

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S276.002	Russell Landcare Trust	SUB-R6	Support in part	The guidance and rules for environmental benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Amend rule to provide definitions and criteria that must be met to qualify for an environmental benefit. Revise the rules so that: all of the ecological feature is protected, the ecological significance of the feature is considered, any additional lots have a suitable house site at least 20m away from any protected ecological feature or greater (e.g. in accordance with the NES-F), provides more details on the required content and objectives of an ecological management plan (including how the management actions will be monitored and reported on), sprawling or sporadic subdivision and development is avoided, and natural character is protected and preserved. Also refer to comments on Draft Plan attached to submission.		Accept in part
FS566.813	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
FS569.835	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
S359.026	Northland Regional Council	SUB-R6	Support in part	Areas of erosion prone land could also be considered as an environmental benefit where these areas are retired from production and appropriate measures taken to stabilise them. Such an approach would complement NRC soil conservation efforts to reduce sediment loads to fresh and coastal waters.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 to provide an environmental benefit where erosion prone land is retired from production and appropriate measures are taken to stabilise the land.		Reject
FS566.1076	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
FS569.1098	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
S364.055	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R6	Oppose	The Director-General considers the word "significant" should be removed from RDIS-2 of Rule SUB-R6. The vegetation that should be assessed by the ecologist is any "indigenous vegetation". Currently, the wording implies that	Amend Rule SUB-R6 as follows: RDIS-2 Each separate area of ~~significant~~ indigenous vegetation, ~~significant~~ indigenous habitat		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the ecologist only assesses the vegetation if it is already considered to be significant.	or natural wetland included in the proposal must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist as satisfying at least one criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland RPS (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity).		
FS566.1150	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
FS569.1172	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
S421.178	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-R6	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the provision for benefit subdivision within the rural zones. However, it is essential that the rule allows for the creation of benefit lots under 4ha. There are positive benefits to be had from Council considering smaller areas for wetlands and biodiversity improvements for more significant or critical catchments. There are some areas around the district that may be more significant than others to protect. A blanket size approach does not target specific catchments or locations that will have more significant gains.	Amend RDIS-2 (inferred) of Rule SUB-R6 to allow for case-by-case approval for areas less than those listed in tables 1 and 2		Reject
FS566.1424	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
FS569.1446	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
S464.013	LJ King Ltd	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1558	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
S523.009	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R6	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-R6		Accept in part
FS566.1803	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
S527.021	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R6	Oppose	SUB-P8 and SUB-R6 create a type of subdivision called 'Environmental benefit subdivision' as a restricted discretionary activity. This appears to be poorly conceived provision - the protection of SNAs should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.	Amend SUB-R6 to make protection of SNAs an essential prerequisite (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1883	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.064	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R6	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R6 which includes reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS566.1966	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1988	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.146	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R6	Oppose	SUB-P8 and SUB-R6 create a type of subdivision called 'Environmental benefit subdivision' as a restricted discretionary activity. This appears to be poorly conceived provision - the protection of SNAs should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.	Amend SUB-R6 - SNA protection should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.		Reject
FS566.2048	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2070	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S543.013	LJ King Limited	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.			
FS566.2174	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
S215.029	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The Controlled Activity subdivision rules do not appear to require compliance with the Transport section of the Plan. As subdivision is one area where access is critical, the Transport rules should apply to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-R6 Require compliance with Transport rules in the Plan for a subdivision to be a Controlled Activity.		Accept in part
FS569.554	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
S243.075	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care' and legal protection/going obligations, allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity. RDIS-3 which requires the protected area to be added to the list of scheduled Significant Natural Areas in the District Plan cannot be met as a standard, unless by private plan change: the burden of which is significant and would negate the effectiveness of the rule. The council is able to capture such areas in its own plan changes, without risk of interim adverse impacts on such areas due to the obligation under the rule that they be legally protected. The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area ~~and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.669	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
S250.010	Willowridge Developments Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	Willowridge support the inclusion of an environmental benefit subdivision (EBS) in the PDP. There is no ecological assessment to confirm that an environmental benefit would be achieved by those thresholds or in fact whether the number of allotments proposed would achieve an appropriate level of environmental benefit. The environmental outcomes could be improved with a provision that promotes ecological enhancement and or restoration. The provisions do not promote the protection of other natural resources such as heritage resources, cultural heritage resources, ONL's or ONF's that could also be considered to achieve net public benefits where permanent protection is achieved through subdivision.	Review and amend the EBS provisions to achieve the following (or relief to the same or similar effect): - Confirm the environmental benefit of enabling greater subdivision opportunities through the protection of indigenous biodiversity with evidence prepared by an ecologist; - Provide for EBS where ecological enhancement and restoration is provided for; - Include EBS provisions for the protection of other natural environment and physical resources that are identified as being nationally important in accordance with section 6 of the RMA.		Reject
FS569.732	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
S272.009	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-R6	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R6 including reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS569.805	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S445.012	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R6	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-S8 in rule SUB-R6		Accept in part
FS569.1767	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1746	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S427.058	Kapiro Residents Association	SUB-R7	Support in part	Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and	Amend Rule SUB-R7 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred].		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area.		
S348.003	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-R7	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the Rural Production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. Previously blocks down to 4000sqm were allowed under the Operative District Plan. Perhaps the new District Plan could reconsider allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000sqm or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. This would give effect to Policy SUB-P8. Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush. This would provide vitality in rural areas, opportunities for farmers to develop their land, relief for urban services, continued local jobs, lifestyle blocks for those that want them, and all while still protecting the productive capacity of the land.	Amend Rule SUB-R7 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS34.1	Jillian D. Young		Oppose	I object to the rezoning of my property in 2884A State Highway 10, Mangonui from General Coastal to Rural Production for the following reasons. 1. Further limitations on the land use, development and subdivision potential. 2. The old semi-volcanic soils in the Far North are NOT highly productive or highly versatile soils : • Soils are weathered, and all are strongly to very strongly leached. • Topsoils are generally shallow, very friable and free draining. • Subsoils are heavy clay with high aluminium and iron concentrations which limit plant root depth penetration due to toxicity. • While topsoils are free-draining, the sticky kaolin clay subsoils impede drainage. • Shallow topsoils and limited root depth reduce drought resilience of pastures. 3. No water source on the land. The arbitrary rezoning of land from General Coastal to Rural Production which does not have highly productive or special soils, has no water source available, in addition to excessively strict land use restrictions when more housing is needed, do not seem to be decisions that factor in common sense. I could not easily locate an original submission that matched my circumstances but this one seemed a bit similar in one aspect : Please disallow SUB-R7 and SUB-R9.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS172.289	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS368.011	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it	Allow	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone.			
S431.087	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R7	Not Stated	The guidance and rules relating to environment benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Amend DIS-1.1 of Rule SUB-R7 so that it sets out a 6ha average lot size for Rural Production zoned land which is also in the Coastal Environment overlay, and a 2ha average lots size for Rural Lifestyle zone land which is also in the Coastal Environment overlay.		Reject
FS23.125	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to mandate average lot sizes of 6 ha in the RPZ and 2 ha in the RLZ. This would foreclose the opportunity for the protection and reasonable use of smaller sites within these zones. The notified plan lot size within the RPZ of 4 ha is more appropriate. In terms of the RLZ, 1 ha would better reflect the quasi-residential use, and proximity of that type of land to urban areas.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS332.087	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
FS564.024	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	The decision sought would result in an inefficient use of land. Assessment criteria relating to the location of building sites and design guidelines for development of lots is a more appropriate mechanism for mitigating effects of development within the Coastal Environment	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
S168.059	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R7	Support	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.	Retain Rule SUB-R7		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS564.019	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Accept in part
FS368.044	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Allow	Retain Rule	Accept in part
S187.051	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R7	Support	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.	Retain Rule SUB-R7.		Accept in part
FS564.020	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Accept in part
FS368.045	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Allow	Retain Rule	Accept in part
S243.076	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R7	Support	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.	Retain Rule SUB-R7		Accept in part
FS564.021	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Accept in part
FS368.046	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Allow	Retain Rule	Accept in part
FS570.634	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
FS566.648	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.670	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
S333.051	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R7	Support	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.	Retain Rule SUB-R7		Accept in part
FS564.022	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Accept in part
FS368.047	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Allow	Retain Rule	Accept in part
S527.023	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R7	Oppose	SUB-P9 and SUB-R7 encourage inappropriate subdivision in the rural production and lifestyle zones if the development achieves so-called environmental outcomes of the management plan subdivision rule. This provision is also poorly conceived. The management plan criteria proposed in Appendix 3 (APP3) are vague, low-reaching and don't set clear expectations for either developers, land owners, or planning officers. The proposed elements and criteria for Management Plans are less than we should expect for all subdivisions in today's world. We consider that management plan subdivisions, to date, have historically failed to achieve quality development or environmental outcomes. If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, they criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.	Amend management plan subdivision criteria to improve environmental outcomes (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS354.137	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	SUB-R7 and the management plan should include consideration of highly production land.	Allow	Allow S527.023 including provisions for highly productive land.	Reject
FS564.025	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	A minimum discretionary activity subdivision consent is required for management plan subdivision applications. The Council has full discretion to consider the appropriateness of the proposal and environmental outcomes to be achieved through the subdivision when deciding whether to approve or decline an application. The submitter considers that the management plan subdivision provisions should be retained as the provisions enable a more integrated form of subdivision and development of rural sites.	Disallow	Reject the submission - Delete this rule	Accept
FS566.1885	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S253.010	IDF Developments Limited	SUB-R7	Support	The general tenor of Rule SUB-R7 draws upon provisions found within the ODP. Those provisions have worked well and should be enhanced within the PDP as this gives effect to the purposes of the Act.	Retain Rule SUB-R7 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS564.023	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Allow the submission.	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7 (inferred)	Accept in part
S529.148	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R7	Oppose	SUB-P9 and SUB-R7 encourage inappropriate subdivision in the rural production and lifestyle zones if the development achieves so-called environmental outcomes of the management plan subdivision rule. This provision is also poorly conceived. The management plan criteria proposed in Appendix 3 (APP3) are vague, low-reaching and don't set clear expectations for either developers, land owners, or planning officers. The proposed elements and criteria for Management Plans are less than we should expect for all subdivisions in today's world. We consider that management plan subdivisions, to date, have historically failed to achieve quality development or environmental outcomes. If the concept of management plan subdivision is	Delete this rule SUB-R7 (inferred) If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, the criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				retained, they criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.			
FS564.026	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	A minimum discretionary activity subdivision consent is required for management plan subdivision applications. The Council has full discretion to consider the appropriateness of the proposal and environmental outcomes to be achieved through the subdivision when deciding whether to approve or decline an application. The submitter considers that the management plan subdivision provisions should be retained as the provisions enable a more integrated form of subdivision and development of rural sites.	Disallow	Reject the submission - Delete this rule SUB-R7	Accept
FS570.2036	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2050	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2072	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S40.016	Martin John Yuretech	SUB-R7	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential,	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a 10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.			
FS368.039	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. ...Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
FS587.005	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Accept in part
S41.016	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-R7	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not	Amend allotment sizes in the Rural Production zone, perhaps with a limited number of allotments with minimum areas of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. Perhaps there should be more focus on the size of the balance parcel - subdividing off 4ha to leave a		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities (sewerage, water supply and stormwater) and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.	10ha balance parcel does not protect productivity, while subdividing 1ha off a 200ha block has next to no effect, especially if the smaller block consists of bush. Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.		
FS368.040	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m ² or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land. ...Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
FS587.006	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers the minimum lot sizes for the Rural Production zone are too large and / or restrictive. Some flexibility is required for those wanting to convert their land into lifestyle blocks or smaller independent blocks rather than having to sell larger parcels of productive land and move from the district. The relief sought could help generate greater investment and enhanced rural productivity.	Allow in part	Retain operative Rule 13.7.2.1(i) minimum lot size 20ha as a controlled activity and provide for a limited number of minimum lot size 4ha as a discretionary activity for Rural Production Zone. Amend the Subdivision Chapter to insert a cluster option for larger blocks which enables 4 x 10,000m ² per initial parent lot with the balance parcel containing a minimum area (i.e., 40ha). Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S151.002	NFS Farms Limited	SUB-R7	Support	Enables integrated subdivision opportunities that complements sustainable environmental management, including the protection of natural character, landscape, amenity, heritage and cultural values.	Retain SUB-R7 (Management Plan Subdivision) as it relates to the Rural Production zone and the submitters landholdings (at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469))		Accept in part
FS368.042	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain SUB-R7 (Management Plan Subdivision) as it relates to the Rural Production zone...	Allow	Retain SUB-R7	Accept in part
S167.058	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R7	Support	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.	Retain Rule SUB-R7		Accept in part
FS368.043	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Allow	Retain	Accept in part
FS566.420	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S349.016	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-R7	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	amend SUB-R7 to provide for 'management plan subdivision' with average lot sizes of 3,000m2 in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a restricted discretionary activity		Accept in part
FS62.050	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part
FS333.037	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			
S431.078	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R8	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS66.145	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The outcome sought that subdivision retains consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone will by its nature be unachievable, given subdivision is a change to that.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.078	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
S436.031	Northland Fish and Game Council	SUB-R8	Support	The recreational values of waterbodies can be constrained by limited public access; therefore, it is important to provide such access. Rivers and streams in the Far North District support trout fisheries, and many wetlands support game bird hunting, but outside of urban areas there is relatively little legal public access to and along waterbodies. While unformed legal roads do provide some access to rivers, they often wander over farmland and it is not obvious where they lie. Once at the river, there are few esplanade reserves and strips, marginal strips, recreation and road reserves and so most riverbanks are in private ownership, potentially with ad medium filum rights. Fish and Game has a statutory obligation to maintain and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas. Public access to lakes, rivers and public spaces can be fragmented by the subdivision process if not carefully managed. The subdivision process itself however provides an opportunity to maintain public access and associated linkages. The recreation of esplanade reserves for example can provide for the protection of conservation values of riparian margins, maintenance of water quality and aquatic habitats and the enhancement of public access and recreational opportunities, including sports fish angling and game bird hunting. Section 6(d) of the RMA recognises that the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes and rivers is a matter of national importance	Retain policies and rules that: - ensure that the plan maintains and enhances public access to and along wetlands, streams, lakes and rivers - provide for the creation and protection of esplanade reserves and strips as a permitted activity.		Accept
FS570.1495	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	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS346.117	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1509	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
FS569.1531	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
S431.079	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R9	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.079	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
S431.080	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R10	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.080	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
S431.081	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R11	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.081	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
S431.082	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R12	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: - consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone - measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change - where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.082	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
S431.083	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R13	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules:		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	• consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.083	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
S431.084	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R14	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.084	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
S431.085	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R15	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.085	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
S168.061	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.		
