

Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Historic Heritage)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S483.120	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	On review of the Notes provided in the Chapter, it appears that both the District Wide and PART - 3 Area Specific Chapters also apply, and that the more stringent rule takes precedence. Top Energy appreciates this clear direction, noting earlier submissions seeking such clarity.	Amend the Historical Heritage provisions so that they enable the appropriate provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) for the maintenance, repair and upgrading of scheduled heritage buildings in all of the Heritage Overlays as set out in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS51.22	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider it is appropriate for amendments to the Historic Heritage provisions to enable the "appropriate provision of infrastructure".	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS351.024	A.W and D.M Simpson		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori.	Disallow	No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS371.024	Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara,		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori.	Disallow	No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri							
FS449.023	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to reserve the power to develop across whenua Maori for their own interests asides the plans intent to protect Whenua Maori.	Disallow	No change for amendments. Current wording is adequate and requires Top Energy to properly engage and consult the land owners and mana whenua otherwise.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS345.171	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S483.126	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	The historic heritage chapter is not of significant relevance to Top Energy. However, it is important that recognition is made within the chapter for the appropriate provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) for the maintenance, repair and upgrading of scheduled heritage buildings.	Amend Historic Heritage provisions to enable the provision of infrastructure (e.g., electricity and telecommunications) for the maintenance, repair and upgrading of scheduled heritage buildings as permitted.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS51.23	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT recognises the importance of the maintenance and repair of existing network utilities buildings and structures. As notified, infrastructure a is discretionary activity if within a site containing a scheduled Heritage Resources. This is considered appropriate to manage effects Infrastructure activities may have adverse effects on the heritage values of the scheduled heritage resource.	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS345.177	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S409.001	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga."</p> <p>HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.</p>	Retain the historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapters, the inclusion of places and areas within a Schedule and Spatial Map Layers, and subjecting places and areas to objectives, policies and rules intended to protect and enhance historic heritage be retained.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS570.1176	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS400.031	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1190	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS569.1212	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
S179.040	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Overview	Support		Retain overview for heritage area overlays		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.87	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries as outline in the submission (409).	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S257.012	Te Hiku Community Board	Overview	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete from the Overview the text relating to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.4	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.				
FS51.225	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with the extension of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area's boundaries to include the entire harbour as associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S357.012	Sean Frieling	Overview	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete from the Overview the text relating to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.6	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.188	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S358.012	Leah Frieling	Overview	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete from the Overview the text relating to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								and general submissions
FS275.8	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.195	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S472.012	Michael Foy	Overview	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete from the Overview the text relating to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.10	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.205	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.				Overlay Overview and general submissions
S431.049	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Amend the Overview statement for the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay Part B, to include the following statement: Historic values, particularly of Part A, can be adversely affected by the nature and scale of development within Part B of this Overlay, where that development results in visual dominance in relation to the Kerikeri Mission Station buildings and to Kororipo Pa.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.237	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS332.049	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S431.050	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Amend the Overview statement for the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay to insert a reference to the 1845 battle of Kororāreka to the end of the first paragraph.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.238	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT is supportive of including reference to the 1845 battle of Kororareka as proposed.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS332.050	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S431.051	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Amend the last sentence of the second paragraph of the Overview statement for Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay as follows: Development in the second half of the 20th century has been limited and generally of a small scale , so that Kororāreka Russell retains a high degree of historic heritage integrity and context, which is significant at the regional and national level.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.239	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS332.051	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S431.052	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Amend the first sentence of the Overview statement for Part D of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay as follows: Covers the remainder of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay and reflects the original street layout and subdivision patterns and the modest scale of buildings and development. and It		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					contains archaeological sites			
FS51.240	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS332.052	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S431.053	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Insert a further sentence at the end of the Overview statement for Part D of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay as follows: Part D is also important as context and backdrop for the other parts of the Kororāreka Russell Historic Heritage Area Overlay, and in providing the setting for the land entrance to Kororāreka/Russell.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.241	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS332.053	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S431.054	John Andrew Riddell	Overview	Not Stated	The overview to the Heritage Area Overlays chapter include several notable omissions in terms of history, values and characteristics.	Amend the Overview statement for the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay to identify the large water setback as an historic heritage characteristic.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.242	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS332.054	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S545.003	Heather Adams and Duncan Ross	Objective for all Heritage Area overlays	Support in part	We strongly support the concept of protecting the unique heritage values, context and landscape of Te Waimate Heritage Area, however we believe that the proposed plan does not go far enough to protect the outstanding landscape and heritage values of the area. Heritage sites have been left out of the plan, such as Cooks Lane, Courthouse Lane and the second site of the flour mill. These sites reinforce the uniqueness of the area. we have grave concerns for what is left of the pastoral landscape, particularly the vista from the Mission House. Already much of the 'notable attempt by the missionaries to recreate an English pastoral landscape' has been recently destroyed, the removal of the hedge rows, trees, a huge amount of soil being moved about, and replaced with	Amend provisions to provide better protection of poorly detailed local sites to preserve them until they are properly investigated and this protection should not be over ridden by Rural Production rules. Amend provisions so that large horticultural structures that obliterate the Mission and pre European horticultural sites be restricted. (Inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				overwhelming horticultural development.				
FS51.219	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. The proposed amendments have merit for consideration.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS566.029	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S409.005	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Objective for all Heritage Area overlays	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the objectives for all heritage area overlays.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS570.1180	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.035	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS566.1194	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS569.1216	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
S421.098	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-O1	Support in part	Objective HA-O1 as currently worded is inconsistent with section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 which provides for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The absolute protection proposed by the objective is inconsistent with the Act and does not promote the purpose of the Act. The current wording implies that the Council has picked one aspect as an outright winner to the detriment of other, lawfully established, and existing activities.	Amend objective HA-O1 as follows: The heritage values of Heritage Area Overlays, as derived from the sites, buildings and objects of historic significance, archaeological sites and landform, are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS24.9	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree that this objective appears to give absolute priority to heritage over all other factors.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS51.65	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the suggested wording additions are necessary. Section 6(f), RMA is inherent in the consideration of	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				activities, and it is unnecessary for this to be stated within the objective.				
FS275.13	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS354.092	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that heritage sites are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, rather than 'protection' per se. This change is consistent with s6 of the RMA so is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.098	Accept	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS570.1330	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS346.332	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS566.1344	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
FS569.1366	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
S356.050	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	HA-O1	Support	Not stated	Retain HA-O1 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.177	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Objective HA-O1.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.2 Key Issue 11: Heritage Area Overlay Objectives
S409.006	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Policy for all Heritage Area overlays	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga."</p> <p>HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.</p>	Retain the policies for all heritage area overlays.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.1181	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS400.036	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1195	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.1217	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S356.051	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	HA-P1	Support	Not stated	Retain HA-P1 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.178	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Policy HA-P1.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S159.045	Horticulture New Zealand	HA-P2	Support in part	The Kerikeri Heritage area overlay does include some areas which are part of rural production. Such activities should be able to continue while maintaining the integrity of the Heritage Overlay area.	Amend Policy HA-P2 to include: c) providing for existing activities in the overlay area		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS151.207	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS151.209	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.170	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover. However, it is not considered appropriate to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA) or expectations of the underlying zoned (e.g., Rural Production).				
FS548.046	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	It is important that existing, legally established activities are recognized and provided for so that they can continue.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.207	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS566.221	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.243	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S179.041	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies for Kororareka Russell Heritage area overlay	Support		Retain policies for the Kororareka Russell heritage Overlay Areas including Part A- The stand, Part B- Wellington street, Part C - Christ Church and Part D – remainder.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.88	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries as outline in the submission (409).				
FS542.107	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1.	Disallow	Amend MUZ-S2	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S431.055	John Andrew Riddell	HA-P6	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend point a. of Policy HA-P6 as follows: a. maintaining the architecture and integrity of the built form within Part A The Strand, recognising the use of verandah, roof forms and materials and the lack of ornamentation that reflect an earlier architectural style. Insert new point i. in Policy HA-P6 as follows: i. recognising the importance of Part D, with its modest scale of development, in providing the heritage and village setting for the land entrance to Kororareka/Russell and for the backdrop to Part A The Strand, Part B Wellington Street, and Part C, Christchurch.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.243	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS332.055	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S13.002	James Conner	Policies for Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage area overlay	Support	<p>Heritage Area Overlay: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - My property, which borders the unformed road connecting Alexander Street, Mill Bay Road, and Richmond Road falls under the Part B heritage area, which I welcome and support. - My property shares a strong visual connection and historical, cultural, and indigenous biodiverse context to the Rangikapiti and Rangitoto pā sites, terraces, and peninsulas, as well as the Mangonui Township, Oruaiti River, and Paewhenua Island. - Whilst the two pā sites guard the harbour mouth, Rangikapiti also provided defence against potential raids via land from the South and West, and provided a gateway to inland Mangonui trail routes, connecting to Māori Point and beyond. For this reason, I welcome the Council's acknowledgment of the need to contextually link the Part A and Part B heritage areas. - In this respect, I support the protection of the unformed road network connecting Alexander St, Mill Bay Road and Richmond Road for their beautifying, indigenous biodiversity, green belt, and heritage value and their connection to whenua and significant historical sites and events. This will ensure the connection of tangata whenua 	No changes requested	Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and the long term protection of the heritage area overlay areas and environment for future generations.				
FS51.84	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula to include the harbour and associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.14	Peter and Donna Brown		Oppose	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S14.002	Hinemoa Conner	Policies for Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage area overlay	Support	Heritage Area Overlay: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay: - My property, which borders the unformed road connecting Alexander Street, Mill Bay Road, and Richmond Road falls under the Part B heritage area, which I welcome and support. My property shares a strong visual connection and historical, cultural, and indigenous biodiverse context to the Rangikapiti and Rangitoto pā sites, terraces, and peninsulas, as well as the Mangonui Township,	No change required		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Oruaiti River, and Paewhenua Island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whilst the two pā sites guard the harbour mouth, Rangikapiti also provided defence against potential raids via land from the South and West and provided a gateway to inland Mangonui trail routes, connecting to Māori Point and beyond. - For this reason, I welcome the Council's acknowledgment of the need to contextually link the Part A and Part B heritage areas. In this respect, I support the protection of the unformed road network connecting Alexander St, Mill Bay Road and Richmond Road for their beautifying, indigenous biodiversity, green belt, and heritage value and their connection to whenua and significant historical sites and events. This will ensure the connection of tangata whenua and the long term protection of the heritage area overlay areas and environment for future generations. 				
FS51.86	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula to include the harbour and associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.15	Peter and Donna Brown		Oppose	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.				Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S257.013	Te Hiku Community Board	HA-P9	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete policy HA-P9, relating to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.16	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. HA-P9 is excessive to what is achieved in HA-P8.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.226	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S357.013	Sean Frieling	HA-P9	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete policy HA-P9, relating to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.17	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. HA-P9 is otiose and excessive to that achieved in HA-P8.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.189	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S358.013	Leah Frieling	HA-P9	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete policy HA-P9, relating to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.18	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. HA-P9 is otiose and excessive to that achieved in HA-P8.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.196	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S472.013	Michael Foy	HA-P9	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete policy HA-P9, relating to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.19	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. HA-P9 is otiose and excessive to that achieved in HA-P8.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.206	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S304.007	Ngati Rangi ki Ngawha Hapu	Policies for Pouerua Heritage area overlay	Support in part	Ngati Rangi should be included as Tangata whenua in regards to Pouerua and is should be consulted and engaged with any activities, overlays, data, and information.	Amend so that Ngati Rangi is included as Tangata whenua in regards to Pouerua and is consulted and engaged with any activities, overlays, data, and information.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S277.005	Alec Jack	Policies for Pouerua Heritage area overlay	Support in part	The rules regarding the Pouerua Heritage area are too restrictive due to the fact that such large areas within the Pouerua Heritage area are devoid of heritage.	Insert policies and rules to the plan to introduce Tradable Development Rights to compensate landowners for land uses and activities which the Heritage Area rules affect within the area.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.157	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	While the use of tradable development rights may have merit, consideration via a full 32 analysis of the cost benefit would be required to provide this planning framework.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S159.046	Horticulture New Zealand	HA-P12	Support in part	The Pouerua Heritage area overlay does include some areas which are part of rural production. Such activities should be able to continue while maintaining the integrity of the Heritage Overlay area.	Amend HA-P12 to include: c) providing for existing activities in the overlay area		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS151.208	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS151.210	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS151.211	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.171	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>The purpose of the Pouerua Historic Heritage Area Overlay is to recognise and protect the geographical location containing significant clusters / components of historic heritage which form the overall heritage landscape.</p> <p>While HNZPT is supportive of amendments that may enable identification of a mixture of activities that may occur within the Pouerua Heritage Area through the underlying zone.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to specify/provide for existing activities managed via the underlying zone/reliant on existing use rights (S.10, RMA).</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS548.047	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	It is important that existing, legally established activities are recognized and provided for so that they can continue.	Allow	Grant the relief sought	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.208	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS566.222	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.244	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S277.003	Alec Jack	HA-P12	Oppose	Not enough is known about the "historical drywall boundaries which reflect early rural subdivisions". The rockwalls look nice but are not necessarily historic. Our family has built many dry walls. I oppose the notion that these fences can be used to impose restrictions on our land use. I oppose this policy.	Amend policy HA-P12 as follows 'To maintain the integrity of the Pouerua Heritage area overlay and protect the heritage values by: recognising that Pouerua sits within a rural farming landscape with numerous Māori stone field systems, and historical drywall boundaries which reflect early rural subdivisions;'		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.155	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the deletion referencing drywalls. These are of historic value of the Pouerua Heritage Area, being important elements of the Area's historic rural farming landscape and a tangible representation of early rural boundaries/subdivisions.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S421.100	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-P13	Support in part	Policy HA-P13 should be amended to achieve consistency with s6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 by referring to protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The amendment would provide additional clarity to landowners who have properties within the overlay.	Amend Policy HA-P13 as follows: To enable farming (inferred), subdivision and land use which recognises and protects the cultural and heritage values of Pouerua, and their strong connections and context of Pouerua scoria cone, Ohaewai volcanic field and Ngahuha scoria cone from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS24.10	Lynley Newport		Support	Too much priority afforded heritage - inconsistent with 6(f). There will be times when development IS appropriate without detriment to heritage values.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.67	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the suggested wording additions are necessary. Farming is considered a 'land use' and it is not appropriate for this activity to be specifically stated in the policy. Also, Section 6(f), RMA is inherent in the consideration of activities, and it is	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				unnecessary for this to be stated within the policy.				
FS354.093	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that heritage sites are identified and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development, rather than 'protection' per se. This change is consistent with s6 of the RMA so is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.100	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.1332	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS346.334	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS566.1346	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.1368	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S277.004	Alec Jack	HA-P13	Support in part	I support the enabling of subdivision within the Pouerua Heritage area. The decision I want from FNDC is to enable subdivision on a case by case basis because there are vast areas within the proposed Pouerua Heritage area devoid of any heritage values - a blanket policy or rule which constrains well placed subdivision is an unreasonable financial burden on the land owner.	Amend HA-P13 to clarify that it also enables subdivisions and land use that make no difference to the cultural and heritage values of the area.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.156	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	Policy HA-P13 is providing direction on the manner in which subdivision and land use is to be undertaken to protect the heritage and cultural values the Pouerua Heritage Area is identified for.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S409.033	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-P14	Support	The HNZPT non-statutory Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series: Guide to the Management of Historic Heritage: District Plans (April 2022) recommends demolition or full destruction of a protected part of scheduled historic heritage should have at least non-complying status for the most significant heritage and discretionary activity status for other heritage. Prohibited Activity status for the Demolition or relocation of the listed scheduled Heritage Resources given their significance and national importance is appropriate.	Retain Rule HA-R14		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other Rules
FS570.1208	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other Rules
FS400.063	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other Rules
FS566.1222	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1244	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other Rules
S159.047	Horticulture New Zealand	HA-P16	Support in part	The Te Waimate Heritage area overlay does include some areas which are part of rural production. Such activities should be able to continue while maintaining the integrity of the Heritage Overlay area.	Amend HA-P16 to include: c) providing for existing activities in the overlay area		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.172	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	The purpose of the Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area Overlay is to recognise and protect the geographical location containing significant clusters/components of historic heritage which form the overall heritage landscape. While HNZPT is supportive of amendments that may enable identification of a mixture of activities that may occur within the Pouerua Heritage Area through the underlying zone. It is not considered appropriate to specify/provide for existing activities managed via the underlying zone/reliant on existing use rights (S.10, RMA).	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS548.048	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	It is important that existing, legally established activities are recognized and provided for so that they can continue.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.209	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.223	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.245	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S545.002	Heather Adams and Duncan Ross	HA-P16	Support in part	We strongly support the concept of protecting the unique heritage values, context and landscape of Te Waimate Heritage Area, however we believe that the proposed plan does not go far enough to protect the outstanding landscape and heritage values of the area. Heritage sites have been left out of the plan, such as Cooks Lane, Courthouse Lane and the second site of the flour mill. These sites reinforce the uniqueness of the area. we have grave concerns for what is left of the pastoral landscape, particularly the vista from the Mission House. Already much of the 'notable attempt by the missionaries to recreate an English pastoral landscape' has been recently destroyed, the removal of the hedge rows, trees, a huge amount of soil being moved about, and replaced with overwhelming horticultural development.	Amend the provisions to better protect local sites to preserve them until they are properly investigated and this protection should not be over ridden by Rural Production rules (inferred). Amend the provisions to restrict large horticultural structures that obliterate the Mission and pre European horticultural sites (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.218	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. HNZPT has also sought greater controls over the management of pastoral farming and horticultural practices within Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.028	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S356.052	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Rules	Support in part	Spelling area throughout rules... "alternation" rather than "alteration". This needs to be corrected.	Amend to correct spelling error.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S515.012	Ngati Rangi ki Ngawha	Rules	Support in part	Ngati Rangi should be included as Tangata whenua in regards to Pouerua and is should be consulted and engaged with any activities, overlays, data, and information.	Amend so that Ngati Rangi is included as Tangata whenua in regards to Pouerua and is consulted and engaged with any activities, overlays, data, and information.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S483.123	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Top Energy supports enablement of infrastructure and renewable energy generation activities, and associated buildings and structures in all Heritage Overlays but find this rule confusing as the rules in this chapter otherwise relate to buildings and structures, or earthworks, suggesting this overlay only manages effects, not activities. However R6 states 'activity' in the rule, and R-11 results in a discretionary activity status for all activities not otherwise listed in the Chapter, meaning that even residential activities would be discretionary in all Heritage Overlays. Accordingly, Top Energy seeks clarification and certainty that existing and new network utility building and structures are appropriately provided for. This would provide clear alignment with RPS direction.	Insert a new permitted activity rule for the maintenance, upgrade, repair of existing network utilities building and structures in all Heritage Area Overlays.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.51	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>HNZPT recognises the importance of the maintenance and repair of existing network utilities buildings and structures.</p> <p>However, consideration is required to determine if the application of HA-R1 and HA-R2 provides suitable guidance. The term 'upgrade' needs defining within the context of permissible works on identified heritage, structures within the Heritage Area overlays and archaeology.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS345.174	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S483.124	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	<p>Top Energy supports enablement of infrastructure and renewable energy generation activities, and associated buildings and structures in all Heritage Overlays but find this rule confusing as the rules in this chapter otherwise relate to buildings and structures, or earthworks, suggesting this overlay only manages effects, not activities. However R6 states 'activity' in the rule, and R-11 results in a discretionary activity status for all activities not otherwise listed in the Chapter, meaning that even residential activities would be discretionary in all Heritage Overlays.</p> <p>Accordingly, Top Energy seeks clarification and certainty that existing and new network utility building and structures are appropriately provided for. This would provide clear alignment with RPS direction.</p>	Insert a new permitted activity rule for new network utilities in all Heritage Area Overlays.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.52	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>HNZPT recognises the importance of the maintenance and repair of existing network utilities buildings and structures.</p> <p>As notified, infrastructure is a permitted activity if not within a site containing a scheduled Heritage Resource in particular Heritage Areas as listed in HA-R6. The activity is discretionary in all of the other Heritage Areas in accordance with HA-R10.</p> <p>Consideration is required to determine the effects on the heritage values of each Heritage Area of new network utilities to determine the appropriateness of the permitted activity status.</p>	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS345.175	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S179.042	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Support in part	We ask that the existing rules or standard on parking and access, signage and visible building on the stand, which are entirely consistent with the proposed objectives and policies, be incorporated in the relevant HAR or HAS Part A The Strand section of the PDP. parking, access, signposting and new buildings have the potential to easily detract from what is a national significant heritage area.	Amend to ensure key controls in the Operative plan are included such as 12.5A.6.1.3 Parking and access in the strand 12.5A.6.1.2 Signs in the strand and Kerikeri Basin heritage precincts 12.5A6.2.3 New buildings which are not visible to the public.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.89	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules –

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				extents of the boundaries as outline in the submission (409).				General Submissions
S159.048	Horticulture New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Rule HA-R11 states that activities not otherwise listed in this chapter are discretionary activities. Rural production activities are not listed as a specific activity so need to be provided for as a permitted activity.	Insert a new rule: HA-RX Rural production activities Activity status: Permitted All zones and heritage overlays		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS151.212	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.173	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlay is to recognise and protect the geographical location containing significant clusters/components of historic heritage which form the overall heritage landscape.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to specify/provide for Rural Production zone activities in the heritage overlay provisions. Those matters are addressed through the underlying zone.</p>	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS570.210	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS566.224	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules –

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								General Submissions
FS569.246	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S225.001	Kay Brenda Davidson	Rules	Oppose	I do NOT support the new heritage area's in Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula and submit there should be no restrictive rules outside the existing heritage areas, due to adverse effects on property rights when proposing subdivisions, earthworks and buildings, nor should there be any expectations to meet with Tangata Whenua in an already extensively modified area. Plan Heritages report NO 2 did not evaluate the economic impact of the extended area.	Delete restrictive rules outside the existing heritage areas.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS275.20	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage areas designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.150	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with the extension of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area's boundaries to include the entire	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				harbour and the associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.				
