

## Contents

|                                                              |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>PC6 - LIMITED SUBMISSIONS BY CONSULTATION POINT .....</b> | <b>1</b>  |
| PC6 MAP .....                                                | 1         |
| <b>PART C 1-4 .....</b>                                      | <b>45</b> |
| PC6 C1-4 C2.1.7.1 .....                                      | 45        |
| <b>CITY GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE .....</b>                   | <b>46</b> |
| PC6 CGRZ .....                                               | 46        |
| <b>MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE .....</b>                 | <b>47</b> |
| PC6 MRZ .....                                                | 47        |
| PC6 MRZ-R2 .....                                             | 52        |
| PC6 MRZ-R3 .....                                             | 53        |
| PC6 MRZ-S1 .....                                             | 54        |
| PC6 MRZ-S2 .....                                             | 55        |
| PC6 MRZ-S3 .....                                             | 56        |
| <b>CITY CENTRE ZONE .....</b>                                | <b>57</b> |
| PC6 CCZ .....                                                | 57        |
| PC6 CCZ-R7 .....                                             | 60        |
| <b>MIXED USE ZONE .....</b>                                  | <b>61</b> |
| PC6 MUZ .....                                                | 61        |
| PC6 MUZ-R10 .....                                            | 65        |
| PC6 MUZ-R16 .....                                            | 67        |
| PC6 MUZ-R19 .....                                            | 68        |
| <b>SPECIAL PURPOSE - FUTURE URBAN ZONE .....</b>             | <b>70</b> |
| PC6 SP-FUZ .....                                             | 70        |

# PROPOSED URBAN PLAN CHANGE 6 - LIMITED SUBMISSIONS BY CONSULTATION POINT ZONING MAP

## PC6 MAP

### 12 - Mr Chris Tyerman

chris.tyerman1@gmail.com

26 Royd Road East, Hexton

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 12

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

The city is expanding & the area identified is the logical area to allow the city to grow especially in the Hexton area .  
The land that is proposed in the Plan change 6 is inferior for horticulture as the soil is not of the suitable for say kiwifruit  
as it is mostly Kaiti Heavy silt loam and more importantly there is no underground water available. Other crops are not  
viable such as grapes ( world wide over supply & large areas are being removed in Gisborne) & citrus ( minimal returns  
)

In summary I fully support the Plan change

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Approve the Plan Change

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## 14 - Lynley Riini

lynleyriini@outlook.com

491 Childers Road,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 14

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

I don't agree with the proposal - Reason being it will devalue our house, increase our rates, will not let sunlight in, peace being disturbed from construction noise - privacy of my property. Zoning of what we can build - parking obstructing vision. Parking infringements over our drive.

This is our hard earnt retirement home to leave peacefully. The devaluing our house. Infrastructure raising our rates. Shading our building not letting sunlight in. The peace having noise of the build. The privacy of our property. The zoning what we can build. The parking obstructing our vision of traffic as we try to navigate our way out of driveway and parking over our driveway time after time with different cars.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

I hope Council do not allow the proposed changes.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## 16 - Rebekha Upston

rebekha@grantcooke.co.nz

399 Palmerston Road,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 16

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

### **The reasons for my views are:**

The area identified (refer attached plan) is already characterised by an established pattern of rural residential and lifestyle development, including existing dwellings throughout the area. As such, it is no longer functioning as productive rural land in any meaningful sense.

The surrounding environment reflects a fragmented land use pattern, with smaller allotments and residential activity forming the dominant character. This existing pattern limits the practical ability for the land to be used for productive purposes and introduces reverse sensitivity effects that are inconsistent with a Rural Productive zoning.

Retaining the current zoning does not reflect the existing environment and results in an inefficient and impractical planning outcome.

In contrast, the Rural Lifestyle 1 zone would better align with the established environment and provide a more appropriate planning framework for the area.

While it is acknowledged that the land may be identified as Highly Productive Land, the intent of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land is to protect land that is capable of being used for sustained primary production. In this case, the existing level of fragmentation, the presence of established dwellings, and the surrounding pattern of development have materially reduced the ability for the land to be used in that way.

Accordingly, the application of Highly Productive Land provisions in this location does not achieve the intent of the National Policy Statement in a practical sense.

Rezoning to Rural Lifestyle 1 would:

- Reflect the existing pattern of development and land use
- Recognise the presence of established dwellings and lifestyle activity
- Provide for a logical and contained extension of rural lifestyle zoning
- Avoid the unnecessary application of Highly Productive Land provisions in an area where productive capacity is already compromised

The area represents a natural continuation of the surrounding lifestyle environment rather than an incursion into intact rural production land. The current zoning does not recognise this transition and is therefore not appropriate in this location.

### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

To rezone this area as Rural lifestyle 1 to fit in with the existing landuse within this pocket of land.

### **I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

**Attachments**

1. [Grip PDF - 2026-05-05T150604.305.pdf](#)

## 25 - Steven McIntosh-Dona

mcintoshdona@icloud.com

81 Stout Street, Whataupoko,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 25

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**My/our submission is:**

We oppose the change. Please refer to pages 4-6 (submission form) re:  
Proposed Urban Plan Change 6.

We oppose the inclusion of Stout Street in the Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 zones to medium density residential:

1. adverse impact on neighbourhood character and appeal
2. availability of more suitable alternative sites
3. lack of site specific justification
4. disproportionate impact on existing residents

**I/we seek the following decision from Council:**

We oppose the inclusion of Stout Street in the Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 zones to medium density residential.

**The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

The intensification to medium density housing – the proposal would enable intensified developments to proceed without notification and consideration of adverse impacts to existing neighbouring property owners.

**Submission Opposing Proposed Medium Density Residential Zoning – Stout Street**

**Submitter Position**

I strongly oppose the inclusion of Stout Street within the proposed Medium Density Residential (MDR) or intensified residential zoning provisions.

While I acknowledge the need to address housing supply and accommodate future growth within Gisborne, I do not consider Stout Street to be an appropriate location for residential intensification. The proposal fails to adequately recognise the unique historical, environmental, and amenity values of the area and would result in significant adverse effects on existing residents and the wider community.

**Grounds for Opposition**

- 1. Adverse Impact on Neighbourhood Character and Appeal**
- 2. Availability of More Suitable Alternative Sites**
- 3. Lack of Site-Specific Justification**
- 4. Disproportionate Impact on Existing Residents**

**1. Adverse Impact on Neighbourhood Character and Appeal**

Stout Street possesses a distinctive residential character that is defined by established homes, lower-density development, mature streetscapes, and a peaceful living environment. The street also contributes positively to Gisborne's identity and tourism appeal.

It is understood that approximately 5,600 international cruise ship passengers visit the area annually, with many choosing to walk or cycle along Stout Street specifically to experience its historic homes and established character. The introduction of medium-density housing and intensified site development would fundamentally alter the nature of the street and diminish these values.

The proposed zoning would likely result in:

- Increased site coverage and multi-unit developments inconsistent with the existing character of the area
- Loss of visual amenity and degradation of the established streetscape
- Increased traffic volumes and pressure on existing transport infrastructure
- Reduced residential privacy and increased noise effects
- Progressive removal of historic and character homes
- Reduced residential desirability and investment confidence
- Erosion of the quiet and cohesive residential environment currently enjoyed by residents

**In my view, the scale of these adverse effects would significantly outweigh any potential benefits associated with intensification in this particular location.**

## **2. More Appropriate Locations Exist for Intensification**

There are other areas within Gisborne that are more suitable for increased residential density and urban growth. Areas with larger section sizes, newer infrastructure, reduced heritage sensitivity, and greater capacity to absorb population growth would provide more appropriate opportunities for intensification without compromising established neighbourhood character.

By contrast, Stout Street contains significant existing amenity and heritage-related values that warrant protection rather than intensification.

The inclusion of Stout Street appears to prioritise convenience and short-term infrastructure efficiencies over long-term urban planning outcomes and community value. Growth should be directed toward locations where it can occur with minimal adverse impact, rather than at the expense of one of Gisborne's most distinctive residential streets.

## **3. Lack of Adequate Site-Specific Justification**

The proposed plan change does not appear to provide sufficient site-specific analysis or justification for the inclusion of Stout Street within the Medium Density Residential zoning provisions.

Sound planning practice requires zoning decisions to be informed by careful consideration of:

- Existing neighbourhood character
- Infrastructure capacity
- Site constraints
- Heritage and amenity values
- Suitability for increased density
- Potential cumulative adverse effects

**In the absence of detailed assessment addressing these matters, the inclusion of Stout Street appears inadequately supported and inconsistent with balanced planning principles.**

## **4. Disproportionate Effects on Existing Residents**

The proposed planning framework would enable compliant intensified developments to proceed without notification to neighbouring property owners.

In an established residential street such as Stout Street, where homes are closely connected in scale, outlook, and character, this approach creates a significant risk of adverse impacts on neighbouring residents without providing any meaningful opportunity for input.

Potential effects include:

- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing and shading
- Increased noise and activity
- Reduced outlook and amenity
- Diminished property values and investment confidence

**This creates an inequitable outcome for existing residents and increases the likelihood of community conflict and ongoing disputes.**

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Stout Street be excluded from the proposed Medium Density Residential or intensified zoning provisions.

While I support responsible urban growth and the need to increase housing supply, intensification should occur in locations that are demonstrably suitable and where adverse impacts on established residential character, heritage values, and community amenity can be appropriately managed.

Stout Street represents a valuable residential and historical asset within Gisborne and should be protected accordingly.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

We seek to have the Council reject Stout Street in the Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 zones to medium density residential.

Please refer to pages 4-6 (submission form)

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* ☐ do not wish

**Attachments**

1. [Pages 4-6.pdf](#)

## 27 - Gerry and Sandra Blampied

hans@kaha.co.nz

24 Diana Avenue, Mangapapa,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 27

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

**To: Gisborne District Council**

**Submission on Proposed Plan Change 6. Support for Proposed Rezoning of Land Near Nelson Road and Cameron Road to City General Residential and Request to Extend City General Residential Zoning to Land South of Nelson Road between Elsdon Best Road and Taruheru Cemetery.**

This submission prepared by Kaha Consultancy is made on behalf of Myles and Andrea Blampied and Gerry and Sandra Blampied in response to Proposed Plan Change 6.

Myles and Andrea Blampied own land at 113, Cameron Road (Lot 4 DP 499274) which is located immediately north of Nelson Road. This land is part of the area proposed to be rezoned to City General Residential.

Gerry and Sandra Blampied own land at 550, Nelson Road (Lot 1 DP 342642) located immediately south of Nelson Road. This land is part of the area proposed to be retain its Rural Residential zoning.

The submission both supports the proposed rezoning of land north of Nelson Road from Rural Residential to City General Residential and requests that the City General Residential Zone be extended to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road, between Elsdon Best Road and Taruheru Cemetery.

The amended proposed rezoning in this submission represents a logical and appropriate extension of the existing urban residential environment and will provide for well-connected and efficient urban growth in a location that is well suited to residential development.

The submitters support the rezoning for the following reasons:

### **1. Logical Urban Expansion**

The subject area is directly adjacent to, and closely connected with, existing urban residential development. Rezoning the land to City General Residential reflects the natural progression of urban growth and provides a coherent expansion of the surrounding residential environment.

### **2. Existing Development Pattern**

The current pattern of development within the area already reflects a higher-intensity rural residential character, with lot sizes and development outcomes that are becoming closer aligned to urban residential living than traditional rural activities. The proposed zoning therefore appropriately recognises the evolving character of the area.

### **3. Efficient Provision of Infrastructure and Services**

The area is capable of being serviced efficiently by reticulated infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater, wastewater, electricity, and telecommunications services. Concentrating residential growth in areas where infrastructure can be extended economically and efficiently is an appropriate and sustainable planning outcome.

**4. Access to Community Facilities and Services** The location is in close proximity to existing community services and facilities, including educational institutions, retail services, and other urban amenities. Future residents will therefore have convenient access to essential services and community infrastructure.

### **5. Support for Social and Community Connections**

Urban residential development in this location will help strengthen social and community connections by integrating future residents into established neighbourhoods and community networks. The rezoning will support the development of cohesive residential communities with good access to services, recreation, and employment opportunities.

## **6. Transport and Accessibility**

The area can be serviced efficiently by a range of transport modes, including pedestrian and bicycle connections, public transport, and vehicle traffic. The location supports a more connected and accessible urban form and provides opportunities for reduced reliance on private vehicles over time.

## **7. Rezoning of Land Immediately South of Nelson Road**

The submitters also submit that the land immediately to the south of Nelson Road should similarly be rezoned from Rural Residential to City General Residential.

This area shares the same characteristics that support the proposed rezoning of the land to the north of Nelson Road. It is already residential in nature, exhibits little or no productive rural or agricultural activity, and is closely connected to the surrounding urban environment. Once the land north of Nelson Road is rezoned and developed for urban residential purposes, the remaining Rural Residential zoning to the south of Nelson Road will no longer be logical or appropriate. The area would become physically and functionally separated from other Rural Residential areas and will instead form an isolated rural residential pocket surrounded by urban residential development and the cemetery. In practical terms, the area already functions as part of the wider residential environment rather than as a rural residential or productive rural area. Retaining a Rural Residential zoning would therefore create an anomalous zoning outcome that does not reflect either the existing character of the land or its future context.

The submitters recognise that the southern part of this area is subject to flooding constraints and is therefore unlikely to be suitable for residential building development. However, this does not detract from the appropriateness of rezoning the broader area for urban residential

purposes. Instead, future residential subdivision is likely to provide opportunities for the creation of reserve areas and open space adjoining the Taruheru River. These areas could provide important recreational amenities for a growing residential population, while also enabling improved walking and cycling connections to and through the area. Such outcomes would contribute positively to urban amenity, connectivity, and community wellbeing.

Rezoning this land to City General Residential would therefore provide a more coherent and consistent urban form, avoid fragmented planning outcomes, and support the efficient long-term integration of infrastructure, transport networks, reserves, and community services across the wider area.

Accordingly, the submitters support extending the proposed City General Residential zoning to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road.

## **Conclusion**

Overall, the proposed rezoning is a sensible and well-located response to future residential growth needs within Gisborne. It promotes efficient urban development, makes effective use of existing infrastructure and services, and supports the creation of connected and sustainable communities.

For these reasons, the submitters support:

- the proposed rezoning of the land near the corner of Nelson Road and Cameron Road from Rural Residential to City General Residential; and
- the extension of the City General Residential zoning to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road.

On behalf of Myles and Andrea Blampied and Gerry and Sandra Blampied,

## **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Supports retaining the proposed City General Residential zoning of the land near the corner of Nelson Road and Cameron Road; and

Requests that the land immediately south of Nelson Road, between Elsdon Best Road and Taruheru Cemetery be also rezoned City General Residential.