S163.004	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	Standards	Support in part	The storage of excess rainfall to be applied to the land in times of moisture deficit allows the soils to stay in a sponge like state and avoid the dry arid state which washes and blows away to add sediment.	Insert in standards all infrastructure must have appropriate infrastructure to protect the natural environment	Reject
S178.004	Reuben Wright	Standards	Support in part	Rules SUB-S2 - S8 do not appear to have an activity status expressed where any application will comply with the various Rules. It is assumed any subdivision should be either permitted or controlled where it complies with anyone of the rules, and restricted discretionary where it does not comply. An activity status should be referenced for each rule.	Amend to clarify activity status with compliance with SUB-S2-S8.	Reject
S178.006	Reuben Wright	Standards	Support in part	Rule SUB-S7 refers to 'Easements for any purpose'. This should not be a rule but rather a matter that control is reserved over or discretion is restricted to for any subdivision.	[Delete SUB-S7 and replace as matter of control/discretion for easements for any subdivision].	Reject
S425.042	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Standards	Support in part	In general, PHTTCCT support well-connected development, and future transport networks (see sub#4) being provided at the time of subdivision. Given the lack of spatial planning incorporated into the plan, it is considered that requiring developers to show how any future transport networks will be accommodated by the development is critical to future proof the District and ensure an integrated well connected transport network. Depending on the scale of development this could include requiring setbacks from indicative roads/cycleways as shown/described in any future or existing) strategies/spatial plans/annual plan be provided, or road connections provided at boundaries of the developments.	Amend the subdivision chapter to ensure that provision for, and connectivity with future transport networks is demonstrated at subdivision.	Reject
S428.015	Kapiro Residents Association	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	
S55.042	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Standards	Oppose	Support the objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from continuing to operate. However, this objective is not supported by clear policies or rules to give effect to this statement in rural areas.	amend standards to give effect to objective SUB - 01	Accept in part
FS129.11	Waste Management		Support		Allow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	New Zealand Limited						
S55.043	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Standards	Support in part	Support the acknowledgement that subdivision should not result in reverse sensitivity effects that result in the inability to undertake activities enabled in the relevant zone. However, this acknowledgement is not supported by clear policies or rules to give effect to this statement in the rural zones	amend standards to give effect to reverse sensitivity protection described in the overview		Accept in part
FS129.12	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S356.092	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Standards	Support	There should be a standard for assessing access and transportation effects as a result of subdivision.	Insert a new Standards that addresses access and transport effects.		Reject
FS25.113	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
FS243.077	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental. However, no details to the proposed changes are introduced in the primary submission and therefore it is unclear to the specific relief sought.	Allow in part	There appears to be no rules	Accept in part
S431.070	John Andrew Riddell	Standards	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed, this is a necessary	Revise the objectives, policies and provisions to better provide for cycling and active transport and walking in urban areas, settlements and their surrounds		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.			
FS332.070	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
S529.222	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS570.2109	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2123	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2145	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.018	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1728	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S556.001	Ian Diarmid Palmer	SUB-S1	Not Stated	The term 'site' is used approximately 1200 times in the text of the PDP including in relation to rules prescribing, for example how many residential units are allowed on a 'site' and the area required to be allocated on a 'site' for each residential unit. However, the standard related to the minimum size of parcels of land (SUB-S1) is titled "Minimum allotment sizes" [emphasis added]. The term 'allotment' appears only 85 times in the PDP text. Given a 'site' (by the definition used) may be comprised of multiple 'titles' (as defined) and a 'title' may be comprised of multiple 'allotments' (as defined) the use of the word 'allotment' in SUB-S1 creates ambiguity and possibly unintended consequences. For example, a subdivision may be proposed of a 8 hectare 'site' into two 4 hectares 'sites' in seeming compliance with SUB-S1 for Rural Lifestyle Controlled subdivision. However, one of the two newly proposed 4 hectare 'sites' may evenly straddle a legal Road (e.g. an unformed Paper Road). LINZ will insist that the new title for this second new 'site' be comprised of two 'allotments' (of 2 hectares each) which will be drawn as such on the Land Transfer and subsequent Deposited Plan. This however could be seen as not then meeting the 4 hectare threshold per SUB-S1.	Amend the word 'allotment' as used in SUB-S1 to 'site' and/or otherwise clarify that the areas listed in SUB-S1 are intended to be measures of 'site' areas. Alternatively many of the places in the PDP where the word 'site' is used should be changed to use the word 'allotment'.		Reject
S264.004	Wilson Hookway	SUB-S1	Support	The increased lot size for Rural Production Zone appears to be double the previous size. I believe this is an unreasonable size increase. This no	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot sizes on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				longer allows owners to retire in their existing homes with a smaller area of land and reduces the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for family members to build on and enter the property market.			
FS297.20	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject
FS297.21	Wilson Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject
FS100.24	Allen Hookway		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject
FS293.20	Danielle Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject
FS257.20	Amber Hookway		Support	Retain the ODP minimum allotment sizes and do not increase the discretionary activity standard in the Rural Production zone to 8 hectares. The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district	Allow		Reject
FS256.22	Lianne Kennedy		Support	The smaller lot sizes gives flexibility to land owners to meet needs of the land and also of	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				families in the midst of a housing crisis especially prevalent in the far north district			
FS368.069	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend to reinstate the Operative District Plan rule for minimum lot size on the Rural Production Zone (Table 13.7.2.1), with 20 ha minimum lot size as a controlled activity	Allow	Amend	Reject
S512.034	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-S2	Support in part	Seek explicit reference of emergency response access needs.	Amend SUB-S2 a. compatibility with the pattern of the surrounding subdivision, land use activities, and access arrangements (including emergency response access);		Accept
S111.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-S2	Oppose	Why must the Council insist on working in squares? What is wrong with a rectangular building platform, or trapezoid, or even triangular? The insistence on square shapes is a nonsense and leads to unnecessary extra 'breaches' having to be addressed. The requirement includes the words ' does not encroach into the permitted activity boundary setbacks for the relevant zone etc, so surely this is enough to ensure the building envelope is of sufficient size. There is no justifiable need to be square.	Amend SUB-S2 as follows: Allotments created must be able to accommodate a buildign envelope of the minimum area specified below, which does not encroach into the permitted activity boundary setbacks for the relevant zone or into an area that does not allow a building to be located ~~4m x14m~~ 196m2, 30m x30m 900m2		Reject
FS172.194	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.64	Joe Carr		Support	obvious reason	Allow		Reject
S189.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-S2	Oppose	The submitter opposes SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment being a square building platform. 30m x 30m building platform area is unnecessarily large.	Amend SUB-S2 as follows: Allotments created must be able to accommodate a building envelope of the minimum area specified below, which does not encroach into the permitted activity boundary setbacks for the relevant zone or into an area that does not allow a building to be located. Replace 14m x 14m with 150m2 Replace 30m x30m with 300m2		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS172.249	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS566.011	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
FS569.043	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.006	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
S561.052	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-S2	Support in part	Kerikeri town is of sufficient urban size and predicted growth to support a medium density residential zone around the immediate town centre. Kāinga Ora request that the application of SUB-S2 be extended to include the proposed Medium Density Residential zone.	Amend SUB-S2 be to include its application to the proposed Medium Density Residential zone. Amend SUB-S2 to include a residential building platform dimension of: 8m x 15m		Accept
FS32.106	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.324	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
FS47.066	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject
FS348.139	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
S349.018	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-S2	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Amend to reduce building platform dimensions under SUB-S2 to 20m x 20m in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Rural Residential Zone		Accept
FS62.052	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.			
FS333.039	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject
S172.009	Terra Group	SUB-S3	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S172.026	Terra Group	SUB-S3	Support	Support this standard as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone (note: submitter duplicates submission point in their submission 172.009).	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S110.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-S3	Oppose	I do not believe the Council has the legal right to force connection to a Council service through a planning instrument such as a District plan options should be available to the subdivider and future lot owners	Amend SUB - S3 all new allotments shall be provided with the ability to connect to a safe potable water supply with an adequate capacity for the respective potential land uses. This may be either by way of a connection to a Council reticulated water supply system, or by way of an on-site water supply system		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS172.192	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.63	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject
S207.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-S3	Oppose	Do not believe Council has the legal right to force connections to a Council service through a planning instrument such as a District Plan. Options should be available to the subdivider and future lot owners	Amend clause 1 of Standard SUB-S3 as follows: All new allotments shall ~~have~~ be provided with the ability to connect to a safe potable water supply with a an adequate capacity that is adequate for the anticipated respective potential land uses. This may be either by way of a connection to a Council reticulated water supply system, or by way of an on-site water supply system.		Reject
FS172.263	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
S512.035	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-S3	Support	Fire and Emergency support the explicit reference to allotments requiring water supplies in line with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	retain SUB-S3		Accept in part
FS289.15	Reuben Wright		Oppose	As per the Kaipara District Councils experience, reference to compliance with this specific standard is not appropriate in a District Plan where the Standard cannot be read as a rule.	Disallow		Accept in part
S368.087	Far North District Council	SUB-S3	Support in part	If a subdivision is not able to connect to a reticulated water system, the way the rule is currently drafted it could be interpreted as requiring that there be a system installed or be provided as a condition of consent (i.e s224(c)) prior to issue of any new title. The intention is that at subdivision it shall be demonstrated that a water supply system can be provided. Redraft more aligned with the standard for wastewater SU B-S5 (2)	Amend SUB-S3 3. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water systems is not available all allotments shall be provided with a means to must provide a water supply system.		Accept
FS25.115	Kiwi Fresh Orange		Support	Supports the amendment, which clarifies the intent of the standard.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Company Limited						
FS243.068	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments proposed, consistent with the change sought in its primary submission.	Allow	Amend SUB-S3	Accept
FS325.073	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the amendment, which clarifies the intent of the standard.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
S554.009	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	SUB-S3	Support	Not stated.	Retain Standard as notified		Accept in part
FS32.012	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Drive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part
FS389.015	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S516.058	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-S4	Not Stated	Standards SUB-S4 and SUB-S5 require all stormwater management and wastewater disposal to be in accordance with the Far North District Council Environmental Engineering Standards. Ngā Tai Ora are concerned that these Engineering Standards do not ensure sustainable, safe and efficient management of stormwater and wastewater disposal. As a catch all standards these reference the entire Engineering Standards, resulting in potential unclear and unmeasurable rules.	Amend the relationship of the District Plan to the Environmental Engineering Standards to: (a) Ensure the District Plan requires the delivery of infrastructure in a manner that achieves sustainable, safe and efficient provision of infrastructure. (b) Ensure referencing of the Environmental Engineering Standards in the District Plan is appropriate and results in clear and measurable rules. (c) Cross-referencing to Environmental Engineering Standards is consistent across all chapters.		Accept in part
FS289.13	Reuben Wright		Oppose	While provisions can be applied in the plan to ensure suitable servicing is provided, it is not appropriate to specifically refer to any engineering standards that the Council has by way of a specific objective, policy or rule.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S215.033	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-S4	Support in part	We support standard SUB-S4 (1) requiring increases in stormwater runoff to be avoided or mitigated for the 10% AEP rainfall event. This is the industry standard for stormwater management and is consistent with Regional Plan rules. We oppose standard SUB-S4 (2) requiring compliance with Council's Engineering Standards April 2022 unless the Engineering Standards are amended. As discussed in our comments on the Engineering Standards (appended), the stormwater provisions of the Engineering Standards contain technical errors, are unnecessarily prescriptive and/or are inconsistent with industry standards and Regional Plan rules.	Amend SUB- S4 to delete (2)		Accept
FS289.14	Reuben Wright		Support	The Engineering Standards should not be referred to in any objective, policy, or rule in the Plan. Minimum engineering requirements should be set as rules, with any Standard adopted by the Council possibly referred to as a means of comply with the rule.	Allow		Accept
FS309.18	Brad Hedger		Oppose	The effects from stormwater management from development is a major contributor to the damage of the receiving environment and ground water recharge. The management of stormwater	Disallow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should not be limited to 10% AEP as larger storm events are occurring on a regular basis.			
FS570.522	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
FS403.144	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Seek provision details as above ...	Accept in part
FS566.536	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
FS569.558	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
S554.010	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	SUB-S4	Support	Not stated	Retain standard as notified		Accept in part
FS32.013	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.			