S225.002	Kay Brenda Davidson	Rules	Oppose	I do NOT support the new heritage area's in Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula and submit there should be no restrictive rules outside the existing heritage areas, due to adverse effects on property rights when proposing subdivisions, earthworks and buildings, nor should there be any expectations to meet with Tangata Whenua in an already extensively modified area. Plan Heritages report NO 2 did not evaluate the economic impact of the extended area.	Delete matters of discretion around meeting with tangata whenua in rules (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS275.21	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic, other than the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve (excluding the Mill Bay foreshore) which could be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S29.004	Bayswater Inn Ltd	Rules	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply. Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B. The PDP is now applying new rules and other provisions and standards that do not currently apply to the property.	Amend to clarify if the reference to 'heritage resource' would require the measurement to be taken from the heritage building or structure (for example the church next to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia) or the property boundary.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.141	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>HNZPT strongly opposes this submission, 40 Marsden Road adjoins highly significant historic heritage places, the Church of St Paul and the Henry Williams Memorial which are listed on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero and scheduled in the district plan (SCHED2: scheduled Heritage Resource #89).</p> <p>Noting that the heritage values of a place include all structures, their curtilage and setting. Therefore, the mitigation of adverse effects on the heritage values of the heritage place must be managed from the property causing those effects (s.17, RMA).</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS400.025	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S73.002	Cinna Smith	Rules	Support in part	Welcome any measures to better protect the outstanding heritage values of Te Waimate and support the proposed change to the boundary area. However, the boundary area needs to be further extended to protect Te Waimate's open, pastoral vistas and other heritage landmarks that are currently excluded. The current draft does not adequately protect the landscape from undue development or change of land use. Unchecked development has ruined so much in Te Waimate in the past decade and the features that make Te Waimate unique and a taonga of national, and international, importance will soon be gone forever.	Amend to recognise and protect the view shafts in Te Waimate, as they were under the old 'special zone' in the former plan.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.145	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the recognition and protection of the view shafts in Te Waimate. Noting that under HNZPT's primary submission (409) it is sought that further protection is required of the Area's historic pastoral farming landscape, being first established in New Zealand at Te Waimate.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS444.002	John and Carroll Beachman		Support	We consider that the reasons set out in Ms Smith's submission are valid and worthy of consideration by the Council in its review of the Heritage Area.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S545.004	Heather Adams and Duncan Ross	Rules	Support in part	We strongly support the concept of protecting the unique heritage values, context and landscape of Te Waimate Heritage Area, however we believe that the proposed plan does not go far enough to protect the outstanding landscape and heritage values of the area. Heritage sites have been left out of the plan, such as Cooks Lane, Courthouse Lane and the second site of the flour mill. These sites reinforce the uniqueness of the area. we have grave concerns for what is left of the pastoral landscape, particularly the vista from the Mission House. Already much of the 'notable attempt by the missionaries to recreate an English pastoral landscape' has been recently destroyed, the removal of the hedge rows, trees, a huge amount of soil being moved about, and replaced with overwhelming horticultural development.	Amend the provisions to better protect local sites to preserve them until they are properly investigated and this protection should not be over ridden by Rural Production rules (inferred). Amend the provisions to restrict large horticultural structures that obliterate the Mission and pre European horticultural sites (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.220	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. The proposed amendments have merit for consideration.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS566.030	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S431.062	John Andrew Riddell	Rules	Not Stated	In general the heritage area provisions in the operative Plan comprehensively address the protection of historic heritage and character and there are no sound resource management reasons why the provisions cannot be carried over into the proposed Plan largely without alteration.	Insert new standard HA-S4 in the Heritage Area Overlay rules applying to the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay Area: HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area. Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the size, location and design of open space; the character and amenity of the surrounding area; the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects; cultural and historic heritage values; the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built 		Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions HA-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					and natural environments in the vicinity; f. consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines Subdivision.			
FS51.250	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.9 Key issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions HA-S3
FS332.062	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions HA-S3
S409.007	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Rules	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the	Retain the rules for all heritage area overlays		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.				
FS570.1182	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS400.037	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS566.1196	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS569.1218	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S277.008	Alec Jack	HA-R1	Oppose	I oppose any form of restriction on the basis of heritage regarding the maintenance & repair of our buildings and structures within the proposed Pouerua Heritage area. They have no heritage value and any such restrictions on their repairs and maintenance therefore incur additional cost without the intended gain for heritage.	Amend rule HA-R1 so that there is no restriction on maintenance and repair of buildings or structures that have no heritage value.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.160	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the proposed amendment to Rule HA-R1 as the heritage values being protected relate to the historic and contextual values of the Heritage Area as a whole and not individual heritage buildings or structures.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
S363.013	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	HA-R1	Support in part	Russell Four Square is located within Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Part A (The Strand). It is a permitted activity to undertake maintenance and repair of the building (HAR1) provided that the structure of the building is not altered and the existing visual appearance of the building is not changed, and any painting or repainting complies with heritage colours specified (HA-S2). Foodstuffs generally support the concept heritage areas, and recognise the importance of the Russell Four Square building within The Strand Precinct. Restricted discretionary activity default activity status is generally supported because the scope of potential effects are limited and well understood.	Retain the default restricted activity status for Rule HA-R1.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS51.201	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider 'redevelopment' falls under the definitions for either maintenance or repair as defined in the PDP. It is appropriate for works that involve the 're-development' of a site within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay are a discretionary activity, especially a prominent property as the iconic Russell Four Square Building.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
S431.056	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R1	Not Stated	The provisions in the proposed Plan are more onerous than is necessary to protect the heritage values and character of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay Part D. This is	Amend PER-2 of Rule HA-R1 so that it does not apply to Part D of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				inappropriate and contrary to policy 6.1.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.				buildings or structures
FS51.244	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS332.056	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
S409.031	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-R1	Support in part	Rules to recognise the importance of Dry Stone Walls within the Heritage area overlays would be appropriate as proposed for the Historic Heritage chapter.	Insert new PER-3 in Rule HA-R1 as follows (or words to that effect): PER-3 Works are to existing dry stone walls and are for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance or repair works in situ using traditional methods, design and materials. Removal of up to a total of 6m length of wall per site for access purposes only, where no alternative access exists. Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1, or PER-2 or PER-3 : Restricted discretionary		Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS570.1206	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.061	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS566.1220	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS569.1242	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
S570.001	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-R1	Support in part	The plan provisions as notified promulgate an inconsistent set of rules with regards to the Heritage Colours standard HA-S2 which applies to all nine heritage areas. There is an inconsistency within HA-R1 in that PER-1 applies HA-S2 to all heritage areas, whereas PER-2 applies the standard to Kororāreka Russell only.	Amend HA-R1 to improve consistency between PER-1 which applies HA-S2 to all heritage areas, and PER-2 which only applies HA-S2 to Kororāreka Russell.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
FS348.243	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.5 Key Issue 14: HA-R1 – Maintenance and repair of buildings or structures
S421.101	Northland Federated	HA-R2	Support in part	It is important to ensure that the rules and associated performance standards imposed are relevant to those areas which need protection from	Delete PER-6 from Rule HA-R2		Accept	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Farmers of New Zealand			inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Performance standard PER-6 is not relevant to the protection of a heritage area overlay it is focused on an addition or alteration to a scheduled heritage resource not being visible from a public area. This has the potential to impede the restoration of a heritage resource which is visible from a public space				alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS51.68	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of this rule. Due to the purpose of the overlay, it is important that effects arising from additions and alterations, when visible from a public place are considered to mitigate potential adverse effects on the Overlay's historic heritage values.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS570.1333	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS346.335	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS566.1347	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1369	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
S257.014	Te Hiku Community Board	HA-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R2 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.22	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R2 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.227	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S277.009	Alec Jack	HA-R2	Oppose	I oppose any form of restriction on the basis of heritage regarding additions or alterations to our existing buildings and structures within the Proposed Heritage area. They have no heritage value and any such restrictions therefore incur additional cost without the intended gain for heritage.	Amend rule HA-R2 so that there is no restriction on additions and alterations to existing buildings or structures that have no heritage value.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS275.23	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R2 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.161	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the proposed amendment to Rule HA-R2 as the heritage values being protected relate to the historic and contextual values of the Heritage Area as a whole and not individual heritage buildings or structures.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
S357.014	Sean Frieling	HA-R2	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R2 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.24	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R2 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.190	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S358.014	Leah Frieling	HA-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R2 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.25	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R2 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.197	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S472.014	Michael Foy	HA-R2	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R2 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.26	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R2 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.207	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S29.001	Bayswater Inn Ltd	HA-R2	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply: Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B. The PDP is now applying new rules and other provisions and standards that do not currently apply to the property.	Amend HA-R2 as it applies to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia. It should not apply as the rule is unworkable given the size and shape of the property.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.138	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of the Paihia Heritage Area overlay.				Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS400.022	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S476.003	David Truscott	HA-R2	Oppose	The purpose of the colour control is unclear. The low reflectivity of the CE colours is contradicted by the other colour charts eg the heritage chart includes bright red which is highly visible in distant views. Council does not require consent in practice for a change of colour where consent is not required for other work. The DP does not state this. The DP does not indicate what the rule is intended to achieve.	Delete Heritage PER-2 (rule HA-R2 inferred) and HA-S2 standards. Policy should promote colour as a character forming townscape element to created a lively, attractive environment. This generates tourism that benefits the local economy.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS51.212	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	While HNZPT does not support the deletion of Rule HA-R2 or the removal of the control of building and structure exteriors (e.g., HA-S2 PER-3 and PER-7). HNZPT has raised matters in the primary submission (570) relating to standards pertaining to exterior colours. Accordingly, HNZPT is supportive of the concept that in some of the Heritage Areas, such as Rawene, colour can be character forming within a townscape; the colour scheme to be applies is an important consideration for those areas identified for their unique heritage values, context and	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				landscaped deemed significant for protection.			
S431.057	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R2	Not Stated	In general the heritage area provisions in the operative Plan comprehensively address the protection of historic heritage and character and there are no sound resource management reasons why the provisions cannot be carried over into the proposed Plan largely without alteration.	<p>Insert additional statement within Rule HA-R2 that Rule HA-S2 does not apply to Part D of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay.</p> <p>Insert new standard HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage within PER-3 of Rule HA-R2 as per the following:</p> <p>HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage</p> <p>The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area.</p> <p>Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the size, location and design of open space; the character and amenity of the surrounding area; the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects; cultural and historic heritage values; the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines. 	Reject	<p>Section 5.3.2.6</p> <p>Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.245	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS332.057	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
S570.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-R2	Support in part	The plan provisions as notified promulgate an inconsistent set of rules with regards to the Heritage Colours standard HA-S2 which applies to all nine heritage areas. HA-R2 lists eight different heritage areas (or parts thereof), with the rule requiring restricted discretionary consent for additions or alterations of buildings in these areas which do not comply with the heritage colour standard. This is inconsistent with how HA-S2 is applied across other rules in the chapter.	Amend HA-R2 to improve consistency and clarity of the application of HA-S2 across heritage areas.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
FS348.244	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
S363.038	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	HA-R2	Oppose	The submitter considers that Rule HA-R2 Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, means that any redevelopment of the Russell Four Square building within The Strand Precinct site is likely to require resource consent as a discretionary activity and that this is onerous when	Amend Rule HA-R2 Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, to provide for the default activity status as a restricted discretionary, within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				the scope of potential effects is limited and well understood, a restricted discretionary activity default is supported.				
FS577.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the default activity status of discretionary activity as being "onerous". The modification of a scheduled historic heritage place must have a holistic approach when considering the potential modification of its historic heritage values, and to achieve the relevant objectives and policies, especially for the Kororareka Russel Heritage Area. It is appropriate for works that involve the 'redevelopment' of a site within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay are a discretionary activity, especially a prominent property.	Disallow	Retain	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
S512.025	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HA-R3	Support	Fire and Emergency support enabling fire protection for heritage resource.	Retain HA-R3		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.213	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Policy HA-R3	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS542.063	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments for a Restricted discretionary status for the Kororareka Russell HA provisions.	Disallow	Amend to a Restricted discretionary status for the Kororareka Russell HA provisions.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S257.015	Te Hiku Community Board	HA-R4	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules	Amend rule HA-R4 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.				and general submissions
FS275.27	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R4 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.228	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S277.010	Alec Jack	HA-R4	Oppose	I oppose the additional layer of bureaucracy which the Heritage area zone introduces to establishing new buildings or structures within the Puerua Heritage area - this represents a substantial and unreasonable devaluation of land use, which will have financial implications for my intergenerational family business's equity and debt serviceability. I am concerned about my ability to provide housing for staff - especially as Climate Change legislation forces a change in land use from extensive ruminant agriculture into more intensive land use such as horticulture which requires more housing for staff.	Amend rule HA-R4 so that there is no restriction on new buildings or structures that have no impact on heritage or landscape values.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS275.28	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	The submission of the original submitter especially as in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested applies ipso facto to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula - Part B. HA-R4 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.162	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the proposed amendment to Rule HA-R4 as the heritage values being protected relate to the historic and contextual values of the Heritage Area as a whole and not individual heritage buildings or structures.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S357.015	Sean Frieling	HA-R4	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R4 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.29	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R4 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.191	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S358.015	Leah Frieling	HA-R4	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R4 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.30	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R4 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.198	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S472.015	Michael Foy	HA-R4	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R4 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.31	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R4 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.208	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S29.002	Bayswater Inn Ltd	HA-R4	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply. Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B. The PDP is now applying new rules and other provisions and standards that do not currently apply to the property.	Amend HA-R4 as it applies to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia. The rule should not apply as it cannot be achieved.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.139	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT strongly opposes this submission, 40 Marsden Road adjoins a highly significant historic heritage places, the Church of St Paul and the Henry Williams Memorial which are listed on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero and scheduled in the district plan (SCHED2: scheduled Heritage Resource #89).	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS400.023	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S431.058	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R4	Not Stated	Policies are not given effect to in the rules. An example is policy HA-P2 is not given effect to in the rules because buildings and structures in Part B of the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay are provided for as a permitted activity. This is in contrast to the restricted discretionary status for such structures and buildings in the operative Plan.	Delete the reference to Kerikeri - Part B from rule HA-R4, and insert the reference within the Rule HA-R8.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.246	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS332.058	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S431.060	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R4	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert a reference to Kororāreka Russell Part D in permitted activity rule HA-R4, and insert the following performance standard PER-3 within the rule:		Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					PER-3 The building or structure complies with HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage.			Overlay – Other rules
FS51.248	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS332.060	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S409.032	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-R5	Support	Rule HA-R5 is problematic where there is an archaeological site within the Heritage Area overlays. Rule HA-R5 permitted activity Rules Per-1, PER-2 and PER-3 have 2m³, 5m² and 200m³ thresholds. However, it is acknowledged that even small excavations can have large impacts on archaeology. The permitted activity rules rely upon Standard HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol. For consistency purposes, Rules HA-R5 PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 should also refer to the setback distance from an archaeological site and not just a scheduled heritage resource.	That Rule HA-R5 be amended as follows (or words to that effect): PER-1 The earthworks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> comply with the relevant permitted activity rules within the Earthworks chapter are not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource or an archaeological site. PER-2 The earthworks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> do not exceed 2m³ in volume over an area of 5m² ; is are not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource or of an archaeological site; Comply with standard HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol. PER-3 The earthworks <ol style="list-style-type: none"> do not exceed 2002m³ 		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					2. are not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource or an archaeological site ; 3. complies Comply with HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol. Note: In addition to the requirements the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.			