## **I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        wish

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

\* Yes

**Attachments**

1. [Rezoning Map.jpeg](#)

## 28 - Myles and Andrea Blampied

hans@kaha.co.nz

24 Diana Avenue, Mangapapa

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 28

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

**Submission on Proposed Plan Change 6. Support for Proposed Rezoning of Land Near Nelson Road and Cameron Road to City General Residential and Request to Extend City General Residential Zoning to Land South of Nelson Road between Elsdon Best Road and Taruheru Cemetery.**

This submission prepared by Kaha Consultancy is made on behalf of Myles and Andrea Blampied and Gerry and Sandra Blampied in response to Proposed Plan Change 6.

Myles and Andrea Blampied own land at 113, Cameron Road (Lot 4 DP 499274) which is located immediately north of Nelson Road. This land is part of the area proposed to be rezoned to City General Residential.

Gerry and Sandra Blampied own land at 550, Nelson Road (Lot 1 DP 342642) located immediately south of Nelson Road. This land is part of the area proposed to be retain its Rural Residential zoning.

The submission both supports the proposed rezoning of land north of Nelson Road from Rural Residential to City General Residential and requests that the City General Residential Zone be extended to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road, between Elsdon Best Road and Taruheru Cemetery.

The amended proposed rezoning in this submission represents a logical and appropriate extension of the existing urban residential environment and will provide for well-connected and efficient urban growth in a location that is well suited to residential development.

The submitters support the rezoning for the following reasons:

**1. Logical Urban Expansion**

The subject area is directly adjacent to, and closely connected with, existing urban residential development. Rezoning the land to City General Residential reflects the natural progression of urban growth and provides a coherent expansion of the surrounding residential environment.

**2. Existing Development Pattern**

The current pattern of development within the area already reflects a higher-intensity rural residential character, with lot sizes and development outcomes that are becoming closer aligned to urban residential living than traditional rural activities. The proposed zoning therefore appropriately recognises the evolving character of the area.

**3. Efficient Provision of Infrastructure and Services**

The area is capable of being serviced efficiently by reticulated infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater, wastewater, electricity, and telecommunications services. Concentrating residential growth in areas where infrastructure can be extended economically and efficiently is an appropriate and sustainable planning outcome.

**4. Access to Community Facilities and Services**

The location is in close proximity to existing community services and facilities, including educational institutions, retail services, and other urban amenities. Future residents will therefore have convenient access to essential services and community infrastructure.

**5. Support for Social and Community Connections**

Urban residential development in this location will help strengthen social and community

connections by integrating future residents into established neighbourhoods and community networks. The rezoning will support the development of cohesive residential communities with good access to services, recreation, and employment opportunities.

#### 6. Transport and Accessibility

The area can be serviced efficiently by a range of transport modes, including pedestrian and bicycle connections, public transport, and vehicle traffic. The location supports a more connected and accessible urban form and provides opportunities for reduced reliance on private vehicles over time.

#### 7. Rezoning of Land Immediately South of Nelson Road

The submitters also submit that the land immediately to the south of Nelson Road should similarly be rezoned from Rural Residential to City General Residential.

This area shares the same characteristics that support the proposed rezoning of the land to the north of Nelson Road. It is already residential in nature, exhibits little or no productive rural or agricultural activity, and is closely connected to the surrounding urban environment.

Once the land north of Nelson Road is rezoned and developed for urban residential purposes, the remaining Rural Residential zoning to the south of Nelson Road will no longer be logical or appropriate. The area would become physically and functionally separated from other Rural Residential areas and will instead form an isolated rural residential pocket surrounded by urban residential development and the cemetery.

In practical terms, the area already functions as part of the wider residential environment rather than as a rural residential or productive rural area. Retaining a Rural Residential zoning would therefore create an anomalous zoning outcome that does not reflect either the existing character of the land or its future context.

The submitters recognise that the southern part of this area is subject to flooding constraints and is therefore unlikely to be suitable for residential building development. However, this does not detract from the appropriateness of rezoning the broader area for urban residential purposes.

Instead, future residential subdivision is likely to provide opportunities for the creation of reserve areas and open space adjoining the Taruheru River. These areas could provide important recreational amenities for a growing residential population, while also enabling improved walking and cycling connections to and through the area. Such outcomes would contribute positively to urban amenity, connectivity, and community wellbeing.

Rezoning this land to City General Residential would therefore provide a more coherent and consistent urban form, avoid fragmented planning outcomes, and support the efficient long-term integration of infrastructure, transport networks, reserves, and community services across the wider area.

Accordingly, the submitters support extending the proposed City General Residential zoning to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road.

#### Conclusion

Overall, the proposed rezoning is a sensible and well-located response to future residential growth needs within Gisborne. It promotes efficient urban development, makes effective use of existing infrastructure and services, and supports the creation of connected and sustainable communities.

For these reasons, the submitters support:

- the proposed rezoning of the land near the corner of Nelson Road and Cameron Road from Rural Residential to City General Residential; and
- the extension of the City General Residential zoning to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road.

#### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

For these reasons, the submitters support:

- the proposed rezoning of the land near the corner of Nelson Road and Cameron Road from Rural Residential to City General Residential; and
- the extension of the City General Residential zoning to include the land immediately south of Nelson Road.

#### **I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

#### **Attachments**

1. [Rezoning Map.jpeg](#)

## 32 - Mr Henry Hansen

henry@eastcoastwools.nz

121 Haisman Road, Hexton

Gisborne 4071

---

**Submitter Number:** 32

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

It is imperative that fertile and suitable land is protected for the future prosperity of Gisborne thru horticulture and farming.

The northern side of Haisman Road should be rezoned the same as southern side of Haisman Road.

The new boundary for productive land should be moved to the northern side of the Taruheru river where the land is more fertile and able to return a sustainable income from horticulture and farming.

The land fertility and structure on the northern side of Haisman Road has become unprofitable to grow and farm annually or with permanent crops. There is precedent in the recent past for subdividing of this land which now implies that its zoning should be changed to Rural Lifestyle. The Taruheru river is the natural boundary.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

The northern side of Haisman Road to the Taruheru river should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle to provide a transition zone to Rural productive land over the river.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

### 33 - Mrs Susan Destounis

antona.susanl@gmail.com

68 Cameron Road,

Gisborne 4071

---

**Submitter Number:** 33

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

We wish to formally express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of our area (Cameron Road). Our family has lived here for more than 20 years. We chose this area specifically for its spacious lifestyle, lower-density living and sense of peace and community. Over many years we have worked extremely hard to build and develop what we intended to be our forever home. The proposed rezoning threatens the very character of the area that long-term residents invested in and helped create. Increased housing density would significantly change the environment and lifestyle that existing residents value so highly.

We are deeply concerned about the impact this will have on privacy, traffic, noise, infrastructure and the overall rural or semi-rural feel of the neighbourhood.

We are also concerned that the proposed changes will limit our freedom and ability to make future changes or improvements to our own blocks of land. Property owners who have invested heavily into developing and maintaining their sections may face additional restrictions, compliance requirements and uncertainty around what we are permitted to do on our own properties. This is particularly frustrating for residents who deliberately chose larger sections to enjoy space, independence and flexibility.

One of our greatest concerns is the likely increase in property rates that may follow rezoning. While rezoning may increase land values on paper, it does not increase the incomes of long-term residents who simply want to continue living in the homes and community they love. We fear that over time we may no longer be able to afford the rates associated with higher-density zoning, effectively forcing us to sell and leave the area we have called home for decades.

It is distressing to think that residents who have contributed to and cared for this community for many years could be financially pressured because of planning decisions beyond our control. We understand that councils must plan for future growth, however we strongly believe this should be balanced with protecting established communities and respecting the wishes of long-term residents. Growth should not come at the expense of the people who already live here and have invested their lives, time, and resources into their properties and neighborhoods.

We respectfully ask the council to reconsider the proposed rezoning and preserve the character, lifestyle, affordability and freedoms that existing residents currently enjoy in our area.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration

Susan & Anton Destounis

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Reconsideration on rezoning our area

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

## 49 - Mr Mark Beard

beardy26@gmail.com

26 Hacche Road, Outer Kaiti

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 49

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

### **The reasons for my views are:**

I am interested in the process in which the council has undergone to enable the proposal for these changes. Have aspects such as roading, flooding, landslides, drainage, town supply water, town supply sewerage, etc been considered?

I wish to oppose the change from rural residential to City General Residential on roads such as Hacche Road. This is a small single lane, non-tar sealed road which has not been maintained by the council. There are large pot holes, overgrown vegetation on the sides of the roads etc. This road struggles to cater for current residents and further increased population would cause even more deterioration and an even more unsafe environment. There is no pavement or side path for people wishing to walk along this road or for children playing on their bikes, walking to school etc. There is no footpath because of lack of space, it is basically a single lane accessway, in which cars need to pull into neighbouring driveways to let oncoming vehicles past.

There is no town supply water or sewerage. There is no mail delivery. It is challenging for rubbish trucks to make it down the road and be able to turn around at times.

Then there is the poor water drainage, surface flooding and flooding of low lying sections by the Waimata river.

I simply cannot understand why you would consider this area safe to develop further given its current state and high risk for flooding. Can you explain your thoughts and rationale for this??

### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Reconsider changing the zoning for areas with inappropriate roading and risk management, such as Hacche Road.

### **I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## 61 - Ms Rose Thum

rose@perfectpieces.co.nz

108 Clifford Street, Whataupoko

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 61

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

### I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

### My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial opposition to

### The reasons for my views are:

Proposed Medium Density Residential Zoning and Performance Standards across the Whataupoko Suburb. Please below document for full submission points.

#### SUBMISSION POINT 1: Protection of Historic Suburb Character and Mature Canopy

- **Reference Framework:** Gisborne District Council Participate Hub - Plan Change 6 (Urban Growth) & Residential Urban Design Guide Appendix.
- **The Issue:** Whataupoko is a highly valued, character-rich, leafy suburb defined by heritage architecture and a well-established tree canopy. Permissive medium-density zoning directly violates the public policy directive issued by Mayor Rehette Stoltz, who stated the council must be "mindful of maintaining the character of the old Victorian buildings" and avoid a scenario where we "immediately see 10 three-storey buildings going up." Sweeping high-density allowances will create a default legal pathway for developers to bypass public notification under non-complying or restricted discretionary statuses. This will lead to the destruction of the suburb's heritage visual fabric and character housing, loss of mature root systems, and private garden clearance without community oversight.
- **The Decision Sought from Council:** Rezone the entirety of the Whataupoko suburb exclusively to the City General Residential Zone to ensure that any proposed multi-unit developments remain strictly managed and subject to a fully notified resource consent process. Furthermore, introduce specialized, mandatory performance standards to the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan (TRMP) and the Residential Urban Design Guide requiring high-percentage permeable green surfaces and deep-soil root zones to legally preserve Whataupoko's mature tree networks.

#### SUBMISSION POINT 2: Infrastructure Capacity and Constraints

##### (Whataupoko Catchment)

- **Reference Document:** Gisborne District Council Future Development Strategy (FDS) 2024–2054 & Plan Change 6 (Urban Growth).
- **The Issue:** The FDS explicitly recognizes that the primary and "most pressing constraint to development" across the urban region is the lack of adequate infrastructure capacity. In Whataupoko, the critical water, wastewater, and stormwater networks are already operating at or near peak capacity and suffer severe stress during weather events. Introducing permissive Medium Density Housing (MDH) provisions that allow multi-unit, 3-storey developments without rigorous, notified resource consents will result in severe network overload. The resulting increase in impermeable surfaces will exacerbate stormwater runoff, strain overland flow paths, and elevate localized flooding risks. It represents a failure of sound resource management to pre-emptively apply high-density zoning before the underlying network infrastructure is functionally capable of absorbing the cumulative load.
- **The Decision Sought from Council:** Completely exclude the Whataupoko suburb from the Medium Density Residential Zone and rezone it exclusively to the City General Residential Zone. Mandate that no property within the Whataupoko suburb boundaries shall be rezoned for medium-density intensification until a detailed, catchment-specific infrastructure capacity assessment is completed and made publicly available. This assessment

must formally prove that local water, wastewater, and stormwater networks possess the verified surplus capacity to safely absorb increased multi-unit density prior to any zoning changes taking legal effect.

### SUBMISSION POINT 3: Prematurity and Lack of Alignment with National RMA Reform

- **Reference Framework:** Parliamentary Select Committee Review of the Planning Bill & Natural Environment Bill.
- **The Issue:** Gisborne is designated as a Tier 3 urban environment, meaning it is **entirely exempt** from the strict, immediate medium-density intensification mandates legally forced upon Tier 1 metropolitans. Because this framework is not mandated by the central government, implementing it is a voluntary local choice. In fact, GDC actively sought a specific ministerial exemption from Chris Bishop's nationwide "Plan Stop" order just to progress these unnecessary rules. It is highly counterproductive and a clear misuse of ratepayer resources for GDC to aggressively force permissive local density rules forward under Urban Plan Change 6 right now, especially while the Parliamentary Select Committee is actively reviewing the comprehensive Resource Management Act (RMA) replacement legislation (the Planning Bill and Natural Environment Bill). Pushing these local shifts forward moments before national legal frameworks pivot creates a massive risk of immediate misalignment with the rest of New Zealand. This produces costly regulatory confusion for local builders, developers, and homeowners.
- **The Decision Sought from Council:** Halt or significantly delay the progression of the permissive medium-density aspects of PC6 until the new national Planning Act and Natural Environment Act have been formally enacted. This ensures Gisborne's district plan aligns perfectly with national standardized frameworks, successfully avoiding a costly, localized, mid-process planning overhaul.