FS403.145	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part
FS389.016	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S516.059	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	SUB-S5	Not Stated	Standards SUB-S4 and SUB-S5 require all stormwater management and wastewater disposal to be in accordance with the Far North District Council Environmental Engineering Standards. Ngā Tai Ora are concerned that these Engineering Standards do not ensure sustainable, safe and efficient management of stormwater and wastewater disposal. As a catch all standards these reference the entire Engineering Standards, resulting in potential unclear and unmeasurable rules.	Amend the relationship of the District Plan to the Environmental Engineering Standards to: (a) Ensure the District Plan requires the delivery of infrastructure in a manner that achieves sustainable, safe and efficient provision of infrastructure. (b) Ensure referencing of the Environmental Engineering Standards in the District Plan is appropriate and results in clear and measurable rules. (c) Cross-referencing to Environmental Engineering Standards is consistent across all chapters.		Accept in part
S110.002	Lynley Newport	SUB-S5	Oppose	I do not believe the Council has the legal right to force connection to a Council service through a planning instrument such as a District plan options should be available to the subdivider and future lot owners	Amend SUB-S5 All allotments shall be provided with either the ability to connect to a Council owned reticulated wastewater scheme, a privately owned reticulated wastewater scheme constructed pursuant to a Discharge Consent, or a means of treating and disposing of wastewater within the site area of the allotment		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS172.193	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS403.146	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part
S207.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-S5	Oppose	Do not believe Council has the legal right to force connections to a Council service through a planning instrument such as a District Plan. Options should be available to the subdivider and future lot owners	Amend clause 1 of Standard SUB-S5 as follows: ~~Where a connection to Council owned reticulated wastewater scheme is available, all allotments must connect~~ All allotments shall be provided with either the ability to connect to a Council owned reticulated wastewater scheme, a privately owned reticulated wastewater scheme constructed pursuant to a Discharge Consent, or a means of treating and disposing of wastewater within the site area of the allotment.		Reject
FS172.264	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS403.149	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S554.011	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	SUB-S5	Support	Not stated	Retain standard as notified		Accept in part
FS32.014	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Drive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part
FS389.017	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS403.151	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S215.034	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-S5	Support in part	We support standard SUB-S4 (1) and (2) requiring provision for wastewater disposal. We oppose standard SUB-S4 (3) requiring compliance with Council's Engineering Standards April 2022 unless the Engineering Standards are amended. Engineering Standard Clause 5.1.5.3 paragraph (a) should be deleted. The lot area is a District Plan matter and is not relevant to the engineering standards. Many existing lots with on-site wastewater disposal are less than 3000m2 and would not comply with this provision. The requirement to comply with Regional Plan rules for wastewater disposal (paragraph b) ensures on-site wastewater disposal is appropriate.	Amend SUB-S5 to delete (3)		Accept
FS570.523	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
FS566.537	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
FS569.559	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
FS403.150	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Reject
S138.010	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity	SUB-S5	Support in part	As all allotments must connect where services are available, clarification is required to assist in determining the availability of connections to Council owned reticulated wastewater scheme. This is because the matters for discretion include the 'capacity of, and impacts on the existing	Amend Standard SUB-S5 - clarifying this standard that requires that where a connection to Council owned reticulated wastewater scheme is available, all allotments must connect.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Northern Region Ltd			reticulated wastewater disposal system. The existing capacity of urban wastewater systems is unknown so it would be difficult to confirm that there is capacity without an extensive and expensive investigation.			
FS403.147	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part
S172.010	Terra Group	SUB-S5	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
FS403.148	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Oppose	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Disallow	Te Whatu Ora agree that the proposed referencing to Engineering Standards should be amended and the relationship between documents should be reviewed.	Accept in part
S278.001	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	SUB-S6	Support in part	Chorus supports the intent to require fibre for newly subdivided allotments where available, but the proposed wording could create ambiguity as to the type of connection to be provided particularly in greenfield developments where no service is currently provided.	Amend SUB-S6 as follows: 1. Telecommunications through an open access fibre network. ~~Telecommunications i. fibre where it is available or; ii. Copper where fibre is not available.~~		Accept in part
S178.005	Reuben Wright	SUB-S6	Support in part	Rule SUB-S6 includes reference to provision of telecommunications via fibre or copper connection. A requirement for a telecommunication service should no longer be required for any subdivision where technology now allows for various telecommunication providers to offer new technology allowing for wireless connection in any location. Any rule requiring telecommunication services for subdivision should be removed.	Delete requirement for a telecommunication service for subdivisions.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S517.003	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Vodafone New Zealand Limited	SUB-S6	Support in part	Rules SUB-R1, SUB-R3, SUB-R5 and SUB-R6 all require telecommunication connection via compliance with Standard SUB-S6. Non-compliance becomes a restricted discretionary. Rule SUB-R6 requires connection not clear if there is a requirement to provide telecommunication connections beyond the urban and Rural residential and Horticulture Processing Facility zones as Rural and Rural Production zones are not mentioned in Rule SUB-R6. In addition, Rural residential and Horticulture Processing Facility zones are zones that would be normally under RBI be serviced via wireless connectivity. Spark and Vodafone are submitting to amend Standard SUB-S6 to recognise wireless connectivity in rural areas.	Amend Standard SUB-S6 to apply to all zones as follows: Connections shall be provided at the boundary of the site area of the allotment for: - telecommunications - Fibre where it is available; or ~~Copper where fibre is not available~~ Where fibre is not available Mobile/Wireless. which includes satellite: oriii. Where fibre or mobile/wireless connectivity is not available copper VDSL is minimum connection standard: andiv. The applicant shall provide with any subdivision consent application of written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that connection: andV. At the time of subdivision. sufficient land for telecommunications. transformers and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, proof of consultation with the telecommunications network utility operators may will be required. 2. Electricity supply through the local electricity distribution network. Note: This standard does not apply to allotments for a utility, road, reserve or for access purposes.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS44.37	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Fibre and VDSL are rarely available in rural areas with connection impossible in most places. Rural areas should not be included with SUB-S6 as there are many options for wireless connection once rural lots are developed with a residential dwelling. If the sites are developed and they wish to connect to satellite connectivity, such as Starlink, then this will occur once a residential dwelling is constructed on the site, not at the subdivision stage. Furthermore, some rural lots will not be developed with residential dwellings and therefore connection to telecommunications will never be required for some sites (lots which are to remain as vacant farmland etc). SUB-S6 is not applicable to rural areas and landowners should not have to apply for a more restrictive subdivision application due to not being able to connect to fibre.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS289.16	Reuben Wright		Oppose	There is no reason to require telecommunication connections for subdivisions where there are now multiple options available for services. These provisions are not considered necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
S109.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-S6	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement in SUB-S6 to provide connections to the boundary for conventional land line telecommunications or grid power as technology and people's preferences have moved beyond these.	Amend SUB-S6 (inferred) as follows: Add new clause 3: 3. Or alternative means, provided that where it is proposed to rely on alternatives to the reticulated services outlined above, the alternative shall be capable of providing the same level of service as conventional reticulated services.		Accept in part
FS172.191	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.62	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S561.053	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-S6	Support in part	Kerikeri town is of sufficient urban size and predicted growth to support a medium density residential zone around the immediate town centre.	Amend SUB-S6 to include a Medium Density Residential zone.		Accept
FS32.107	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject
FS348.005	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the submission.	Reject
FS23.325	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept
FS47.067	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.140	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
S172.012	Terra Group	SUB-S7	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S368.086	Far North District Council	SUB-S7	Support in part	The last sentence is in (4) unclear as to purpose and definition and is not considered necessary for the purpose of applying this rule. Recommend removing 'Centre line easements shall apply when the line is privately owned.	Amend SUB-S7 4. Service easements, whether in gross or for private purposes, with sufficient width to permit maintenance, repair or replacement of service ~~Centre line easements shall apply when the line is privately owned:~~		Accept
S77.008	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity)	Amend to insert the option of creating an esplanade strip in the subdivision chapter (inferred)		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.		
S146.009	Trevor John Ashford	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the land owner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.	Accept
S40.009	Martin John Yurelich	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend standard SUB-S8 to insert the option of creating an esplanade strip	Accept
S41.009	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-S8	Support	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend standard SUB-S8 to insert the option of creating an esplanade strip	Accept
S163.012	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.	Accept
S377.009	Rua Hatu Trust	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity)	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.		
S470.009	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip.	Accept
S161.008	Shanon Garton	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in the subdivision chapter (inferred)	Accept
S172.011	Terra Group	SUB-S8	Support	Support this standard, as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)	Accept in part
S333.057	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-S8	Support	The rule appropriately aligns with the esplanade reserve requirements of the RMA 1991. A lake of 8ha is suitably defined in the rule, with esplanades around smaller lakes likely of no or of limited public benefit and a significant imposition on landowners	Retain Rule SUB-S8	Accept in part
S485.010	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend SUB-S8 to not make it a requirement [for Council] to take an esplanade reserve	Accept in part
S168.065	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-S8	Support	The rule appropriately aligns with the esplanade reserve requirements of the RMA 1991. A lake of	Retain Standard SUB-S8	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				8ha is suitably defined in the rule, with esplanades around smaller lakes likely of no or of limited public benefit and a significant imposition on landowners		
S187.057	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-S8	Support	The rule appropriately aligns with the esplanade reserve requirements of the RMA 1991. A lake of 8ha is suitably defined in the rule, with esplanades around smaller lakes likely of no or of limited public benefit and a significant imposition on landowners.	Retain Rule SUB-S8.	Accept in part
S358.041	Leah Frieling	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend Standard SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip	Accept
S357.038	Sean Frieling	SUB-S8	Support in part	Sometimes esplanade strips are more suitable than esplanade reserves. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in their title.	Amend to insert the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.	Accept
S472.046	Michael Foy	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity)	Amend to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in the subdivision chapter (inferred)	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.			
S547.009	LJ King Limited	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend to make it not a requirement to take an esplanades reserve.		Accept in part
S544.009	Kelvin Richard Horsford	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title	Amend to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in the subdivision chapter (inferred)		Accept
S283.008	Trent Simpkin	SUB-S8	Support in part	Esplanade Strips need to be an option. There needs to be allowance made for esplanade strips, as well as reserves. Sometimes they are more suitable for a development, and council has enough reserves which they are unable to maintain, so it makes more sense to vest it in the owners name to look after it.	Amend to add the option of an esplanade strip to the standard.		Accept
FS45.10	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support, Esplanade strips are a proven success currently	Allow		Accept
FS172.280	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
FS570.822	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
FS566.836	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.858	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
S541.009	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend to make it not a requirement to take an esplanades reserve.		Accept in part
FS155.78	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS172.338	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
S519.010	Elbury Holdings	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend SUB-S8 to not make it a requirement to take an esplanade reserve		Accept in part
FS155.79	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S368.091	Far North District Council	SUB-S8	Support in part	drafting error. Omission of esplanade strip within the rule, needs to be included	Amend SUB-S8 ...An esplanade reserve or esplanade strip must be provided with a minimum width of 20m, in accordance with section 230 of the RMA.		Accept
FS44.58	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support		Allow		Accept
S287.007	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-S8	Oppose	Esplanade Strips need to be an option. There needs to be allowance made for esplanade strips, as well as reserves. Sometimes they are more suitable for a development, and council has enough reserves which they are unable to maintain, so it makes more sense to vest it in the owners name to look after it.	Amend to add the option of an esplanade strip to the standard.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS29.23	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree with there being the option of an esplanade strip or reserve, not just one option. Sometimes one or the other is more suitable for a property.	Allow		Accept
FS570.878	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
FS566.892	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
FS569.914	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
S523.024	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-S8	Support	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-S8 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS88.66	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1818	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
S108.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-S8	Support in part	The submitter considers that the provision of an esplanade strip can sometimes be a better option than an esplanade reserve e.g: if the river changes course or the MHWS line changes. It can also be preferable to leave the ownership of the land with the landowner rather than transferring the land to the Council.	Amend SUB-S8 to allow for the option of providing an esplanade strip.		Accept
FS172.190	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
FS196.61	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter	Allow		Accept
S502.088	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-S8	Support in part	The provision of esplanade is to provide for walking, recreation and ecological benefits to members of the wider public. Section 230 of the RMA acknowledges that this can be provided in the form of Esplanade Reserve or Esplanade Strip. Both options should be available as a permitted activity to a developer in compliance with the Act.	Amend SUB-S8 to provide for Esplanade Reserve or Esplanade Strip a permitted activity to a developer in compliance with the Act		Accept
FS172.227	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S208.001	Thomson Survey Limited	SUB-S8	Support in part	The Council fails to recognise that an esplanade strip is sometimes a better option. There are instances where the water feature is better suited to an esplanade strip boundary that changes with the water feature, e.g. if the river changes course or the MHWS line changes. It is also often preferable to leave the ownership of the land with the landowner as opposed to transferring the land to the Council.	Amend Standard SUB-S8 to allow for the option of providing an Esplanade Strip.		Accept
FS172.265	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S348.007	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the	Amend Standard SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.			
FS172.290	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S395.009	Sean Jozef Vercammen	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.		Accept
FS172.294	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S410.009	Kerry-Anne Smith	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.		Accept
FS172.301	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S411.009	Roger Myles Smith	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.		Accept
FS172.303	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S439.009	John Joseph and Jacqueline	SUB-S8	Support in part	Section 77 of the RMA 1991 allows Council to create a rule that allows for an esplanade strip, but the PDP only has allowance for esplanade	Amend Standard SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Elizabeth Matthews			reserves. In some instances, esplanade strips are more suitable, so this option should be available. Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.			
FS172.331	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S243.083	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-S8	Support	The rule appropriately aligns with the esplanade reserve requirements of the RMA 1991. A lake of 8ha is suitably defined in the rule, with esplanades around smaller lakes likely of no or of limited public benefit and a significant imposition on landowners.	Retain Rule SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.641	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
FS566.655	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
FS569.677	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
S272.004	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-S8	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular, we support Subdivision SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other	Retain SUB-S8		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.			
FS570.765	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.779	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.801	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S272.022	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-S8	Support	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS570.782	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.796	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.818	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.059	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-S8	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular, we support Subdivision	Retain SUB-S8 including application to all zones		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.			