FS44.44	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	<p>My concern with adding "or an archaeological site" means that if an archaeological site is accidentally discovered members of the public will need to seek a retrospective resource consent. I suggest that instead it is worded - "are not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource or a MAPPED archaeological site."</p> <p>This means that resource consent is only triggered where archeological sites are known. Mapped can include anything on HNZPT Arch Site which is where all the recorded sites are placed, including any new sites found within an archaeological assessment.</p>	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS67.25	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.				
FS143.42	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The proposed requirement for earthworks to be set back 20m from an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of authorisation processes provided for under Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS143.46	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS68.28	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS69.27	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS66.46	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.				
FS570.1207	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS400.062	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS566.1221	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS569.1243	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
S483.121	Top Energy Limited	HA-R5	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks amendments to PER-2 and PER-3 to exempt earthworks associated with the undergrounding of cables from the volume and area thresholds. Undergrounding of cables should be encouraged in these visually sensitive environments, and the thresholds proposed in the PDP as notified will not facilitate this. Given that the earthworks themselves (as underground) will not have any visual or character impact, and the setback is required, exclusion is considered appropriate.	Amend PER -2 and PER-3 of Rule HA-R5 as follows (or to the same effect) PER-2 1. The earthworks are associated with new underground network utilities and: a. are not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource; and b. comply with standard HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol. 2. For all other earthworks: a. do not exceed 2m3 in volume over an area of 5m².		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					b. is not within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource; 3			
					c. complies with standard HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol.			
TFS51.50	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>HNZPT agrees that the undergrounding of network utilities would mitigate the potential for effects to the above ground (built structures) heritage values and visual amenity of the Heritage Areas.</p> <p>However, the process of undergrounding has the potential to adversely affect other heritage values (archaeological, cultural and landscape), and this must be considered and managed.</p> <p>HNZPT agrees that there should be reference to HA-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol, aligning with HA-R5, PER-3</p>	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS345.172	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
S179.109	Russell Protection Society (INC)	HA-R5	Not Stated	we question whether the 200m3 of earthworks (PER-2) provided for in parts of B,C,D of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Overlay areas may be too generous given the proposed rules for the coastal environment overlay (CE-S3).	Amend HA-R5 PER-2 (whole rule inferred) as required to ensure consistency with CE-S3.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS51.90	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries as outline in the submission (409).	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S257.016	Te Hiku Community Board	HA-R5	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R5 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.32	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter. HA-R5 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.229	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S357.016	Sean Frieling	HA-R5	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R5 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.33	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter. HA-R5 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.192	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S358.016	Leah Frieling	HA-R5	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R5 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.34	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R5 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.199	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S472.016	Michael Foy	HA-R5	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R5 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.35	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R5 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.209	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S277.011	Alec Jack	HA-R5	Oppose	With so much area devoid of heritage, it is unreasonable to apply additional compliance cost regarding earthworks within the Pouerua Heritage area.	Amend rule HA-R5 to remove controls on earthworks within 20m of a scheduled Heritage Resource.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS51.163	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the proposed amendment to Rule HA-R5.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
S421.102	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-R5	Not Stated	<p>This rule deals with the issue of earthworks within heritage area overlays. Federated Farmers seeks the inclusion of ancillary rural earthworks as a permitted activity in this rule. It is important that the existing and legal operations of landowners are provided for moving forward. The inclusion of ancillary rural earthworks will ensure that necessary works can be undertaken by landowners which have occurred within the areas as permitted activities for generations.</p> <p>Such activities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tilling or cultivation of soil for the establishment and maintenance of crops and pasture; - the harvesting of crops; - the planting and removal of trees; - horticultural root ripping; - digging of pits, burying dead stock and plant waste; - the digging of post holes and the drilling of bores; - installing and maintaining services such as water pipes and troughs. 	<p>Insert an additional point in Per-1 of Rule HA-R5 as follows (or similar wording that achieves the same intent):</p> <p>3. Are ancillary rural earthworks.</p>		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS354.094	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The addition of 'ancillary rural earthworks' as a permitted activity is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.102	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1334	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS346.336	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS566.1348	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS569.1370	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
S363.039	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	HA-R5	Oppose	The submitter considers that Rule HA-R5 Earthworks, means that any redevelopment of the Russell Four Square building within The Strand Precinct site is likely to require resource consent as a discretionary activity and that this is onerous when the scope of potential effects is limited and well understood, a restricted discretionary activity default is supported.	Amend Rule HA-R5 Earthworks, to provide for the default activity status as a restricted discretionary, within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks
FS577.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the default activity status of discretionary activity as being "onerous". Disallow as a restricted discretionary, within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay approach when considering the potential modification of its historic heritage values and to achieve the	Disallow	Retain	Reject	Section 5.3.2.7 Key Issue 16: HA-R5 – Earthworks

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				relevant objectives and policies, especially for the Kororareka Russel Heritage Area. It is appropriate for works that involve earthworks of a site within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay are a discretionary activity, especially a prominent property as the iconic Russell Four Square Building.				
S483.125	Top Energy Limited	HA-R6	Oppose	Top Energy seeks that this rule be deleted or amended to exclude network utilities.	Delete Rule HA-R6		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.53	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not agree with the reasons proposed for the deletion of HA-R6. It is considered that the PDP as notified provides adequate balance of the provision for infrastructure (including network utilities) while protecting the purpose of the overlay - the protection of the identified heritage areas' unique heritage values, context, and landscapes.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS345.176	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S257.017	Te Hiku Community Board	HA-R6	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R6 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.36	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				submitter - HA-R6 as proposed is inadequately drafted.				Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.230	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S357.017	Sean Frieling	HA-R6	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R6 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.37	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R6 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.193	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S358.017	Leah Frieling	HA-R6	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R6 by deleting reference to Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.38	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R6 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								and general submissions
FS51.200	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S472.017	Michael Foy	HA-R6	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Amend rule HA-R6 by deleting reference to Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS275.39	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - HA-R6 as proposed is inadequately drafted.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
FS51.210	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay Overview and general submissions
S277.012	Alec Jack	HA-R6	Oppose	This is an additional layer of compliance cost that isn't justified and it reduces our land use options at a time when the ruminant agriculture that predominates in the area is being forced to reduce emissions. The rule may be intended to protect heritage, but it is drafted too widely, because it sterilises development across the whole extent of a large farm containing one heritage resource.	Amend rule HA-R6 to remove controls on renewable electricity generation infrastructure.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.164	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the proposed amendment to Rule HA-R6.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S356.053	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	HA-R6	Support	Not stated	Retain HA-R6 as notified		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.179	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Rule HA-R6.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS542.059	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments for a Restricted discretionary status for the Kororareka Russell HA provisions.	Disallow	Amend to a Restricted discretionary status for the Kororareka Russell HA provisions.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S483.122	Top Energy Limited	HA-R6	Not Stated	Top Energy supports enablement of infrastructure and renewable energy generation activities, and associated buildings and structures in all Heritage Overlays but find this rule confusing as the rules in this chapter otherwise relate to buildings and structures, or earthworks, suggesting this overlay only manages effects, not activities. However R6 states 'activity' in the rule, and R-11 results in a discretionary activity status for all activities not otherwise listed in the Chapter, meaning that even residential activities would be discretionary in all Heritage Overlays. Accordingly, Top Energy seeks clarification and certainty that existing and new network utility building and	Amend approach taken in Heritage Area Overlay in regard to infrastructure and renewable energy infrastructure as an 'activity'.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				structures are appropriately provided for. This would provide clear alignment with RPS direction.				
FS345.173	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S421.104	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-R8	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmer has concerns over performance standard RDIS-1 in rule HA-8 and its potential impacts on farm buildings. While supporting the restricted discretionary activity classification for new buildings or structures, we do not support the standard that requires the building or structure not to be visible from a public place. This requirement is particularly concerning as the term 'public place' has not been defined in the proposed district plan.</p> <p>Farm buildings need to be located where they are needed and where it is practical to do so. Council needs to include a definition for the term 'public place' into the proposed district plan. Once this is done, the Council needs to refine performance standard RDIS-1 so that it specifically states what types of public places are relevant for the standard. The standard should relate to public places such as reserves, footpaths and community hubs and specifically excludes public places such as roadsides which are currently captured under the rule.</p>	<p>Amend Rule HA-R8 to provide for the location of farm buildings where they are needed and where it is practical to locate them.</p> <p>Amend RDIS-1 of Rule HA-R8 to list the public places (such as footpaths) that are captured.</p>		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.70	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT opposes this submission. All buildings and structures within the Heritage Area Overlays must be considered against S.6(f) when the purpose of the overlay is for the	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				protection of the significant historic heritage geological location. It is considered not necessary to list what is captured by the term 'public places' if a definition is provided.				Overlay – Other rules
FS354.095	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter identifies that there is a need to make adequate provision for farm buildings, and expresses concerns about the need to not be visible from a public place, which is not defined.	Allow	Allow S421.104	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS570.1336	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS346.338	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS566.1350	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS569.1372	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S431.059	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R8	Not Stated	Policies are not given effect to in the rules. An example is policy HA-P2 is not given effect to in the rules because buildings and structures in Part B of the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay are	Delete the reference to Kerikeri - Part B from rule HA-R4, and insert the reference within the Rule HA-R8.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				provided for as a permitted activity. This is in contrast to the restricted discretionary status for such structures and buildings in the operative Plan.				Overlay – Other rules
FS51.247	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS332.059	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S431.061	John Andrew Riddell	HA-R8	Not Stated	Not stated	Limit the reference to Kororāreka Russell in Rule HA-R8 to Parts A, B and C of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay Area, and insert standard HA-S4 within RDIS-3 of Rule HA-R8.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.249	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS332.061	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S570.003	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-R8	Support in part	The plan provisions as notified promulgate an inconsistent set of rules with regards to the Heritage Colours standard HA-S2 which applies to all nine heritage areas. HA-R8 provides that new buildings within heritage areas	Amend HA-R8 to improve consistency and clarity of the application of HA-S2 across heritage areas.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Kororāreka Russell and Te Waimate must comply with HA-S2.				
FS348.245	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S363.040	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	HA-R8	Oppose	The submitter considers that Rule HA-R8 New buildings or structures, means that any redevelopment of the Russell Four Square building within The Strand Precinct site is likely to require resource consent as a discretionary activity and that this is onerous when the scope of potential effects is limited and well understood, a restricted discretionary activity default is supported.	Amend Rule HA-R8 New buildings or structures, to provide for the default activity status as a restricted discretionary activity, within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS577.003	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the default activity status of discretionary activity for new buildings or structures being established in the Kororareka Russell Heritage Overlay Area as being "onerous". The modification of a scheduled historic heritage place must have a holistic approach when considering the potential modification of its historic heritage values and to achieve the relevant objectives and policies, especially for the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area. It is appropriate for works that involve the 'redevelopment' of a site within the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area overlay are a discretionary activity, especially a prominent property as the iconic Russell Four Square Building.	Disallow	Retain	Reject	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S421.105	Northland Federated	HA-R9	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of the activity status for both rules from discretionary to	Amend the activity status in Rule HA-R9 from discretionary to restricted discretionary.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Farmers of New Zealand			restricted discretionary. It is felt that a restricted discretionary activity classification is more appropriate. It would still provide the Council with the ability to control the matters that it reserves it discretion over as well as providing certainty for landowners who have property/ties located within the overlays that they can continue to operate as existing and lawfully established activities.				Overlay – Other rules
FS51.71	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT opposes this submission because the introduction of new buildings or structures within the Overlay areas specified in HA-R9 could be inappropriate and full discretion in considering effects on the heritage values of these Heritage Areas is appropriate.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS542.060	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the change in activity status.	Allow	Amend the activity status	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS570.1337	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS346.339	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS566.1351	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission.		Overlay – Other rules
FS569.1373	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S588.013	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	HA-R9	Support	Corrects an Error or Oversight	Retain corrections to Rule HA-R9 as notified in Plan Variation 1.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S600.001	Patricia Stewart	HA-R9	Support	The requirement of needing to obtain a resource consent as a Discretionary activity will provide some protection to the Kohukohu Heritage Precinct as new developments will be scrutinised for their compatibility with existing structures.	Retain the inclusion of the Kohukohu Heritage Area in the activity status table for rule HA-R9.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S277.013	Alec Jack	HA-R10	Oppose	There is no justification for an unlimited discretionary activity consent status to be required in this specialised context, far exceeding the heritage and landform objective as set out in HA-O1.	Amend rules HA-R10 and HA-R11 to remove discretionary activity status. To the extent that any resource consents are required in this context, the consent status should be restricted discretionary, with discretion restricted to effects only on heritage and landscape values.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS196.27	Joe Carr		Support	The submitter's request is well reasoned and reasonable.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.165	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the application of a restricted discretionary activity status under either HA-R10 or HA-R11.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S282.01	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	HA-R10	Oppose	Given the wide reaching extent of these heritage areas (many of which cover existing urban townships), requiring all infrastructure activities to require resource consent is not in keeping with what would be expected in urban areas.	Amend HA-R10 to align with HA-R6 and allow infrastructure activities to take place within Heritage Area overlays provided they are not located within a site containing a scheduled Heritage resource.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.116	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT opposes this submission point. The heritage areas covered by HA-R11 have been RDA is inappropriate, as if the activity is not known, it is difficult to determine that matters to reserve discretion over.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S421.106	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-R11	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of the activity status for both rules from discretionary to restricted discretionary. It is felt that a restricted discretionary activity classification is more appropriate. It would still provide the Council with the ability to control the matters that it reserves it discretion over as well as providing certainty for landowners who have property/ties located within the overlays that they can continue to operate as existing and lawfully established activities.	Amend the activity status in Rule HA-R11 from discretionary to restricted discretionary.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.72	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT opposes this submission point. RDA is inappropriate, as if the activity is not known, it is difficult to determine that matters to reserve discretion over.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS354.096	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	A change to restricted discretionary activity status is sought which is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.106	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1338	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS346.340	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS566.1352	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS569.1374	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S277.014	Alec Jack	HA-R11	Oppose	There is no justification for an unlimited discretionary activity consent status to be required in this specialised context, far exceeding the heritage and landform objective as set out in HA-O1.	Amend rules HA-R10 and HA-R11 to remove discretionary activity status. To the extent that any resource consents are required in this context, the consent status should be restricted discretionary, with discretion restricted to effects only on heritage and landscape values.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS51.166	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the application of a restricted discretionary activity status under either HA-R10 or HA-R11.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS542.061	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the change in activity status.	Allow	Amend the activity status	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Overlay – Other rules
FS542.062	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports the change in activity status.	Allow	Amend the activity status.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S483.024	Top Energy Limited	HA-R11	Not Stated	<p>Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The Overlay chapters are one example and are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that indicates some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity, however resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally.</p> <p>Some overlays include a catch all 'activities not otherwise specified' activity status (e.g. Treaty Settlement Land Overlay). Some overlays don't. This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan. This is particularly relevant in the Overlay chapters where each Overlay chapter has a different approach to activity status default rules.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter", consistent with zone chapters.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				With specific regard to the permitted activity default, it is noted that this could lead unintentional consequences.				
FS78.033	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter support this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
FS345.075	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S588.014	WALTER (Wally) HICKS	HA-R11	Support	Corrects an Error or Oversight	Retain corrections to Rule HA-R11 as notified in Plan Variation 1.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S597.001	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	HA-R11	Support	Rule HA-R11 inadvertently captures a range of activities that will have no effects on the heritage values of heritage overlay areas.	Delete rule HA-R11 as proposed in variation 1.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
S179.043	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Standards	Support in part	We ask that the existing rules or standard on parking and access, signage and visible building on the stand, which are entirely consistent with the proposed objectives and policies, be incorporated in the relevant HAR or HAS Part A The Strand section of the PDP. parking, access, signposting and new buildings have the potential to easily detract from what is a national significant heritage area.	Amend to ensure key controls in the Operative plan are included such as 12.5A.6.1.3 Parking and access in the strand 12.5A.6.1.2 Signs in the strand and Kerikeri Basin heritage precincts 12.5A6.2.3 New buildings which are not visible to the public.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS51.91	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries as outline in the submission (409).				– General submissions and HA-S3
S431.063	John Andrew Riddell	Standards	Not Stated	In general the heritage area provisions in the operative Plan comprehensively address the protection of historic heritage and character and there are no sound resource management reasons why the provisions cannot be carried over into the proposed Plan largely without alteration.	Insert new standard HA-S4 in the Heritage Area Overlay rules applying to the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay Area: HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area. Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the size, location and design of open space; the character and amenity of the surrounding area; the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects; cultural and historic heritage values; the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; f. consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines Subdivision. 		Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS51.251	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.				– General submissions and HA-S3
FS332.063	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
S421.107	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-S1	Support in part	<p>The part of the standard that is not supported by Federated Farmers is the setback requirement of a minimum of 75m for any construction of buildings or structures or additions to building structures from a scheduled heritage resource or the road boundaries of State Highway 1 and other specified roads.</p> <p>It is unclear why a 75m setback is proposed for this standard. It is more appropriate that a consistent approach to setbacks is used rather than a number of different distances. Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of the setback in the Te Waimate Heritage Overlay so that the required setback is 20m which is consistent with the other setbacks required in heritage overlays.</p>	<p>Delete the second standard from Standard HA-S1, as follows:</p> <p>Any construction of buildings or structures and additions and alterations to all buildings or structures shall be setback a minimum of 75m from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a scheduled Heritage Resource; and the road boundaries of State Highway 1, Te Ahu Ahu, Showgrounds and/or Waikaramu Roads. 		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS51.73	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT opposes this submission. All buildings and structures within the Heritage Area Overlay must be tested against S.6(f) when the purpose of the overlay is for the protection of the significant historic heritage geological location.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS354.097	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	A setback of 75m in the Te Waimate Heritage Overlay is not appropriate so the deletion is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.107	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								a Scheduled Heritage Resource and HA-S3
FS570.1339	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS346.341	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS566.1353	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS569.1375	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
S29.003	Bayswater Inn Ltd	HA-S1	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply. Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B. The PDP is now applying new rules and other provisions and standards that do not currently apply to the property.	Amend HA-S1 as it applies to 40 Marsden Road, Paihia. The rule should not apply as it cannot be achieved and is impractical for long sections.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.140	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT strongly opposes this submission, 40 Marsden Road adjoins highly significant historic heritage places, the Church of St Paul and the Henry Williams Memorial which are listed on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero and scheduled in the district plan (SCHED2: scheduled Heritage Resource #89).	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS400.024	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
S127.001	Lynley Newport	HA-S1	Oppose	There is no resource management-based justification for the 75m setback. This has no relevance to heritage values being protected. The overlay area displays numerous buildings already within the 75m. To require consent for additions and alterations to buildings already closer than 75m is restrictive and considerable over-reach of powers.	Delete the reference to Te Waimate Heritage Overlay from Standard HA-S1.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
FS51.146	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT supports the recognition and protection Te Waimate and considers it inappropriate for HA-S1 not to apply to the Te Waimate Heritage Area. Under HNZPT's primary submission (409) it is sought that further protection is required of the Area's historic pastoral farming landscape, being first established in New Zealand at Te Waimate.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.10 Key Issue 19: HA-S1 – Setback from a Scheduled Heritage Resource
S23.001	Trent Simpkin	HA-S2	Support in part	Use of 'and' between colour charts infers that the colour needs to be from all of the colour charts. A better explanation of what colours can be used is required.	Amend the standard to clarify if the colour has to be from one of these colour charts, or a colour that is within all of them.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S173.001	Tristan Simpkin	HA-S2	Support in part	Brand names should not be used in the district plan i.e. Resene. Consideration needs to be given for Dulux and other paint suppliers who have the same or similar colors. There also needs to be provision made in this rule for unpainted materials - i.e. timber, concrete, steel etc, which often have clear coatings or stain.	Amend standard to de-brand the paint colours within the standard, and allow for use of raw materials, unpainted.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS29.14	Trent Simpkin		Support	Brand names shouldn't be used in a district plan. I agree with this amendment.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS275.41	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - the point is well made - the territorial authority ought not to regulate in favor of any particular brand of service or product where such is available in a competitive market.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS51.148	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the standards for the Heritage Areas. While HNZPT considers the standard does not necessitate the application of Resene paints only with the use of the word "equivalent" in Standard HA-S2 there is merit in considering the rewording of the standard to de-brand but retain the appropriate colour range to be applied. However, HNZPT is concerned with how the provision of other materials would be suitable. This should be determined as a matter of discretion.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
S33.001	Trent Simpkin	HA-S2	Support in part	Brand names should not be used in the district plan i.e. Resene. Consideration needs to be given for Dulux and other paint suppliers who have the same or	Amend standard to de-brand the paint colours within the standard, and allow for use of raw materials, unpainted.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				similar colors. There also needs to be provision made in this rule for unpainted materials - i.e. timber, concrete, steel etc, which often have clear coatings or stain.				