### SUBMISSION POINT 4: Invalid Demographic and Demand Baselines for Suburban Intensification

- **Reference Framework:** Stats NZ Subnational Population Projections, Stats NZ June 2025 Population Estimates, and Ministry of Social Development (MSD) Housing Register Data.
- **The Issue:** The structural justification for pushing the permissive Medium Density Residential framework into Gisborne's outer suburbs relies on an assumption of aggressive population growth and a compounding housing crisis. Because Gisborne is a Tier 3 territory, there is **no national mandate or legal requirement** to implement medium-density housing frameworks here; it is an entirely voluntary local policy choice. Official data proves that the Council's baseline justifications are invalid across three core areas:
  - **Observed Data Aligns with Low Growth Projections:** In their official Subnational Population Projections, Stats NZ models a "Low Growth" scenario where Gisborne's population plateaus at **52,600 by 2028** before slowly contracting to **49,600 by 2053**. The most recent [Stats NZ June 2025 Population Estimates](#) show Gisborne's actual population dropped slightly to **52,700**, down from **52,800** the year prior. This real-world data proves the district has completely diverged from Medium/High pathways. It is tracking directly along the Low Growth Trend, meaning there is no demographic pressure justifying high-density intensification outside the inner-city core.
  - **Drastically Reduced True Housing Demand:** This population plateau perfectly aligns with a long-term easing of local housing pressure. As reported in the *Gisborne Herald*, official Ministry of Social Development (MSD) data shows that the number of applicants on the social housing register in Gisborne nearly halved over a two-year period between March 2024 and March 2026, dropping from **639 down to 393**. This represents a drastically reduced demand for emergency infrastructure.
  - **MSD Register Shifting Population Realities:** The significant contraction of the MSD register directly correlates with structural shifts in our regional population. Planning for aggressive, permissive high-density housing types in the outer suburbs fails to account for these real-world population shifts. It risks creating a severe mismatch between the types of housing being forced by Plan Change 6 (PC6) and the actual demographic needs of our stabilizing population.
- **The Decision Sought from Council:** Reject the implementation of blanket Medium Density Housing (MDH) zoning in Gisborne's character suburbs based on flawed, over-inflated growth projections. Council must recalibrate the growth baselines of Plan Change 6 to align with the documented Stats NZ Low Growth Projections and actual downward social housing trends. Retain and stick with the **City General Residential Zone** for outer suburbs like Whataupoko, restricting future intensive multi-unit zoning exclusively to the inner-city commercial core where existing services can sustain it.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Decisions sought, as above.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        do not wish

## 72 - David Brendon and Anne Marie Quinn

mrsq@xtra.co.nz

1 Ballance Street, Whataupoko,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 72

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

We oppose the change as allowing medium density housing, particularly apartments up to 3 levels will ruin the character of this established housing area, which has a lot of charm that is admired by both locals and tourists.

Why does the council want to shoot itself in the foot by an action that will over time reduce the rateable values of these properties.

Households in Whataupoko currently pay significantly higher rates to GDC than most of Gisborne. However, rates will reduce over time as capital values in Whataupoko lose the premium they have because of medium density housing and the issues that will go with it.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

To exclude the predominantly old established streets (Stout Street, Railway Lane, Clifford Street, Whitaker Street, and the streets that traverse these streets from Fitzherbert Street to Balance Street) from the medium density residential zone.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

## 73 - Stephen Andrews

sandrews.blackgold@gmail.com

505 Nelson Road, RD1,

Gisborne 4071

---

**Submitter Number:** 73

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

### **The reasons for my views are:**

This is from Stephen Andrews at 505 Nelson Rd, RD1, Gisborne.

1. I am opposed to the rezoning proposal in its entirety.

2. No where has there been any mention of the impact of rate calculations for those being rezoned. In our case we go from Rural Residential to City Residential under the proposal.

I understand there are different rating formulas for different zones. I think this is a major oversight when you require residents' feedback.

A recent Stuff article regarding a rezoning in Hawkes Bay contributed to a 47% increase in that residents rating bill during a 3 year period. That is not economically sustainable for residents especially at a time when insurance costs have risen dramatically.

Could you provide accurate guidance on how rates would be calculated under the proposal.

3. Presently we have no streetlights, footpaths or city sewerage connections so I do not understand why we would be wanting to change to City Residential until such time as GDC undertakes these improvements.

You are asking residents to change zoning before actual services associated with the new zone are in place. The trouble with that is we only get this chance to submit against the proposal so you are asking for a lot of goodwill on affected residents' part.

4. It seems odd that the properties opposite us in Nelson Road are not being zone changed under the proposal. We would request we be treated the same and not be subject to the proposed zone change, leaving us as Rural Residential.

5. Before being truly able to assess the current proposal I would like to have seen proposals for traffic management. The area has progressively got busier in the 28 years we have owned our property. There is significant congestion at times that coincide with school hours and people going to and from their work.

Your proposal to increase household density would need a plan in advance to manage an already broken traffic management scenario.

Main congestion points are the intersections of Lytton Road and both Nelson Road and Ormond Road. These areas are in need of thoughtful traffic management plans.

The Ormond Road intersection could cause emergency services delays when attending the hospital. Not something any of us need.

6. Infrastructure regarding flood events like we have had in the last few years are currently not meeting requirements let alone how it might be if the zoning proposal proceeds as drafted currently.

For example the Hapara Stream crosses near the southern boundary of our property. Because of our topography it causes us no harm but the two properties to our North are low lying and flood. The stream itself, in our property can be stepped over in summer but in the bigger storms it rises by 3metres in height and swells to approximately 20 metres wide.

The stream appears to commence on the western side of Cameron Road, heading east across grazing land where stock breaks its banks and then toward its exit into the Taruheru River.

Higher density housing will only make the area's capability to handle run off considerably worse than it is currently.

6. GDC presents nice words regarding the benefits of the proposed change but those nice words are the charm being taken away from us and our wonderful setting and neighbourhood.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

7. I respectfully ask that our property, and perhaps others who desire the same, are not subject to zone changing within the next five years until a more rigorous proposal is put up for submission. In the interim period we wish to remain unaffected like our neighbours opposite us.  
Thank you for the opportunity to respond and decline this proposal.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*           do not wish

## 82 - Edwin Simperingham

ed\_simperingham@yahoo.com

258 Clifford Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 82

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

My submission relates to the zoning of 258 Clifford Street and surrounding area as Medium Density Housing Zone.

I support the introduction of the medium density housing zone and its application in Whataupoko. I seek that the zone provides specifically for access from Railway Lane (which is not a legal road but should be). Services should be able to run down railway lane - particularly 3 waters.

Medium Density Housing Zone. Treatment of Railway Lane.

I support making it easier for people to live in the CBD. We need it to be easy so that our centre can thrive.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Retain medium density housing zone and associated objectives, policies and rules. Ensure Railway Lane is able to provide legal access without the need for easements and that services access for 3 waters can also use Railway Lane. Railway lane should be vested as a legal road.

Ensure is a Permitted Activity for residential development above street level and behind shops. Delete all parking requirements.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

## 83 - Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)

mattn@barker.co.nz

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street,

Auckland 1140

---

**Submitter Number:** 83

**Submission Point Number:** 8

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

### INTRODUCTION

1. This is a submission on the Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 ("PC6") to the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan in accordance with clause 6(1) of the first schedule of the Resource Management Act ("RMA") 1991.
2. This submission relates to specific provisions as listed in the attached document and those related provisions of PC6. The reasons are provided in the attached document.

### FSNI'S LANDHOLDINGS AND OPERATIONAL CONTEXT

6. FSNI is New Zealand's largest grocery retailer with 330 stores across the North Island and serving over 2.7 million New Zealanders every week. Foodstuffs is proudly 100% New Zealand owned and operated and employs more than 30,000 people nationwide. As active members of the community, FSNI strive to provide the best shopping experience possible for all customers.
7. Foodstuffs supermarket brands consist of New World, Pak'n Save, Four Square and Gilmours which operate throughout the North Island and also at the national level. Within Gisborne, FSNI currently operates a Pak'n Save 274 Childers Road ("the site"). The site is currently zoned Fringe Commercial and is proposed to be zoned Mixed Use under PC6.
8. Further expansion opportunities in the future are projected for the site to serve growing communities.
9. In FSNI's experience, regional and district planning frameworks often do not properly recognise the need for businesses growth to occur, especially alongside residential growth. Given FSNI's significant past and planned further investment in New Zealand, the content of these and any future District Plan provisions will be integral to the continuing operation and development of FSNI in Gisborne.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

### SUBMISSION

10. FSNI makes a number of submission points on the PC6 provisions as these relate to the Mixed Use zone as set in Attachment 1.
11. FSNI seeks all such consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in Attachments 1.
12. FSNI current store locations in the Gisborne area are given in Attachment 2 with related submission points.
13. FSNI seeks all such consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in Attachments 1 and 2.
14. For the PC6 provisions not addressed in this submission, FSNI either agrees with, or is indifferent to, the PC6 provisions as written in their present form. Should the drafting subsequently change, FSNI reserves its ability to file a further submission or provide further comment on those changes.

**Attachment 2:** FSNI current store locations in the Gisborne area and related submission points:

Relief Sought: Retain zoning as notified

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

#### **Attachments**

1. [Attachment 1.pdf](#)

## 95 - Anne Boyce

anneboyce63@gmail.com

63 Clifford Street, Whataupoko

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 95

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:

Proposed urban plan change 6.

Oppose the change.

Do not wish the government funded buildings to go ahead.

Opposed the building of social housing funded by the government in Whataupoko. Especially near town end, opposite my house.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Oppose the location.

Reject the social housing proposed.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## 102 - Ellmers Family Trust

sellmers@xtra.co.nz

PO Box 40,

Gisborne 4040

---

**Submitter Number:** 102

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* Yes

**I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**Awapuni Road land - 83 Awapuni Road and adjoining rear Awapuni Road land holdings.**

**Submitter names & organisation name:**

**Sandra & Garth Ellmers**

**Ellmers Family Trust**

83 Awapuni Road, Gisborne

Email: [sellmers@xtra.co.nz](mailto:sellmers@xtra.co.nz)

Neighbouring landowners **Brian Hall** and **Sam Charteris** support this submission and are willing to be contacted by Council.

**Brian Hall**

Phone: **027 442 2353**

Email: [brhall@xtra.co.nz](mailto:brhall@xtra.co.nz)

**Sam Charteris**

Phone: **027 439 5024**

Email: [sam@cg.co.nz](mailto:sam@cg.co.nz)

**Michael Florance**

Estate

Phone: **021 222 8053**

Email: [mike.f@bayleysgisborne.co.nz](mailto:mike.f@bayleysgisborne.co.nz)

Bayleys Real

This submission also references an attached letter from **Mike Florance, Bayleys Real Estate Commercial, Industrial, Sales & Leasing Agent**. His letter explains the current oversupply and limited demand for light industrial shed-style premises in Gisborne and the need for duplex-style accommodation suitable for retirees.

**1) The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

This submission relates to **Proposed Plan Change 6** to the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan, specifically the proposed zoning of the land at **83 Awapuni Road, Gisborne**, and adjoining rear landholdings owned by **Brian Hall** and **Sam Charteris**.

Under Plan Change 6, our land is proposed to be zoned **Mixed Use**.

This submission opposes the proposed Mixed Use zoning. The submitters instead seek that the relevant three large parcels of land owned by the Ellmers, Halls and Charteris be rezoned **Medium Density Residential**.

The land this submission relates to includes:

- the Ellmers Family Trust land at **83 Awapuni Road**;
- the adjoining Brian Hall land;
- and the adjoining Sam Charteris land.

## **2) My/our submission is:**

We **oppose** the proposed Mixed Use zoning for our land at 83 Awapuni Road and adjoining landholdings.

We seek that the proposal be **amended** so that this land is instead zoned **Medium Density Residential**.

In our view, Medium Density Residential zoning would better reflect:

- the appealing location of the sites between the city beaches, the CBD and existing recreational activities in the area.
- the economic reality of the local commercial and light industrial market;
- the existing conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-type activities;
- the transport and access constraints affecting Awapuni Road from any major increase in development of commercial and/or light industrial activities;
- the current and future housing needs of Gisborne;
- the substantial increase in the aging population in Gisborne;
- and the opportunity to provide much-needed secure duplex, townhouse or smaller easy-care housing for older Gisborne residents close to existing amenities.

## **Reasons for our submission**

### **1. Mixed Use zoning is unlikely to be practical or economically viable in this location**

Although Mixed Use zoning may appear flexible in theory, we do not consider it to be a realistic or deliverable planning outcome for this land.

The rear land on our site has limited practical visibility and frontage because the Awapuni Road frontage is occupied by existing residential houses. Commercial businesses generally require tidy, visible and attractive street frontage. The current frontage is not suitable for a high-profile commercial development and does not create the sense of arrival or business identity that commercial occupiers require.

The existing residential houses along the front of Awapuni Road also create a major compatibility issue. These neighbours have historically complained about traffic movements, noise and after-hours activity. This means that even if the rear land is zoned Mixed Use, any meaningful commercial or light industrial activity would likely continue to be constrained by the residential environment at the road frontage.

In practice, the Mixed Use zoning risks becoming a theoretical planning outcome rather than a genuinely useful or developable zoning. It would not be economically viable and would therefore not attract investment.

### **2. There is an existing conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-style activity**

There is already a clear conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-style activities operating on adjoining land. The current recycling activity on Brian Hall's land has generated noise concerns, including banging, clanging, vehicle movements and machinery associated with metal recycling.

The tenants at 83 Awapuni Road, J.T.Contractors, are also affected by the noise and have been complaining about the continual noise disruption. This type of use is certainly not compatible if combined with the proposed re-zoning of the land to Mixed Use which includes residential, commercial and light industrial. The noise generated from most light industrial businesses can be loud, constant and would also generate substantial heavy traffic movements daily which would not be acceptable for the operation of commercial activities or residential use.

The issue is not simply whether an activity is technically permitted. The real issue is whether the planning framework creates a sensible, compatible and attractive long-term outcome for this part of Awapuni Road. The ideal location of this land is ideal for the provision of higher density housing for the aging population in our city.

We submit that continuing to encourage a mix of residential neighbours, commercial activities and light industrial activities will prolong the existing conflict and the continual underutilization of these three large, well-located pieces of land so close to the CBD. Medium Density Residential zoning would provide a more compatible mix with the existing residential zoning and present a more favourable economic outcome long-term.

### **3. Traffic and road upgrade requirements make Mixed Use development difficult**

We understand from discussions with Council that any significant development accessing Awapuni Road, a State Highway and district arterial road, is likely to require a substantial transport assessment. Under Plan Change 6, an Integrated Transport Assessment would be triggered once trip generation thresholds are exceeded. The proposed thresholds include, for example, **20 residential units, 200m<sup>2</sup> GFA for many commercial activities, 450m<sup>2</sup> GFA for trade suppliers or bulky goods retail, and 2,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA for industrial activities.**

This is a major issue for any future development of the land. Any meaningful Mixed Use development would trigger assessment and potentially require costly road upgrades, possibly including intersection or roundabout works. These costs are unlikely to be economically feasible for local commercial, office, or light industrial development as the demand and the returns from investment in these smaller premises are just not there or are inadequate to fund substantial road upgrades.

A large chain-style business requiring substantial yard space, parking or vehicle access may be one of the few commercial uses that could potentially absorb these costs. However, that would not necessarily produce the best urban design, amenity or compatibility outcome for this location. Furthermore, these types of large retails require substantial road frontage. As the road frontage properties are zoned residential they would likely oppose any large commercial/light industrial re-development on the land behind their properties.

By contrast, a coordinated Medium Density Residential development across the Ellmers, Hall and Charteris landholdings may also trigger road upgrade requirements, but the economics are more likely to stack up. Medium Density Residential development would provide multiple options for units, apartments and town houses which would generate sufficient value to help fund necessary infrastructure. This makes Medium Density Residential a more compatible, realistic, economically viable and deliverable outcome than Mixed Use.