FS570.1948	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1962	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1984	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.191	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-S8	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS570.2078	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2092	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2114	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S569.009	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner. At least with esplanade strips there is a duty (or at least the opportunity) for the landowner to look after the area, since it is still included in his/her title.	Amend SUB-S8 to include the option of creating an esplanade strip in this rule.		Accept
FS348.240	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
S167.065	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-S8	Support	The rule appropriately aligns with the esplanade reserve requirements of the RMA 1991. A lake of 8ha is suitably defined in the rule, with esplanades around smaller lakes likely of no or of limited public benefit and a significant imposition on landowners.	Retain Rule SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS566.427	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
S464.009	LJ King Ltd	SUB-S8	Oppose	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, of by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserves removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend SUB-S8 to not make it a requirement [for Council] to take an esplanade reserve.		Accept in part
FS566.1554	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
S523.004	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	SUB-S8	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips	Retain SUB-S8		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)			along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS566.1799	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
S543.009	LJ King Limited	SUB-S8	Support in part	Council already has enough reserves around that they are unable to maintain, so by vesting the land in Council via an esplanade reserve removes it from the care and stewardship of the adjacent landowner.	Amend to make it not a requirement to take an esplanades reserve		Accept in part
FS566.2170	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
S445.008	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-S8	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.	Retain SUB-S8 and include in all zones in the PDP.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS569.1763	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1742	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S445.025	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-S8	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-S8 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1779	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1758	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S428.023	Kapiro Residents Association	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
S529.230	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part
FS570.2117	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2131	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2153	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.026	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1736	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S428.024	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
S529.231	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part
FS570.2118	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2132	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2154	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.027	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1737	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S428.025	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
S529.232	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part
FS570.2119	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2133	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2155	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.028	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1738	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S428.026	Kapiro Residents Association	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements tngahat foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
S529.233	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part
FS570.2120	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2134	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2156	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.029	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Standards	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1739	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S259.015	Nicole Wooster	Objectives	Support	Provision needs to be made for roading takes to address climate change in areas like north Hokianga and where our farm is located. If a person subdivides or does a large scale land use the plan should allow for consideration of new roading routes to avoid or address hazards. For example an alternative route for the Mangamuka gorge, as we have lost access to a 45min direct route to our closest town. The coastal hazard mapping also identifies our local roading network being significantly affected. Council should be linking the District Plan to a climate response strategy to ensure communities have a safe and usable road network.	Amend plan to ensure that it has the ability to take roading to address climate change / hazards issues not just urban connections.		Reject
S276.003	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the provisions do not prevent incremental loss.	Insert Operative Plan policies 13.4.12 (on management plan subdivision) and 13.4.13 (on subdivision design).		Reject
FS332.173	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
FS570.800	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
FS566.814	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
FS569.836	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
S333.108	P S Yates Family Trust	Management Plan Subdivision	Support	The Management Plan Subdivision matters set out an appropriate set of provisions to secure	Retain Management Plan Subdivision		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				environmental benefits from the once off management plan subdivision opportunity			
S168.148	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Management Plan Subdivision	Support	The Management Plan Subdivision matters set out an appropriate set of provisions to secure environmental benefits from the once off management plan subdivision opportunity.	Retain Management Plan Subdivision		Accept
S187.095	The Shooting Box Limited	Management Plan Subdivision	Support	The Management Plan Subdivision matters set out an appropriate set of provisions to secure environmental benefits from the one off management plan subdivision opportunity.	Retain Management Plan Subdivision.		Accept
S431.088	John Andrew Riddell	Management Plan Subdivision	Not Stated	The guidance and rules relating to environment benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Amend APP3 by adding the following to section d, Draft Management Plan: Council retains the discretion not to accept bonding where there is a potentially harsh environment or other factor(s), which present a significant risk in its assessment to successful re-establishment or management plan implementation. Evidence of the degree of risk should be included in the information required in part a, description of proposal, of Appendix APP3.		Accept in part
FS332.088	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
S243.127	Matauri Trustee Limited	Management Plan Subdivision	Support	he Management Plan Subdivision matters set out an appropriate set of provisions to secure environmental benefits from the once off management plan subdivision opportunity.	Retain Management Plan Subdivision		Accept
FS570.685	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.699	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
FS569.721	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
S529.149	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Management Plan Subdivision	Oppose	SUB-P9 and SUB-R7 encourage inappropriate subdivision in the rural production and lifestyle zones if the development achieves so-called environmental outcomes of the management plan subdivision rule. This provision is also poorly conceived. The management plan criteria proposed in Appendix 3 (APP3) are vague, low-reaching and don't set clear expectations for either developers, land owners, or planning officers. The proposed elements and criteria for Management Plans are less than we should expect for all subdivisions in today's world. We consider that management plan subdivisions, to date, have historically failed to achieve quality development or environmental outcomes. If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, they criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.	Delete APP3 (inferred)		Reject
FS570.2037	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2051	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2073	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S167.108	Bentzen Farm Limited	Management Plan Subdivision	Support	The Management Plan Subdivision matters set out an appropriate set of provisions to secure environmental benefits from the once off management plan subdivision opportunity.	Retain Management Plan Subdivision		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.470	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
S354.023	The BOI Watchdogs	c.Proposed Management Measures	Oppose	Controls should not be placed on the ownership of dogs until BOI Watchdog concerns have been addressed in order to determine if they are appropriate. Refer to full submission.	Delete management plan criteria, including (i) measures to protect, manage and enhance indigenous vegetation and habitats, ONL and ONF, heritage resources and riparian margins, including appropriate means of controlling dogs, cats, rats, mustelids and other animal pests and the means of controlling pest plants.		Reject
FS570.1032	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
FS566.1046	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
FS569.1068	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
S428.009	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. - Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
S364.007	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Kiwi conservation is particularly important in the Far North District context. Although it is noted that the North Island Kiwi is "Not Threatened", it has only reached this improved conservation status after significant community conservation efforts. These efforts should not go to waste and specific kiwi conservation objectives, policies, and rules should therefore be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.	Insert framework into the District Plan to promote pet-free subdivisions in high-density kiwi areas.		Accept in part
FS24.33	Lynley Newport		Oppose	As DoC states, the north island brown kiwi has done well in the district - and that's without a restrictive and oppressive rule regime. Bring the community with you, don't alienate. Responsible pet ownership is what is needed, not total bans.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS93.40	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Stop the dog bans, and restrictions on allowable dog numbers, via sub-division resource consents. - There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked. - These bans/restrictions are so	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who keep their dogs under control. They pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife. • Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act. • De-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs. • In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective (Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable. Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (<i>Sus scrofa</i>), deer (<i>Cervus spp.</i>) and goats (<i>Capra hircus</i>) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular."			
FS88.58	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	OPPOSE! OPPOSE! OPPOSE! Enough already. Dogs are not the problem here. Subdivision is.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				If kiwi are so important, why are we allowing subdivision in high-density kiwi areas? - Reducing their habitat - Cutting through kiwi corridors - Increasing the number of cars (which kill more kiwi than dogs or cats) - Adding lighting that affects wildlife - Human and construction noise pollution that affects wildlife If you care about kiwi, stop destroying their habitat. And stop hiding behind banning companion animals! (It's not the well cared for and managed dogs that are usually the culprits of dog-related kiwi deaths anyway. Addressing wandering dogs and population management in areas known for stray and neglected dogs would be far more effective than arbitrarily banning dogs and cats.)			
FS25.127	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent behind the submission, subject to the Department providing appropriate information to identify areas and appropriate drafting of provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriately identifying areas.	Accept in part
FS446.008	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in principle subject to appropriate wording.	Allow in part	Insert framework into the District Plan to promote pet-free subdivisions in high-density kiwi areas.	Accept in part
FS570.1088	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
FS346.147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1102	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
FS569.1124	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
S483.162	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In general, Top Energy seeks to ensure that adequate provision for electricity and telecommunications infrastructure is provided at the time of subdivision to ensure planned and coordinated development, and that existing infrastructure is protected from inappropriate development and future land use.	Amend subdivision chapter to ensure that electricity and telecommunications infrastructure is adequately provided for at the time of subdivision		Accept in part
FS24.35	Lynley Newport		Oppose	Electricity and telecommunications providers looked after quite well enough already. The submitter needs the good will of 'host' landowners, not their animosity.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS131.025	Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	The original submission is seeking to obligate a developer in what is already a onerous and challenging process which discourages development or depends on the original submitters approval.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part
FS345.213	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
S429.003	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Policies and rules relating to vegetation clearance are too permissive and do not provide sufficient protection for even the minimal maintenance of (a) indigenous vegetation and ecosystems, (b) kiwi and indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZ Threat Classification System), (c) freshwater, and	Revise the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as - - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(d) other ecological, landscape, character and amenity values.	indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present. Additional specific provisions include - - Rules for banning potential predator pets (dogs, cats, mustelids, etc) from areas where kiwi or other at risk/threatened species are present and vulnerable to these predators (e.g. shore birds such as dotterel, wetland birds such as bittern and dabchick, at-risk lizards, and other animals). - Consent conditions should require fencing on the boundaries of public land, such as esplanade reserve, and around areas of wetlands and waterways. - Consent conditions for areas of significant vegetation/habitat etc. should set high standards of protection for indigenous vegetation, kiwi, at risk/threatened species and biodiversity, including appropriate types of fencing, predator control, protection and restoration of native vegetation, weed control, restrictions on planting exotic vegetation, etc. Covenants should be legally binding in perpetuity and should include provisions	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					for monitoring implementation and enforcement. - Fencing needs to be appropriate for vulnerable species in the area, for example, fencing that allows free movement of kiwi; or in other cases fencing to stop dogs entering a kiwi area. - Signage to help protect kiwi and other vulnerable species, such as wetland species, shore birds. - Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be suitable for nocturnal wildlife, such as kiwi, and dark-sky-friendly (certified to minimise glare, reduce light trespass and protect the visibility of stars).		
FS67.16	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.17	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.			
FS69.16	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS446.012	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in principle subject to appropriate wording.	Allow in part	amendRevise the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as - - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present.	
FS66.17	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
S559.005	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The application of TW-P3 needs to be strengthened in the PDP chapters.	Amend the Subdivision chapter to insert clauses that stipulate that only tangata whenua can determine if something is likely to have an adverse effect on a site of significance to Māori or their relationship to a site of significance to Māori and requiring a cultural impact assessment in both situations in relation to adverse effects on sites of significance, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga (inferred).		Accept in part
FS155.14	Fiona King		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
FS151.138	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.2195	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
FS348.032	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	Accept in part
FS566.2209	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
FS569.2231	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
S559.013	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The amendment is to ensure recharge is maintained.	Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater design for new development.		Accept in part
FS151.146	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.2203	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
FS348.040	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	Accept in part
FS566.2217	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
FS569.2239	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
S559.048	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Our whenua is rural and, in most cases, lack a water supply network. With the growth of Kerikeri and its surrounding area, more demand is being put on our groundwater systems and in our coastal areas these systems are sensitive to extraction (saltwater intrusion).	Amend so that high intensity development is not enabled unless serviced by a supply network or adequate on-site storage is provided to cater for extended dry spells droughts.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS151.357	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.2238	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
FS348.075	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	Accept in part
FS566.2252	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
FS569.2274	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
S521.007	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.	<p>Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-FM>		Accept in part
FS309.4	Brad Hedger		Support in part	Water reuse strategies should form part of all new development along with renewable energy.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				These aspects should have incentives in the plan to encourage use.			
FS277.17	Jenny Collison		Support	This should be standard building practice	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.1717	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.053	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.	<p>Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-FM>		Accept in part
FS309.5	Brad Hedger		Support in part	Water reuse strategies should form part of all new development along with renewable energy. These aspects should have incentives in the plan to encourage use.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.1942	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1956	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1978	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S429.008	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In areas where freshwater issues are relevant to District Council functions and the DP, the NPS Freshwater Management of 2020 needs to be given effect in all relevant parts of the DP, including the Ecosystems & Biodiversity chapter and Natural Character chapter.	Amend the Plan to ensure that when subdivision, land use or development is considered, it gives effect to: -the NPS FM's fundamental concept of Te Mana o te Wai (including the principles and the hierarchy of obligations) should be applied to all freshwater issues that may be affected by development, not just the aspects of freshwater management referred to in the NPS (this point is stated in NPS FM s1.3(2)) -Policies and rules to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects(including cumulative effects) of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments (NPS FM s3.5(4)) -Avoiding the loss of wetlands and protecting their values: 'The loss of extent of natural inland wetlands is avoided, their values are protected, and their restoration is promoted...' (NPS FM s3.22).We note, in particular, that some provisions of the Natural Character chapter seem to contradict the NPS-FM. -Requirements to use water sensitive and low impact designs for stormwater and wastewater, including constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) to retain stormwater and runoff and prevent silt and pollutants being carried into waterways. -To avoid/reduce freshwater pollution generated by wastewater emissions, it should be a requirement to use enclosed wastewater systems that use disposal-to-land (i.e. systems that do not rely on dispersal via water or disposal into water) such as electrocoagulation methods involving coagulation and flocculation, widely used in parts of Europe. If not a requirement, these systems should at minimum be given priority over systems that rely on dispersal or disposal via water. -When subdivision or development takes place, all waterways should be protected by requirements for	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					native planting and other measures.		
FS66.22	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission lacks specificity, such that the exact nature of effect of the changes sought can not be understood. That said, the Proposed Plan generally gives appropriate effect to the provisions of the NPS Freshwater Management, acknowledging that the functions under this NPS primarily fall to the regional Council.	Disallow		Accept in part
S556.002	Ian Diarmid Palmer	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The term 'site' is used approximately 1200 times in the text of the PDP including in relation to rules prescribing, for example how many residential units are allowed on a 'site' and the area required to be allocated on a 'site' for each residential unit. However, the standard related to the minimum size of parcels of land (SUB-S1) is titled "Minimum allotment sizes" [emphasis added]. The term 'allotment' appears only 85 times in the PDP text. Given a 'site' (by the definition used) may be comprised of multiple 'titles' (as defined) and a 'title' may be comprised of multiple 'allotments' (as defined) the use of the word 'allotment' in SUB-S1 creates ambiguity and possibly unintended consequences. For example, a subdivision may be proposed of a 8 hectare 'site' into two 4 hectares 'sites' in seeming compliance with SUB-S1 for Rural Lifestyle Controlled subdivision. However, one of the two newly proposed 4 hectare 'sites' may evenly straddle a legal Road (e.g. an unformed Paper Road). LINZ will insist that the new title for this second new 'site' be comprised of two 'allotments' (of 2 hectares each) which will be drawn as such on the Land Transfer and subsequent Deposited Plan. This however could be seen as not then meeting the 4 hectare threshold per SUB-S1.	Amend the word 'allotment' as used in SUB-S1 to 'site' and/or otherwise clarify that the areas listed in SUB-S1 are intended to be measures of 'site' areas. Alternatively many of the places in the PDP where the word 'site' is used should be changed to use the word 'allotment'.		Reject
FS66.28	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The relief to amend the word 'allotment' as used in SUB-S1 to 'site' and/or otherwise clarify that the areas listed in SUB-S1 are intended to be	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				measures of 'site' areas is supported to allow for clear application of the rule.		