FS275.40	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - the point is well made - the territorial authority ought not to regulate in favor of any particular brand of service or product where such is available in a competitive market.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS51.142	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the standards for the Heritage Areas. While HNZPT considers the standard does not necessitate the application of Resene paints only with the use of the of the word "equivalent" in Standard HA-S2 there is merit in considering the rewording of the standard to de-brand but retain the appropriate colour range to be applied. However, HNZPT is concerned with how the provision of other materials would be suitable. This should be determined as a matter of discretion.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
S277.015	Alec Jack	HA-S2	Oppose	I oppose the imposition of standards restricting the colour of the exterior facades of all buildings or structures. There are no heritage buildings on our land - all would be considered modern and so restrictions on colours is over reaching the intention to preserve heritage.	Amend Standard HA-S2 so that it does not apply to Pouerua Heritage Area.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS275.42	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - except to extend the submitter's amendment to include an exclusion for the Mangonui - Rangitoto	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Heritage Area Part B. The point is well made - the territorial authority ought not to regulate in favor of any particular brand of service or product where such is available in a competitive market.				
FS51.167	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the exclusion of the Pouerua Heritage Area from Standard HA-S2.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
S283.007	Trent Simpkin	HA-S2	Oppose	Heritage colors are strictly painted, and need option for natural finishes. Submitter opposes this rule for three reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) it needs to allow for natural finishes i.e. timber, concrete etc, not just colors 2) the brand name 'Resene' should not be used, it should be generic 3) it does not allow for Colorsteel colors i.e. pre painted steel roofs etc which are often used on heritage buildings. 	Amend standard to read ' if the exterior surface is painted , it must have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard they must be finished in accordance with the colour scheme from the following paint ranges or equivalent...' (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS275.43	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS51.168	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT consider there is merit in clarifying when painting is required, however, there is concern over the proposed wording as it could be interpreted that an exterior could be left unpainted, while that would not be in accordance with the character of the place.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS570.821	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.835	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS569.857	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
S570.004	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HA-S2	Support in part	The plan provisions as notified promulgate an inconsistent set of rules with regards to the Heritage Colours standard HA-S2.	Amend HA-S2 to improve consistency and clarity of its application across the chapter and to only apply the standard to heritage areas where such a control is justified.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS354.098	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	The submitter seeks that the standard for heritage colours only apply to heritage areas where such a control is justified. Also they should not apply where a building or structure is unpainted.	Allow in part	Allow S570.004 and amend the requirement for painting buildings in heritage colours where specifically justified.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
FS348.246	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.11 Key Issue 20: HA-S2 – Heritage Colours
S421.108	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-S3	Support	Federate Farmers supports the use of the accidental discovery as set out in this standard.	Retain Standard HA-S3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS51.74	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HA-S3 as notified.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1340	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS346.342	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS566.1354	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
FS569.1376	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.9 Key Issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions and HA-S3
S421.089	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Kerikeri	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as	Amend the Overview to the Kerikeri Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>				
FS51.56	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS354.0100	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the Overview to the Kerikeri Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment. This is</p>	Allow	Allow S421.089	Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				supported as rural production activities are important to the Far North economy.				and general submissions
FS570.1321	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.323	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1335	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1357	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.045	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Kerikeri	Support in part	<p>Kerikeri Heritage Precinct (Heritage Character Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access via Landing Road needs to be treated as the entrance to the heritage area and reflected through building restrictions on height, colours, non- reflective building materials, shape and design elements. 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Kerikeri Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The rules should encourage native vegetative planting as means to lessen the visual amenity impact of buildings on the heritage area. - The heritage area should be extended to include the Kerikeri Inlet as this is the original gateway to Kororipo Pa and Town Basin. The visual view shaft needs protection. - It is important that the ridgelines form the boundary of the inner heritage area to prevent inappropriate development that will impact on the Town Basin area. 				
FS354.099	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There needs to be provision for rural production in the heritage overlays - including Kerikeri.	Disallow	Disallow S409.045 unless adequate provision made for rural production activities as permitted activities in the overlay.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1220	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.075	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1234	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1256	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay
S421.090	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Kohukohu	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>	Amend the Overview to the Kohukohu Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS51.57	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover. However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)				
FS570.1322	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.324	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1336	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1358	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.046	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Kohukohu	Support	We are supportive of the retention of the existing Kohukohu Heritage Area boundary as proposed.	Retain the Kohukohu Heritage Area		Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1221	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.076	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1235	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1257	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
S421.091	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Kororāreka Russell	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers	Amend the Overview to the Kororareka Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouterua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>				
FS51.58	Heritage New Zealand Pouterua Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1323	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.325	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1337	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1359	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.034	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Kororāreka Russell	Support in part	Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and surrounds - it is extremely evident that the proposed heritage area will not protect Russell Peninsula from adverse and detrimental development. There are already examples of building development that is completely out of character and scale in the area. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga requests the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the heritage area be considered when standing upon Te Maiki (Flagstaff Hill). From this vantage point one can see 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>across Kororareka towards Waikare Inlet, eastward out to Motorua Island, northward to the Black Rocks and west towards Waitangi and Paihia. These views hafts need to be protected and conserved from inappropriate development especially those on ridgelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pa sites need to be included in the Heritage Area. There is a rich history associated with pa sites. - We advocate a separate heritage layer for the entrance to the Russell Peninsula starting from the Russell Whakaparara Road intersection. This area is to provide a visual protection from further adverse development, including promotion of native visual buffer planting. Russell is situated on a peninsula and the plan needs to take into account the special character of this peninsula. - In addition to the boundary defined within the draft plan, we request that a further planning layer be applied to the east and north for the balance of the peninsula that will prevent development on the ridgelines, restrict exterior colours to the heritage colour palate and control reflectivity. This is to include Long Beach and the area behind. It is essential that development is considered from when viewed not only from land but also from the Bay. 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				- The planning controls in the draft district plan need to ensure that the viewshafts remain.				
FS372.009	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The submission is supported for the reasons given in the submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1209	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.064	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1223	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1245	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
S421.092	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers	Amend the Overview to the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouterua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>				
FS51.59	Heritage New Zealand Pouterua Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS275.44	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS570.1324	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.326	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1338	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1360	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S513.001	RHL and LM Ferguson Family Trust	Heritage Overlay - Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula	Oppose	All of the Rangitoto Peninsula ('RP') (i.e. land on the eastern side of the Mangōnui Harbour to the west of the Hihi urban area and including Butler Point) is proposed to be subject to the 'Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area ('MRPHA') - Part B	Delete the Heritage Area overlay from the Rangitoto Peninsula except for the land directly associated with and/or proximal to listed Heritage Resources. At this time the only listed Heritage Resource on the RP is 'Butler House' that is historically significant in large part due to the whaling ship		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Overlay'. We consider it inappropriate and non-compliant with the RMA as well as contrary to the principles of fair and equitable regulatory practice to extend the RPHAB over the whole of the RP for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The rationale for, and the areal extent of, the RPHAB was based on inadequate and incomplete expert evidence and analysis. 2. The boundaries for the RPHAB do not adhere to any self-consistent logic. 3. The Ferguson Family Trust, having restored and maintained Butler House for over 50 years, and opened it to the public, has already voluntarily entered a formal agreement with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga. This places strict caveats on all aspects of the maintenance and development of Allot 1 Sec 2 Village of Mangōnui on which the Butler House is sited, as well as Allot 4 Sec 2 Village of Mangōnui. <p>Thus, a further Heritage Area overlay over these historical sites is actually unnecessary as the sites are already protected.</p> <p>Although we do not see the point of a Heritage Area overlay complicating an already protected area, we are prepared to agree to this with respect to Lot 2,4,5,6,7,8 & 10 Section 2 Village of Mangōnui; Lot 1 Section 2 Village of Mangōnui; Lot 9 Section 2 Village of Mangōnui; All the land in Crown Grant 57H (H.1.37); Allotment 67 Parish of Mangōnui East ... as this is entirely consistent with the vision our</p>	provisioning enterprise that Captain William Butler conducted in the mid-19th Century. The land that this resource and that enterprise is on, or directly relates to, is Lots 1 and 2 of Section 2 Village of Mangōnui (Marchant Road, Hihi) and no other parts of the Rangitoto Peninsula .		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>family has had for conserving these sites ever since we acquired the property in 1970.</p> <p>We do object strenuously to an extension of the heritage area over all of the rest of our property, Part Allotment 2 Parish of Mangōnui East and Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 48582 that have no historical significance with regard to colonial history, and have no documented Maori sites.</p> <p>The Section 32 Heritage assessment did not evaluate, as it is required to do by the RMA, the impact of arbitrarily imposing Heritage Area overlays over large tracts of land with regard to the wider benefits and costs. This must include recognition of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions. Retaining the potential to develop areas of our property that have no heritage significance will be a necessary requirement to maintain the financial viability of our internationally significant tourist operation.</p> <p>Thus, a very real social, economic and cultural consequence of this draconian overreach by the Far North District Council would be closure of Butler Point to the General Public.</p>				
FS275.45	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. The Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Part B sector outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic -	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				respecting the Rangitoto Peninsula, only the sites listed in the Schedule of Historic Sites (Schedule 2 Appendix 3) and their immediate appurtenant land should be so designated.				
FS51.214	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S409.047	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula	Support in part	<p>Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area –</p> <p>We are supportive of the proposed heritage areas insofar as the extent of the proposed boundaries for Manganui and Rangitoto Peninsula/Butler Point Area, however we consider that the boundary needs to be extended to include the entire harbour and associated adjacent ridge line perimeter. Our comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reason that both Maori and Europeans settled at Manganui and Rangitoto was because of the harbour itself. It provided shelter, ki moana, and was a gateway and stepping location for departures back to the Pacific and Hawaii and for trading. The entire harbour was utilised as evidenced by the recorded archaeology associated with Paewhenua Island, that included flaking floors, flax industry, and mill etc. - A number of pa sites including at Rangikapiti, Rangitoto, Taemaro Road (P04/70) and others are located at the entrance to and 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>surrounding the harbour. Vistas to and from these pa sites need protection, including a prohibition on plantation planting on the pa sites - (P04/70) contains a pine plantation. These pa sites clearly demonstrate the spread of pre-European occupation around the perimeter of Manganui Harbour. These pa sites are related visually and through whakapapa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important that the open areas of Butlers Point are protected from any further building development. This land is a backdrop to Mangonui Township and Rangitoto Pa. That area also contains a significant number of recorded archaeological sites. - Heritage New Zealand requests that the proposed heritage areas be progressed, but with additional sublayer comprising the balance of the harbour area up to the perimeter ridgeline. <p>Controls need to be sufficiently assertive to prevent development upon the ridgelines, or protruding above the ridgelines, and adoption of recessive colours and non-reflective building materials in the sub-area. By doing so the landscape character of the harbour will be retained.</p>				
FS570.1222	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.077	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1236	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1258	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S421.093	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Paihia	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for. We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The	Amend the Overview to the Paihia Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.				
FS51.60	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS570.1325	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.327	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1339	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1361	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S565.001	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Heritage Overlay - Paihia	Oppose	The PDP approach associated with the Paihia Heritage Areas A and B is not supported. The analysis that underpins the PDP approach is broad in nature and has not been undertaken on a site by site basis to verify and confirm that each site has the values considered worthy of identification and protection. If Council is to impose the blanket identification of the areas, there must be more appropriate site by site analysis and assessment undertaken to confirm the heritage values sought to be protected. Development has been undertaken in accordance with the Operative District Plan in relation to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area which went through a lengthy plan change process and considered the area and surrounds in far greater detail than the PDP. Council's s32 report suggests that there is no technical evidence to support the existing spatial extent for the Paihia Mission Heritage Area.	Amend the proposed Paihia Heritage Areas A and B and their provisions and revert back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.221	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of the Paihia Heritage Area overlay.				
FS348.217	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA.	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S409.035	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Paihia	Support in part	<p>Paihia Heritage Area - It should be noted that in the Paihia Cemetery in the rear yard of the Church of Paul and Henry Williams contains Maori burials. This is not referenced in the archaeologist's report.</p> <p>We support the recommendation of the consultant archaeologists for the inclusion of the Waitangi Islands - Motu o Rangī, Motuarahi, Motu Maire and Kuia Rongouru / Taylor Island because of their historical, contextual and spatial relationship. They are of significance to iwi and are listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga as wahi tapu. The heritage area should also include the Paihia Village Green scenic reserve, and the historic library at 2 Williams Road.</p> <p>There needs to be development restrictions on the entire ridge (behind the Church) that overlooks the Bay. This is a prominent ridge that contains Pa, archaeology and other artifacts. It is the backdrop for the town and provides a visual escapement from the bay encapsulating the town.</p> <p>An additional sub area is recommended for the area south of the river Te Haumai to include the settlement of Tohitapu as also suggested by Plan Heritage Limited.</p>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Paihia Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1210	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.065	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1224	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1246	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S421.094	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Pouerua	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for. We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond	Amend the Overview to the Pouerua Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.				
FS24.11	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed, but also have concerns about the size / extent of Pouerua and Waimate North heritage layers as now mapped - impacts on a lot of rural production land.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS51.61	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support in part	The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places. HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover. However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA) .	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS354.102	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend the Overview to the Pouerua Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment. This is supported as rural production activities	Allow	Allow S421.094	Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				are important to the Far North economy.				
FS570.1326	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.328	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1340	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1362	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.039	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Pouerua	Support in part	Pouerua Historic Heritage Area – - The proposed heritage area is a significant expansion on the current area, but that expansion is generally in a southern direction towards Moerewa that encompasses only a few recorded archaeological sites, inclusive of a pa site, but otherwise a landscape that does not appear to be of heritage value. The area does not contain	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Pouerua Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>any Stonefield sites and appears to be in modern pastoral farming. We would like to have clarification why this area is included in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundary as extended slightly to the north does include a significant cultural landscape containing various pa sites and stone structures. - It is evident that there needs to be a continuous connection between the proposed Pouerua Heritage Area through to State Highway 12 and north of State Highway 1 through to the proposed southern boundary of the proposed Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area. This would protect the foreground vista through to the ridge pa sites from State Highway 1. - The focus of this heritage area should be on the Maunga and the stone gardens with very strict controls. The balance area (proposed extension area) could be subject to less restrictive rules. The context of the area is that the volcanic soils have been the driver of the rich cultural landscape that includes, gardens, pa, kainga and early colonial buildings. 				
TFS354.101	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There needs to be provision for rural production in the heritage overlays - including Pouerua.	Disallow	Disallow S409.039 unless adequate provision made for rural production activities as permitted activities in the overlay.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1214	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.069	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1228	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1250	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
S421.095	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Rangihoua	Support in part	Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for. We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond	Amend the Overview to the Rangihoua Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.				
FS51.62	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS570.1327	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.329	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1341	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1363	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.036	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Rangihoua	Support	The extent of the Rangihoua Heritage Area is deemed to be appropriate.	Retain the Rangihoua Heritage Area		Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1211	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.066	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1225	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1247	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.2 Key Issue 2: Kohukohu Heritage Area Overlay and Rangihoua Heritage Area Overlay
S421.096	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Rāwene	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>	Amend the Overview to the Rawene Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.63	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places. HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover. However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA)	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS196.28	Joe Carr		Support	As per the submitter.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS570.1328	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS346.330	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS566.1342	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission.		Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1364	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S409.041	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Rāwene	Support in part	<p>Rawene Historic Heritage Area –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rawene township is situated at the northern end of a peninsula that leads into the Hokianga Harbour. Rawene's vehicle access is from Twin Coast Discovery Highway via State Highway 12 from the south and from Kohukohu to the north via the car ferry. Due to the prominent location of the township, it is visible from both the Hokianga Harbour and land. The township with its unique character, historic buildings, and rich history is a tourism destination on the Twin Coast Discovery Highway. Many local businesses cater for day travelers. - It seems that Plan Heritage Limited has defined the proposed heritage area boundary from "lots which fall within the early township that are distinctly different (earlier) subdivision form, and which are shown in historical aerial topography to have generally been developed by 1942". Unfortunately, that mapped area excludes some very important places. 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Rawene Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heritage New Zealand recommends that the proposed heritage area be expanded to include the Hokianga Health Enterprise Trust facility (hospital) - first free hospital service, the cemetery that contains the remains of ancestors (located diagonally opposite the hospital) and the Rawene Domain. In addition, adjacent to the camping ground contains a site of significance to Maori and needs to be incorporated into the heritage area. - A further sub area should include the entire peninsula and contain lesser rules that protect the entrance way view to the township by design, colour and shape and set back rules. - Furthermore, there needs to be restrictions the prevent development on the ridge line of the peninsula as the viewshafts need to be protected when looking to Rawene across the harbour. 				