#### **4. Medium Density Residential is the highest and best use of this land**

The Awapuni Road land is extremely well located. It is close to the CBD, Waikanae Beach, walking and cycling routes, the pool complex, recreation facilities and other city amenities. This makes it highly suitable for medium-density housing, especially duplex units, townhouses or smaller easy-care homes for older residents.

We consider the land to be particularly suitable for a planned development aimed at older residents who are not ready for aged care or a retirement village, but who want to downsize from larger homes into secure, low-maintenance housing near the beach and town.

This type of housing would meet a real and growing need in Gisborne. As the population ages, there will be increasing demand for smaller, accessible and low-maintenance homes in central locations. There has been very little development of suitable units and townhouses for older Gisborne residents over the past 20 years, despite an increasing need for this type of housing. There are a small number of existing small retirement units in the area which are in high demand and low supply. The Waikanae Beach/Salisbury & Awapuni Road area is a sought after location for older people to retire to due to the ease of pedestrian access to the city, supermarkets, doctors and other city amenities plus the recreational opportunities that can all be easily accessed, reducing the need for constant vehicle use.

Medium Density Residential zoning would allow this land to be used for a form of housing that is practical, needed and well matched to the location.

#### **5. Medium density housing here would free up existing family homes**

A medium-density duplex or townhouse development would also have wider housing benefits for Gisborne.

Many older residents currently live in larger homes on larger sections in the suburbs which they are struggling to maintain or are due to retire and want somewhere smaller and more central. If attractive, smaller, easy-care homes were available near the beach and town, many of those residents would be able to downsize while remaining close to their friends and communities. This would free up larger existing homes for families, first-home buyers or people wanting to trade up.

This creates a positive flow-on effect through the housing market without requiring the same level of outward urban expansion. It also supports the purpose of Plan Change 6, which is to provide more housing choice and enable medium-density residential development in accessible parts of Gisborne.

#### **6. The CBD is not the only suitable location for medium density**

We do not consider that medium-density housing should be limited to the CBD, which would not be an appealing option for many older, retired people. It favours apartment style developments and restricts housing options for the older demographic. It does not provide incentive for older residents to continue to live in and an area close to nature where they can continue to engage in nearby outdoor recreational activities.

Most older residents, given the choice would not want to live in the centre of the CBD. Many would instead prefer to live close to the beach, walking areas, recreation opportunities and community amenities, while still being near town.

The Awapuni/Waikanae area already demonstrates this demand through existing units, townhouses and apartment-style developments near Grey Street, Salisbury Road and the Warehouse area.

To develop medium-density housing in the CBD would require purchasing existing developed properties, which would substantially increase the cost of development. That would push the end housing product beyond the target market of older residents who may own their own homes but still need an affordable and realistic downsizing option.

By contrast, the Awapuni Road land provides a rare opportunity to develop medium-density housing on larger, more affordable land parcels in a location that is still close to the CBD, but also close to the beach, recreation facilities and established residential communities.

#### **7. There is limited demand for further light industrial and shed-style development**

We are attaching a letter from **Mike Florance of Bayleys Real Estate**, a Commercial, Industrial, Sales & Leasing Agent. His letter supports the Medium Density Residential concept and explains the current market reality, including the oversupply and limited demand for light industrial shed-style premises in Gisborne, and the stronger need for duplex or smaller residential accommodation suitable for retirees.

This supports our concern that Mixed Use zoning is not well matched to current market demand. If there is limited demand for additional light industrial or small commercial premises, and if such development may also trigger traffic upgrades and neighbour conflict, then Mixed Use is unlikely to produce a practical or economically sensible outcome.

Medium Density Residential zoning is more likely to unlock the value of the land and deliver a form of development that Gisborne actually needs.

#### **8. A coordinated residential development would allow better planning**

If the Ellmers, Hall and Charteris landholdings were zoned Medium Density Residential, the landowners could plan together for a coordinated long-term development.

This could allow for:

- a better internal access layout;
- a possible shared access point from Awapuni Road;
- a more efficient approach to any required roading upgrades;
- a planned medium-density residential environment;
- better urban design;
- more attractive streetscape and amenity outcomes;
- reduced conflict with existing residential neighbours;
- and a more positive long-term connection between the CBD and beach area.

If Council eventually required a roundabout or other road upgrade, a coordinated residential development would have a better chance of funding and justifying that infrastructure than fragmented commercial or light industrial development.

#### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

We seek that Gisborne District Council amend Plan Change 6 as follows:

1. **Reject the proposed Mixed Use zoning** for the Ellmers Family Trust land at **83 Awapuni Road** and the adjoining rear landholdings owned by Brian Hall and Charteris Commercial.
2. **Rezone the Ellmers Family Trust land, Brian Hall's land and the Charteris's land as Medium Density Residential.**
3. Recognise that Medium Density Residential is the more practical, compatible and economically viable zoning outcome for this location.
4. Recognise that any meaningful commercial or light industrial development of these rear landholdings is likely to create transport, noise, amenity and compatibility issues, and will likely trigger costly road upgrade requirements.
5. Recognise that a coordinated Medium Density Residential development across these adjoining landholdings would better support Gisborne's housing needs, particularly the need for duplexes, townhouses and smaller easy-care homes suitable for older residents.

6. Recognise that Medium Density Residential zoning would create a positive housing flow-on effect by allowing older residents to downsize, thereby freeing up larger existing homes for families, first-home buyers and other residents.
7. Undertake any necessary further planning analysis to confirm that Medium Density Residential zoning is the best long-term use for this land, rather than relying on a Mixed Use zoning that is likely to be incompatible with the adjoining residential land zoning.

## Conclusion

We submit that the proposed Mixed Use zoning does not provide the best long-term outcome for this land.

The current and likely future constraints are significant: poor commercial frontage, conflict with residential neighbours, noise sensitivity, traffic generation thresholds, potential road upgrade costs, and limited demand for further light industrial or shed-style development.

Medium Density Residential zoning would provide a more practical, compatible and economically realistic outcome. It would allow for duplexes, townhouses or smaller homes in a location close to the beach, CBD, recreation facilities and existing community amenities. It would meet the needs of Gisborne's ageing population, provide a realistic downsizing option, and free up larger homes elsewhere in the city.

For these reasons, we request that Gisborne District Council rezone the Ellmers Family Trust land, Brian Hall's land and Sam Charteris's land at Awapuni Road as **Medium Density Residential** under Plan Change 6.

We also note that adjoining landowners **Brian Hall and Sam Charteris both support this submission to zone their land to Medium Density Residential**, are willing to be contacted by Council and are keen to be included in discussions with Gisborne District Council on the future use and development of their land.

The submitters wish to be heard during the submission process.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        wish

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

\*        Yes

## 128 - Ellmers Family Trust

sellmers@xtra.co.nz

PO Box 40,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 128

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* Yes

**I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.**

\* Yes

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

### 1) The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:

This submission relates to **Proposed Plan Change 6** to the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan, specifically the proposed zoning of the land at **83 Awapuni Road, Gisborne**, and adjoining rear landholdings owned by **Brian Hall** and **Sam Charteris**.

Under Plan Change 6, our land is proposed to be zoned **Mixed Use**.

This submission opposes the proposed Mixed Use zoning. The submitters instead seek that the relevant three large parcels of land owned by the Ellmers, Halls and Charteris be rezoned **Medium Density Residential**.

The land this submission relates to includes:

- the Ellmers Family Trust land at **83 Awapuni Road**;
- the adjoining Brian Hall land;
- and the adjoining Sam Charteris land.

### 2) My/our submission is:

We **oppose** the proposed Mixed Use zoning for our land at 83 Awapuni Road and adjoining landholdings located behind the residentially zoned houses on the west side of Awapuni Road.

We seek that the proposal be **amended** so that this land is instead zoned **Medium Density Residential**.

In our view, Medium Density Residential zoning would better reflect:

- the appealing location of the sites between the city beaches, the CBD and existing recreational activities in the area.
- the economic reality of the local commercial and light industrial market;
- the existing conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-type activities;
- the transport and access constraints affecting Awapuni Road from any major increase in development of commercial and/or light industrial activities;
- the current and future housing needs of Gisborne;
- the substantial increase in the aging population in Gisborne;
- and the opportunity to provide much-needed secure duplex, townhouse or smaller easy-care housing for older Gisborne residents close to existing amenities.

## **Reasons for our submission**

### **1. Mixed Use zoning is unlikely to be practical or economically viable in this location**

Although Mixed Use zoning may appear flexible in theory, we do not consider it to be a realistic or deliverable planning outcome for this land.

The land on our site is located behind the residential homes in Awapuni Road so has limited practical visibility and frontage because the frontage is fully occupied by existing residentially zoned land. Commercial businesses generally require tidy, visible and attractive street frontage. For a high-profile commercial development to be successful it must have appealing and visible frontage to create the sense of arrival or business identity that commercial occupiers require. With the proposed Mixed-Use zoning this will never be possible because all of the land is situated to the rear of the existing residentially zoned land.

The existing residential houses along the front of Awapuni Road also create a major compatibility issue. These neighbours have historically complained about traffic movements, noise, dust and after-hours activity. This means that even if the rear land is zoned Mixed Use, any meaningful commercial or light industrial activity would likely continue to be severely constrained by the residential environment at the road frontage as the residential zoning takes precedence over any light industrial or commercial land use on the land behind..

In practice, the Mixed Use zoning risks becoming a theoretical planning outcome rather than a genuinely useful or developable zoning. It would not be economically viable and would therefore not attract investment.

### **2. There is an existing conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-style activity**

There is already a clear conflict between residential neighbours and industrial-style activities operating on adjoining land. The current recycling activity on Brian Hall's land has generated noise concerns, including banging, clanging, vehicle movements and machinery associated with metal recycling.

The tenants at 83 Awapuni Road, J.T.Contractors, are also affected by the noise and have been complaining about the continual noise disruption. This type of use is certainly not compatible if combined with the proposed re-zoning of the land to Mixed Use which includes residential, commercial and light industrial. The noise generated from most light industrial businesses can be loud, constant and would also generate substantial heavy traffic movements daily which would not be acceptable for the operation of commercial activities or residential use.

The issue is not simply whether an activity is technically permitted. The real issue is whether the planning framework creates a sensible, compatible and attractive long-term outcome for this part of Awapuni Road. The ideal location of this land is ideal for the provision of higher density housing for the aging population in our city.

We submit that continuing to encourage a mix of residential neighbours, commercial activities and light industrial activities will prolong the existing conflict and the continual underutilization of these three large, well-located pieces of land so close to the CBD. Medium Density Residential zoning would provide a more compatible mix with the existing residential zoning and present a more favourable economic outcome long-term.

### **3. Traffic and road upgrade requirements make Mixed Use development difficult**

We understand from discussions with Council that any significant development accessing Awapuni Road, a State Highway and district arterial road, is likely to require a substantial transport assessment. Under Plan Change 6, an Integrated Transport Assessment would be triggered once trip generation thresholds are exceeded. The proposed thresholds include, for example, 20 residential units, 200m<sup>2</sup> GFA for many commercial activities, 450m<sup>2</sup> GFA for trade suppliers or bulky goods retail, and 2,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA for industrial activities.

This is a major issue for any future development of the land. Any meaningful Mixed Use development would trigger assessment and potentially require costly road upgrades, possibly including intersection or roundabout works. These costs are unlikely to be economically feasible for local commercial, office, or light industrial development as the demand and the returns from investment in these smaller premises are just not there or are inadequate to fund substantial road upgrades.

A large chain-style business requiring substantial yard space, parking or vehicle access may be one of the few commercial uses that could potentially absorb these costs. However, that would not necessarily produce the best urban design, amenity or compatibility outcome for this location. Furthermore, these types of large retails require substantial road frontage. As the road frontage properties are zoned residential they would likely oppose any large commercial/light industrial re-development on the land behind their properties.

By contrast, a coordinated Medium Density Residential development across the Ellmers, Hall and Charteris landholdings may also trigger road upgrade requirements, but the economics are more likely to stack up. Medium Density Residential development would provide multiple options for units, apartments and town houses which would generate sufficient

value to help fund necessary infrastructure. This makes Medium Density Residential a more compatible, realistic, economically viable and deliverable outcome than Mixed Use.

#### **4. Medium Density Residential is the highest and best use of this land**

The Awapuni Road land is extremely well located. It is close to the CBD, Waikanae Beach, walking and cycling routes, the pool complex, recreation facilities and other city amenities. This makes it highly suitable for medium-density housing, especially duplex units, townhouses or smaller easy-care homes for older residents.

We consider the land to be particularly suitable for a planned development aimed at older residents who are not ready for aged care or a retirement village, but who want to downsize from larger homes into secure, low-maintenance housing near the beach and town.

This type of housing would meet a real and growing need in Gisborne. As the population ages, there will be increasing demand for smaller, accessible and low-maintenance homes in central locations. There has been very little development of suitable units and townhouses for older Gisborne residents over the past 20 years, despite an increasing need for this type of housing. There are a small number of existing small retirement units in the area which are in high demand and low supply. The Waikanae Beach/Salisbury & Awapuni Road area is a sought after location for older people to retire to due to the ease of pedestrian access to the city, supermarkets, doctors and other city amenities plus the recreational opportunities that can all be easily accessed, reducing the need for constant vehicle use.

Medium Density Residential zoning would allow this land to be used for a form of housing that is practical, needed and well matched to the location.

#### **5. Medium density housing would free up existing family homes**

A medium-density duplex or townhouse development would also have wider housing benefits for Gisborne.

Many older residents currently live in larger homes on larger sections in the suburbs which they are struggling to maintain or are due to retire and want somewhere smaller and more central. If attractive, smaller, easy-care homes were available near the beach and town, many of those residents would be able to downsize while remaining close to their friends and communities. This would free up larger existing homes for families, first-home buyers or people wanting to trade up.

This creates a positive flow-on effect through the housing market without requiring the same level of outward urban expansion. It also supports the purpose of Plan Change 6, which is to provide more housing choice and enable medium-density residential development in accessible parts of Gisborne.

#### **6. The CBD is not the only suitable location for medium density**

We do not consider that medium-density housing should be limited to the CBD, which would not be an appealing option for many older, retired people. It favours apartment style developments and restricts housing options for the older demographic. It does not provide incentive for older residents to continue to live in and an area close to nature where they can continue to engage in nearby outdoor recreational activities.

Most older residents, given the choice would not want to live in the centre of the CBD. Many would instead prefer to live close to the beach, walking areas, recreation opportunities and community amenities, while still being near town. The Awapuni/Waikanae area already demonstrates this demand through existing units, townhouses and apartment-style developments near Grey Street, Salisbury Road and the Warehouse area.

To develop medium-density housing in the CBD would require purchasing existing developed properties, which would substantially increase the cost of development. That would push the end housing product beyond the target market of older residents who may own their own homes but still need an affordable and realistic downsizing option.