S436.032	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	NFGC supports separation of urban areas by defined and open space and effective rural zoning, and encouraging a more compact urban footprint through limiting rural lifestyle development. However, settlement patterns should be tightly restricted in undeveloped rural areas or in areas with high landscape and/or natural character values such as near wetlands and lakes. Elements of the experience sought by recreational hunters and anglers in the Far North District include the wilderness experience, the opportunity to engage in the sports, and the opportunity to obtain fish and game birds for food or enjoyment in a natural/nonbuilt environment, all with minimal restriction. This is a significant recreational and cultural aspect of the district which deserves recognition, particularly given the projected increasing footprint of settlement and industry. It constitutes an essential public amenity for an increasingly urbanised population. These are values that should be recognised in the Far North District Plan. A proliferation of rural 'lifestyle' blocks in the Far North District will allow future landowners to object to hunting activities; for example, by complaining under s48 of the Arms Act regarding the discharge of a firearm in or near a dwelling, house or public place to "annoy or frighten any persons". Introducing new dwelling areas near lakes and wetlands with values for hunters will have a number of possible implications on the future of hunting, limiting the suitability of subdivision in these areas. Growth of settlement into as-yet undeveloped land is a threat in terms of potential effects on sensitive ecosystems, particularly wetlands, and fauna (particularly avifauna). The following issues are of significance to NFGC: - Runoff of heavy metals and other contaminants from hard surfaces into waterbodies; - Drainage of wetland and bog areas for	Amend the plan as required to ensure: - development occurs away from areas valued for their amenity characteristics which are important for culture and recreation - recreational game bird hunting and recreational freshwater fishing are included as permitted activities in all rural areas - development is directed away from known hazard areas (ie, flooding hazards) - existing ponding zones are implemented and there is no further drainage to support growth of settlement areas - that water sensitive design principles (as used in the Auckland Unitary Plan) are encouraged and prioritised for new developments to reduce the creation of runoff and the sources of contaminants - that the effects of settlement expansion on avifauna are acknowledged and that the effects are sustainably managed	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				protection of increased settlement; - Increased predation of avifauna from pets and pests associated with human population			
FS66.30	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter, including that development occurs away from areas valued for their amenity characteristics which are important for culture and recreation, is not sufficiently specific. Such areas should be identified in the submission so that the implications of the relief sought can be properly understood.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS570.1496	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
FS346.118	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1510	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
FS569.1532	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
S359.025	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Fully support the identification of and specific zoning for Māori land (under Te Ture Whenua Act) and land returned through Treaty Settlement as cultural or commercial redress. However, we recommend that the provisions relating to the use and subdivision of these zones (eg. Policy NFL-P5) be reviewed to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF)	Amend the subdivisions provisions applying to the Maori Purpose Zone and the Treaty Settlement Land overlay to ensure they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.			
FS23.104	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that specific provision is made for Māori land and that these provisions do not inappropriately constrain the use to be made of this land - given the need to provide for positive economic usage by Māori not just preservation and conservation.	Allow	Allow the relief and make changes to ensure that economic relief can continue to be made of Māori land	Reject
FS243.005	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kainga Ora seeks to enable Māori-led projects on whenua Māori land, particularly where it addresses the severe housing shortage in Te Tai Tokerau and supports the realisation of Papakāinga.	Allow	Amend the subdivisions provisions applying to the Māori Purpose Zone and the Treaty Settlement Land overlay to ensure they do not unnecessarily restrict the intent for the use of such land (for example land returned as commercial redress should not be limited to 'ancestral' use where it is in an ONL or ONF) especially as there is no definition of what constitutes 'ancestral' use.	Reject
FS570.1061	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
FS346.486	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1075	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
FS569.1097	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S431.148	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the assessment criterion 'the adequacy of available or programmed development infrastructure' in all relevant policies on managing land use and subdivision to: the adequacy of available infrastructure and the certainty that any programmed future development of infrastructure will occur Inferred to extend to include similarities to the phrase 'the adequacy of available or programmed development infrastructure' as included throughout the plan		Accept in part
FS23.146	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	The suggested amendments would be difficult to demonstrate compliance with given, the infrastructure is at the discretion of the Council. It is unclear what "certainty" means in this context	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.148	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
S431.150	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert a further criterion in all relevant policies on managing land use and subdivision, as follows: any cumulative effects		Reject
FS332.150	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
FS404.056	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The FNDP should have policy direction for assessment of cumulative effects.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S521.009	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part
FS277.19	Jenny Collison		Support in part	To support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1719	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.015	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The implementation of the NPS-FM and managing freshwater to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai is primarily the responsibility of the regional council, however clause 3.5(4) specifically requires that every territorial authority includes objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments - 'Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.' (s3.5(4))'	Amend PDP Requirements to use water sensitive and low impact designs for stormwater and wastewater, including constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) to retain stormwater and runoff and prevent silt and pollutants being carried into waterways.		Accept in part
FS404.076	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1711	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.626	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1738	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S442.016	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The implementation of the NPS-FM and managing freshwater to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai is primarily the responsibility of the regional council, however clause 3.5(4)	Amend PDP to avoid/reduce freshwater pollution generated by wastewater emissions, it should be a requirement to use enclosed wastewater systems that use disposal-to-land (i.e. systems that do not		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				specifically requires that every territorial authority includes objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments - 'Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.' (s3.5(4))'	rely on dispersal via water or disposal into water) such as electrocoagulation methods involving coagulation and flocculation, widely used in parts of Europe. If not a requirement, these systems should at minimum be given priority over systems that rely on dispersal or disposal via water.		
FS404.077	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1712	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.627	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1739	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S442.017	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The implementation of the NPS-FM and managing freshwater to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai is primarily the responsibility of the regional council, however clause 3.5(4) specifically requires that every territorial authority includes objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments -	Amend PDP to protect waterways by requirements for native planting and other measures when subdivision or development takes place.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.' (s3.5(4))'			
FS404.078	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1713	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.628	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1740	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S436.028	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy	Insert specific reference to recreational hunting where reverse sensitivity issues are discussed, especially in relation to subdivisions and new growth		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.			
FS570.1492	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
FS346.114	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1506	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
FS569.1528	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
S529.055	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future		
FS570.1944	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1958	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1980	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.175	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Stormwater and wastewater should be fully managed to avoid sediment/pollutants being carried to waterways and wetlands, especially during high rainfall events which are expected to become more extreme due to climate change. Under s7(i) of the RMA, councils must have particular regard to the effects of climate change. In general, water sensitive and low impact designs should be a standard requirement, not just encouraged. For example, stormwater and water from wastewater disposal fields can carry pollutants and silt into waterways during high	Amend the plan so that water sensitive and low impact designs are a standard requirement		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rainfall events. They should not be discharged directly into waterways but be retained in constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) or other water sensitive and low impacts features.			
FS570.2063	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2077	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2099	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.177	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The disposal of wastewater from sewage treatment plants into wetlands and water bodies has been a matter of concern to communities for some time. The Council's Infrastructure Committee requested further investigation of disposal-to-land options for several wastewater schemes, and requested a wastewater disposal-to-land workshop in late 2021 to cover methodologies and processes associated with establishing a disposal-to-land scheme. The PDP should include provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes.	Insert provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes.		Reject
FS570.2065	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2079	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2101	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S170.004	Alec Brian Cox	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Rules in the Subdivision section seek to impose minimum standards on developments. In recent times, there have been a number of developments in the form of gated communities	Amend to apply the subdivision rules to Land Use Changes which create multiple units.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				where the number of allotments exceeds the number allowed for a private accessway, where roads remain as part of the allotments. In the alternative approach of a Land Use Change, used for Retirement Villages, the subdivision rules are not enforced as there are no new allotments. In these two situations, the unit size is increased by a share of the common ground, thus permitting a more intensive development before reaching the limits. To provide an equitable situation common ground should be excluded from the net allotment size.			
FS566.493	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
S443.009	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. - Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS569.1754	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1734	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S170.002	Alec Brian Cox	New Definition	Support in part	The Rules in the Subdivision section seek to impose minimum standards on developments. In recent times, there have been a number of developments in the form of gated communities where the number of allotments exceeds the number allowed for a private accessway, where roads remain as part of the allotments. In the alternative approach of a Land Use Change, used for Retirement Villages, the subdivision rules are not enforced as there are no new allotments. In these two situations, the unit size is increased by a share of the common ground, thus permitting a more intensive development before reaching the limits. To provide an equitable situation common ground should be excluded from the net allotment size.	Insert definition of 'Net allotment size'; being allotment size excluding common/shared areas.		Reject
FS566.491	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
S170.003	Alec Brian Cox	New Definition	Support in part	The Rules in the Subdivision section seek to impose minimum standards on developments. In recent times, there have been a number of developments in the form of gated communities where the number of allotments exceeds the number allowed for a private accessway, where roads remain as part of the allotments. In the	Amend to include in the Definitions "net allotment size", as allotment size excluding any common/shared areas.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				alternative approach of a Land Use Change, used for Retirement Villages, the subdivision rules are not enforced as there are no new allotments. In these two situations, the unit size is increased by a share of the common ground, thus permitting a more intensive development before reaching the limits. To provide an equitable situation common ground should be excluded from the net allotment size.			
FS566.492	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
S428.016	Kapiro Residents Association	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.		
S529.223	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS570.2110	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2124	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2146	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.226	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS570.2113	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2127	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2149	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.019	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1729	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S428.017	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	
S529.224	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS570.2111	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2125	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2147	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1730	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S428.018	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	
S529.225	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS570.2112	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2126	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2148	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.021	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
FS566.1731	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S247.005	Margaret Sheila Hulse and John Colin Hulse	Overview	Support in part	The plan does not mention development contributions policy. It would be helpful to plan users to provide links to the development contributions policy. We submit that subdivision developers' fees should NOT be helped by the Council but paid solely by the-developers	Insert in the SUB Overview as follows: "Council policy in regard to development contributions payable by subdividers is contained in the councils long-term Plan, separate from this district plan."		Reject
S55.013	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Overview	Support	Support the acknowledgement that subdivision should not result in reverse sensitivity effects that result in the inability to undertake activities enabled in the relevant zone.	retain overview as proposed		Accept in part
FS129.8	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S421.170	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Not Stated	Federated Farmers believes that council subdivision and development policies and planning should provide for managed growth in rural communities. While acknowledging that the loss of productive land can impact on the region's economy, there is also a need to recognise that farmers undertake small lot subdivision to provide for farm succession, dispose of surplus dwellings	Amend the Overview to: • acknowledge the need to provide a framework for the managed growth of rural communities; and • expand the issue of reverse sensitivity in the rural environment so that it is addressed in detail and clearly sets out		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and for providing on-farm accommodation for employees. There should also needs to be acknowledgement that considered well managed growth in rural communities provides for diversity and vibrancy in rural areas, sustains essential community infrastructure, and provides employment flexibility and opportunities. One major concern with subdivision in rural areas is the issue of reverse sensitivity. Rural residential activities are often incompatible with rural production activities. Federated Farmers advocates for reverse sensitivity protection for rural land use so that the introduction of residential activities in rural areas will not negatively impact on the current use of rural land for production purposes. Federated Farmers wants to ensure that any objectives, policies, and relevant rules consider and mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity issues to arise, where practical.	why the issue needs to be acknowledged and addressed;		
FS172.306	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support providing a framework for the managed growth of rural communities for the reasons stated in the primary submission.	Allow in part		Reject
FS196.152	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko nui	Allow		Reject
FS570.1402	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
FS346.404	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
FS566.1416	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
FS569.1438	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S349.008	Neil Construction Limited	Overview	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete the overview, or amend to facilitate additional rural residential subdivision in the District,		Reject
FS62.042	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS333.029	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S425.039	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Objectives	Support in part	In general, PHTTCCT support well-connected development, and future transport networks (see sub#4) being provided at the time of subdivision. Given the lack of spatial planning incorporated into the plan, it is considered that requiring developers to show how any future transport networks will be accommodated by the development is critical to future proof the District and ensure an integrated well connected transport network. Depending on the scale of development this could include requiring setbacks from indicative roads/cycleways as shown/described in any future or existing) strategies/spatial plans/annual plan be provided, or road connections provided at boundaries of the developments.	Amend the subdivision chapter to ensure that provision for, and connectivity with future transport networks is demonstrated at subdivision	Reject
S428.012	Kapiro Residents Association	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.			