FS570.1216	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.071	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1230	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1252	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
S421.097	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	Support in part	<p>Federated Farmers is concerned with the potential impacts of heritage area overlays and the restrictions the overlays will place over working farms in the Far North district. The farms in the district have been operating for many generations with the farmers proactively retaining the historic and cultural values that exist on the land. Federated Farmers supports the protection historical heritage as provided for by section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6 requires that the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is recognised and provided for.</p> <p>We have concerns that the heritage area overlays proposed go beyond what is provided for in the Act. The overlays for the areas of Pouerua and Te Waimate Heritage areas do not acknowledge and provide for the existing rural activities that are legally occurring in those areas. We would not consider these activities as being an inappropriate use or development given the substantial contribution they make to the economy at all levels.</p>	Amend the Overview to the Te Waimate Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS24.12	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed and concerned at the large area covered by the Te Waimate heritage area.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Overlay overview and general submissions
FS51.64	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	<p>The purpose of the Historic Heritage Area Overlays is to recognise and protect a physical geographical location comprising a significant interrelated historic heritage landscape of contextually related places.</p> <p>HNZPT is supportive of amending the general overview for all of the Heritage Areas to identify the mixture of activities that occur within these geographical locations, along with those anticipated through the underlying zones the overlays cover.</p> <p>However, it is not considered necessary to specify the established rural activities as those activities rely on existing use rights (S.10, RMA).</p>	Allow in part		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.3.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions</p>
FS354.104	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the Overview to the Te Waimate Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment. This is supported as rural production activities are important to the Far North economy.</p>	Allow	Allow S421.097	Reject	<p>Section 5.3.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions</p>
FS570.1329	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	<p>Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	<p>Section 5.3.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions</p>
FS346.331	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	<p>The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	<p>Section 5.3.2.1</p> <p>Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				and general submissions
FS566.1343	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS569.1365	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S73.001	Cinna Smith	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	Support in part	Welcome any measures to better protect the outstanding heritage values of Te Waimate and support the proposed change to the boundary area. However, the boundary area needs to be further extended to protect Te Waimate's open, pastoral vistas and other heritage landmarks that are currently excluded. The current draft does not adequately protect the landscape from undue development or change of land use. Unchecked development has ruined so much in Te Waimate in the past decade and the features that make Te Waimate unique and a taonga of national, and international, importance will soon be gone forever.	Amend the heritage overlay boundary as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encompass the valley north of the Mission Station (to the bush and ridge), including Courthouse Lane and as far as the school (near the intersection of Waimate North Road). - The farm/valley directly opposite the Mission on Te Ahu Ahu Road (formerly 'Cook's Farm') was the site of the first pastoral farm in New Zealand. This is clearly marked and recognised in the maps and illustrations of missionary settlers. This area is directly visible from the Mission and I believe that it should be included in the heritage area. - On the edge of this farm, opposite Te Waimate's historic church, is a cluster of ancient trees where local Maori left their tūpāpaku / dead. It is my understanding that this area is of great spiritual significance to Maori, yet it is not within the proposed heritage boundary. Again, this area is clearly marked in the maps of early missionaries as a "knoll and sacred grove." - Also near the Mission, Cook's Lane is the first road from Te Waimate to Kerikeri. It is narrow dirt lane, but is now being used by large, heavy trucks associated with the kiwifruit development. I believe that this road should be protected from heavy use such as this and included in the heritage area. 		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.144	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the amendment of the Te Waimate overlay boundaries. Noting that under HNZPT's primary submission (409) it is sought that	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				further protection is required of the Area's historic pastoral farming landscape, being first established in New Zealand at Te Waimate.				Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS444.001	John and Carroll Beachman		Support	We consider that the reasons set out in Ms Smith's submission are valid and worthy of consideration by the Council in its review of the Heritage Area.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S514.001	The General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	Oppose	The proposed inclusion of heritage protection for the Sunday School at the Church of St John the Baptist (Historic Site 117 being at 344 Te Ahu Ahu Road, Ohaeawai) is opposed. The Church is already included in the Historic Site overlay. As outlined in the Section 32 Evaluation Report for Historic Heritage and Heritage Areas, "there is no standard methodology or assessment criteria to identify significant heritage buildings" (page. 14). It is therefore considered that the current extent of the Heritage Overlay encapsulating the Church and excluding the Sunday School is sufficient to protect the heritage values of the site.	Delete the Te Waimate Heritage Area overlay from the Sunday School at 344 Te Ahu Ahu Road, Ohaeawai.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.215	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, specifically noting support for the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area overlay. HNZPT strongly disagrees with the requested decision as the Sunday School is within a deeply historic landscape that is reflected through the provision of the overlay. It is considered that while the Sunday School is both a scheduled Heritage Resource in the district plan (SCHED2,	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				#284) and Category 2 listed on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (#9925). It is also an important contributor to Te Waimate's unique heritage values, context, and landscape.				
S545.001	Heather Adams and Duncan Ross	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	Support in part	We strongly support the concept of protecting the unique heritage values, context and landscape of Te Waimate Heritage Area, however we believe that the proposed plan does not go far enough to protect the outstanding landscape and heritage values of the area. Heritage sites have been left out of the plan, such as Cooks Lane, Courthouse Lane and the second site of the flour mill. These sites reinforce the uniqueness of the area. we have grave concerns for what is left of the pastoral landscape, particularly the vista from the Mission House. Already much of the 'notable attempt by the missionaries to recreate an English pastoral landscape' has been recently destroyed, the removal of the hedge rows, trees, a huge amount of soil being moved about, and replaced with overwhelming horticultural development.	Amend the Te Waimate Heritage Area to extend it to include much more of the unique historic vista from the Mission House complex, Cooks Lane, Courthouse Lane, Whakataha Road, the second site of the flour mill.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.217	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. The proposed amendments have merit for consideration.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.027	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.053	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.017	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S409.043	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	Support in part	<p>Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed heritage area is an improvement on the current Heritage precinct however it still does not protect the landscape from undue development or change of land use. - Pastoral farming in New Zealand was first established at Te Waimate, including in the valley north of the Mission Station. This area is now under threat from horticultural farming practises that include structures associated with kiwi fruit and avocado orchards. The proposed heritage area excludes most of this valley. We request that the heritage area be extended to include the valley through to the top of the bush escarpment and ridge situated immediately north of the Mission Station. - We also recommend controls associated with the change of land use from pastoral farming to horticulture. Cropping need not be included. 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS354.103	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	There needs to be provision for rural production in the heritage overlays - including Te Waimate.	Disallow	Disallow S409.043 unless adequate provision made for rural production activities as permitted activities in the overlay.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1218	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.073	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1232	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1254	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S409.019	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Overview	Support in part	In the context of protecting historic heritage, the overall Section 6(f) RMA evaluation is not simply a matter of considering effects on listed historic heritage in a Plan but is broader and encompasses effects upon historic heritage generally in decision-making as such effects are part of the cumulative picture through consideration of the character and significance of the whole wide heritage area.	Amend paragraph 3 of the Historical heritage Overview as follows (or wording to this effect): While this chapter only has Rules for Scheduled heritage resources and dry stone walls of historic value that are not individually scheduled but are subject to blanket protection , consideration of non-scheduled resources can occur at the time of processing a resource consent, or when undertaking earthworks.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Historic heritage includes those items Scheduled by Council and heritage yet to be identified and/or assessed.</p> <p>Reference should also be made to the blanket protection of dry stone walls. It is noted that cultural landscapes are dealt with under the Heritage area overlays section of the PDP.</p> <p>However, the last paragraph is not proactive for scheduling purposes as was outlined in Appendix B of this submission for the Draft PDP.</p> <p>HNZPT considers that it is appropriate to proactively ensure that there is a systematic and on-going programme by council over time to review the Schedule with a view to assessing and scheduling more places and areas rather than what can become a 'one time only' upon Proposed Plan notification approach. Too much priority can also be placed upon additions to the HNZPT New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero.</p> <p>However, HNZPT do not have the same level of resources or capabilities for the district as the Council does.</p> <p>Mention of a heritage fund supports PDP HH-P9. Including ArchSite as an information layer within the GIS system can help identify when an archaeological authority may be required before undertaking any work.</p> <p>It supports HH-P8 and HH-P11.</p>	<p>Amend the last paragraph of the Historical heritage Overview as follows (or wording to this effect): Due to the scale of Historic Heritage within the District, it is not financially viable to identify all Heritage Resources, and for cultural reasons some resources should not be formally identified (e.g., urupa/burial grounds). Council will continue to where possible, work with other government agencies (e.g., Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga) tangata whenua and the public to identify valued Heritage Resources and schedule them in the District Plan. In identifying historic heritage for protection within the District, Council's emphasis is on historic heritage already listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; sites and areas of significance to Maori identified by iwi/hapu; and locally, regionally and potentially nationally significant items identified by Council as part of a staged programme in conjunction with the Northland Regional Council. However, Council also envisages this formal process being off-set by additional, more modern approaches to recording, relating and celebrating the stories and events of the past, including non-statutory methods such as a heritage fund, heritage trails and information plaques in accordance with the Arts, Culture and Heritage Strategy for Far North. Council will also include ArchSite, the online version of</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					the New Zealand Archaeological Association's Site recording Scheme, as an information Map Layer tool within the GIS system. This will help users to assess when an archaeological authority may be required from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, although not all sites will be identified on it as the District has not been systematically surveyed; there will be previously unknown sites; and many sites have not yet been 'ground truthed'.			
FS44.45	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Fully agree that FNDC should add Arch Site to its GIS platform and regularly update this. FNDC's current Historic maps layer is very outdated which had led to archaeological sites being missed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS570.1194	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS400.049	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS566.1208	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								the Historic Heritage Overview
FS569.1230	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S421.109	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Oppose	Federated Farmers is concerned that the Council is using regulatory methods as a means to manage historic heritage without the non-regulatory methods supporting in the background. Council needs to utilise more non-regulatory methods for managing historical heritage. Landowner engagement and education should be the first approach to the effective management of historic heritage rather than the Council relying on regulatory methods which will only work where there is damage and change to the historic heritage feature. As well, the overview needs to be consistent with the requirements of s6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6(f) requires the recognition and provision of the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Only inappropriate activities that could cause more than minor effects on heritage and cultural values should be managed. Existing use rights of lawfully established activities also need to be recognised and protected.	Amend the Overview so that it promotes the use of non-regulatory methods as well as ensuring that historic heritage will be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS51.75	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT supports the use of both regulatory and non-regulatory methods for the protection of historic heritage. Nevertheless, as historic heritage is of	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				national importance, it is necessary to ensure regulatory methods are applied to achieve Part 2 of the RMA. Accordingly, non-regulatory methods cannot be the first approach, however, should be promoted to provide the support necessary for the retention and protection of historic heritage via education, funding etc.				the Historic Heritage Overview
FS354.105	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend the Overview so that it promotes the use of non-regulatory methods as well as ensuring that historic heritage will be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. HortNZ supports this approach.	Allow	Allow S421.109	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS570.1341	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS346.343	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS566.1355	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS569.1377	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21:

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission.		Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S409.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Objectives	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga."</p> <p>HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.</p>	Retain the historic heritage objectives		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS570.1177	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS400.032	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS566.1191	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.2

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission.		Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS569.1213	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
S409.020	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Objectives	Support in part	HNZPT supports the Historic Heritage Objectives where they are consistent with the HNZPT non-statutory Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series: Guide to the Management of Historic Heritage: District Plans (April 2022) recommended Objectives. HNZPT is concerned about the protection of Dry Stone Walls. There are a number of locations in the district where historic (pre-1900) stone walls are prevalent. A specific Objective to recognise their importance would be appropriate.	Retain the objectives and insert a new objective as follows (or words to this effect): HH-04 Dry stone walls of historic, cultural, amenity and landscape value to the community are maintained and protected throughout the district.		Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS570.1195	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS400.050	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1209	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS569.1231	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S421.110	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-O1	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives HH-O1 and HH-O3 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Objective HH-O1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS570.1342	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS346.344	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS566.1356	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS569.1378	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S421.112	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-O2	Support in part	In respect of objective HH-O2, Federated Farmers requests that the objective is amended to be consistent with s6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991. This will ensure that recognition is made in the objectives to only capture what is considered to be inappropriate subdivision, use and development for that specific heritage area.	Amend Objective HH-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision does not result in the loss or degradation of Heritage Resources. Historic heritage is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in the district. or wording with similar intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS24.13	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS51.76	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-O2 as notified.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS534.015	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	The notified drafting of this objective suggests that any loss or degradation of a heritage resource is to be avoided - regardless of the severity of the adverse effect or the merits of the proposal generating the effect. WBFL agrees that s6(f) RMA is more circumspect and does not require all effects to be avoided. Policies HH-P2 and HH-P3 contemplate effects on historic heritage, so alignment of the objective is desirable.	Allow	Amend to be consistent with s6(f) of the RMA.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS570.1344	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS346.346	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS566.1358	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS569.1380	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
S421.111	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-O3	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives HH-O1 and HH-O3 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Objective HH-O3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS570.1343	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS346.345	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS566.1357	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives
FS569.1379	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.2 Key Issue 22: Historic Heritage Objectives

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S399.053	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	Policies	Not Stated	<p>The historical and cultural values policies do not provide for accidental discovery of artefacts or kōiwi (human remains) that are not the result of earthworks.</p> <p>The policies do not provide for the repatriation of taonga to tangata whenua as an automatic requirement of resource consents. This has led to the loss of taonga in the past.</p>	<p>Insert a new policy as follows:</p> <p>HH-P17 Require activities adjacent to or affecting sites of significance to Māori and/or archaeological sites identified in a iwi/hapū management plan or where there is reasonable cause to suspect there is an archaeological site to demonstrate the activity is having appropriate regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the outcomes of consultation with tangata whenua including the affected hapū and relevant iwi authority; b) any management set out in an iwi/hapū management plan; c) any assessments or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological expert; and d) the outcomes of consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and the Department of Conservation. 		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS143.69	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The submission seeks that activities adjacent Areas of Interest in iwi/hapū management plans be assessed against certain matters. This provision is too broadly cast with reference to adjacency lacking the specificity required in a policy with potentially wide reaching impact which will not efficiently nor effectively protect sites of significance to tangata whenua.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS51.276	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the need for activities on adjoining sites of scheduled historic heritage and SASM sites, as well as those where there is reasonable cause	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				to suspect unrecorded materials / features obtain appropriate expert advice/direction.				Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S399.052	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	Policies	Not Stated	<p>The historical and cultural values policies do not provide for accidental discovery of artefacts or kōiwi (human remains) that are not the result of earthworks.</p> <p>The policies do not provide for the repatriation of taonga to tangata whenua as an automatic requirement of resource consents. This has led to the loss of taonga in the past.</p>	<p>Insert a new policy as follows:</p> <p>HH-P16 Require a protocol for accidental discovery of artefacts or kōiwi (human remains) which is consistent with any relevant iwi/hapū management plan(s) as a condition of consent for all works requiring land use consent.</p>		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.3.3.3</p> <p>Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies</p>
FS51.275	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT supports referencing of the Accidental Discovery Protocol; standard HA-S3 could be reproduced for the Historic Heritage section.	Allow in part		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.3.3.3</p> <p>Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies</p>
S409.003	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Policies	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga."</p> <p>HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.</p>	Retain the historic heritage policies.		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.3.3.3</p> <p>Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1178	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS400.033	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1192	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1214	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S409.024	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Policies	Support in part	A specific policy to recognise the importance of Dry Stone Walls would be appropriate.	Insert new policy HH-P16 as follows (or words to that effect): HH-P16 Protect dry stone walls of historical, cultural and amenity value to the community through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Blanket protection of dry stone walls throughout the District. Providing information and advice to the public, including Geographic Information Systems information on the location of protected dry stone walls. Discouraging planting close to dry stone walls. 		Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					<p>d. Encouraging proactive and appropriate maintenance.</p> <p>e. Recommending consultation with Heritage New Zealand where dry stone walls are estimated to have been constructed prior to 1900 or their age is in doubt.</p> <p>f. Limiting works affecting existing dry-stone walls, other than:</p> <p>a. Repairs or maintenance in situ using traditional methods, design and materials.</p> <p>b. Removal of up to 6m length of wall for access purposes only, where no alternative access exists.</p>			
FS570.1199	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS400.054	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions\.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS566.1213	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								the Historic Heritage Overview
FS569.1235	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S421.113	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1345	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.347	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1359	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1381	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.124	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P2	Support in part	Federated Farmers has concerns over the proposed wording of Policy HH-P2 as it inconsistent with s6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6(f) requires the recognition	Amend point a. of Policy HH-P2 as follows: a. Avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use, and development significant adverse		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and provision for the protection of the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. The policy as written does not reflect this.	effects and avoiding, remedying or mitigating any other adverse effects on the recognised heritage values of scheduled Heritage Resources or wording with similar intent.			
FS51.77	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-P2 as notified.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1356	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.358	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1370	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1392	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.114	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P3	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1346	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.348	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1360	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1382	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.115	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P4	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1347	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.349	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1361	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1383	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S409.021	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-P5	Support in part	Notwithstanding the scope of the proposed activity status to consider potential effects and involvement by HNZPT as an affected party, Policy HH-P5 should reference the need for the involvement of a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional.	Amend subsection a. of Policy HH-P5 as follows (or words to that effect): a. The demolition or destruction is only part of the scheduled Heritage resource and it is demonstrated by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional that the part to be demolished or destroyed does not detract from the Heritage Resources values; or		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS548.123	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers understands the need for the preservation of historic heritage. The blanket protection of historic heritage is inappropriate as it will be overly restrictive on existing, lawfully established activities such as farming.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1196	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS400.051	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Heritage Area and associated provisions.				
