Space – I would argue that the current designation supports DO-08

As with DO-017 how does changing the designation of the park away from Natural Open Space further the aspirations in DO-017 I would argue that this is already occurring under the current designation

"Natural Open Space Zones comprise sites which are generally in a highly natural state, Mclean Park comprises of areas of high natural state such as the fore dunes particularly in the south and stream in the north of the park, the park has is a link to Kapiti Island via the Otaheke Channel and could be argued is an extension in terms of connecting the natural open space to the Nature reserve which is Kapiti Island.

"The site is recognised and valued for its sea front location, its connection to the town and cultural heritage. It includes a popular destination playground and a shared path along the foreshore."
"Mclean Park Management Plan 2017 P5"

Natural Open Space Zones restrict the building of no more than 2% of land area. KCDC have applied for a Gate Way building and at the completion of this building they will have exceeded 2% of building on the reserve. By changing the status to Open space it allows for more building up to 5% of the park.

I believe this change and subsequent ability to build up to 5% on the park will drastically change the park from its current use. This has not been made public to the residents of Kapiti and no consultation has taken place.

To change the parks designation which allows intensification of buildings at some point in the future is not in line with the park's intent and would make a mockery to the landscape award below and the Mclean Park Management Plan.

"This development achieved a landscape design award from the NZ Institute of Landscape Architects"
Mclean Park Management Plan 2017 P15"

NZOS Operative 05/09/2022

Natural Open Space zoned land typically contains very low building coverage of buildings relative to land area.

Mclean Park currently approximately 1% of land has building on it being one toilet block!

"A feature of the zone is that it covers most of the immediate coastal margin" 3.0337 Hectares and the only coastal NOSZ on the From Paekakariki to Waikanae! This is important.

This change has not had adequate consultation and is inconsistent with the Mclean Park Management Plan.

From: [Glen Cooper](#)
To: [Mailbox - District Planning](#)
Cc: [Fred Davey](#)
Subject: Further submission in support of
Date: Thursday, 6 October 2022 12:08:31 pm
Attachments: [SKM_C364e0822100611010.pdf](#)

Please find attached my further submission in support of Plan change number 1L Rezone of Maclean Park Paraparaumu from natural open space to open space zone.

Regards

Glen Cooper