

## Appendix 7.1 – 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
<b>S431.062</b>	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.	<p>Insert new standard HA-S4 in the Heritage Area Overlay rules applying to the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay Area:</p> <p><b>HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage</b></p> <p><b>The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area.</b></p> <p><b>Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the size, location and design of open space;</li> <li>b. the character and amenity of the surrounding area;</li> <li>c. the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects;</li> <li>d. cultural and historic heritage values;</li> <li>e. 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;</li> <li>f. consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines Subdivision.</li> </ul>	<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	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
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		<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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.	<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.9 Key issue 18: Heritage Area Overlay Standards – General submissions HA-S3
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.	Insert additional statement within Rule HA-R2 that Rule HA-S2 does not apply to Part D of the Kororāreka Russell Heritage Overlay. Insert new standard HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage within PER-3 of Rule HA-R2 as per the following: <b>HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage</b> <b>The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area.</b> <b>Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the size, location and design of open space;</li> <li>the character and amenity of the surrounding area;</li> <li>the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects;</li> <li>cultural and historic heritage values;</li> </ol>		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
					e. 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.			
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		<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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.	<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.6 Key Issue 15: HA-R2 – Additions or alterations to existing buildings or structures
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: <b>PER-3</b> <b>The building or structure complies with HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage.</b>		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area 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		<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
				sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.				Overlay – Other rules
<b>S431.061</b>	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.		<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
<b>FS51.249</b>	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		<u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
<b>FS332.061</b>	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	<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
<b>S277.013</b>	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.		<u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
<b>FS196.27</b>	Joe Carr		Support	The submitter's request is well reasoned and reasonable.	Allow		<u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.8 Key Issue 17: Heritage Area Overlay – Other rules
<b>FS51.165</b>	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		<u>Accept in part</u> <b>Reject</b>	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
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: <b>HA-S4 Building or Structure Coverage</b> <b>The maximum combined net floor area of all buildings or structures on the site is no more than 20% of the net site area.</b> <b>Where the standard is not met, matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the size, location and design of open space;</li> <li>the character and amenity of the surrounding area;</li> <li>the extent that screening, planting and landscaping are utilised for mitigating adverse effects;</li> <li>cultural and historic heritage values;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>f. consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines Subdivision.</li> </ol>		Reject Accept in part	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 Kororareka Russell Heritage Area Overlay.	Disallow		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
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	<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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	<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 Kerikeri Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
FS354.0100	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	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	Allow	Allow S421.089	<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
				the existing environment. This is supported as rural production activities are important to the Far North economy.				and general submissions
<b>FS570.1321</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.323</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1335</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1357</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>S421.091</b>	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 proactively retaining the historic and	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.		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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>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>				
<b>FS570.1323</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.325</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1337</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
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.	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
S421.092	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula	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 Puerua 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 Mangonui and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		<b>Reject</b> <b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
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		<b>Reject</b> <b>Accept in part</b>	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
<b>FS570.1324</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.326</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1338</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1360</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>S421.093</b>	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	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.		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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>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 Puerua 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>				
<b>FS570.1325</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.327</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1339</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1361</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
<b>S421.094</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Pouerua	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 Pouerua Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and provides for existing, legally established rural activities as part of the existing environment.		<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS24.11</b>	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		<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS354.102</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend the Overview to the Pouerua Heritage overlay so that it acknowledges and	Allow	Allow S421.094	<b>Reject</b> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1

## 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
				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.				Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS570.1326</b>	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.	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.328</b>	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	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1340</b>	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.	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1362</b>	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.	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>S421.095</b>	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	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.		<b>Reject</b> <b>Accept in part</b>	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>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>				
<b>FS570.1327</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.329</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1341</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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
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.	<b>Accept in part</b>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
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.		<b>Reject</b> <b>Accept in part</b>	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		<b>Reject</b> <b>Accept in part</b>	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
<b>FS570.1328</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS346.330</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1342</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1364</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>S421.097</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Heritage Overlay - Te Waimate	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	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.		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	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>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 Puerua 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>				
<b>FS24.12</b>	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed and concerned at the large area covered by the Te Waimate heritage area.	Allow		<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS354.104</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	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.	Allow	Allow S421.097	<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS570.1329</b>	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.	<u>Accept in part</u>	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
<b>FS346.331</b>	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	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS566.1343</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>FS569.1365</b>	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.	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.2.1 Key Issue 10: Heritage Area Overlay overview and general submissions
<b>S249.001</b>	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 and 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> <p>Justification for the entire Rangitoto Peninsula land being subject to the Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Part</p>	Delete the Heritage Area Overlay from the Rangitoto Peninsula except for the land directly associated with and/or proximal to listed heritage resources.		<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept in part</a>	Section 5.3.1.5 Key Issue 5: Mangōnuī 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>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>				
<b>FS275.12</b>	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter.	Allow		<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Accept in part</a></u></p>	<p>Section 5.3.1.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Mangōnuī and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay</p>
<b>FS51.151</b>	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		<u><a href="#">Accept in part</a></u>	<p>Section 5.3.1.5</p> <p>Key Issue 5: Mangōnuī and Rangitoto Peninsula Heritage Area Overlay</p>
<b>S62.001</b>	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 majority of these properties are lifestyle blocks with modern buildings gardens and paddocks. There are no historic	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 itself - but not the Lakeland properties that come down to the lake.		<u><a href="#">Accept in part</a></u>	<p>Section 5.3.1.7</p> <p>Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay</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
				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.				
<b>S220.001</b>	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).		<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
<b>FS51.149</b>	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		<u>Accept in part</u>	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay
<b>S277.002</b>	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	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).		<u>Accept in part</u>	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>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.</p> <p>The lake level has lifted dramatically since it was first surveyed &amp; mapped in the 19th century - any pre-European 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 &amp; 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 &amp; environmental value but this does not warrant further restrictions on the basis of heritage.</p>			
<b>S326.001</b>	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).	<b>Reject</b> <u>Accept in part</u>	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
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 <u>in part</u>	Section 5.3.1.7 Key Issue 7: Pouerua Heritage Area Overlay