FS566.1210	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1232	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.116	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P5	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1348	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.350	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1362	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1384	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.125	Northland Federated	HH-P6	Support in part	In respect of policy HH-P6, the policy should be amended so that it	Insert a new point f. within Policy HH-P6 that recognises that in some		Reject	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Farmers of New Zealand			recognises that positive benefits can result in some circumstances from relocating certain historic heritage sites. For example, relocating a site out of an extreme flood hazard area to enable its on-going protection.	circumstances there may be positive benefits from the relocation of certain historic heritage sites.			Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS51.78	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT highlights the ICOMOS NZ Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value 2010 provides a set of principles to guide the conservation of places of historic heritage in New Zealand. The Charter states that the on-going associate of a structure with its location is essential to maintain authenticity and integrity. However, HNZPT does recognise that in exceptions circumstances relocation may be acceptable if the structure is in imminent danger. This should be considered case-by-case and it is considered that HH-P6 e. adequately addresses the need for relocation.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1357	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.359	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1371	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1393	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.117	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P7	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P7 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1349	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.351	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1363	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1385	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.126	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P8	Support in part	Policy HH-P8 needs to be amended to so that the requirement to demonstrate the protection of the heritage resource is removed. The need to demonstrate is not necessary as the policy requires the heritage resource to be protected after regard is had to the matters listed.	Amend Policy HH-P8 (inferred) as follows: Allow earthworks in proximity to scheduled Heritage Resources only where it can be demonstrated that its heritage values will be protected, having regard to the ... or wording with similar intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.79	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-P8 as notified.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1358	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.360	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1372	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1394	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S409.022	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-P8	Support in part	Policies HH-P8 and HH-P11 rely in part upon Standard EW-S3 Standard Accidental Discovery protocol for earthworks that triggers engagement with HNZPT and confirmation of the need or otherwise for an archaeological authority that will require an assessment. Mention of consultation with HNZPT generally would be useful and consistent with its inclusion in Policies HH-P11 and HH-P15.	Amend subsections d, e and f of Policy HH-P8 as follows (or words to that effect): d. avoidance of archaeological sites; and e. need for small-scale earthworks for burials within an existing cemetery or for landscaping within historic heritage sites and places; and f. any consultation undertaken with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1197	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS400.052	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1211	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1233	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S399.048	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	HH-P9	Not Stated	Mātauranga Māori and waahi are misspelled in the policy.	Amend point d. of Policy HH-P9 to include macrons as follows: d) encouraging mātauranga māori, tikanga and kaitiakitanga to manage and maintain wāhi taonga		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.118	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P9	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P9 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1350	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS346.352	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1364	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1386	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.119	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P10	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P10 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1351	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.353	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1365	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1387	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S399.050	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	HH-P11	Not Stated	Policy HH-P11 does not recognise iwi/hapū management plans in land and subdivision activities.	Amend point a. of Policy HH-P11 as follows: a. the outcomes of any consultation undertaken with tangata whenua, any relevant iwi/hapū management plan and the need to undertake a Cultural Impact Assessment;		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.127	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P11	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support policy HH-P11 as it is currently written. The policy, through the use of the term 'reasonable cause' introduces significant uncertainty for applicants as it is not clear what the term is intended to mean and how it is to be determined and by whom. It also has the potential to increase the time, costs and resources required by an applicant.	Delete Policy HH-P11, or if that relief is not accepted, amend as follows: Protect archaeological sites where there is a reasonable cause to suspect they are present , by ensuring land and subdivision activities have regard to: ... or wording with similar intent.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS24.14	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree that as worded this policy creates uncertainty	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS51.80	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-P11 as notified.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1359	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.361	Royal Forest and Bird		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1373	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1395	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.120	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P11	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P11 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1352	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.354	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1366	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1388	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S454.077	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	HH-P12	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP.	Retain Policy HH-P12		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS51.175	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Policy HH-P12	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.121	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P12	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P12 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1353	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.355	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1367	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1389	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S454.078	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	HH-P13	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this policy in the FNPDP.	Retain Policy HH-P13		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS51.176	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support	HNZPT also supports the retention of Policy HH-P13	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S409.023	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-P13	Support in part	Policy HH-P13 should explicitly reference the need for the involvement of a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional.	Amend subsection d. of Policy HH-P13 as follows (or words to that effect): d. the adverse effects on the heritage values of the scheduled Heritage Resource or Heritage Overlay are minimised when assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage professional.		Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1198	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS400.053	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1212	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1234	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission.		Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.122	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P13	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P13 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1354	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.356	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1368	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1390	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.123	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P14	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies HH-P1, HH-P3, HH-P4, HH-P5, HH-P7, HH-P9, HH-P10, HH-P11, HH-P12, HH-P13 and HH-P14 as currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy HH-P14 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS534.016	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	The word "Only" in the phrase "Only allow subdivision of sites that contain a scheduled Heritage Resource where it can be demonstrated that: [...]" in HH-P14 signifies that the subdivision of	Disallow in part	Disallow in part the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>sites containing a scheduled heritage resource will be prohibited if the subclauses of HH-P14 are not met.</p> <p>However, Policy HH-P15 and Rules HH-R8 to HH-R10, provide consenting pathways for activities with adverse effects on a scheduled heritage site - i.e., it is possible for proposals that do not comply with HH-P14 to be consented. As such the HH-P14 direction to "Only allow..." appears misaligned with HH-P15 as well as the rules. In WBFL's view, the HH-P14 chapeau could be deleted, and the sub-clauses could be merged into HH-P15, which provides guidance on effects management measures to be considered.</p>				
FS570.1355	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.357	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1369	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1391	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S399.051	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	HH-P15	Support	Point o. of Policy HH-P15 recognises iwi/hapū management plans.	Retain point o. of Policy HH-P15	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S486.076	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	HH-P15	Oppose	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa considers loss and degradation of heritage resources includes the loss of access to these resources. We seek clarity on how Council proposes to provide access/legal right/physical access for tāngata whenua to their heritage, sites of significance and the like to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.	Amend Policy HH-P15 by inserting a new paragraph: q. opportunities to create access (by rights of way or other methods) for tāngata whenua to their sites of significance, to enable them to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S390.062	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	HH-P15	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy HH-P15 and considers loss and degradation of heritage resources includes the loss of access to these resources. Clarity is sought on how Council proposes to provide access/legal right/physical access for tāngata whenua to their heritage, sites of significance and the like to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.	Amend policy HH-P15 by adding a new clause as follows: q. opportunities to create access (by rights of way or other methods) for tangata whenua to their sites of significance, to enable them to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S421.128	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-P15	Support in part	In respect of policy HH-P15, Federated Farmers is concerned over the intent of the policy which appears to be inconsistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. We seek the amendment of the policy to be consistent with the requirements of the Act.	Amend Policy HH-P15 as follows: Manage land use, development and subdivision involving a scheduled heritage resource to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the particular heritage values of the scheduled Heritage Resource and its significance the subdivision, land	Reject	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					use or development is not inappropriate for the environment is it located in ... or wording with similar intent.			
FS51.81	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-P15 as notified. HNZPT considers the addition of the word 'development' provides clarity with s.6(f), RMA. HNZPT does not support the deletion and proposed new text. Each of the scheduled heritage resources have been identified because of their particular heritage values and those must be considered as part of a resource consent application to determine if the subdivision, land, or development is inappropriate.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS570.1360	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS346.362	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS566.1374	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS569.1396	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept	Section 5.3.3.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						inconsistent with our original submission.		Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S498.063	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	HH-P15	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy HH-P15 and considers loss and degradation of heritage resources includes the loss of access to these resources. Clarity is sought on how Council proposes to provide access/legal right/physical access for tāngata whenua to their heritage, sites of significance and the like to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.	Amend policy HH-P15 by adding a new clause as follows: q. opportunities to create access (by rights of way or other methods) for tangata whenua to their sites of significance, to enable them to maintain and carry out their cultural processes and procedures for current and future generations.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS151.108	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
FS23.231	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.3 Key Issue 23: Historic Heritage Policies
S409.004	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Rules	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to	Retain the historic heritage rules		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.				
FS570.1179	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.034	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1193	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1215	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S409.029	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Rules	Support in part	Rules to recognise the importance of dry stone walls would be appropriate.	Insert a new rule as follows: HH-RXXX Maintenance and repair of Existing Dry Stone Walls All zones Outside of Heritage Area overlays Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Works to existing dry stone walls are to:		Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					i. Maintenance or repair works in situ using traditional methods, design and materials. ii. Removal of up to a total of 6m length of wall per site for access purposes only, where no alternative access exists. Activity status where compliance not achieved - Refer to Rule HH-R2.			
FS570.1204	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS400.059	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS566.1218	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS569.1240	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S502.028	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HH-R1	Support in part	There are times where a fence, or deck which is part of a Heritage Building may be repaired and as part of this it may not be painted, rather it may be left as a natural product or stained. We seek to add in 'if painted' to cover this particular scenario.	Amend HH-R1 PER-1 The exterior facades of all buildings or structures where the existing colour scheme is to be changed, must if painted be finished in accordance with the colour scheme from the following paint ranges or equivalent: i. Resene heritage colours; ii. Resene whites and neutrals; iii. Resene colour range BS5252 (A01-C40 range).		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS51.1	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT consider there is merit in clarifying when painting is required. However, there is concern over the proposed wording. It could be interpreted as permitting the exterior to be left unpainted when that would not be in accordance with the character of the place.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S503.026	Waitangi Limited	HH-R1	Not Stated	There are times where a fence, or deck which is part of a Heritage Building may be repaired and as part of this it may not be painted, rather it may be left as a natural product or stained. We seek to add in 'if painted' to cover this particular scenario.	Amend PER-1 of Rule HH-R1 as follows: The exterior facades of all buildings or structures where the existing colour scheme is to be changed, must if painted be finished in accordance with the colour scheme from the following paint ranges or equivalent...		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS51.11	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT consider there is merit in clarifying when painting is required, however, there is concern over the proposed wording that may imply an exterior could be left unpainted when that would not be in accordance with the character of the place.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S409.025	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-R2	Support in part	The restricted discretionary wording for Rule HH-R2 should reference reversibility and the content of any conservation plan.	Amend Rule HH-R2 to include the following (or words to that effect): Matters of discretion are restricted to: xxx. The extent to which any changes are consistent with a relevant Conservation Plan informed by the /COMOS New Zealand Charter 2010. xxx. The extent to which the changes are reversible.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS570.1200	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.055	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1214	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1236	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S409.026	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-R3	Support in part	The matters over which control is reserved in Rule HH-R3 should refer to the reversibility of what is proposed.	Amend subsection a of Rule HH-R3 as follows (or words to that effect): a. Methodologies used to protect and maintain heritage values, including reversibility and integration with other scheduled Heritage		Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					Resources on the site or surrounding area;			
FS570.1201	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.056	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1215	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1237	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S502.029	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HH-R4	Support in part	The relevant authorizing authority or authorities will be able to determine if any adverse effects will be created on the scheduled heritage resource, such that if written approval is received from such authorities, application through the resource consenting process should not be required. At times there will be very minor structures which will be placed on a site within 20m of a heritage building which will have no adverse impacts. Where this is the case, an option should be made available such that with the approval of the relevant party no consent is required. Obtaining approval from the	Amend HH-R4 PER-1 Any new buildings or structures, additions or alterations are setback a minimum of 20m from a scheduled Heritage Resource unless written approval has been received by the relevant authorising authority or authorities (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Department of Conservation and Tangata Whenua).		Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				relevant party will ensure that the pertinent issues within the matters of discretion listed within this rule are adhered to.				
FS51.2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports this approach; obtaining approval from the relevant authorising authority/ies will ensure consideration of the potential for adverse effects on heritage values will then be managed through that engagement.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S503.027	Waitangi Limited	HH-R4	Not Stated	Heritage New Zealand will be able to determine if any adverse effects will be created on the scheduled heritage resource, such that if written approval is received from them an application through the resource consenting process should not be required. Similar to the examples above, at times there will be very minor structures which will be placed on a site within 20m of a heritage building which will have no adverse impacts. Where this is the case, an option should be made available such that with the approval of the relevant party no consent is required. Obtaining approval from the relevant party will ensure that the pertinent issues within the matters of discretion listed within this rule are adhered to.	Amend Rule HH-R4 as follows: Any new buildings or structures, additions or alterations are setback a minimum of 20m from a scheduled Heritage Resource with the exception of the Waitangi Estate where written approval has been received by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.		Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS51.12	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT would be supportive of this approach if it related only to the Waitangi Treaty Grounds. HNZPT understands the Waitangi Estate incorporates the landholdings that surround the Treaty Grounds. obtaining approval from HNZPT would ensure the relevant consideration of the potential for adverse effects on	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				heritage values could be managed through that engagement.				
S409.027	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-R4	Support in part	The HNZPT non-statutory Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series: Guide to the Management of Historic Heritage: District Plans (April 2022) recommends restricted discretionary activity status for new structures within scheduled sites. While this is the case in the PDP for sites within Heritage area overlays, PDP Rule HH-R4 is problematic where an existing or future item may be located outside of these and changes including new structures are a permitted activity.	Amend PER-1 of Rule HH-R4 as follows (or words to that effect): Any new buildings or structures, additions or alterations are setback a minimum of 20m from a scheduled Heritage Resource. This rule shall not apply to domestic small scale renewable electricity generation, and connections to buildings or structures for network utilities.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS570.1202	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.057	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1216	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1238	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S502.030	Northland Planning and	HH-R5	Support in part	The definition of earthworks is now all encompassing such that minor works	Amend HH-R5 PER-1		Reject	Section 5.3.3.4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Development 2020 Limited			are now defined as earthworks in the plan. Works such as putting in a path or trenching of cables are generally so minor that they should not require consent. Provision has been made for minor earthworks to be undertaken on site without triggering resource consent. A volume of 50m ³ has been adapted as anything less than 50m ³ doesn't trigger the Control of Earthworks bylaw.	Any earthworks are setback a minimum of 20m from a scheduled Heritage Resource. This rule does not apply to earthworks associated with burials within an existing cemetery or minor earthworks under 50m³ volume with a cut/fill face of less than 0.5 metres.		Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S503.028	Waitangi Limited	HH-R5	Not Stated	The definition of earthworks is now all encompassing such that minor works are now defined as earthworks in the plan. Works such as putting in a path or trenching of cables are generally so minor that they should not require consent. Provision has been made for minor earthworks to be undertaken on site without triggering resource consent. A volume of 50m ³ has been adapted as anything less than 50m ³ doesn't trigger the Control of Earthworks bylaw.	Amend Rule HH-R5 as follows: ... This rule does not apply to earthworks associated with burials within an existing cemetery or minor earthworks under 50m³ volume with a cut/fill face of less than 0.5 metres.	Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S409.028	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-R5	Support in part	Rule HH-R5 is problematic where an existing or future item may be located outside of Heritage Area overlays Rule HA-R5 PER-2 and PER-3 that have 2m ³ , 5m ² and 200m ³ thresholds. It is acknowledged that even small excavations can have large impacts on archaeology. Permitted earthworks within the setting of a heritage item has the potential to damage the heritage values of the item as well as any archaeology where the extent of the place has not been mapped in a Plan and/ or the setting is not well understood. Rule HH-R5 relies upon the Standard EW-S3 Standard Accidental Discovery protocol and quantity thresholds	Amend Rule HH-R5 as follows (or words to that effect): PER-1 Any earthworks are setback a minimum of 20m from a scheduled Heritage Resource. The earthworks 1. Do not exceed 100m³ 2. Are not within 20m of a Scheduled Heritage Resource or an archaeological site 3. Comply with EW-S3 Accidental Discovery Protocol	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>generally in the zone for the avoidance of archaeology.</p> <p>The requested addition in this submission of ArchSite, the online version of the New Zealand Archaeological Association's Site recording Scheme, as an information Map Layer tool within the GIS system, would help to avoid recorded archaeology when undertaking earthworks within a scheduled Heritage Resource setting and elsewhere.</p> <p>For consistency purposes, Rule HH-R5 should at the very least be consistent with Rule HA-RS PER-3 that is itself permissive in that 200m³ is a standard Residential zone quantity threshold for earthworks in district plans.</p> <p>Reference should be made in Rule HH-R5 and in the Heritage Area overlays earthwork Rules to the setback distance from an archaeological site and not just a Scheduled heritage resource. Standard HA-S3 Accidental discovery protocol refers to a 20m setback for works to cease upon the discovery of any suspected sensitive material.</p>	<p>This rule does not apply to earthworks associated with burials within an existing cemetery.</p> <p>Note: In addition to the requirements of the District Plan, it should be noted that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 ("HNZPTA") requires all applicants to obtain an authority from the HNZPTA before any archaeological site is modified or destroyed. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.</p>			
FS44.46	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	<p>100m³ of earthworks outside of heritage areas is very restrictive. If no archaeology is present, it is not necessary to have this volume restriction. Volume restrictions are imposed elsewhere in the plan.</p> <p>Proposal to insert 20m setback to archeological sites should only relate to mapped archaeological sites, otherwise members of the public who accidentally discover an archeological site during earthworks will need a retrospective resource consent.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS67.26	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS143.41	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The proposed requirement for earthworks to be set back 20m from an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of authorisation processes provided for under Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS68.29	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS69.28	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS66.47	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The addition to the rule requiring resource consent for earthworks within 20m of an archaeological site is unnecessary duplication of approvals required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve relevant objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS548.125	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers lodged a submission in support of the rule as it was notified. The introduction of a volume limit is not supported and is seen as unnecessary and restrictive.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS534.017	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	WBFL suggests that sub-clause (1) of HNZ's submission may need refinement if adopted. It is unclear whether HNZ's 100 m³ allowance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is only intended to capture earthworks that are within 20 m of the scheduled site; or, b. would capture all continuous earthworks with a volume of >100 m³, even if the portion of the earthworks located within 20 m of the scheduled site is < 100 m³. 	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS570.1203	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.058	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1217	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1239	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission.		Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S421.129	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HH-R5	Support	Federated Farmers supports this rule as currently drafted as the setback for earthworks from a scheduled Heritage Resource of 20m is consistent with other setbacks for heritage area overlays.	Retain Rule HH-R5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS51.82	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the retention of HH-R5 as notified.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS570.1361	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS346.363	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1375	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS569.1397	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S282.011	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark	HH-R6	Support in part	While rule HH-R6 states that it does not apply to connections to buildings or structures for network utilities, there are no other rules in this section that would otherwise allow these activities and as	Insert new rule to allow connections to buildings or structures for network utilities as permitted activities.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited			such it would appear the intent is to allow for such connections as permitted activities.				the Historic Heritage Overview
S483.127	Top Energy Limited	HH-R6	Oppose	<p>Top Energy opposes a discretionary activity status for infrastructure related activities within a site containing a Heritage Resource. Ensuring electricity connection to this resource is critical to ensuring they are looked after, are functional and safe.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that it is better to manage the effects of activities on sensitive resources through performance standards relating to earthworks and buildings and structures.</p> <p>Accordingly, Top Energy seek that HH-R10 be deleted, or amended to exclude network utilities and that HH-R4 and HHR5 be relied on instead to manage any adverse effects associated with the built form of network utilities.</p>	Delete Rule HH-R6		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS51.54	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>HNZPT does not agree with the reasons proposed for the deletion of HH-R6. HH-R6 does apply to network connections to buildings and structures.</p> <p>This rule, as notified is appropriate to manage effects Infrastructure activities may have on the heritage values of a scheduled heritage resource.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS345.178	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S483.189	Top Energy Limited	HH-R8	Support	<p>Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The Overlay chapters are one example and are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that indicates some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity, however resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally.</p> <p>Some overlays include a catch all 'activities not otherwise specified' activity status (e.g. Treaty Settlement Land Overlay). Some overlays don't. This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan. This is particularly relevant in the Overlay chapters where each Overlay chapter has a different approach to activity status default rules.</p> <p>With specific regard to the permitted activity default, it is noted that this could lead unintentional consequences.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter", consistent with zone chapters.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
FS78.035	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter support this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								the Historic Heritage Overview
FS345.240	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 5.3.3.1 Key Issue 21: Dry stone walls, infrastructure and the Historic Heritage Overview
S409.030	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	HH-R10	Support	The HNZPT non-statutory Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series: Guide to the Management of Historic Heritage: District Plans (April 2022) recommends demolition or full destruction of a protected part of scheduled historic heritage should have at least non-complying status for the most significant heritage and discretionary activity status for other heritage. Prohibited Activity status for the Demolition or relocation of the Scheduled Heritage Resources given their significance is appropriate.	Retain Rule HH-R10		Accept	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS570.1205	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS400.060	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
FS566.1219	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1241	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.4 Key Issue 24: Historic Heritage Rules
S421.099	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	HA-P1	Support in part	Policy HA-P1 applies to all heritage area overlays. The policy as currently worded is inconsistent with section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 which provides for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Again, the Council appears to have elevated on aspect of the environment (heritage) over another which is inappropriate. Federated Farmers supports clause (e) of the policy as it recognises and provides for the removal of non-heritage buildings and structures which is important for viable farming operations.	Amend point a. of Objective HA-P1 as follows: a. identifying and protecting the heritage buildings, objects and sites, and archaeological sites within the Heritage area overlay from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development; Retain point e. of Objective HA-P1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent.		Accept	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS51.66	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not consider the suggested wording additions are necessary. Section 6(f), RMA is inherent in the consideration of activities, and it is unnecessary for this to be stated within the policy.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS570.1331	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS346.333	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1345	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
FS569.1367	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.2.3 Key Issue 12: Heritage Area Overlay Policies
S277.006	Alec Jack	Rules	Support in part	The rules regarding the Pouerua Heritage area are too restrictive due to the fact that such large areas within the Pouerua Heritage area are devoid of heritage.	Insert policies and rules to the plan to introduce Tradable Development Rights to compensate landowners for land uses and activities which the Heritage Area rules affect within the area.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.158	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	While the use of tradable development rights may have merit, consideration via a full .32 analysis of the cost benefit would be required to provide this planning framework.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
S277.007	Alec Jack	Rules	Oppose	The rules regarding the Pouerua Heritage area are too restrictive due to the fact that such large areas within the Pouerua Heritage area are devoid of heritage. The decision I seek from FNDC is to apply less stringent rules to the area and allow for site specific activities - allow more, on a site by site basis.	Amend all rules related to the Pouerua Heritage Area, to ensure these do not unnecessarily regulate activities that do not affect heritage.		Reject	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions
FS51.159	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. However, sought clarification of why there has been a significant expansion of the southern boundary of the Pouerua Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.2.4 Key Issue 13: Heritage Area Overlay Rules – General Submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				While HNZPT does not support the removal of planning provisions that manage and protect the Pouerua Heritage Area's heritage values there is merit in considering less restrictive rules within the southern extension.				