By contrast, the Awapuni Road land provides a rare opportunity to develop medium-density housing on larger, more affordable land parcels in a location that is still close to the CBD, but also close to the beach, recreation facilities and established residential communities.

#### **7. There is limited demand for further light industrial and shed-style development**

We are attaching a letter from **Mike Florance of Bayleys Real Estate**, a Commercial, Industrial, Sales & Leasing Agent. His letter supports the Medium Density Residential concept and explains the current market reality, including the oversupply and limited demand for light industrial shed-style premises in Gisborne, and the stronger need for duplex or smaller residential accommodation suitable for retirees.

This supports our concern that Mixed Use zoning is not well matched to current market demand. If there is limited demand for additional light industrial or small commercial premises, and if such development may also trigger traffic upgrades and neighbour conflict, then Mixed Use is unlikely to produce a practical or economically sensible outcome.

Medium Density Residential zoning is more likely to unlock the value of the land and deliver a form of development that Gisborne actually needs.

### **8. A coordinated residential development would allow better planning**

If the Ellmers, Hall and Charteris landholdings were zoned Medium Density Residential, the landowners could plan together for a coordinated long-term development.

This could allow for:

- a better internal access layout;
- a possible shared access point from Awapuni Road;
- a more efficient approach to any required roading upgrades;
- a planned medium-density residential environment;
- better urban design;
- more attractive streetscape and amenity outcomes;
- reduced conflict with existing residential neighbours;
- and a more positive long-term connection between the CBD and beach

If Council eventually required a roundabout or other road upgrade, a coordinated residential development would have a better chance of funding and justifying that infrastructure than fragmented commercial or light industrial development.

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are: Proposed change to City General Residential of part of our land.

We support the change of zoning for the parts of our land located at 601 Wainui Road that were previously zoned rural. We intend to developing whole area of land into residential housing in the future so the proposed inclusion of the parts zoned rural will facilitate an integrated development.

### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

We seek that Gisborne District Council amend Plan Change 6 as follows:

1. **Reject the proposed Mixed Use zoning** for the Ellmers Family Trust land at **83 Awapuni Road** and the adjoining rear landholdings owned by Brian Hall and Charteris Commercial.
2. Rezone the Ellmers Family Trust land, Brian Hall's land and the Charteris's land as Medium Density Residential.
3. Recognise that Medium Density Residential is the more practical, compatible and economically viable zoning outcome for this location.
4. Recognise that any meaningful commercial or light industrial development of these rear landholdings is likely to create transport, noise, amenity and compatibility issues, and will likely trigger costly road upgrade requirements.
5. Recognise that a coordinated Medium Density Residential development across these adjoining landholdings would better support Gisborne's housing needs, particularly the need for duplexes, townhouses and smaller easy-care homes suitable for older
6. Recognise that Medium Density Residential zoning would create a positive housing flow-on effect by allowing older residents to downsize, thereby freeing up larger existing homes for families, first-home buyers and other
7. Undertake any necessary further planning analysis to confirm that Medium Density Residential zoning is the best long-term use for this land, rather than relying on a Mixed Use zoning that is likely to be incompatible with the adjoining residential land

### **Conclusion**

We submit that the proposed Mixed Use zoning does not provide the best long-term outcome for this land.

The current and likely future constraints are significant: poor commercial frontage, conflict with residential neighbours, noise sensitivity, traffic generation thresholds, potential road upgrade costs, and limited demand for further light industrial or shed-style development.

Medium Density Residential zoning would provide a more practical, compatible and economically realistic outcome. It would allow for duplexes, townhouses or smaller homes in a location close to the beach, CBD, recreation facilities and

existing community amenities. It would meet the needs of Gisborne's ageing population, provide a realistic downsizing option, and free up larger homes elsewhere in the city.

It also fulfils the council's wish to provide future housing growth by increasing the density of houses close to the central city and offering a range of benefits and housing options to the older members of our communities whilst enabling lower long term infrastructure costs.

For these reasons, we request that Gisborne District Council rezone the Ellmers Family Trust land, Brian Hall's land and Sam Charteris's land at Awapuni Road as **Medium Density Residential** under Plan Change 6.

Please note that the adjoining landowners **Brian Hall and Sam Charteris both support this submission to zone their land to Medium Density Residential**, are willing to be contacted by Council and are keen to be included in discussions with Gisborne District Council on the future use and development of their land.

Zone the proposed parts of our land at 601 Wainui Road as City General Residential.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        wish

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

\*        Yes

#### **Attachments**

1.        [20260525 Email Submission on Proposed PC6 - Consultee 108748 Submission #128 Attachment.pdf](#)

## 136 - Sarah and Guy Thompson

sarahlharris@hotmail.com

25 Russell Road, RD2, Ngatapa,

Gisborne 4072

---

**Submitter Number:** 136

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

### I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

### My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial support of

### The reasons for my views are:

We support PC6 in part. We wish the zoning map be amended to extend the area of general residential to include an area of land currently zoned rural residential.

We own a small citrus orchard at Kiwi Street Makaraka (highlighted in blue below). There is no house on the site. Our orchard used to be part of a larger orchard, now subdivided into three lots accessed via Toru Street, Kiwi Street (ours) and Ora Street. The Ora Street property was sold approximately 8 years ago due to the owners no longer being able to run the citrus orchard effectively without complaints from neighbours about spray and other nuisance effects beyond the boundary. We purchased the Kiwi Street property approximately 6 years ago and due to historical compliance agreements with the previous owners, as the current owners we are required to notify all neighbours 24 hours prior to applying any sprays. We are lucky that the orchard is in citrus, as they require only a small number of sprays per year. This is the key limiting factor to further development of the orchard into a higher value crop. Crops such as kiwifruit and apples would not be viable at this site due to the number and types of sprays they require. Citrus as a crop is barely viable, returning an incredibly small profit at the end of the season once costs are covered. Advice from a number of local horticultural experts has been to forget about trying to utilise this site for horticultural purposes and instead focus on converting it to residential, as there is no future for this site with the number of houses/residential sections now surrounding it. Recently the site at Toru Street has also been subdivided down to 4 1ha lots as the owner has seen no future in citrus at this site due to the low returns. With 3 of the four sites on the market (3ha combined), there was zero interest from horticulturalists to purchase.

It is understood rural residential zoning exists to create a barrier between rural and residential zones and the effects that come with each. There is an area of Rural P zoned land to the north of our site at Kiwi Street. While it is acknowledged that the separation of Rural and Residential is important, this site has a large shelter belt, Council owned flood reserves (x2) and the Taruheru River between it and the area of Rural P and this is a sufficient barrier between the two zones.

The proximity to the small commercial zone in Makaraka is another reason why this site is suitable for residential zoning. The site has defined boundaries (the Makaraka commercial zone, the Taruheru River, the Main Road and the Makaraka Cemetery and Campion Collage) so there is little to no opportunity for greenfield development beyond this small area of rural residential land.

### I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:

We request the area zoned Rural Residential in the black rectangle in figure 2 be re-zoned to General Residential.

Figure 1: Kiwi Street Orchard highlighted in blue

Figure 2: Area proposed to be re-zoned.

Figure 3: PC6 Zone Map

### I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.

\* do not wish

### Attachments

1. [Figures 1-3 from Submission Sarah and Guy Thompson Form .pdf](#)

# 141 - Tāmanuhiri Tūtū Poroporo Trust

tiahnrthooper@gmail.com

Ngā Wai e Rua Building, Ground Floor,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 141

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

## I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

## My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial support of

## The reasons for my views are:

1. As kaitiaki of the tribal interest, Tāmanuhiri Tūtū Poroporo Trust (TTPT) has reviewed the material relating to Urban Plan Change 6 (PC6). TTPT considers PC6 does not adequately reflect current and emerging settlement patterns, particularly the increasing prevalence of remote and flexible working arrangements. These shifts are reducing reliance on traditional urban centres and enabling greater decentralisation into rural and peri-urban areas.
2. In making this statement, TTPT recognises and affirms the mana whenua and mana moana of Ngāi Tāmanuhiri across our rohe, from Paritū to Koputūtea, inland to Mangapoike, and extending out to Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa.
3. TTPT is the Post-Settlement Governance Entity (PSGE) for Ngāi Tāmanuhiri, established under the Ngāi Tāmanuhiri Claims Settlement Act 2012. TTPT is statutorily recognised as the mandated iwi authority responsible for managing and protecting Ngāi Tāmanuhiri settlement assets, cultural redress, and collective interests on behalf of its registered members.
4. TTPT's rohe includes significant coastal, riverine, forestry and erosion-prone lands, together with substantial commercial and cultural interests, including Wharerata Forest. A map of the Ngāi Tāmanuhiri area of interest is provided at Appendix 2.
5. Ngāi Tāmanuhiri holds enduring interests in housing, land use, and wellbeing outcomes across Tairāwhiti. Our perspective is grounded in whakapapa, connection to whenua, and the lived experience of how planning decisions shape where and how our people are able to live.
6. TTPT supports the intent of PC6 to enable housing supply and choice, including intensification where appropriate. We acknowledge the importance of responding to housing need and affordability pressures and do not oppose intensification in principle.
7. However, we are concerned that PC6 appears to rely on an implicit assumption of centralised urban growth, with housing delivery, infrastructure investment, and servicing largely oriented toward the Gisborne urban area. This response encourages Council to reflect more critically on that assumption and to ensure the planning framework remains adaptive to changing realities of work, living, and community connection.

## I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:

### Growth patterns and assumptions

8. PC6 places strong emphasis on compact urban form, proximity to central services and employment, and intensification within the existing urban footprint, with future growth largely framed as urban-adjacent expansion. While these approaches can deliver efficiencies in some contexts, they risk over-concentrating growth, investment, and opportunity in a single centre.

9. From an iwi perspective, growth is not experienced as a singular, centralised phenomenon. Whānau live, work, and maintain connections across multiple settlements, including peri-urban areas, rural communities, and smaller towns. A planning framework that implicitly privileges one growth model risks constraining housing choice and reinforcing inequities, rather than responding to the diversity of lived experience across Tairāwhiti.

### **Decentralisation, work patterns, and lived reality**

10. PC6 appears to rely on traditional assumptions about daily commuting and centralised employment as primary drivers of residential location. These assumptions no longer reflect contemporary realities.

11. Working from home and hybrid work arrangements are now common, and many people actively choose to live closer to whānau, whenua, and community rather than employment centres. For Māori communities, whānau-based living and connection to place have long shaped settlement patterns. Advances in technology and service delivery now better support these patterns rather than constrain them.

12. We encourage Council to ensure the planning framework responds to these realities and does not assume proximity to the urban core is the primary determinant of housing demand or sustainability.

### **Infrastructure and future urban zone considerations**

13. We are concerned that infrastructure constraints may be being used to justify urban concentration, rather than prompting consideration of more flexible or innovative servicing approaches. Centralised infrastructure models can delay housing delivery outside the urban core and limit the ability of smaller communities to grow sustainably.

14. Council is encouraged to more actively consider scalable infrastructure, staged servicing approaches, and locally appropriate or community-level servicing solutions where these can achieve health, environmental, and resilience outcomes.

15. The Special Purpose - Future Urban Zone plays a critical role in shaping long-term settlement patterns. While framed as a holding zone, its objectives and policies appear to reinforce an urban-adjacent growth model. We question whether the framework enables genuine flexibility for alternative settlement patterns over time or whether it effectively pre-determines future growth outcomes through structured planning and sequencing.

### **Māori outcomes and equity**

16. Decentralised and distributed growth is not a barrier to housing delivery for Māori communities. It is often an enabler of better housing and wellbeing outcomes, including papakāinga, whānau-based and intergenerational living, and reconnection to whenua and rohe.

17. A planning framework that over-emphasises central urban living risks increasing barriers to housing on Māori land and reinforcing patterns of disconnection. We encourage Council to view decentralisation through an equity and Treaty-consistent lens, as a means of enabling choice, cultural continuity, and community resilience.

### **Closing comments**

18. PC6 presents an important opportunity to shape Tairāwhiti's future. We support its intent to enable housing supply and choice, while encouraging Council to more explicitly interrogate assumptions of centralised growth, recognise decentralised living as a legitimate and desirable outcome, and ensure the framework remains adaptive to changing realities and community aspirations.

19. This response is offered in a constructive spirit, to support strategic reflection and long-term resilience rather than prescribe specific outcomes.

### **I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*           do not wish

### **Attachments**

1. [Ngai Tamanuhiri Waiver Request and Appendix 2.pdf](#)

## 142 - Walter Findlay Limited

davidfindlay@wfl.co.nz

190 Grey Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 142

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

### I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

### My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial opposition to

### The reasons for my views are:

#### **Submission point 1 — Rezoning of 190 Grey Street and the surrounding block from Fringe Commercial to Mixed Use**

Provision: PC6 zoning map / Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) provisions as they apply to the land at 190 Grey Street, Gisborne and the wider block owned by Walter Findlay Ltd bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street.

#### **Reasons**

Walter Findlay Ltd has been manufacturing and distributing bread since 1913 — over 110 years — and owns approximately 75% of the block bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street, from which it has operated continuously since 1937, 89 years. The company is a significant Gisborne employer, currently providing 65 full-time-equivalent positions, and contributing approximately \$17 million in wages into the Gisborne district over the past 10 years.

The operation runs 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and generates significant heavy-vehicle movements associated with production and distribution. These are longstanding, lawfully established characteristics of the site under its current Fringe Commercial zoning, which anticipates and provides for commercial/industrial activity of this kind without the amenity expectations that accompany residential use.

PC6 proposes to replace the Fringe Commercial zone (together with the Outer and Amenity Commercial zones) with a new Mixed Use zone that enables residential activity on and around this land. This creates a direct and material reverse-sensitivity risk: new residential neighbours, once established, may raise amenity complaints (noise, odour, light, traffic, night-time activity) about an operation that has run lawfully on this site for 89 years, creating pressure over time to constrain hours of operation, production capacity, or vehicle movements.

This is not only a private commercial concern. Gisborne's relative remoteness means that in significant weather events and other emergencies — which appear to be occurring with increasing frequency — transport routes into and out of the district can be disrupted for extended periods. Walter Findlay Ltd is the only local manufacturer able to produce bread at the scale needed to supply the community noting that bread supply is regarded as an “essential requirement” during any adverse event. If Walter Findlay Ltd's ability to operate from 190 Grey Street were compromised, or production relocated elsewhere as a result of the matters raised in this submission, the community's ability to access locally produced bread during an emergency, when it may not be able to be trucked or flown in from outside the district, would be significantly reduced. Council should have regard to this community resilience function when weighing the effects of the proposed rezoning against the housing-supply objectives of PC6.

Walter Findlay Ltd has purchased additional land around 190 Grey Street specifically to enable future expansion of its manufacturing operation, in direct reliance on the certainty provided by the current zoning. Introducing a Mixed Use zone, and the residential activity it enables, undermines the basis on which that investment was made and creates uncertainty as to whether planned expansion remains practically achievable.