S359.029	Northland Regional Council	Objectives	Support in part	We recommend objectives and policies in the subdivision section be strengthened to strongly discourage fragmentation of rural land as this can limit the viability of surrounding farming units and lead to high costs to service these developments. This is of particular concern for highly productive soils and should be based on the provisions in the NPS-HPL. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland does not fully reflect the direction in the NPS-HPL with regard to the protection of productive land. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to take direction from the NPS-HPL	Amend the objectives to strongly discourage fragmentation of rural land.		Accept in part
FS24.42	Lynley Newport		Oppose	central and local government has done quite enough to throttle diversity in the rural area. Agree with protecting highly productive land from fragmentation, but not all rural land is highly productive. Neither is there an expectation by rural land owners to receive council provided services. reverse sensitivity remains a valid consideration, but there are alternative mitigation measures to simply preventing subdivision.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS44.42	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	The 4ha allotment size as a discretionary activity enables less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living. This ensures small scale lifestyle development is available in more rural areas for people who either want to retire and remove the family house from the farm, or take off an area which is not productive on the main	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				farming unit, to enable a family to establish a dwelling and have a couple of sheep or cattle with gardens, where a less intensive use would be beneficial for the environment in terms of pugging and erosion. As a discretionary activity any proposal requires the full range of effects to be considered through the resource consent process and the decision remains up to Council to consider whether approval should be granted.			
FS25.059	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Supports the intent of amending the FNDP to implement the NPS-HPL. However, any provisions that are to be more stringent than the NPS-HPL need to be justified. Furthermore, the NPS-HPL provides a range of exceptions, which should be recognised.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS66.118	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not give effect to the RPS which does not 'strongly discourage the fragmentation of rural land' neither does it give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land which manages subdivision, use and development on Highly Productive Land, not all rural land. The relief also fails to recognise the varied characteristics of rural land in the Far North, and the large percentage which does not have productive value, and the opportunities to enhance biodiversity and cultural outcomes through subdivision.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS243.080	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable development within and around existing towns, particularly those that support compact and varied housing.	Allow	Amend the objectives to strongly discourage fragmentation of rural land.	Accept in part
FS354.128	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Objectives to discourage fragmentation of rural land and retention of highly productive land to give effect to the NPSHPL are supported.	Allow	Allow S359.029	Accept in part
FS570.1065	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
FS346.490	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission			
FS566.1079	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
FS569.1101	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
S356.076	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Objectives	Support	Suggest adding a new objective that seeks to support the provision and maintenance of infrastructure and ensure that policies and rules are amended appropriately.	Insert new objective: Subdivision and subsequent development provides for the efficient and timely provision of infrastructure and services.		Reject
FS25.097	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
FS243.069	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports development in all forms being aligned with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure	Allow	Insert new objective: Subdivision and subsequent development provide for the efficient and timely provision of infrastructure and services.	Reject
FS369.410	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the intent to enable growth and development that is supported by infrastructure.	Allow in part		Reject
S331.049	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Objectives	Not Stated	The submitter requests that a new objective be provided for educational facilities or additional infrastructure to ensure that the impact of population growth on the provision of educational facilities is considered in the location and sequencing of developments.	Insert a new objective SUB-O5, as follows: Subdivision occurs in a sequenced and coherent manner in locations and at a rate that: a. enables growth and development to be supported by additional infrastructure.		Accept
FS25.128	Kiwi Fresh Orange		Support	Agrees that Kerikeri is part of an urban environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Company Limited					appropriate wording (inferred).	
FS243.081	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the new objective and questions whether it is needed in the PDP. It is likely that this objective may slow down and not enable urban development and growth.	Disallow	Insert a new objective SUB-O5, as follows: Subdivision occurs in a sequenced and coherent manner in locations and at a rate that: a. enables growth and development to be supported by additional infrastructure.	Reject
FS369.409	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy supports the intent to enable growth and development that is supported by infrastructure.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S431.067	John Andrew Riddell	Objectives	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed, this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Amend the objectives, policies and provisions to better provide for cycling and active transport and walking in urban areas, settlements and their surrounds		Reject
FS332.067	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
S529.219	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS570.2106	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2120	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2142	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.015	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	Objectives	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)			example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS566.1725	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S512.028	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Objectives	Support	Fire and Emergency support the subdivision policy framework to the extent that subdivision should have the infrastructure appropriate for the intended use of the land (SUB-O3).	retain objectives		Accept in part
FS369.411	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy supports the retention of SUB-O3 as notified.	Disallow		Accept in part
S247.003	Margaret Sheila Hulse and John Colin Hulse	SUB-O1	Support in part	We are concerned that no further residential subdivisions should be approved before there is enough medical infrastructure within Kerikeri and Waipapa areas to support extra families living here. Our chief concern is that the local GP practices have closed their books to new patients, and with more people being allowed to settle here they will not be covered with adequate medical facilities should they need it, despite being to the contrary; A number of local residents have agreed with us that this is an ongoing issue which will get worse if not addressed	Amend SUB-O1 by adding a new paragraph to read: .g) avoid subdivision for residential development in areas where primary medical care services are available adequate to support the wellbeing, health and safety of additional people.."		Reject
S421.171	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O1	Support	Federated Farmers supports the objectives SUB-O1 to SUB-O4 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. In particular we support the recognition of highly productive land and the reverse sensitivity issues that arise from subdivision in rural areas.	Retain Objective SUB-O1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS24.22	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Only support in part because in recognising the need to protect highly productive land, the council should therefore make provision for the subdivision and development of rural land that does NOT fall within the definition of highly productive. One size does not fit all.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS172.307	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS196.151	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1403	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.405	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
FS566.1417	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
FS569.1439	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
S159.065	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-O1	Support	Avoiding reverse sensitivity effects is supported	Retain Objective SUB-O1		Accept in part
FS129.9	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS151.230	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS151.231	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.227	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
FS566.241	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
FS569.263	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S101.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-O1	Support in part	The Council is proposing zoning in some areas where the already existing land use pattern is contrary to achieving the objectives and policies of the zone in the land is located. For example, Rural Production zoning applying to an area where the land use pattern and lot sizes is no longer able to be utilised for productive purposes and where reverse sensitivity issues already exist. So rather than have parts (c) and (d) talk of 'avoiding' something that already exists and therefore automatically triggering inconsistency with the Objective no matter what subdivision is proposed, the existing situation should be acknowledged and the Objective aimed more at not materially adding to the issues raised. The word 'Avoid' seriously limits the ability to balance effects and achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The point being made here is that there is already land unable to be used in a way that achieved the zones objectives and policies, and to put it bluntly, if this is the case, there should be no impediment to subdividing further.	Amend SUB-O1, parts (c) and (d) as follows: c) does not significantly increase the risk of reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from continuing to operate, d) does not significantly increase the risk of the land not being able to be used in a manner consistent with the zone's objectives and policies.		Reject
FS172.182	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.47	Joe Carr		Support	logical reasoning by submitter, meets RMA Pt 2 sec 5	Allow		Reject
FS548.023	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers submission supported objective SUB-O1 as it was notified. The watering down of the objective as proposed will allow for increase reverse sensitivity and inconsistent land use practices to occur as it is debated what is meant by "does not significantly increase".	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
S201.001	Denis Thomson	SUB-O1	Oppose	The Council is proposing zoning in some areas where the already existing land use pattern is contrary to achieving the objectives and policies of the zone in the land is located. For example, Rural Production zoning applying to an area where the land use pattern and lot size is no longer able to be utilised for productive purposes	Amend SUB-O1, parts (c) and (d) as follows: "c. <i>does not significantly increase</i> the risk of reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and where reverse sensitivity issues already exist. So rather than have parts (c) and (d) talk of 'avoiding' something that already exists and therefore automatically triggering inconsistency with the Objective no matter what subdivision is proposed, the existing situation should be acknowledged and the Objective aimed more at not materially adding to the issues raised. The word "avoid" should not be used in an objective in any event as an objective is just that - an overall objective and using a word like "avoid" seriously limits the ability to balance effects and achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The point being made here is that there is already land unable to be used in a way that achieves the zone's objectives and policies, and to put it bluntly, if this is the case, there should be no impediment to subdividing it further.	continuing to operate; "d. does not significantly increase the risk of the land not being able to used in a manner consistent with the zone's objectives and policies."		
FS172.266	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS548.068	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers submission supported objective SUB-O1 as it was notified. The watering down of the objective as proposed will allow for increase reverse sensitivity and inconsistent land use practices to occur as it is debated what is meant by "does not significantly increase".	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
S356.072	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-O1	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent but considers the objective could be more clearly articulated. For example, it is not entirely clear the difference between subclause (a) and (d). It is also unclear whether by meeting (a)-(f) if this then constitutes an "efficient use of land". For example, subclause (b) appears to be out of place and may therefore be better deleted. If a residential/mixed use subdivision were to be considered in this context, this should demonstrate good accessibility for people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by	Amend to provide better clarity on what constitutes "efficient use of land", including consideration of residential/mixed use subdivisions having good accessibility for people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of active and public transport where practicable.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				way of active and/or public transport where practicable.			
FS25.093	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
FS243.070	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that responds to the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience and enabling adaptation. Clarification of what is meant by "efficient" would provide greater certainty to those undertaking development and support the outcomes sought above.	Allow	Amend SUB-O1	Reject
S463.041	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-O1	Oppose	The drafting of sub-clause (b) of this objective could not be applied to situations where local character and sense of place are intended to change over time as a result of subdivision activity anticipated by the Plan. Special Purpose Zones (such as the KCZ) are locations where subdivision and subsequent development must deliver a "planned" outcome. It is incongruous in WBF's view, to require subdivision of the scale anticipated in the KCZ to maintain the status quo "character and sense of place". Rather, it will deliver a preferred outcome that integrates with the existing environment rather than leaving it unchanged. Sub-clause (c) requires refinement for brevity.	Amend Objective SUB-O1 as follows: SUB-O1 Subdivision results in the efficient use of land, which: a. achieves the objectives of each relevant zone, overlays, and district wide provisions; b. contributes to the existing or planned local character and sense of place including that required to be delivered by subdivision in the Special Purpose Zones; c. avoids reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect existing activities ~~already established on land~~ from continuing to operate; ~~d. avoids land use with patterns which would prevent land from achieving the objectives and policies of the zone in which it is located;~~ e. ~~does not increase risk from natural~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					~~hazards or risks are mitigated~~ managed natural hazard risks and reduces existing risks where practicable reduced; ~~and f. manages adverse effects on the environment.~~		
FS66.119	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submitter correctly notes that It is incongruous to require all forms of subdivision subdivision to maintain the status quo character and sense of place.	Allow		Accept in part
S416.035	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SUB-O1	Support in part	KiwiRail support that subdivision should avoid the creation of reverse sensitivity effects on land. Subdivision and associated land use development that subdivision enables can result in compromises to the safe operation of the rail network or public safety is not appropriately designed and mitigated. A small amendment to the clause is proposed to clarify this.	Insert additional point in Objective SUB-O1 as follows: Maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network		Reject
FS36.057	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the relief sought to amend the objective to recognise that the safety and the efficiency of the transport network is maintained.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S179.090	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-O1	Support		Retain objective SUB-O1		Accept in part
FS23.047	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.019	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision objectives as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management.	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions S431.067 and S431.168	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S554.007	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	SUB-O1	Support	KFO supports the objective as it promotes the efficient use of land	Retain objective as notified		Accept in part
FS32.0010	Jeff Kemp		Support	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Drive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part
FS389.013	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S55.015	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-O1	Support	Support the objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from continuing to operate. However, this objective is not supported by clear policies or rules to give effect to this statement in rural areas	Retain as proposed.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS548.011	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers' submission sought the retention of this objective as notified along with the expansion of the framework to address reverse sensitivity issues in the rural environment.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part
S349.009	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-O1	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete SUB-O1, or amend to facilitate additional rural residential subdivision in the District		Reject
FS62.043	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject
FS333.030	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S77.003	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S40.004	Martin John Yuretech	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S41.004	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows:: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S377.004	Rua Hatu Trust	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S410.004	Kerry-Anne Smith	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S411.004	Roger Myles Smith	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners	Amend to: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S470.004	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S358.007	Leah Frieling	SUB-O2	Oppose	The majority of land in the District is not classified as highly productive. The District Plan does not distinguish between highly productive land and	Delete paragraph a) of Objective SUB-O2	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				less productive land when it comes to subdivision. Delete paragraph a) of Objective SUB-O2, so that protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.		
S395.004	Sean Jozef Vercammen	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S472.007	Michael Foy	SUB-O2	Support in part		Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2, so that protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision	Accept in part
S472.041	Michael Foy	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S547.004	LJ King Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: • Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S547.018	LJ King Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	The amendment is so the protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S544.004	Kelvin Richard Horsford	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S348.010	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S439.004	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend Objective SUB-O2: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to work in partnership with landowners given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S161.003	Shanon Garton	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					- If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS24.43	Lynley Newport		Support	There is considerable merit in the points being made in this and like worded submissions. FNDC needs to consider them.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S357.007	Sean Frieling	SUB-O2	Oppose	The new subdivision rules will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and the less productive land when it comes to subdivision. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2, so that protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.		Accept in part
FS24.44	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Needs to be a distinction between HPL and non HPL in order to give effect to the NPS-HPL and any subsequent amendments	Allow in part		Accept in part
S364.053	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-O2	Support in part	The Director-General supports the intention of Objective SUB-O2, however considers 'clause a' dilutes the objective which should recognise and provide for the matters of national importance. Highly productive land is not a matter of national importance under section 6 of the RMA.	Amend Objective SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision recognises and provides for the: a. Protection of highly productive land; and b. Protection, restoration or enhancement of Outstanding Natural		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Natural Character of the Coastal Environment, areas of High Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Character, wetland, lake and river margins, Significant Natural Areas, Sites and areas of Significance to Māori, and Historic Heritage.		