S502.113	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	Amend Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS51.6	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Support	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA. HNZPT supports the creation of individual site records, scheduling in the Schedule of historic sites, buildings, and objects (SCHED2), and notations on the planning maps for each of the historic sites located within the Waitangi Treaty Ground. HNZPT considers each of the historic sites, and the Treaty Ground have significance	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				heritage values collectively and in their own right.				
S503.012	Waitangi Limited	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Not Stated	<p>Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment.</p> <p>As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.</p>	Amend Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS51.8	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the creation of individual site records, scheduling of the scheduled Heritage Resource, # 100 in the Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects (SCHED2), and notations on the planning maps for each of the historic sites located within the Waitangi Treaty Ground. HNZPT considers each of these historic sites, and the Treaty Grounds contain significant heritage values, both collectively and in their own right.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
S2.001	Malcolm Tindal	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Support in part	Correct entry for heritage item. Original entry was 1984, and details were updated in 2018.	Amend legal description for site 176 (villa at cnr of Yarborough Street & Kirkpatrick St, Kohukohu), as follows: Lot 23, Lots 22, 29 DP86 Kohukohu Township.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.24	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the importance of providing correct, updated information for scheduled Historic Sites, Buildings and Objects. Doing so ensure good plan administration.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
S409.014	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	SCHED2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain Schedule 2 - Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS570.1189	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS400.044	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites,

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.				buildings and objects
FS566.1203	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS569.1225	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
S277.024	Alec Jack	Heritage Area	Oppose	Jacks Lake is not a natural feature - it is man-made and was created by Ned Jack with financial assistance (50% subsidy for habitat creation) from the Acclimatization Society (now Fish and Game NZ) in 1975. I will provide multiple levels of evidence at the hearings stage. I also oppose the inclusion of our land immediately adjacent to Lake Owhareiti in the ONF91 classification. Lake Owhareiti itself dictates its boundary, not a land title, or a line on a map. The farmland adjacent to the lake isn't an outstanding natural feature.	Amend the Planning Maps to exclude Jacks Lake, and Lake Owhareiti foreshore area on our farm from area classified "ONF91 Pouerua (Pakaraka Mountain) scoria cone, lava field and lava-dammed lakes".		Accept	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
S330.001	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Heritage Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B and considers that while the policy intent associated with the NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Regional Policy Statement are clear, the rationale and evidential basis for the proposed mapping is not considered to be	Delete the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				appropriate at a district level where values on a site by site basis should be known assessed and confirmed to be true.				
S330.002	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Heritage Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Paihia Heritage Area Overlay Part A and Part B and considers that the Paihia Mission Heritage Area in the Operative District Plan went through a lengthy plan change process and considers the area and surrounds in far greater detail than the proposed district plan.	Insert the Paihia Mission Heritage Area from the Operative District Plan.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S310.001	Lianne Kennedy	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS297.8	Wilson Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS100.4	Allen Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS293.8	Danielle Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.184	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the reduction of the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS257.8	Amber Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS256.4	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.900	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions..	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.914	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.936	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S261.001	Amber Hookway	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who subsequently no longer have the heritage area on their property. The area has changed and is more on the property than previously. I request this	Delete heritage area from 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Heritage area be removed completely from 211 Waikuku Road.				
FS297.38	Wilson Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS100.1	Allen Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS293.38	Danielle Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.152	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the reduction of the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS257.37	Amber Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS256.1	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S264.001	Wilson Hookway	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who subsequently no longer have the heritage area on their property. The area has changed and is more on the property than previously. I request this Heritage area be removed completely from 211 Waikuku Road.	Delete heritage area from 211 Waikuku Road, Waimate.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS297.39	Wilson Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS100.2	Allen Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS293.39	Danielle Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.153	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the reduction of the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS257.38	Amber Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS256.2	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S309.001	Danielle Hookway	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS297.40	Wilson Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS100.3	Allen Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS293.40	Danielle Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS257.39	Amber Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay Section 5.3.1.9

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS256.3	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S311.001	Allen Hookway	Heritage Area	Oppose	The heritage area does not follow the boundary line and crosses into 211 Waikuku Road. An objection was made at the time of receiving the first letter as did other neighbours who no longer have the heritage area over their land. The area has changed and now covers more of the property than previously.	Amend proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to remove from the site at 211 Waikuku Road.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS297.41	Wilson Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS100.5	Allen Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS293.41	Danielle Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.185	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the reduction of the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS257.40	Amber Hookway		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS256.5	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The overlay should follow the boundary and therefore not affect 211 Waikuku Road at all. Any area within the heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S409.049	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Additional Heritage Areas Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga requests that the following places also be included within the District Plan as heritage areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waitangi, - Kaeo - Whangaroa Harbour area - Kawakawa Township - Oruru Valley - Omapere / Opononi - Te Ahu Ahu Area (Bounded by Remuera Settlement Road, SH 1 and SH 15 + Lake Omapere). - Northern War Sites - Ruapekpeka - Ohaewai - Okaihau - Puketutu - Waikare 	Insert new heritage areas (including associated mapping, overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All islands within the Bay of Islands - Early contact sites. - Early settlement sites Mangahawea - Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne - Te Rerenga Wairua/Cape Reinga 				
FS44.50	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Rather than just the Waitangi Treaty Grounds being mapped with another overlay, we seek to establish a special zone across the whole estate which would incorporate those particular matters that relate to the treaty grounds as a sub zone. This ensures that there is only one set of rules to look at rather than a standardized zone and about 6 different overlays which is complicated and contradictory. The special zoning across the whole estate means that we can also have consideration to heritage matters which may lie outside of the treaty grounds. Overall, special zoning is much more effective and can achieve the same outcome as a precinct.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS24.60	Lynley Newport		Oppose	This is seriously excessive. Cannot be supported. In any event it covers so many areas that any change such as that being sought would require an entire renotification under Schedule 1 processes, with full section 32 re-analysis; submission and further submission processes.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS67.4	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The submission seeks wholesale changes to the District Plan with the addition of significantly more heritage areas, yet only very generally identifies these, including for example seeking that "all islands within the Bay of	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Islands", "Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne" and "Early contact sites" be identified as heritage areas. That lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan. There is no RMA 1991 justification for the inclusion of these areas and no specific identification of the properties affected or the values sought to be protected, and no evidential basis to support the inclusion of the additional heritage areas. The further submitter is an owner of coastal land in the Bay of Islands whose property may be affected by the relief sought in this submission, however the submission is so broadly cast as to not enable a proper understanding of the impact of the relief sought or the reasons for inclusion of the additional areas. For these reasons, the submission should be disallowed by the Council.</p> <p>The identification of the additional areas as historic heritage through this submission is poor planning practice, introducing as it does potentially significantly more extensive scheduled heritage areas through a submission only, without prior consultation with affected landowners and the sharing of evidence in support as is normally the case. There is no section 32 RMA analysis to support the additional scheduling sought, including the benefits and costs and the extent which economic growth will be provided or reduced. The scheduling lacks identification of criteria and values used to identify these areas, including any physical evidence or other values that is intended to be protected. For these reasons the relief sought is opposed.</p>				

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS143.45	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	<p>The submission seeks wholesale changes to the District Plan with the addition of significantly more heritage areas, yet only very generally identifies these, including for example seeking that "all islands within the Bay of Islands", "Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne" and "Early contact sites" be identified as heritage areas. That lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan. There is no RMA 1991 justification for the inclusion of these areas and no specific identification of the properties affected or the values sought to be protected, and no evidential basis to support the inclusion of the additional heritage areas. The further submitter represents owners of coastal land in the Bay of Islands whose property may be affected by the relief sought in this submission, however the submission is so broadly cast as to not enable a proper understanding of the impact of the relief sought or the reasons for inclusion of the additional areas. For these reasons, the submission should be disallowed.</p> <p>The identification of the additional areas as historic heritage through this submission is poor planning practice, introducing as it does potentially significantly more extensive scheduled heritage areas through a submission only, without prior consultation with affected landowners and the sharing of evidence in support as is normally the case. There is no section 32 RMA analysis to support the additional scheduling sought, including the benefits and costs and the extent which economic growth will be provided or</p>	Disallow		Accept	<p>Section 5.3.1.1</p> <p>Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				reduced. The scheduling lacks identification of criteria and values used to identify these areas, including any physical evidence or other values that is intended to be protected. For these reasons the relief sought is opposed.				
FS68.5	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	<p>The submission seeks wholesale changes to the District Plan with the addition of significantly more heritage areas, yet only very generally identifies these, including for example seeking that "all islands within the Bay of Islands", "Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne" and "Early contact sites" be identified as heritage areas. That lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan. There is no RMA 1991 justification for the inclusion of these areas and no specific identification of the properties affected or the values sought to be protected, and no evidential basis to support the inclusion of the additional heritage areas. The further submitter is an owner of coastal land in the Bay of Islands whose property may be affected by the relief sought in this submission, however the submission is so broadly cast as to not enable a proper understanding of the impact of the relief sought or the reasons for inclusion of the additional areas. For these reasons, the submission should be disallowed by the Council.</p> <p>The identification of the additional areas as historic heritage through this submission is poor planning practice, introducing as it does potentially significantly more extensive scheduled heritage areas through a submission only, without prior consultation with</p>	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				affected landowners and the sharing of evidence in support as is normally the case. There is no section 32 RMA analysis to support the additional scheduling sought, including the benefits and costs and the extent which economic growth will be provided or reduced. The scheduling lacks identification of criteria and values used to identify these areas, including any physical evidence or other values that is intended to be protected. For these reasons the relief sought is opposed.				
FS69.4	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The submission seeks wholesale changes to the District Plan with the addition of significantly more heritage areas, yet only very generally identifies these, including for example seeking that "all islands within the Bay of Islands", "Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne" and "Early contact sites" be identified as heritage areas. That lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan. There is no RMA 1991 justification for the inclusion of these areas and no specific identification of the properties affected or the values sought to be protected, and no evidential basis to support the inclusion of the additional heritage areas. The further submitter is an owner of a property on Moturua Island in the Bay of Islands whose property may be affected by the relief sought in this submission, however the submission is so broadly cast as to not enable a proper understanding of the impact of the relief sought or the reasons for inclusion of the additional areas. For these reasons, the submission should be disallowed by the Council.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				The identification of the additional areas as historic heritage through this submission is poor planning practice, introducing as it does potentially significantly more extensive scheduled heritage areas through a submission only, without prior consultation with affected landowners and the sharing of evidence in support as is normally the case. There is no section 32 RMA analysis to support the additional scheduling sought, including the benefits and costs and the extent which economic growth will be provided or reduced. The scheduling lacks identification of criteria and values used to identify these areas, including any physical evidence or other values that is intended to be protected. For these reasons the relief sought is opposed.				
FS107.2	Laurell Douglas		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS284.2	Waitangi Limited		Oppose	Rather than just the Waitangi Treaty Grounds being mapped with another overlay, we seek to establish a special zone across the whole estate which would incorporate those particular matters that relate to the treaty grounds as a sub zone. This ensures that there is only one set of rules to look at rather than a standardized zone and about 6 different overlays which is complicated and contradictory. The special zoning across the whole estate means that we can also have consideration to heritage matters which may lie outside of the treaty grounds. Overall, special zoning is much more effective and can	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				achieve the same outcome as a precinct.				
FS66.4	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	<p>The submission seeks wholesale changes to the District Plan with the addition of significantly more heritage areas, yet only very generally identifies these, including for example seeking that "all islands within the Bay of Islands", "Early European explorers Cook, Du Fresne" and "Early contact sites" be identified as heritage areas. That lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan. There is no RMA 1991 justification for the inclusion of these areas and no specific identification of the properties affected or the values sought to be protected, and no evidential basis to support the inclusion of the additional heritage areas. The further submitter is an owner of coastal land in the Bay of Islands whose property may be affected by the relief sought in this submission, however the submission is so broadly cast as to not enable a proper understanding of the impact of the relief sought or the reasons for inclusion of the additional areas. For these reasons, the submission should be disallowed by the Council.</p> <p>The identification of the additional areas as historic heritage through this submission is poor planning practice, introducing as it does potentially significantly more extensive scheduled heritage areas through a submission only, without prior consultation with affected landowners and the sharing of evidence in support as is normally the case. There is no section 32 RMA analysis to support the additional</p>	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				scheduling sought, including the benefits and costs and the extent which economic growth will be provided or reduced. The scheduling lacks identification of criteria and values used to identify these areas, including any physical evidence or other values that is intended to be protected. For these reasons the relief sought is opposed.				
FS570.1224	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS400.079	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS566.1238	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS569.1260	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
S257.011	Te Hiku Community Board	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS275.5	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic - respecting the the Rangitoto Peninsula, only the sites listed in the Schedule of Historic Sites (Schedule 2 Appendix 3) and their immediate appurtenant land should be so designated. .	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.224	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S357.011	Sean Frieling	Heritage Area	Oppose	Do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.7	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic - respecting the Rangitoto Peninsula, only the sites listed in the Schedule of Historic Sites (Schedule 2 Appendix 3) and their immediate appurtenant land should be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS51.187	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with the extension of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area's boundaries to include the entire harbour as associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S358.011	Leah Frieling	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.9	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic - respecting the Rangitoto Peninsula, only the sites listed in the Schedule of Historic Sites (Schedule 2 Appendix 3) and their immediate appurtenant land should be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.194	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S472.011	Michael Foy	Heritage Area	Oppose	We do not support the new heritage overlays at Mangonui, and submit that there should not be restrictive rules outside of the existing heritage areas within Mangonui.	Delete Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B from the Planning Maps.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS275.11	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	With respect to Mangonui, the proposal for the heritage area designated as Part B outlined in the Heritage Area Overlays Overview and as shown in the complimentary Historical & Cultural Values Overlays map is excessive and is unwarranted and contrary to reason and logic - respecting the Rangitoto Peninsula, only the sites listed in the Schedule of Historic Sites (Schedule 2 Appendix 3) and their immediate appurtenant land should be so designated.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.204	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S249.001	Ian Diarmid Palmer and Zejia Hu	Heritage Area	Oppose	<p>The rationale for, and the aerial extent of, the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B was based on inadequate and incomplete expert evidence and analysis.</p> <p>The boundaries for the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B do not adhere to any self-consistent logic. It is inappropriate to combine areas featuring colonial period European built historic heritage resources with areas featuring pre-contact Māori historic heritage in a single heritage area. Designating an area of land as a heritage area based on its Māori cultural connections and/or landscape attributes amounts to double counting contrary to the RMA.</p>	Delete the Heritage Area Overlay from the Rangitoto Peninsula except for the land directly associated with and/or proximal to listed heritage resources.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>Justification for the entire Rangitoto Peninsula land being subject to the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part B overlay was in part based on an erroneous premise regarding the land's involvement in historically significant colonial European industrial enterprises.</p> <p>The section 32 heritage assessment did not evaluate the economic impact of imposing heritage area overlays over large tracts of land for the first time or assess the risk of not acting.</p>				
FS275.12	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.151	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with the extension of the Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area's boundaries to include the entire harbour and the associated adjacent ridgeline perimeter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
S62.001	Warren Bliss	Heritage Area	Support in part	Pouerua Heritage area and its values should be protected but disagree generally with the enlarged extension of the protection zone (from the original zone created by Dr Doug Sutton) - except that there is probable merit in extending the zone to the north of Pouerua to encompass a small cluster of heritage sites previously excluded. Considers that the extended area to the south of Pouerua has no relevance to this historic site - in particular the properties along Lakeland Lane. The	Amend the extent of the heritage area surrounding Pouerua, so that it is revised back to the original layout as per the area created by Dr Doug Sutton, except for possibly the north side extension from Pouerua. The review of the extent should have particular emphasis on the southern areas that encompass Lakeland Lane properties and should remove areas that have no heritage sites or resources on them. It may be acceptable to revise the boundary directly around lake Owhareiti		Accept	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				majority of these properties are lifestyle blocks with modern buildings gardens and paddocks. There are no historic structures, stonefield gardens or sites of any significance to Maori. There are no volcanic rocks littering the area as there are in the other areas surrounding Pouerua. It is not fair or reasonable to penalise landowners by "lumping in" properties to a heritage area because its an easy line to draw on a map.	itself - but not the Lakeland properties that come down to the lake.			