The land and buildings at 190 Grey Street are also used by Walter Findlay Ltd as security for its financing arrangements. A rezoning that reduces the certainty of continued commercial/industrial use — or that could reduce the value the market and lenders place on the land because it now sits within a zone oriented toward residential use — has a direct adverse financial effect on the company, independent of any physical effect on its operations.

This effect is not limited to Walter Findlay Ltd's own continued use of the site. Any future purchaser of the land would face the same reverse-sensitivity constraints and operational uncertainty, which impairs the marketability of the land and buildings as well as their financing value — in effect, the asset becomes materially harder to sell as a going

manufacturing concern, compounding the adverse effect on the value Walter Findlay Ltd can realise from, or borrow against, the property.

Walter Findlay Ltd began as, and remains, a legacy Gisborne manufacturing business, but has since grown into a multi-site manufacturer, with other manufacturing sites in New Zealand, Australia and the United States. The Grey Street site remains central to the company's operations and identity, but the company's ability to direct future capital investment and expansion to its other sites, in New Zealand and overseas, means undermining the certainty of this site carries a real risk of jobs, wages and investment shifting away from Gisborne over time, not merely a constraint on an existing local operation. Walter Findlay Ltd is also aware that its concerns are shared by other established commercial and industrial landowners in the vicinity — including Gisborne Fisheries and Logan Print — whose investment decisions were likewise made in reliance on existing zoning. Unsettling those decisions after the fact risks signalling to current and prospective investors that zoning certainty in Gisborne cannot be relied upon for long-term business investment, with implications for investment confidence and economic development in the district that extend well beyond Walter Findlay Ltd's own circumstances. No party made an original submission addressing the effect of PC6 on established, large-scale manufacturing sites of this kind, or on the Fringe Commercial zone specifically. Walter Findlay Ltd considers this a material gap: PC6's evaluation should explicitly weigh the loss of long-term commercial/industrial certainty for a significant existing employer against the housing-supply objectives the plan change is intended to serve, consistent with the purpose of sustainable management under section 5 RMA, which includes enabling people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

**Decision requested**

- Retain Fringe Commercial zoning (or an equivalent commercial/industrial zoning that does not enable residential activity as of right) over the land at 190 Grey Street and the wider block owned by Walter Findlay Ltd bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street; or
- In the alternative, if Mixed Use zoning is applied to this land, include a site-specific precinct or overlay that: (a) explicitly recognises and provides for the continuation and reasonably foreseeable expansion of Walter Findlay Ltd's existing lawfully established manufacturing and distribution activity as a permitted activity; (b) requires no-complaint covenants or notices on title for any new residential or mixed-use development established within a defined buffer distance of the site; and (c) requires amenity buffers (acoustic setbacks/fencing, landscaping) on any new residential/mixed-use development adjoining the site; and
- Council expressly recognise, as a relevant consideration in assessing PC6, the community resilience and emergency food-supply role played by established local food manufacturing sites such as Walter Findlay Ltd's, given Gisborne's remoteness and the increasing frequency of weather events disrupting transport routes into the district; and
- Any other or alternative relief that would achieve the outcome that Walter Findlay Ltd's existing operations, expansion plans, employment, and asset/security value are not undermined by the rezoning.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        wish

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

\*        Yes

**Attachments**

1.        [Walter Findlay Waiver Request .pdf](#)

## 143 - Doug Bell

bellvine@xtra.co.nz

783 Back Ormond Road,

Makauri 4071

---

**Submitter Number:** 143

**Submission Point Number:** 1

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

I support protecting valuable productive land, for rural production. I consider further zoning could occur on the northern side of Haisman bounded by the Taruheru river. I consider that this land is certainly not horticulturally valuable.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

I would like to see the rezoning of rural lifestyle (back ormond road area) land to be expanded to the west of Haisman road bounded by the Taruheru river and Tucker road.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

# PART C 1-4

## PC6 C1-4 C2.1.7.1

### 82 - Edwin Simperingham

ed\_simperingham@yahoo.com

258 Clifford Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 82

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

My submission relates to the zoning of 258 Clifford Street and surrounding area as Medium Density Housing Zone.

I support the introduction of the medium density housing zone and its application in Whataupoko. I seek that the zone provides specifically for access from Railway Lane (which is not a legal road but should be). Services should be able to run down railway lane - particularly 3 waters.

Medium Density Housing Zone. Treatment of Railway Lane.

I support making it easier for people to live in the CBD. We need it to be easy so that our centre can thrive.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Retain medium density housing zone and associated objectives, policies and rules. Ensure Railway Lane is able to provide legal access without the need for easements and that services access for 3 waters can also use Railway Lane. Railway lane should be vested as a legal road.

Ensure is a Permitted Activity for residential development above street level and behind shops. Delete all parking requirements.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

# CITY GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

## PC6 CGRZ

### 29 - Barbara Barwick

Barwick@xtra.co.nz

23 Grant Road, Whataupoko

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 29

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

Concerned about protected views concerned about both 2 and 3 storey buildings, this is important for now and the future.

Need to look at more green corridors, not enough green spaces in full proposed urban plan change zone.

Any alterations need to be properly accessible for wheelchairs, mobility scooters, walkers, walking sticks, pushchairs in full proposed urban plan change zone - for example the Bridge to Nowhere is not accessible for anyone with the described needs.

Think its a good idea to have the ability to break up larger sections to allow for tiny homes in the full proposed urban plan change zone - but will there be an extra rate charge if a secondary building is put on a singular title - notes that current system requires 3 yearly confirmation of letting of granny flat. This should be clarified for people.

What will these changes mean for cross-lease properties.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Amend the rules to reflect the comments made above and ensure changes protect the community and environment both now and in the future.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* No

# MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

## PC6 MRZ

### 29 - Barbara Barwick

Barwick@xtra.co.nz

23 Grant Road, Whataupoko

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 29

**Submission Point Number:** 3

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

Concerned about protected views concerned about both 2 and 3 storey buildings, this is important for now and the future.

Need to look at more green corridors, not enough green spaces in full proposed urban plan change zone.

Any alterations need to be properly accessible for wheelchairs, mobility scooters, walkers, walking sticks, pushchairs in full proposed urban plan change zone - for example the Bridge to Nowhere is not accessible for anyone with the described needs.

Think its a good idea to have the ability to break up larger sections to allow for tiny homes in the full proposed urban plan change zone - but will there be an extra rate charge if a secondary building is put on a singular title - notes that current system requires 3 yearly confirmation of letting of granny flat. This should be clarified for people.

What will these changes mean for cross-lease properties.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Amend the rules to reflect the comments made above and ensure changes protect the community and environment both now and in the future.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* No

## 82 - Edwin Simperingham

ed\_simperingham@yahoo.com

258 Clifford Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 82

**Submission Point Number:** 3

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

My submission relates to the zoning of 258 Clifford Street and surrounding area as Medium Density Housing Zone.

I support the introduction of the medium density housing zone and its application in Whataupoko. I seek that the zone provides specifically for access from Railway Lane (which is not a legal road but should be). Services should be able to run down railway lane - particularly 3 waters.

Medium Density Housing Zone. Treatment of Railway Lane.

I support making it easier for people to live in the CBD. We need it to be easy so that our centre can thrive.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Retain medium density housing zone and associated objectives, policies and rules. Ensure Railway Lane is able to provide legal access without the need for easements and that services access for 3 waters can also use Railway Lane. Railway lane should be vested as a legal road.

Ensure is a Permitted Activity for residential development above street level and behind shops. Delete all parking requirements.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

## 85 - Patricia Margaret Maclean

trisha\_m\_m@hotmail.com

106 Clifford Street, Whataupoko,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 85

**Submission Point Number:** 3

---

### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

### **The reasons for my views are:**

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are: Multi Storey Building proposal - changes to Whataupoko - Proposed Urban Plan Change 6.

I oppose the Urban Plan Change 6. The current proposition doesn't have adequate provision to protect residents of Whataupoko's properties from the planned multi storey buildings. Whataupoko has long been regarded as a beautiful, green & historical suburb by locals and visitors. The planned new builds will not have the same aesthetic - full site coverage, no landscaping, no garaging, no consent required & residents cannot object. If this plan should go ahead there will be no going back - Whataupoko's classic character, beautifully preserved villas with lush greenery will be changed forever. I have recently visited Melbourne and their councils are strict on maintaining historical suburbs - houses, building & general character of the area after having learnt from past mistakes. I am hoping GDC has the foresight to treasure and maintain Whataupoko.

Attachment to submission:

COMMUNITY PETITION |

Date: 10th April 2026

Author: Trish Maclean

Against Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 Whataupoko Residential Intensification

Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan Gisborne District Council

We, the undersigned residents and concerned members of the Whataupoko community, formally object to the proposed intensification of our suburb under Urban Plan Change 6 of the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan. We call on Gisborne District Council, Mayor

Rehette Stoltz, Deputy Mayor Aubrey Ria, and Resource Management Minister Chris Bishop to permanently abandon this proposal and remove Whataupoko from future intensification zones and not proceed with it under reduced consultation.

While we acknowledge Tairāwhiti's housing pressures, we do not accept that Whataupoko is an appropriate location for medium-density intensification at the scale proposed. The evidence below demonstrates serious, irreversible harms.

### **THREE CORE OBJECTIONS:**

1. Infrastructure capacity is insufficient and must be addressed before any zoning change.

Gisborne District Council's own Future Development Strategy consultation identified infrastructure capacity as "the most pressing constraint to development" in the region. (1)

Whataupoko's water, wastewater and stormwater networks were designed for existing low density use and cannot accommodate the intensification proposed without major capital works.

This is not hypothetical. Across New Zealand, councils attempting to intensify housing without first upgrading infrastructure have encountered serious problems. Hamilton City Council explicitly states that "infrastructure capacity constraints may limit growth:" in areas

where it cannot invest in upgrades, and warns that "investment in other areas will not be prioritised or publicly funded." (2) Christchurch City Council documented that entire suburbs (Shirley, Aranui, Prestons) had to be exempted from intensification rules because vacuum

sewer pipes have reached capacity limiting redevelopment to “like-for-like” replacement only. (3)

In Auckland, Watercare has identified over 50,000 sites subject to water and wastewater servicing constraints, preventing development despite zoning changes. (4) Building ahead of infrastructure creates public health risks and makes future upgrades exponentially more costly.

Whataupoko must not be rezoned until a detailed, publicly available infrastructure assessment confirms capacity exists. Any future changes should also be blocked unless infrastructure readiness is guaranteed.

2. Concentrating noise and privacy loss in multi-storey apartments creates documented health harms that cannot be remedied.

Research consistently shows that multi-storey housing, particularly apartment buildings, with shared walls and floors creates acoustic problems that degrade quality of life.

Neighbour noise in multi-storey housing “affects health, emotions, behaviours, privacy and social relations,” with residents reporting persistent difficulty in managing disputes. (5)

Unlike single-family neighbourhoods, multi-storey housing “inherently involves acoustic interactions between adjacent dwellings, increasing residents’ exposure to noise transmitted through shared structural elements.” (6)

The impact extends beyond annoyance. Noise disturbance “Has been found to worsen stress and diminish overall quality of life,” particularly for renters who have no control over neighbour behaviour. (7) Building regulations designed to minimise noise require expensive acoustic engineering costs developers often resist and builders fail to implement properly, leaving residents without remedy.

Private green space gardens, yards, outdoor areas is systematically lost during densification. Research shows that loss of private green space is “rarely offset by provision of more public green space,” and that reduced access to green space in densifying neighbourhoods “negatively influences mental health.” (8)

Neighbourhood cleanliness, visual comfort and shade from trees directly impact occupant health; as densification removes gardens and trees, these benefits disappear.

These harms are permanent and cannot be reversed once building occurs: Whataupoko’s existing residents will lose private green space, quiet, and privacy. Any proposal should be permanently ruled out, not just delayed.

3. Consultation was not genuine and did not meet basic democratic standards.

Urban Plan Change 6 was advanced using a government exemption under the “Plan Stop” mechanism, which suspends normal Resource Management Act consultation processes. (9)

This exemption process meant Plan Change 6 was not subject to full Schedule 1 public consultation under the RMA. Instead, the Council conducted engagement workshops in early 2025, then proceeded to formal notification in March 2026.

Proper consultation requires what are known as the Gunning Principles: consultation must occur at a formative stage when proposals can still be shaped; proposers must give sufficient reasons permitting “intelligent consideration”; adequate time must be given; and decisionmakers must “conscientiously take into account” responses received. (10) The exemption process violates the first principle by the time residents could formally submit on Plan Change 6, the zoning framework and boundaries were already decided.

Research on planning consultation confirms that “consultation that sidesteps democratic questions does not remove conflict,” and that when citizens perceive they cannot influence outcomes, they disengage or resort to political pressure and legal challenge. (11) The exemption process predetermined the outcome before the public had genuine input.

If Plan Change 6 proceeds, it must only be through full RMA Schedule 1 consultation with formative-stage engagement. Better still, Whataupoko should be removed permanently so this question need not be revisited.

#### REFERENCES:

(1) Gisborne District Council. Future Development Strategy. Engagement Summary; 2025.

(2) Hamilton City Council. Three Waters Capacity. Available at: <https://hamilton.govt.nz/property-rates-and-building/water-services/three-waters-capacity>. Accessed April 2026.

(3) Foy R. Social Impacts of Housing Intensification Research Review. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council; 2023.

(4) Newsroom. Council’s one-size-fits-all approach ‘penalises’ compact developments; 2025 Feb 10. Available at: <https://newsroom.co.nz/2025/02/10/councils-one-size-fits-allapproach-> penalises-compact-developments/

(5) Sentop Dumen A, Rasmussen B. Neighbour noise :n multi-storey housing: Public experiences, attitudes and the need for acoustic labelling to ensure consumer protection. Sage Journals. .2025;1351010X241311800.

(6) ScienceDirect. The impact of building regulations on neighbor noise complaints in a longitudinal study. 2024;2352710226003967.

(7) Town and Country Planning Association. Why all new homes must minimise noise and light pollution; 2025.

(8) Gascon M, Triguero-Mas M, Martinez D, et al. The nexus between urban green space, housing type, and mental health. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2022;57:2511-2321

(9) Ministry for the Environment. Understanding Plan Stop. Resource Management Amendment Act 2025. Available at: <https://environment.govt.nz/acts-andregulations/acts/rm-amendment-act-2025/understanding-plan-stop/>

(10) The Consultation Institute. The Gunning Principles — Implications; 2024. Available at: <https://www.consultationinstitute.org/the-gunning-principles-implications/>

(11) The Consultation Institute. Consultation Planning Challenges. Available at: <https://www.consultationinstitute.org/consultation-planning-challenges>. Accessed April 2026.