FS93.15	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	Social wellbeing is of national importance. This needs to be acknowledged, as the dog bans and restrictions are affecting the wellbeing of our community NOW. • STOP the dog bans and restriction of the number of dogs on sub-divided land • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education	Disallow		Reject
FS66.120	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought unnecessarily removes the recognition of highly productive land, which should be included, and should accurately follow the obligations of the NPS Highly Productive Land	Disallow		Reject
FS66.185	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The change sought by the submitter fails to give effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land.	Disallow		Reject
FS548.112	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject
FS354.130	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of protection of highly productive land as it is not a s6 matter. Such land is required by the NPSHPL to be protected so the clause should not be deleted	Disallow	Disallow S364.053	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1134	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
FS346.193	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1148	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
FS569.1170	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
S541.004	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS155.56	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S541.017	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	That protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2.	Accept in part
FS155.57	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S485.019	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	That protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2.	Accept in part
FS155.58	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S519.019	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	That protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2.	Accept in part
FS155.59	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S485.043	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
FS155.60	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S519.043	Elbury Holdings	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
FS155.61	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S159.066	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-O2	Support	Protection of highly productive land is supported.	Retain Objective SUB-O2	Accept in part
FS151.232	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS151.233	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS151.234	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS172.241	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Inconsistent with NPS HPL.	Disallow	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.228	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
FS566.242	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
FS569.264	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
S421.172	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O2	Support	Federated Farmers supports the objectives SUB-O1 to SUB-O4 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. In particular we support the recognition of highly productive land and the reverse sensitivity issues that arise from subdivision in rural areas.	Retain Objective SUB-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS172.308	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS196.150	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1404	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
FS346.406	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
FS566.1418	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
FS569.1440	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S356.073	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-O2	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-O2 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.094	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part	Accept in part
FS369.414	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure that existing electricity infrastructure is not compromised. Given the regional significance of most of the electricity infrastructure network, protection of this infrastructure is required to achieve alignment with the RPS and with SUB - R10 and SUB-R9.	Disallow		Accept in part
S451.004	Pacific Eco-Logic	SUB-O2	Support in part	Objective SUB-02 (b) states that subdivision provides for the protection of "significant natural areas". It is unclear what this means, as the plan does not include any SNAs in Schedule 4	Amend Objective SUB-02 (b) to clarify that areas that contain significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats for indigenous fauna are to be protected		Accept
FS66.184	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	As noted by the submitter, the Proposed Plan does not include SNAs so reference to them should be deleted.	Allow		Accept
FS332.191	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
FS570.1509	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
FS566.1523	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
FS569.1545	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S179.091	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-O2	Support		Retain objective SUB-O2		Accept in part
FS23.048	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
FS372.020	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision objectives as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management.	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions S431.067 and S431.168	Accept in part
FS369.412	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure that existing electricity infrastructure is not compromised. Given the regional significance of most of the electricity infrastructure network, protection of this infrastructure is required to achieve alignment with the RPS and with SUB - R10 and SUB-R9.	Disallow		Accept in part
S483.163	Top Energy Limited	SUB-O2	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks to ensure that existing electricity infrastructure is not compromised. As noted in the memo provided to Council dated 20th September 2021, given the regional significance of most of the electricity infrastructure network, protection of this infrastructure	Insert point c in Objective SUB-O2 as follows (or to the same effect): Subdivision provides for the: a.... b. Protection, restoration or enhancement of Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Natural Character of the Coastal Environment, Areas of High Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Character, wetland, lake and river margins, Significant Natural Areas, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Historic Heritage; andc. Electricity infrastructure network		
FS131.026	Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	The original submission is seeking to obligate a developer in what is already a onerous and challenging process which discourages development or depends on the original submitters approval.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept
FS345.214	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
S257.007	Te Hiku Community Board	SUB-O2	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2, so that protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.		Accept in part
FS397.003	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that there remains a need to promote various subdivision options in the Rural Production Zone	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS354.129	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of protection of highly productive land. Such land is required by the NPSHPL to be protected so the clause should not be deleted.	Disallow	Disallow S257.007	Accept in part
S146.004	Trevor John Ashford	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an	Amend to: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS393.004	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS393.005	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.004	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of our land is in part within a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S349.010	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete SUB-O2, or amend to facilitate additional rural residential subdivision in the District		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS62.044	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS333.031	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS369.413	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to amend this objective to ensure that existing electricity infrastructure is not compromised. Given the regional significance of most of the electricity infrastructure network, protection of this infrastructure is required to achieve alignment with the RPS and with SUB - R10 and SUB-R9.	Disallow in part		Accept
S442.148	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-O2	Support in part	Objective SUB-02 (b) states that subdivision provides for the protection of "significant natural	Amend Objective SUB-02 (b) to clarify that areas that contain significant indigenous vegetation and		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				areas". It is unclear what this means, as the plan does not include any SNAs in Schedule 4.	significant habitats for indigenous fauna are to be protected.		
FS346.759	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S569.004	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS348.235	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	Accept in part
S464.004	LJ King Ltd	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to	Amend to: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		
FS566.1549	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
S464.018	LJ King Ltd	SUB-O2	Oppose	The amendment is so the protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision.	Amend SUB-O2 as follows: Subdivision provides for the: ~~a. Protection of highly productive land;~~ and ~~b. a. Protection, restoration or enhancement of Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Natural Character of the Coastal Environment, Areas of High Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Character, wetland, lakes and river margins, Significant Natural Areas, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, and Historic Heritage.~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1563	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
S543.004	LJ King Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		Accept in part
FS566.2165	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
S543.018	LJ King Limited	SUB-O2	Oppose	The amendment is so the protection of highly productive land is not an objective of subdivision	Delete paragraph a) of SUB-O2.		Accept in part
FS566.2179	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
S483.164	Top Energy Limited	SUB-O3	Not Stated	Top Energy supports the requirement for infrastructure as part of subdivision.	Retain Objective SUB-O3		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS24.45	Lynley Newport		Oppose	TE needs to acknowledge that not everybody wants or needs conventional power supply. Multiple alternatives exist and renewable energy sources should be encouraged.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS111.110	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.215	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
S421.173	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O3	Support	Federated Farmers supports the objectives SUB-O1 to SUB-O4 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. In particular we support the recognition of highly productive land and the reverse sensitivity issues that arise from subdivision in rural areas.	Retain Objective SUB-O3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS172.309	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS196.149	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1405	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
FS346.407	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
FS566.1419	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
FS569.1441	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS369.421	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S356.074	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-O3	Support in part	Support subject to strengthening clause (b) to ensure new transport infrastructure is connected to the wider network.	Amend objective as follows: SUB-O3 Infrastructure is planned to service the proposed subdivision and development where: a. there is existing infrastructure connection, infrastructure ~~should~~ is provided in an integrated, efficient, coordinated and future-proofed manner at the time of subdivision; and b. where no existing connection is available infrastructure ~~should be~~ is planned and ~~consideration be given to~~ connections made with the wider infrastructure network.		Accept
FS25.095	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part	Accept
FS111.106	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
FS243.071	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports development in all forms being aligned with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure. The amendments sought by S356.074 direct the provision of infrastructure	Allow	Amend objective as follows:	Accept
FS369.420	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S561.045	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-O3	Support in part	Any new growth needs to be supported by the necessary infrastructure to enable any urban area to function.	Amend SUB-O3 as follows: Infrastructure is existing and / or planned to service the proposed subdivision and development where: a. there is existing infrastructure connection, infrastructure should be provided in an integrated, efficient, coordinated and future-proofed manner at the time of subdivision; and b. where no existing connection is available infrastructure should be planned and consideration be given to connections with the wider infrastructure network.		Reject
FS25.116	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendment because it is appropriate that development can support and enable the provision of infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS32.099	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS325.074	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the amendment because it is appropriate that development can support and enable the provision of infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS23.317	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.059	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.132	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	Accept
FS369.429	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S179.092	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-O3	Support		Retain objective SUB-O3		Accept in part
FS23.049	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
FS372.021	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision objectives as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management.	Disallow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions S431.067 and S431.168	Accept in part
FS369.418	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S554.008	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited	SUB-O3	Support	KFO supports the objective as it provides for an opportunity to develop land where there is no current reticulated system available, and an on-site solution is achievable.	Retain objective as notified		Accept in part
FS32.011	Jeff Kemp		Support in part	The submitter supports the overall intent and purpose of the original submission as it is the only viable and practical option to enable planned and coordinated development in and around Kerikeri and the Waipapa area. The submitter notes that the documentation on proposed traffic movements is unclear. The original submission has not provided details on potential traffic movements and intersections for Waitotara Dive and Waipapa Road and how these might link to State Highway 10. For example, it is unclear if the new link from State Highway 10 through to the Kerikeri Town Centre is going to be a primary route and the link through to Waipapa Road a secondary route. The submitter notes it is unclear if the proposed	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to consideration of traffic movements, flood mitigation measures and amending the zoning as depicted in the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				flood mitigation measures will increase or reduce flooding along Waitotara Drive. The submitter also supports the proposed zoning as depicted within the original submission is an efficient use of land.			
FS389.014	Smartlife Trust		Oppose	All of submission S554 in relation to the proposed Structure Plan for the landholding. In particular, the documents / plans which refer to a future access point through the Further Submitters land	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.428	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S271.021	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-O3	Support	Ensuring integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision is supported	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
FS111.104	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
FS570.744	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.758	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.780	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.419	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S172.004	Terra Group	SUB-O3	Support	Support this objective, noting the importance of a planned infrastructure network.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
FS111.105	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.417	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S446.023	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-O3	Support	Ensuring integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision is supported	Retain SUB-O3 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS111.107	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
FS369.423	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
FS569.1782	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1782	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S524.021	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-O3	Support	Ensuring integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision is supported	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
FS111.109	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1839	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.425	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S529.011	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-O3	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including	Amend Objective SUB-O3 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				items such as on-site community wastewater systems			
FS570.1901	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1915	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1937	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS369.426	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Disallow		Accept
S529.086	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-O3	Support	Ensuring integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision is supported	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.1974	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1988	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2010	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.427	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S522.034	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-O3	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend Objective SUB-O3 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS566.1773	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.424	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Disallow		Accept
S138.007	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	SUB-O3	Support in part	It is not clear from objective SUB-O3 if the responsibility to provide infrastructure at the time of subdivision lies with the developer or the Council. In urban reticulated environments, provision of the necessary connections and coordination of infrastructure services for 'Plan enabled' development is the responsibility of the Council.	Amend Objective SUB-O3 to clarify what is meant by 'infrastructure should be provided in an integrated, efficient, coordinated and future proofed manner at the time of subdivision'.		Reject
FS369.416	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Disallow		Accept
S425.043	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	SUB-O3	Support	Ensuring integrated provision of infrastructure (which includes cycle ways) development at the time of subdivision is supported	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
FS369.422	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S425.044	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part	Ensuring integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions, and provides for future connectivity is considered to be a critical component to establishing a coordinated response to land use development and good urban design outcomes. PHTTCCT consider that it is appropriate to establish these connections at time of subdivision	Seek the following amendment to SUB-O4: "Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including by and provides providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies."		Accept in part
S399.066	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	SUB-O4	Not Stated	Many blocks of Māori land are land locked and are not able to be accessed. This reduces their ability to be developed and contribute to the economic development of tangata whenua and the district. This can be addressed in a minor way at the time adjoining land is subdivided by	Insert new point d. in Objective SUB-O4 as follows: d. enabling and maintaining access to land locked allotments		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ensuring access is provided as part of that development.	Alternatively this may be able to be addressed in the Māori Purpose Section		
S399.067	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	SUB-O4	Not Stated	Many blocks of Māori land are land locked and are not able to be accessed. This reduces their ability to be developed and contribute to the economic development of tangata whenua and the district. This can be addressed in a minor way at the time adjoining land is subdivided by ensuring access is provided as part of that development.	Insert new point d. in Objective SUB-O4 as follows: d. enabling and maintaining access to land locked allotments Alternatively this may be able to be addressed in the Māori Purpose Section		Reject
S272.018	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-O4 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS93.39	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	The majority of members of the BOI Watchdogs live in Kerikeri. They are supportive of measures to protect wildlife, but not supportive of illogical measures, such as the banning of dogs from subdivisions or restriction of household dog numbers via the RMA and sub-division rules at FNDC. You will unite dog owners and conservationists if you stop the dog bans and restrictions, and instead use proven methods to reduce wandering dogs, which reduces predation on wildlife. That is - community education, effective policing, and de-sexing. I feel that the dog owners of Kerikeri need to be	Disallow in part		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				heard by local organisations who 'represent' them in a broader capacity. It will be hard to find dog lovers who think dog bans are acceptable.			
FS570.778	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.792	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.814	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S523.021	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-O4	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-O4 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS88.63	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.	Allow in part		Reject
FS566.1815	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
S524.022	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-O4	Support in part	not stated	Amend SUB-O4. Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and D. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies		
FS88.67	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Ensure pedestrians walking dogs are able to use these connecting walkways. (ie Don't ban dogs from using the walkways)	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS111.115	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions and provides for future connectivity at time of subdivision.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1840	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.057	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-O4	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular, we support Subdivision SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-O4		Accept in part
FS88.80	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Protect wildlife without banning companion animals	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1946	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1960	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1982	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S421.174	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-O4	Support	Federated Farmers supports the objectives SUB-O1 to SUB-O4 as they are drafted in the proposed district plan. In particular we support the recognition of highly productive land and the reverse sensitivity issues that arise from subdivision in rural areas.	Retain Objective SUB-O4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part
FS172.310	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS196.148	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1406	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
FS346.408	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
FS566.1420	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
FS569.1442	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
S356.075	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-O4	Support in part	Support subject to the inclusion of a reference to transport connections within the sub-clauses to	Amend objective as follows: Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment and provides for:		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				add clarity and better ensure subdivision design appropriate considers transport connectivity.	a. Safe transport connections including active modes and public transport where practicable. a. public open spaces; b. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and c. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies.		