FS51.143	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	In its primary submission (409) HNZPT supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with further clarification justifying the significant expansion of the southern boundary of the Pouerua Heritage Area.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
S171.001	Murdoch Phillips	Heritage Area	Oppose	Opposes FNDC Heritage plan for Paihia. Our rates and consents are high enough without Council imposing more cost and time delays on us when requiring consents. Currently Council don't seem to have any concerns about people camping on our reserves but is happy to charge landowners more for their right to live here. If Council is going to have a Heritage Area in Paihia it should be all of Paihia not the divide and conquer proposal, it wants to implement.	Heritage Area A to stay. Heritage Area B wiped completely.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.147	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework for the protection of the Paihia Heritage Area overlay, with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries. HNZPT disagrees with the removal of Area B. This portion of the Heritage	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Area contains significant archaeological sites and SASMs.				
S220.001	Kerry Ludbrook	Heritage Area	Oppose	As a descendent of Henry Williams, the importance of the area is understood. Part of Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka) should however be removed from the Pouerua Heritage Area as the land has been cultivated many times historically and it does not have archaeological significance. The land should retain its Rural Production zoning so that it can be farmed. The land does not include a residential unit so requires the flexibility to continue cropping or allow changes of grass swards and the establishment of a residential unit.	Delete the Pouerua Heritage Area overlay from Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka).		Reject	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.149	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. However, sought clarification of why there has been a significant expansion of the southern boundary of the Pouerua Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
S277.002	Alec Jack	Heritage Area	Oppose	The Lake Owhareiti Trust are, and represent, the Maori beneficial owners of the lake. Lake Owhareiti already has multiple layers of protection (ONF91, NRC environmental regulations, site of importance to Maori, etc) but the addition of Heritage Area restrictions would add cost & complexity to any future plans the trustees' might have - at a time when imminent Waitangi Settlements will at last enable them to fulfil their vision for their Lake. The lake level has lifted dramatically since it was first surveyed & mapped in the 19th century - any pre-European	Amend the Pouerua Heritage Area to remove Lake Owhareiti and reinstate the original boundary of Pouerua Heritage Precinct (which excluded Jacks Lake and Lake Owhareiti).		Accept	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Maori heritage has long since been flooded or destroyed by European farm cultivation. The eucalypt plantation on a peninsula of our land titles (currently an island) was planted by my grandfather & uncle. Heritage Area restrictions would make it unaffordable for us to harvest those trees to enable us to retire the area in native trees. Lake Owhareiti has immeasurable cultural & environmental value but this does not warrant further restrictions on the basis of heritage.				
FS51.154	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	In its primary submission (409) HNZPT supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, with further clarification justifying the significant expansion of the southern boundary of the Pouerua Heritage Area.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
S292.001	C and A Harman	Heritage Area	Oppose	The proposed Te Waimate Heritage area extends across a large portion of Lot 1 DP 2011442 and which is active primary production land with a land use capability of 2s1 being versatile soils. The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land seeks to secure protection of highly productive soil and to extend the heritage overlay on this land would limit the use and therefore conflict with the National Policy Statement and Council's obligations under the RMA 1991. The heritage area introduces restrictions on structures and earthworks which affect productive land uses.	Amend extent of proposed Te Waimate Heritage area to reduce the extent of heritage area that applies to 208 Waikaramu Road, Ohaeawai (Lot 1 DP 201442) (as per plan attached to original submission).		Reject	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.169	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT does not support the reduction of the extent of the Te Waimate Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S326.001	Shirley Dryden	Heritage Area	Oppose	<p>The proposed Pouerua Heritage overlay area is too large and encompasses many properties that have no historical significance. Lot 1 DP 194271 (inferred) (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka) should not be in the heritage overlay. The land has been cultivated extensively and it does not have archaeological significance. The heritage area needs to be specific to each property. It is too restrictive to properties that have no historical significance. It needs local knowledge and expertise.</p> <p>The land should retain its Rural Production zoning so that it can be farmed. The land does not include a residential unit and this needs to be considered.</p>	Delete the Pouerua Heritage Area overlay from Lot 1 DP 194271 (Ludbrook Road, Pakaraka).		Reject	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.186	Heritage New Zealand Pouere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas. However, sought clarification of why there has been a significant expansion of the southern boundary of the Pouerua Heritage Area.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
S12.001	Emily and Richard Fladgate	Heritage Area	Oppose	Opposes the new FNDC Kerikeri Heritage Area (B) in regards to the mapping of the proposed southwest boundary of the Kerikeri Heritage Area (B) as it affects our Inlet Rd property because: the lines were drawn based on desktop research only, the alignment is not logical, does not follow the overall pattern of wider delineations (which is mostly along other property boundary lines), there is no adequate reasoning why the Heritage area should not stick to the existing property boundary. In 30 years since submitter	Amend the extent of Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay - Part B, to correspond with the existing property boundary of 83A and 99 Kerikeri Inlet Road (Lot 2 DP 380510) as shown in Attachment 5 to original submission.		Accept	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				has lived on property, they have not identified any archaeological sites, historic trees or buildings, nor any sites of cultural significance. Also there are no recorded sites on the far north maps. The natural contours of the land combined with an existing overland flow path makes the property boundary a clear cut naturally defined end of the Southwest line of the heritage area (see attachments to submission for more information).				
FS51.202	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the realignment of the Kerikeri Heritage Area - Part B boundary to correspond with the northeastern property boundary of 83A and 99 Kerikeri Inlet Road to improve plan administration.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.3 Key Issue 3: Kerikeri Heritage Area Overlay
S450.001	Bell Family Trust	Heritage Area	Oppose	2 Kings Road, Paihia, has never been classified as a heritage site/area and there is no heritage attached to the property. This has a detrimental effect on what can be done on the property, its valuation and possible sale.	Delete the Paihia Heritage Area (Part B) from 2 Kings Road, Paihia (Lot 1 DP 42791).		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.203	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of the Paihia Heritage Area overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S476.002	David Truscott	Heritage Area	Oppose	Heritage Area Part B for Rawene serves little purpose. The archeological heritage can be safeguarded in other ways as indicated in the S32 report. Council moved on from its former draft DP controls leaving a hollow justification for the designation. The boundary is not logical, relating to the 19th century road	Delete the Heritage Area Part B for Rawene in favour of archaeological protection, which can be achieved by other means, as discussed in the s32 report.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				and section layout that does not need protection.				
FS51.211	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas, including both Part A and Part B of the Rawene Heritage Area. Along with amendments to provide for additional extents to the Heritage Area's overlay boundaries.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
S532.001	Don Mandeno	Heritage Area	Oppose	22 Marsden road was previously removed from the heritage area by the decision NO2014 NZ EnvC 129. the heritage is already well preserved.	Delete Paihia Heritage overlay from 22 Marsden road, Paihia.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS51.216	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) supports the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Heritage Areas with amendments to provide for additional extents of the boundaries of the Paihia Heritage Area overlay.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S29.007	Bayswater Inn Ltd	Heritage Area	Oppose	40 Marsden Road, Paihia, should retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan that were imposed following an appeal to the Environment Court 2005/2006. The new provisions in the Proposed District Plan should not apply.	Delete Heritage Overlay - Paihia Heritage Area - Part B from 40 Marsden Road, Paihia.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.028	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S409.042	Heritage New Zealand	Heritage Area	Support in part	Rawene Historic Heritage Area – - Rawene township is situated at the northern end of a peninsula	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Rawene Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Pouhere Taonga			<p>that leads into the Hokianga Harbour. Rawene's vehicle access is from Twin Coast Discovery Highway via State Highway 12 from the south and from Kohukohu to the north via the car ferry. Due to the prominent location of the township, it is visible from both the Hokianga Harbour and land. The township with its unique character, historic buildings, and rich history is a tourism destination on the Twin Coast Discovery Highway. Many local business' cater for day travelers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It seems that Plan Heritage Limited has defined the proposed heritage area boundary from "lots which fall within the early township that are distinctly different (earlier) subdivision form, and which are shown in historical aerial topography to have generally been developed by 1942". Unfortunately, that mapped area excludes some very important places. - Heritage New Zealand recommends that the proposed heritage area be expanded to include the Hokianga Health Enterprise Trust facility (hospital) - first free hospital service, the cemetery that contains the remains of ancestors (located diagonally opposite the hospital) and the Rawene Domain. In addition, adjacent to the camping ground contains a site of significance to Maori and needs to be incorporated into the heritage area. 	associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A further sub area should include the entire peninsula and contain lesser rules that protect the entrance way view to the township by design, colour and shape and set back rules. - Furthermore, there needs to be restrictions the prevent development on the ridge line of the peninsula as the viewshafts need to be protected when looking to Rawene across the harbour Amend the spatial extent of the Kohukohu Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission 				
FS402.024	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora oppose the recommended extension to the Rawene Heritage Area to include the Hokianga Health Enterprise Trust facility (Rawene Hospital), because the hospital site has been significantly modified and developed to provide for an operational hospital. Additional limitations that would result due to the heritage area will result in unnecessary constrain, cost and delay in the on-going operation and development of the hospital.	Disallow	Seek provision detail as above.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
FS570.1217	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.072	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				Heritage Area and associated provisions.				
FS566.1231	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1253	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.8 Key Issue 8: Rāwene Heritage Area Overlay
S409.016	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support	The Proposed Plan is required to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance, in particular 6(f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development" and s6(e) "the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga." HNZPT considers that the hybrid-plan format of the Proposed Plan, that includes: the identification of historic heritage; heritage area overlays; Kororareka Russell Township Zone and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori issues (Overview), objectives, policies and rules each within a Section of the plan, is of assistance to the reader in understanding the background and reasons for the rules.	Retain the spatial map layers for historic heritage.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS570.1191	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.046	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS566.1205	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
FS569.1227	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.1 Key Issue 1: Requests for new Heritage Area Overlays
S409.037	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and surrounds –</p> <p>It is extremely evident that the proposed heritage area will not protect Russell Peninsula from adverse and detrimental development. There are already examples of building development that is completely out of character and scale in the area. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the heritage area be considered when standing upon Te Maiki (Flagstaff Hill). From this vantage point one can see across Kororareka towards Waikare Inlet, eastward out to Motorua Island, northward to the Black Rocks and west towards Waitangi and Paihia. These views hafts need to be protected and conserved from inappropriate 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Kororareka Russell Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>development especially those on ridgelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pa sites need to be included in the Heritage Area. There is a rich history associated with pa sites. - We advocate a separate heritage layer for the entrance to the Russell Peninsula starting from the Russell Whakaparara Road intersection. This area is to provide a visual protection from further adverse development, including promotion of native visual buffer planting. Russell is situated on a peninsula and the plan needs to take into account the special character of this peninsula. - In addition to the boundary defined within the draft plan, we request that a further planning layer be applied to the east and north for the balance of the peninsula that will prevent development on the ridgelines, restrict exterior colours to the heritage colour palate and control reflectivity. This is to include Long Beach and the area behind. It is essential that development is considered from when viewed not only from land but also from the Bay. - The planning controls in the draft district plan need to ensure that the viewshafts remain 				
FS570.1212	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS400.067	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1226	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1248	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.4 Key Issue 4: Kororāreka Russell Heritage Area Overlay
S409.038	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Paihia Heritage Area - It should be noted that in the Paihia Cemetery in the rear yard of the Church of Paul and Henry Williams contains Maori burials. This is not referenced in the archaeologist's report.</p> <p>We support the recommendation of the consultant archaeologists for the inclusion of the Waitangi Islands - Motu o Rangi, Motuarahi, Motu Maire and Kuia Rongouru/Taylor Island because of their historical, contextual and spatial relationship. They are of significance to iwi and are listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga as wahi tapu. The heritage area should also include the Paihia Village Green scenic reserve, and the historic library at 2 Williams Road.</p> <p>There needs to be development restrictions on the entire ridge (behind the Church) that overlooks the Bay.</p>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Paihia Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>This is a prominent ridge that contains Pa, archaeology and other artifacts. It is the backdrop for the town and provides a visual escapement from the bay encapsulating the town.</p> <p>An additional sub area is recommended for the area south of the river Te Haumai to include the settlement of Tohitapu as also suggested by Plan Heritage Limited.</p>				
FS570.1213	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.068	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1227	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1249	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.6 Key Issue 6: Paihia Heritage Area Overlay
S409.040	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Pouerua Historic Heritage Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed heritage area is a significant expansion on the current area, but that expansion is generally in a southern direction towards Moerewa that encompasses only a few recorded archaeological sites, 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of the Pouerua Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>inclusive of a pa site, but otherwise a landscape that does not appear to be of heritage value. The area does not contain any Stonefield sites and appears to be in modern pastoral farming. We would like to have clarification why this area is included in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The boundary as extended slightly to the north does include a significant cultural landscape containing various pa sites and stone structures. - It is evident that there needs to be a continuous connection between the proposed Puerua Heritage Area through to State Highway 12 and north of State Highway 1 through to the proposed southern boundary of the proposed Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area. This would protect the foreground vista through to the ridge pa sites from State Highway 1. - The focus of this heritage area should be on the Maunga and the stone gardens with very strict controls. The balance area (proposed extension area) could be subject to less restrictive rules. The context of the area is that the volcanic soils have been the driver of the rich cultural landscape that includes, gardens, pa, kainga and early colonial buildings. 				
FS570.1215	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission.		Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.070	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1229	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1251	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouterua Heritage Area Overlay
S409.044	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed heritage area is an improvement on the current Heritage precinct however it still does not protect the landscape from undue development or change of land use. - Pastoral farming in New Zealand was first established at Te Waimate, including in the valley north of the Mission Station. This area is now under threat from horticultural farming practises that include structures associated with kiwi fruit and avocado orchards. The proposed heritage area excludes most of this valley. We request that the heritage area be extended to include the valley through to the top of the bush 	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Te Waimate Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>escarpment and ridge situated immediately north of the Mission Station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We also recommend controls associated with the change of land use from pastoral farming to horticulture. Cropping need not be included. 				
FS570.1219	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.074	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1233	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1255	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Accept in part	Section 5.3.1.9 Key Issue 9: Te Waimate Heritage Area Overlay
S409.048	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage Area	Support in part	<p>Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area –</p> <p>We are supportive of the proposed heritage areas insofar as the extent of the proposed boundaries for Manganui and Rangitoto Peninsula/Butler Point Area, however we consider that the boundary needs to be extended to include the entire harbour and associated adjacent ridge line</p>	Amend the provisions and spatial extent of Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Historic Heritage Area and insert additional new sub-areas (including associated overview, objectives, policies and rules) as indicated in submission.		Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				<p>perimeter. Our comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reason that both Maori and Europeans settled at Manganui and Rangitoto was because of the harbour itself. It provided shelter, ki moana, and was a gateway and stepping location for departures back to the Pacific and Hawaii and for trading. The entire harbour was utilised as evidenced by the recorded archaeology associated with Paewhenua Island, that included flaking floors, flax industry, and mill etc. - A number of pa sites including at Rangikapiti, Rangitoto, Taemaro Road (P04/70) and others are located at the entrance to and surrounding the harbour. Vistas to and from these pa sites need protection, including a prohibition on plantation planting on the pa sites - (P04/70) contains a pine plantation. These pa sites clearly demonstrate the spread of pre-European occupation around the perimeter of Manganui Harbour. These pa sites are related visually and through whakapapa. - It is important that the open areas of Butlers Point are protected from any further building development. This land is a backdrop to Mangonui Township and Rangitoto Pa. That area also contains a significant number of recorded archaeological sites. - Heritage New Zealand requests that the proposed heritage areas be progressed, but with additional 			

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				sublayer comprising the balance of the harbour area up to the perimeter ridgeline. Controls need to be sufficiently assertive to prevent development upon the ridgelines, or protruding above the ridgelines, and adoption of recessive colours and non-reflective building materials in the sub-area. By doing so the landscape character of the harbour will be retained.				
FS570.1223	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS400.078	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Oppose	The submission seeks additional sites / areas to be within the Heritage Overlay. The Further Submitter's original submission sought amendments to the overlay and reversion back to the Paihia Mission Heritage Area and associated provisions.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS566.1237	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay
FS569.1259	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission.	Reject	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S502.114	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	Heritage Item	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	Amend mapping of Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
FS51.7	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	<p>The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA.</p> <p>HNZPT supports the creation of individual site records, scheduling in the Schedule of historic sites, buildings, and objects (SCHED2), and notations on the planning maps for each of the historic sites located within the Waitangi Treaty Ground. HNZPT considers each of the historic sites, and the Treaty Ground have significance heritage values collectively and in their own right.</p>	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects
S503.013	Waitangi Limited	Heritage Item	Not Stated	Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) is located on Lot 1 DP 326610. While located within the general vicinity of	Amend mapping of Historic Site 100 (Te Karuwha Parade, Waitangi - Treaty House Hobson Memorial Whare Runanga, Flagpole) located on Lot 1 DP 326610. Create four separate 'site records' on the		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites,

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				each other, the combination of all items into one record can be confusing and there is potential that a historic building or structure may be missed in assessment. As such we seek that Site 100 is split into 4 separate notations on the map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.	map such that it is clear what buildings are considered historic within the planning document. This is consistent with other historic items in the District where there are multiple listings on a site.			buildings and objects
FS51.9	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support	HNZPT supports the creation of individual site records, scheduling in the Schedule of historic sites, buildings, and objects (SCHED2), and notations on the planning maps for each of the historic sites located within the Waitangi Treaty Grounds. HNZPT considers each of the historic sites, and the Treaty Grounds contain significance heritage values, both collectively and in their own right.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.3.3.5 Key Issue 25: SCHED 2 – Schedule of historic sites, buildings and objects