## SIGNATURES

This petition will be presented to Gisborne District Council and relevant elected representatives. (*attached*)

## I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:

I want the Council to reject Urban Plan Change 6 - from Stout St through to Clifford St. The CBD has so many suitable areas and empty buildings. There are a lot of areas along Childers Rd, and streets in that area. The old Public Health Bldg. opposite Briscoes and where the Columbine Hosiery factory was behind Gisborne Intermediate to name a couple. These are areas that are suitable for intensification with low cost buildings.

## DEMANDS:

We call on decision-makers to:

1. Permanently remove Whataupoko from intensification zones under Plan Change 6 and all future plan changes.
- 2 Require full infrastructure capacity assessment before any residential zoning changes are considered anywhere in Tairāwhiti.
3. Commit to genuine, formative-stage consultation on any future intensification proposals affecting established residential neighbourhoods.

## I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.

\* ☐ I wish

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

\* ☐ Yes

## Attachments

1. [20260525 Manual Submission on Proposed PC6 - Consultee 108725 Submission #85 Attachment.pdf](#)

## PC6 MRZ-R2

### 17 - Rozeeta Sinel

rozeetasinel8@hotmail.com

515A Childers Road, Te Hapara

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 17

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

515a Childers Rd. Unhappy with Medium Density Residential Zoning.

**My submission is:**

I wish to oppose the Zoning on along 515a Childers Rd. Due to privacy reasons for young families that live in that area. Blocking of sun. Also if 2 or 3 story buildings go up on my neighbouring property noise and behaviours may be concerning for others. It will also devalue my property and neighbours property.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

The change that could take place and be more reasonably - single units and reasonable for elderly would be okay.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## PC6 MRZ-R3

### 17 - Rozeeta Sinel

rozeetasinel8@hotmail.com

515A Childers Road, Te Hapara

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 17

**Submission Point Number:** 3

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

515a Childers Rd. Unhappy with Medium Density Residential Zoning.

**My submission is:**

I wish to oppose the Zoning on along 515a Childers Rd. Due to privacy reasons for young families that live in that area. Blocking of sun. Also if 2 or 3 story buildings go up on my neighbouring property noise and behaviours may be concerning for others. It will also devalue my property and neighbours property.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

The change that could take place and be more reasonably - single units and reasonable for elderly would be okay.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## PC6 MRZ-S1

### 17 - Rozeeta Sinel

rozeetasinel8@hotmail.com

515A Childers Road, Te Hapara

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 17

**Submission Point Number:** 4

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

515a Childers Rd. Unhappy with Medium Density Residential Zoning.

**My submission is:**

I wish to oppose the Zoning on along 515a Childers Rd. Due to privacy reasons for young families that live in that area. Blocking of sun. Also if 2 or 3 story buildings go up on my neighbouring property noise and behaviours may be concerning for others. It will also devalue my property and neighbours property.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

The change that could take place and be more reasonably - single units and reasonable for elderly would be okay.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## PC6 MRZ-S2

### 17 - Rozeeta Sinel

rozeetasinel8@hotmail.com

515A Childers Road, Te Hapara

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 17

**Submission Point Number:** 5

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

Oppose the zoning of 515A Childers Road to Medium Density Residential. Zoning this and the adjoining properties will-

- reduce the privacy on my property and for young families
- Block sunlight
- Devalue my property and my neighbour's property
- 2 and 3 Storey buildings going up on nearby properties will create noise and behaviour that may be concerning to others.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

A change that could take place and be more reasonable would be single units that would be good for the elderly.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

## PC6 MRZ-S3

### 17 - Rozeeta Sinel

rozeetasinel8@hotmail.com

515A Childers Road, Te Hapara

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 17

**Submission Point Number:** 6

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

**The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

515a Childers Rd. Unhappy with Medium Density Residential Zoning.

**My submission is:**

I wish to oppose the Zoning on along 515a Childers Rd. Due to privacy reasons for young families that live in that area. Blocking of sun. Also if 2 or 3 story buildings go up on my neighbouring property noise and behaviours may be concerning for others. It will also devalue my property and neighbours property.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

The change that could take place and be more reasonably - single units and reasonable for elderly would be okay.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* do not wish

# CITY CENTRE ZONE

## PC6 CCZ

### 85 - Patricia Margaret Maclean

trisha\_m\_m@hotmail.com

106 Clifford Street, Whataupoko,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 85

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

#### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

#### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in opposition to

#### **The reasons for my views are:**

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are: Multi Storey Building proposal - changes to Whataupoko - Proposed Urban Plan Change 6.

I oppose the Urban Plan Change 6. The current proposition doesn't have adequate provision to protect residents of Whataupoko's properties from the planned multi storey buildings. Whataupoko has long been regarded as a beautiful, green & historical suburb by locals and visitors. The planned new builds will not have the same aesthetic - full site coverage, no landscaping, no garaging, no consent required & residents cannot object. If this plan should go ahead there will be no going back - Whataupoko's classic character, beautifully preserved villas with lush greenery will be changed forever. I have recently visited Melbourne and their councils are strict on maintaining historical suburbs - houses, building & general character of the area after having learnt from past mistakes. I am hoping GDC has the foresight to treasure and maintain Whataupoko.

Attachment to submission:

COMMUNITY PETITION |

Date: 10th April 2026

Author: Trish Maclean

Against Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 Whataupoko Residential Intensification

Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan Gisborne District Council

We, the undersigned residents and concerned members of the Whataupoko community, formally object to the proposed intensification of our suburb under Urban Plan Change 6 of the Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan. We call on Gisborne District Council, Mayor

Rehette Stoltz, Deputy Mayor Aubrey Ria, and Resource Management Minister Chris Bishop to permanently abandon this proposal and remove Whataupoko from future intensification zones and not proceed with it under reduced consultation.

While we acknowledge Tairāwhiti's housing pressures, we do not accept that Whataupoko is an appropriate location for medium-density intensification at the scale proposed. The evidence below demonstrates serious, irreversible harms.

#### **THREE CORE OBJECTIONS:**

1. Infrastructure capacity is insufficient and must be addressed before any zoning change.

Gisborne District Council's own Future Development Strategy consultation identified infrastructure capacity 2s "the most pressing constraint to development" in the region. (1)

Whataupoko's water, wastewater and stormwater networks were designed for existing low density use and cannot accommodate the intensification proposed without major capital works.

This is not hypothetical. Across New Zealand, councils attempting to intensify housing without first upgrading infrastructure have encountered serious problems. Hamilton City Council explicitly states that “infrastructure capacity constraints may limit growth:” in areas where it cannot invest in upgrades, and warns that “investment in other areas will not be prioritised or publicly funded.” (2) Christchurch City Council documented that entire suburbs (Shirley, Aranui, Prestons) had to be exempted from intensification rules because vacuum sewer pipes have reached capacity limiting redevelopment to. “like-for-like” replacement only. (3)

In Auckland, Watercare has identified over 50,000 sites subject to water and wastewater servicing constraints, preventing development despite zoning changes. (4) Building ahead of infrastructure creates public health risks and makes future upgrades exponentially more costly.

Whataupoko must not be rezoned until a detailed, publicly available infrastructure assessment confirms capacity exists. Any future changes should also be blocked unless infrastructure readiness is guaranteed.

2. Concentrating noise and privacy loss in multi-storey apartments creates documented health harms that cannot be remedied.

Research consistently shows that multi-storey housing, particularly apartment buildings, with shared walls and floors creates acoustic problems that degrade quality of life.

Neighbour noise in multi-storey housing “affects health, emotions, behaviours, privacy and social relations,” with residents reporting persistent difficulty in managing disputes. (5)

Unlike single-family neighbourhoods, multi-storey housing “inherently involves acoustic interactions between adjacent dwellings, increasing residents’ exposure to noise transmitted through shared structural elements.” (6)

The impact extends beyond annoyance. Noise disturbance “Has been found to worsen stress and diminish overall quality of life,” particularly for renters who have no control over neighbour behaviour. (7) Building regulations designed to minimise noise require expensive acoustic engineering costs developers often resist and builders fail to implement properly, leaving residents without remedy.

Private green space gardens, yards, outdoor areas is systematically lost during densification. Research shows that loss of private green space is “rarely offset by provision of more public green space,” and that reduced access to green space in densifying neighbourhoods “negatively influences mental health.” (8)

Neighbourhood cleanliness, visual comfort and shade from trees directly impact occupant health; as densification removes gardens and trees, these benefits disappear.

These harms are permanent and cannot be reversed once building occurs: Whataupoko’s existing residents will lose private green space, quiet, and privacy. Any proposal should be permanently ruled out, not just delayed.

3. Consultation was not genuine and did not meet basic democratic standards.

Urban Plan Change 6 was advanced using a government exemption under the “Plan Stop” mechanism, which suspends normal Resource Management Act consultation processes. (9)

This exemption process meant Plan Change 6 was not subject to full Schedule 1 public consultation under the RMA. Instead, the Council conducted engagement workshops in early 2025, then proceeded to formal notification in March 2026.

Proper consultation requires what are known as the Gunning Principles: consultation must occur at a formative stage when proposals can still be shaped; proposers must give sufficient reasons permitting “intelligent consideration”; adequate time must be given; and decisionmakers must “conscientiously take into account” responses received. (10) The exemption process violates the first principle by the time residents could formally submit on Plan Change 6, the zoning framework and boundaries were already decided.

Research on planning consultation confirms that “consultation that sidesteps democratic questions does not remove conflict,” and that when citizens perceive they cannot influence outcomes, they disengage or resort to political pressure and legal challenge. (11) The

exemption process predetermined the outcome before the public had genuine input.

If Plan Change 6 proceeds, it must only be through full RMA Schedule 1 consultation with formative-stage engagement. Better still, Whataupoko should be removed permanently so this question need not be revisited.

#### REFERENCES:

(1) Gisborne District Council. Future Development Strategy. Engagement Summary; 2025.

(2) Hamilton City Council. Three Waters Capacity. Available at: <https://hamilton.govt.nz/property-rates-and-building/water-services/three-waters-capacity>. Accessed April 2026.

- (3) Foy R. Social Impacts of Housing Intensification Research Review. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council; 2023.
- (4) Newsroom. Council's one-size-fits-all approach 'penalises' compact developments; 2025 Feb 10. Available at: <https://newsroom.co.nz/2025/02/10/councils-one-size-fits-allapproach-penalises-compact-developments/>
- (5) Sentop Dumen A, Rasmussen B. Neighbour noise :n multi-storey housing: Public experiences, attitudes and the need for acoustic labelling to ensure consumer protection. Sage Journals. .2025;1351010X241311800.
- (6) ScienceDirect. The impact of building regulations on neighbor noise complaints in a longitudinal study. 2024;2352710226003967.
- (7) Town and Country Planning Association. Why all new homes must minimise noise and light pollution; 2025.
- (8) Gascon M, Triguero-Mas M, Martinez D, et al. The nexus between urban green space, housing type, and mental health. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2022;57:2511-2321
- .
- (9) Ministry for the Environment. Understanding Plan Stop. Resource Management Amendment Act 2025. Available at: <https://environment.govt.nz/acts-andregulations/acts/rm-amendment-act-2025/understanding-plan-stop/>
- (10) The Consultation Institute. The Gunning Principles — Implications; 2024. Available at: <https://www.consultationinstitute.org/the-gunning-principles-implications/>
- (11) The Consultation Institute. Consultation Planning Challenges. Available at: <https://www.consultationinstitute.org/consultation-planning-challenges>. Accessed April 2026.

## SIGNATURES

This petition will be presented to Gisborne District Council and relevant elected representatives. (*attached*)

## I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:

I want the Council to reject Urban Plan Change 6 - from Stout St through to Clifford St. The CBD has so many suitable areas and empty buildings. There are a lot of areas along Childers Rd, and streets in that area. The old Public Health Bldg. opposite Briscoes and where the Columbine Hosiery factory was behind Gisborne Intermediate to name a couple. These are areas that are suitable for intensification with low cost buildings.

## DEMANDS:

We call on clecision-makers to:

1. Permanently remove Whataupoko from intensification zones under Plan Change 6 and all future plan changes.
- 2 Require full infrastructure capacity assessment before any residential zoning changes are considered anywhere in Tairāwhiti.
3. Commit to genuine, formative-stage consultation on any future intensification proposals affecting established residential neighbourhoods.

## I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.

\* ☐ wish

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

\* ☐ Yes

## Attachments

1. [20260525 Manual Submission on Proposed PC6 - Consultee 108725 Submission #85 Attachment.pdf](#)

## PC6 CCZ-R7

### 82 - Edwin Simperingham

ed\_simperingham@yahoo.com

258 Clifford Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 82

**Submission Point Number:** 4

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

**The reasons for my views are:**

My submission relates to the zoning of 258 Clifford Street and surrounding area as Medium Density Housing Zone.

I support the introduction of the medium density housing zone and its application in Whataupoko. I seek that the zone provides specifically for access from Railway Lane (which is not a legal road but should be). Services should be able to run down railway lane - particularly 3 waters.

Medium Density Housing Zone. Treatment of Railway Lane.

I support making it easier for people to live in the CBD. We need it to be easy so that our centre can thrive.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

Retain medium density housing zone and associated objectives, policies and rules. Ensure Railway Lane is able to provide legal access without the need for easements and that services access for 3 waters can also use Railway Lane. Railway lane should be vested as a legal road.

Ensure is a Permitted Activity for residential development above street level and behind shops. Delete all parking requirements.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

# MIXED USE ZONE

## PC6 MUZ

### 139 - Alistar McKellow

mckellows@xtra.co.nz

389 Palmerston Road,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 139

**Submission Point Number:** 3

---

#### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

#### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* neither in support or opposition of

#### **The reasons for my views are:**

Subject: Technical Clarification of Relief Sought - Submission on Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 - Alistar McKellow

Attention: Lead Policy Planner PC6 Hearings Administrator

I am writing to provide a formal technical clarification regarding the specific relief sought in my original submission on Proposed Urban Plan Change 6 (PC6), which specifically targeted the low-frequency noise gap (the dBC-dBA delta metric).

To assist council officers and the council's acoustic experts in compiling the Section 42A Recommendation Report, I request that the following integrated acoustic parameters be evaluated and written directly into the proposed zone performance standards:

**1. The Low-Frequency Sliding Scale:** If a flat 12dB gap presents daytime operational constraints, I request the adoption of a sliding scale framework: a maximum delta of 15 dB daytime and a strict 10 dB nighttime limit to protect residential sleep amenity.

**2. Retention of Special Audible Characteristics (SAC):** The transition from the old L10 metric to the new Leq metric must not remove or exempt activities from SAC adjustments. All provisions for tonality and impulsiveness corrections under NZS 680212008 must be explicitly retained across the new Medium Density and Mixed-Use zones to prevent highly annoying, intermittent noises from eroding residential amenity.

**3. Mixed Use Zone Boundary Interfaces:** Where a commercial activity in the Mixed-Use Zone directly adjoins a residential activity, the maximum noise permitted at that specific residential boundary line must strictly adhere to standard residential thresholds (55 dB day/45 dB night).

**4. Restriction on Section 127 Variations:** The plan must incorporate a policy stating that the introduction of the Mixed-Use Zone does not provide a default justification for existing businesses to use Section 127 of the RMA to increase their site-specific consented noise limits without full notification to affected in zone residential neighbours.

Please ensure this technical clarification is formally provided to the reporting officers and acoustic experts ahead of the pre-circulation of evidence so that it can be explicitly addressed in the Section 42A report.

#### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

I request that the following integrated acoustic parameters be evaluated and written directly into the proposed zone performance standards:

**1. The Low-Frequency Sliding Scale:** If a flat 12dB gap presents daytime operational constraints, I request the adoption of a sliding scale framework: a maximum delta of 15 dB daytime and a strict 10 dB nighttime limit to protect residential sleep amenity.

**2. Retention of Special Audible Characteristics (SAC):** The transition from the old L10 metric to the new Leq metric must not remove or exempt activities from SAC adjustments. All provisions for tonality and impulsiveness corrections under NZS 6802:2008 must be explicitly retained across the new Medium Density and Mixed-Use zones to prevent highly annoying, intermittent noises from eroding residential amenity.

**3. Mixed Use Zone Boundary Interfaces:** Where a commercial activity in the Mixed-Use Zone directly adjoins a residential activity, the maximum noise permitted at that specific residential boundary line must strictly adhere to standard residential thresholds (55 dB day/45 dB night).

**4. Restriction on Section 127 Variations:** The plan must incorporate a policy stating that the introduction of the Mixed-Use Zone does not provide a default justification for existing businesses to use Section 127 of the RMA to increase their site-specific consented noise limits without full notification to affected in-zone residential neighbours.

## 142 - Walter Findlay Limited

davidfindlay@wfl.co.nz

190 Grey Street,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 142

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

### I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

### My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial opposition to

### The reasons for my views are:

#### **Submission point 1 — Rezoning of 190 Grey Street and the surrounding block from Fringe Commercial to Mixed Use**

Provision: PC6 zoning map / Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) provisions as they apply to the land at 190 Grey Street, Gisborne and the wider block owned by Walter Findlay Ltd bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street.

#### **Reasons**

Walter Findlay Ltd has been manufacturing and distributing bread since 1913 — over 110 years — and owns approximately 75% of the block bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street, from which it has operated continuously since 1937, 89 years. The company is a significant Gisborne employer, currently providing 65 full-time-equivalent positions, and contributing approximately \$17 million in wages into the Gisborne district over the past 10 years.

The operation runs 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and generates significant heavy-vehicle movements associated with production and distribution. These are longstanding, lawfully established characteristics of the site under its current Fringe Commercial zoning, which anticipates and provides for commercial/industrial activity of this kind without the amenity expectations that accompany residential use.

PC6 proposes to replace the Fringe Commercial zone (together with the Outer and Amenity Commercial zones) with a new Mixed Use zone that enables residential activity on and around this land. This creates a direct and material reverse-sensitivity risk: new residential neighbours, once established, may raise amenity complaints (noise, odour, light, traffic, night-time activity) about an operation that has run lawfully on this site for 89 years, creating pressure over time to constrain hours of operation, production capacity, or vehicle movements.

This is not only a private commercial concern. Gisborne's relative remoteness means that in significant weather events and other emergencies — which appear to be occurring with increasing frequency — transport routes into and out of the district can be disrupted for extended periods. Walter Findlay Ltd is the only local manufacturer able to produce bread at the scale needed to supply the community noting that bread supply is regarded as an “essential requirement” during any adverse event. If Walter Findlay Ltd's ability to operate from 190 Grey Street were compromised, or production relocated elsewhere as a result of the matters raised in this submission, the community's ability to access locally produced bread during an emergency, when it may not be able to be trucked or flown in from outside the district, would be significantly reduced. Council should have regard to this community resilience function when weighing the effects of the proposed rezoning against the housing-supply objectives of PC6.

Walter Findlay Ltd has purchased additional land around 190 Grey Street specifically to enable future expansion of its manufacturing operation, in direct reliance on the certainty provided by the current zoning. Introducing a Mixed Use zone, and the residential activity it enables, undermines the basis on which that investment was made and creates uncertainty as to whether planned expansion remains practically achievable.

The land and buildings at 190 Grey Street are also used by Walter Findlay Ltd as security for its financing arrangements. A rezoning that reduces the certainty of continued commercial/industrial use — or that could reduce the value the market and lenders place on the land because it now sits within a zone oriented toward residential use — has a direct adverse financial effect on the company, independent of any physical effect on its operations.

This effect is not limited to Walter Findlay Ltd's own continued use of the site. Any future purchaser of the land would face the same reverse-sensitivity constraints and operational uncertainty, which impairs the marketability of the land and buildings as well as their financing value — in effect, the asset becomes materially harder to sell as a going

manufacturing concern, compounding the adverse effect on the value Walter Findlay Ltd can realise from, or borrow against, the property.

Walter Findlay Ltd began as, and remains, a legacy Gisborne manufacturing business, but has since grown into a multi-site manufacturer, with other manufacturing sites in New Zealand, Australia and the United States. The Grey Street site remains central to the company's operations and identity, but the company's ability to direct future capital investment and expansion to its other sites, in New Zealand and overseas, means undermining the certainty of this site carries a real risk of jobs, wages and investment shifting away from Gisborne over time, not merely a constraint on an existing local operation. Walter Findlay Ltd is also aware that its concerns are shared by other established commercial and industrial landowners in the vicinity — including Gisborne Fisheries and Logan Print — whose investment decisions were likewise made in reliance on existing zoning. Unsettling those decisions after the fact risks signalling to current and prospective investors that zoning certainty in Gisborne cannot be relied upon for long-term business investment, with implications for investment confidence and economic development in the district that extend well beyond Walter Findlay Ltd's own circumstances. No party made an original submission addressing the effect of PC6 on established, large-scale manufacturing sites of this kind, or on the Fringe Commercial zone specifically. Walter Findlay Ltd considers this a material gap: PC6's evaluation should explicitly weigh the loss of long-term commercial/industrial certainty for a significant existing employer against the housing-supply objectives the plan change is intended to serve, consistent with the purpose of sustainable management under section 5 RMA, which includes enabling people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

**Decision requested**

- Retain Fringe Commercial zoning (or an equivalent commercial/industrial zoning that does not enable residential activity as of right) over the land at 190 Grey Street and the wider block owned by Walter Findlay Ltd bounded by Grey Street, Kahutia Street and Bright Street; or
- In the alternative, if Mixed Use zoning is applied to this land, include a site-specific precinct or overlay that: (a) explicitly recognises and provides for the continuation and reasonably foreseeable expansion of Walter Findlay Ltd's existing lawfully established manufacturing and distribution activity as a permitted activity; (b) requires no-complaint covenants or notices on title for any new residential or mixed-use development established within a defined buffer distance of the site; and (c) requires amenity buffers (acoustic setbacks/fencing, landscaping) on any new residential/mixed-use development adjoining the site; and
- Council expressly recognise, as a relevant consideration in assessing PC6, the community resilience and emergency food-supply role played by established local food manufacturing sites such as Walter Findlay Ltd's, given Gisborne's remoteness and the increasing frequency of weather events disrupting transport routes into the district; and
- Any other or alternative relief that would achieve the outcome that Walter Findlay Ltd's existing operations, expansion plans, employment, and asset/security value are not undermined by the rezoning.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*        wish

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

\*        Yes

## PC6 MUZ-R10

### 83 - Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)

mattn@barker.co.nz

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street,

Auckland 1140

---

**Submitter Number:** 83

**Submission Point Number:** 5

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

While FSNI supports supermarkets being a permitted activity within the Mixed Use zone they seek that the permitted GFA threshold for supermarkets is increased to 7,000 m<sup>2</sup>. The Pak n'Save at 274 Childers Road is currently 4,720m<sup>2</sup> and FSNI have plans to expand this supermarket.

While FSNI generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

FSNI seeks that MUZ-R10 Matters for Discretion are amended as follows:

1. Supermarkets have Permitted activity status in the Mixed Use zone and PREC2 Mixed Use Business Precinct where:

- a. The gross floor area does not exceed ~~5,000m<sup>2</sup>~~ **7,000 m<sup>2</sup>**; and
- b. Compliance is achieved with:
  - i. MUZ-S4 Landscaping at the Residential and Reserve zone Interface; and
  - ii. MUZ-S5 Outdoor Storage or Rubbish Collection and Service Areas.

2. Supermarkets have Restricted Discretionary activity status in the Mixed Use zone and PREC2 Mixed Use Business Precinct where compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R10 Supermarkets (1).

Matters of Discretion when compliance is not achieved:

- a. The effects of non-compliance with any relevant standard and any relevant Matters of Discretion of any standard that is not met.
- b. ~~The relevant matters contained in the Urban Design Guide — For Commercial Development in Urban Areas contained in Appendix H6.~~
- c. The matters in:
  - i. MUZ-P1 Compatible Activities; and
  - ii. MUZ-P2 Mixed Use Zone Character and Amenity.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

## PC6 MUZ-R16

### 83 - Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)

mattn@barker.co.nz

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street,

Auckland 1140

---

**Submitter Number:** 83

**Submission Point Number:** 6

---

**I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

**My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial opposition to

**The reasons for my views are:**

While FSNI generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.

**I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

FSNI seeks that MUZ-R16 Matters for Discretion are amended as follows:

Matters of Discretion when compliance is not achieved:

- a. The effects of non-compliance with any relevant standard and any relevant Matters of Discretion of any standard that is not met.
- b. ~~The relevant matters contained in the Urban Design Guide — For Commercial Development in Urban Areas contained in Appendix H6.~~
- c. Financial Contributions.
- c. The matters in:
  - i. MUZ-P1 Compatible Activities;
  - ii. MUZ-P2 Mixed Use Zone Character and Amenity;
  - iii. MUZ-P3 Incompatible Activities;
  - iv. MUZ-P4 Zone Interface;
  - v. MUZ-P5 PREC1 Mixed Use Amenity Precinct; and
  - vi. MUZ-P6 PREC2 Mixed Use Business Precinct.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\* wish

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

\* Yes

# PC6 MUZ-R19

## 83 - Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI)

mattn@barker.co.nz

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street,

Auckland 1140

---

**Submitter Number:** 83

**Submission Point Number:** 7

---

### I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission

\* No

### My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.

\* in partial opposition to

### The reasons for my views are:

While FSNI generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.

FSNI opposes the proposed wording of sub clause d and e. In FSNI's experience commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.

### I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:

FSNI seeks that MUZ-R19 – Matters for Discretion are amended as follows:

Matters of Discretion when compliance is not achieved:

- a. The effects of any non-compliance with any relevant standard or relevant Matters of Discretion.
- b. ~~The relevant matters contained in the Urban Design Guide – For Commercial Development in Urban Areas contained in Appendix H6.~~
- c. The effect of the activity on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network including on parking and access, traffic generation and the safety of other road users.
- d. ~~The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the planned character and amenity of the Mixed Use zone.~~
- e. ~~The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the local streetscape.~~
- f. Effects on the amenity values of adjoining sites including visual dominance, privacy and shading effects.
- g. The capacity of existing and planned infrastructure to service the activity.
- h. Financial contributions.

### I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.

\* wish

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

\* Yes

# SPECIAL PURPOSE - FUTURE URBAN ZONE

## PC6 SP-FUZ

### 141 - Tāmanuhiri Tūtū Poroporo Trust

tiahntrhooper@gmail.com

Ngā Wai e Rua Building, Ground Floor,

Gisborne 4010

---

**Submitter Number:** 141

**Submission Point Number:** 2

---

#### **I could gain advantage in trade competition through this submission**

\* No

#### **My submission is (select one) the proposed plan change.**

\* in partial support of

#### **The reasons for my views are:**

1. As kaitiaki of the tribal interest, Tāmanuhiri Tūtū Poroporo Trust (TTPT) has reviewed the material relating to Urban Plan Change 6 (PC6). TTPT considers PC6 does not adequately reflect current and emerging settlement patterns, particularly the increasing prevalence of remote and flexible working arrangements. These shifts are reducing reliance on traditional urban centres and enabling greater decentralisation into rural and peri-urban areas.
2. In making this statement, TTPT recognises and affirms the mana whenua and mana moana of Ngāi Tāmanuhiri across our rohe, from Paritū to Koputūtea, inland to Mangapoike, and extending out to Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa.
3. TTPT is the Post-Settlement Governance Entity (PSGE) for Ngāi Tāmanuhiri, established under the Ngāi Tāmanuhiri Claims Settlement Act 2012. TTPT is statutorily recognised as the mandated iwi authority responsible for managing and protecting Ngāi Tāmanuhiri settlement assets, cultural redress, and collective interests on behalf of its registered members.
4. TTPT's rohe includes significant coastal, riverine, forestry and erosion-prone lands, together with substantial commercial and cultural interests, including Wharerata Forest. A map of the Ngāi Tāmanuhiri area of interest is provided at Appendix 2.
5. Ngai Tāmanuhiri holds enduring interests in housing, land use, and wellbeing outcomes across Tairāwhiti. Our perspective is grounded in whakapapa, connection to whenua, and the lived experience of how planning decisions shape where and how our people are able to live.
6. TTPT supports the intent of PC6 to enable housing supply and choice, including intensification where appropriate. We acknowledge the importance of responding to housing need and affordability pressures and do not oppose intensification in principle.
7. However, we are concerned that PC6 appears to rely on an implicit assumption of centralised urban growth, with housing delivery, infrastructure investment, and servicing largely oriented toward the Gisborne urban area. This response encourages Council to reflect more critically on that assumption and to ensure the planning framework remains adaptive to changing realities of work, living, and community connection.

#### **I seek the following decision from Gisborne District Council:**

##### **Infrastructure and future urban zone considerations**

13. We are concerned that infrastructure constraints may be being used to justify urban concentration, rather than prompting consideration of more flexible or innovative servicing approaches. Centralised infrastructure models can delay housing delivery outside the urban core and limit the ability of smaller communities to grow sustainably.

14. Council is encouraged to more actively consider scalable infrastructure, staged servicing approaches, and locally appropriate or community-level servicing solutions where these can achieve health, environmental, and resilience outcomes.

15. The Special Purpose - Future Urban Zone plays a critical role in shaping long-term settlement patterns. While framed as a holding zone, its objectives and policies appear to reinforce an urban-adjacent growth model. We question whether the framework enables genuine flexibility for alternative settlement patterns over time or whether it effectively pre-determines future growth outcomes through structured planning and sequencing.

**I (select one) to be heard in support of my submission.**

\*           do not wish