FS25.096	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept
FS111.112	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions and provides for future connectivity at time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept
FS243.072	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing. Kāinga Ora supports provisions that promote multi- nodal transport options	Allow	Amend SUB-O4 as follows:	Accept
S271.022	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part	Not stated	Amend SUB-O4. Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					D. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies		
FS36.058	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the relief sought as it seeks to ensure that future connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists is provided for, which supports active modes of transport and reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS111.111	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions and provides for future connectivity at time of subdivision.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.745	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.759	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.781	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S179.093	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-O4	Support		Retain objective SUB-O4		Accept in part
FS23.050	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.022	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision objectives as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions S431.067 and S431.168	Accept in part
S446.024	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part		Amend SUB-O4. Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including by		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					~~and provides~~ providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and D. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies		
FS111.113	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions and provides for future connectivity at time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1783	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1783	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S529.087	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-O4	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend SUB-O4. Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including by ~~and provides~~ providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and D. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies		Accept in part
FS111.114	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail		Support	PHTTCCT support integrated transport planning which includes multi modal solutions and provides for future connectivity at time of subdivision.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)						
FS570.1975	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1989	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2011	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S272.002	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-O4	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular, we support Subdivision SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-O4		Accept in part
FS570.763	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.777	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.799	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S364.054	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-O4	Support	The Director-General supports Objective SUB-O4	Retain Objective SUB-O4		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1135	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
FS346.194	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1149	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
FS569.1171	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
S529.188	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS570.2075	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2089	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2111	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S523.002	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-O4	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-O4		Accept in part
FS566.1797	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
S445.006	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-O4	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach	Retain SUB-O4		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS569.1761	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1741	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S445.022	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-O4	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-O4 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS569.1776	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1755	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S55.014	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Policies	Oppose	Support the acknowledgement that subdivision should not result in reverse sensitivity effects that result in the inability to undertake activities enabled in the relevant zone. However, this acknowledgement is not supported by clear	Amend policies to give effect to reverse sensitivity protection described in the overview.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				policies or rules to give effect to this statement in the rural zones		
S55.016	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Policies	Support	Support the objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from continuing to operate. However, this objective is not supported by clear policies or rules to give effect to this statement in rural areas	amend policies to give effect to the objective	Accept in part
S425.040	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	In general, PHTTCCT support well-connected development, and future transport networks (see sub#4) being provided at the time of subdivision. Given the lack of spatial planning incorporated into the plan, it is considered that requiring developers to show how any future transport networks will be accommodated by the development is critical to future proof the District and ensure an integrated well connected transport network. Depending on the scale of development this could include requiring setbacks from indicative roads/cycleways as shown/described in any future or existing) strategies/spatial plans/annual plan be provided, or road connections provided at boundaries of the developments.	Amend the subdivision chapter to ensure that provision for, and connectivity with future transport networks is demonstrated at subdivision	Reject
S512.029	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Policies	Support	Fire and Emergency support the subdivision policy framework to the extent that subdivision should have the infrastructure appropriate for the intended use of the land (SUB-O3).	retain policies	Accept in part
S427.052	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and	Amend the policies to: - include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres, and - allow development proposals to be rejected on the grounds of significant adverse effects from traffic [inferred].	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area.		
S428.013	Kapiro Residents Association	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S451.005	Pacific Eco-Logic	Policies	Support in part	The policies do not adequately address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna; and the management of sewage and other sources of contaminants that could affect natural waters	Insert policies that: 1. Clarify that significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, (including the balance lot) are to be protected as part of a subdivision 2. Require cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds) 3. Require sewage and stormwater management to prevent nutrients and sediment from reaching natural waterways, including natural wetlands 4. Identify priorities where riparian fencing and planting should be a condition of subdivision		Accept in part
FS24.46	Lynley Newport		Oppose	disagree that the matters raised are not adequately covered already. No need for additional policies.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS93.1	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Do not support (1) the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants or sub-division processes. My rates are not for their use, and this cost, in the 20/21 year, \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density. - Agree with (2) if support is provided for fencing in poorer communities where dog owners cannot afford to fence, AND if Northland forests are predator fenced like Sanctuary Mountain Maungatautari.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.49	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	1. Do not support banning of companion animals in these properties. 2. Strongly do NOT agree. This encroaches on our human rights to share our own homes with who we want on our own property. We paid for the property and we pay rates yearly on those properties. We should have the right to live there with our families (including our animals). There is the Animal Management Act to deal with breaches.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				If this extends to shorelines as, the amount of properties available to families with pets will be even more significantly reduced. Already over 53,000 hectares is designated as where kiwi are present. Council are over-regulating responsible animal guardians and under-regulating irresponsible ones. It's time to address the core issues (lack of desexing of companion animals, wandering dogs, insufficient feeding of dogs, animal abuse, etc) which will decrease a lot of dogs and cats causing problems without impinging responsible peoples rights. Companion animals and kiwi can co-exist with appropriate measures taken. 4. Support			
FS332.192	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
FS570.1510	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
FS566.1524	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
FS569.1546	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
S359.030	Northland Regional Council	Policies	Support in part	We recommend objectives and policies in the subdivision section be strengthened to strongly discourage fragmentation of rural land as this can limit the viability of surrounding farming units and lead to high costs to service these developments. This is of particular concern for highly productive soils and should be based on the provisions in	Amend the policies to strongly discourage fragmentation of rural land.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the NPS-HPL. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland does not fully reflect the direction in the NPS-HPL with regard to the protection of productive land. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to take direction from the NPS-HPL			
FS24.47	Lynley Newport		Oppose	it is not true to state that fragmentation to rural land should be prevented in all instances.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS44.43	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	The 4ha allotment size as a discretionary activity enables less productive land to be utilised for activities such as lifestyle development with small scale subsistence living. This ensures small scale lifestyle development is available in more rural areas for people who either want to retire and remove the family house from the farm, or take off an area which is not productive on the main farming unit, to enable a family to establish a dwelling and have a couple of sheep or cattle with gardens, where a less intensive use would be beneficial for the environment in terms of pugging and erosion. As a discretionary activity any proposal requires the full range of effects to be considered through the resource consent process and the decision remains up to Council to consider whether approval should be granted.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS25.060	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Supports the intent of amending the FNDP to implement the NPS-HPL. However, any provisions that are to be more stringent than the NPS-HPL need to be justified. Furthermore, the NPS-HPL provides a range of exceptions, which should be recognised.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS354.131	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Policies to discourage fragmentation of rural land and retention of highly productive land to give effect to the NPSHPL are supported.	Allow	Allow S359.030	Accept in part
FS570.1066	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
FS346.491	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission			
FS566.1080	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
FS569.1102	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
S359.012	Northland Regional Council	Policies	Support in part	Recommend low impact stormwater design be mandatory for new development to ensure recharge is maintained (e.g. a requirement in engineering standards to use swales instead of kerb and channel)	Insert new policy: Where subdivision and development is proposed for coastal locations, that on-site storage or suitable alternative is required, including low impact stormwater designs.		Accept in part
FS44.40	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Subdivision may create vacant lots with SW design being created at the time of built development on the lot, which could occur after the subdivision is completed. Stormwater design is covered within the landuse section for each zone if there is a breach of impermeable surfaces and is also completed at the build stage which is covered by Building Consent. Do not believe there is a need for stormwater design at the subdivision stage, especially for low density subdivisions where only one additional allotment is created. This can be covered once the lots are developed.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS25.056	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of the submission, subject to appropriate wording being provided.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part
FS309.16	Brad Hedger		Support in part	It is considered that due to the location of coastal areas that mitigation is not required. My experience is that the control of stormwater from adjacent properties if not managed or mitigated will cause damage to the receiving environment.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.0100	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important, particularly in places like Kororāreka that do not have a public supply, that new development incorporates low impact design, and requires the use of water tanks on site rather than taking unnecessarily from ground or surface water supplies.	Allow	Allow the relief sought .	Accept in part
FS325.036	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the intent of the submission, subject to appropriate wording being provided.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part
FS570.1048	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
FS346.473	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1062	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
FS569.1084	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
S431.065	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. Subdivision provisions need to be likely to achieve the purposes of the respective zones and recognise and provide for matters of national importance and given effect to national and regional policy statements. This is facilitated by, among other things, clear policy guidance.	Insert the following as a new policy: Subdivision, use and development shall preserve and where possible enhance, restore and rehabilitate the character of the applicable zone in regards to s6 matters. In addition subdivision, use and development shall avoid adverse effects as far as practicable by using techniques including: (a) clustering or grouping development within areas where there is the least impact on natural character		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					and its elements such as indigenous vegetation, landforms, rivers, streams and wetlands, and coherent natural patterns; (b) minimising the visual impact of buildings, development, and associated vegetation clearance and earthworks, particularly as seen from public land and the coastal marine area; (c) providing for, through siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions, legal public right of access to and use of the foreshore and any esplanade areas; (d) through siting of buildings and development, design of subdivisions, and provision of access that recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori with their culture, traditions and taonga including concepts of mauri, tapu, mana, wehi and karakia and the important contribution Maori culture makes to the character of the District (refer Chapter 2 and in particular Section 2.5 and Council's "Tangata Whenua Values and Perspectives" (2004); (e) providing planting of indigenous vegetation in a way that links existing habitats of indigenous fauna and provides the opportunity for the extension, enhancement or creation of habitats for indigenous fauna, including	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					mechanisms to exclude pests; (f) protecting historic heritage through the siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions. (g) achieving hydraulic neutrality and ensuring that natural hazards will not be exacerbated or induced through the siting and design of buildings and development		
FS88.85	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS66.122	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy unnecessarily re-casts other District Plan policies, with the matters set out better placed as assessment criteria for subdivisions.	Disallow		Accept
FS332.065	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
S559.051	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Policies	Support in part	The amendment is to ensure recharge is maintained.	Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater design for new development.		Reject
FS151.360	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS243.053	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports development aligned with the provision of climate-resilient services and infrastructure, however requiring low impact stormwater design for all new development could create barriers to delivering affordable housing.	Allow	Insert a policy into the PDP which requires low impact stormwater design for new development	Reject
FS570.2241	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
FS348.078	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	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2255	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
FS569.2277	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
S431.064	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The guidance and rules relating to environment benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Insert the following as a new policy: That more intensive, innovative development and subdivision which recognises specific site characteristics is provided for through the management plan rule where this will result in superior environmental outcomes		Reject
FS66.121	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The intent of the new policy sought by the submitter is supported, subject to refinement to ensure the exact outcomes of management plan subdivisions are properly reflected.	Allow in part		Reject
FS332.064	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
S431.066	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as a new policy: That conditions be imposed upon the design of subdivision of land to require that the layout and orientation of all new lots and building platforms created include, as appropriate, provisions for achieving the following: (a) development of energy efficient buildings and structures; (b) reduced travel distances and private car usage; (c) encouragement of pedestrian		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					and cycle use; (d) access to alternative transport facilities; (e) domestic or community renewable electricity generation and renewable energy use.		
FS66.123	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The matter set out are assessment criteria rather than policy.	Disallow		Accept
FS332.066	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
S442.149	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	The policies do not adequately address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna; and the management of sewage and other sources of contaminants that could affect natural waters.	Insert policies that: 1. Clarify that significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, (including the balance lot) are to be protected as part of a subdivision. 2. Require cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance to vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g. kiwi, matuku, shorebirds) 3. Require sewage and stormwater management to prevent nutrients and sediment from reaching natural waterways, including natural wetlands. 4. Identify priorities where riparian fencing and planting should be a condition of subdivision		Accept in part
FS66.124	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The subdivision is supported to the extent that subdivision protects areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, but not SNAs which are not yet identified in the Proposed Plan.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS346.760	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S272.019	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more	Insert new policy (inferred) requiring esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more when one of the following situations applies:		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					•the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or •a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or •the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement.		
FS66.125	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy proposed unnecessarily re-casts existing proposed policies and does not give effect to the Plan objectives.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.779	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.793	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.815	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.185	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support	RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' (RMA s77(2)) Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for	Amend rules/policies to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normalmarket value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b) a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c) the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA).			
FS66.126	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy proposed unnecessarily re-casts existing proposed policies and does not give effect to the objectives of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.127	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy proposed unnecessarily re-casts existing proposed policies and does not give effect to the objectives of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2072	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2086	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2108	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S523.015	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	Policies	Support in part	As noted, there is increasing need to support connectivity and active modes of transport. RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow	Amend policies to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)			councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' (RMA s77(2)) Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b) a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c) the land is included in a development	following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA).			
FS66.128	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy proposed unnecessarily re-casts existing proposed policies and does not give effect to the objectives of the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS566.1809	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
S483.165	Top Energy Limited	Policies	Not Stated	A new policy is required to direct the protection of electricity infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects generated by in appropriate subdivision and future land use to achieve alignment with the RPS and to SUB - R10 and SUB-R9.	Insert a new policy as follows (or to the same effect). SUB-PX Ensure that subdivision and future land uses do not generate reverse sensitivity effects on electricity network by: ensuring suitable setbacks are achieved from all electricity infrastructure including by requiring setbacks at the time of subdivision from mapped Critical Electricity Lines.		Reject
FS131.027	Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	The original submission is seeking to obligate a developer in what is already a onerous and challenging process which discourages development or depends on the original submitters approval.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept
FS345.216	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
S431.068	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources,	Revise the objectives, policies and provisions to better provide for cycling and active transport and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed, this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	walking in urban areas, settlements and their surrounds		
FS332.068	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
S431.149	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert a further criterion in all relevant policies on managing land use and subdivision, as follows: any cumulative effects		Reject
FS332.149	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
FS404.055	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The FNDP should have policy direction for assessment of cumulative effects.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.220	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. - Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS570.2107	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2121	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2143	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S521.016	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS566.1726	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S445.013	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	As noted, there is increasing need to support connectivity and active modes of transport. RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any	Amend policies to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' (RMA s77(2)) Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b)a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c)the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA).	market value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement		
FS569.1768	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1747	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S333.042	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P1	Support in part	Policy SUB-P1 enables boundary adjustments where they are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone. Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the rural production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not increase density not give rise to further effects on the environment that already exist (subject to meeting the controlled activity matters).	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and ~~b. are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.	Accept in part
S368.088	Far North District Council	SUB-P1	Support in part	Drafting error. There is a potential conflict in the policy for boundary adjustments where one or more lots being adjusted is not able to comply with the minimum lot sizes in a zone, and will still not achieve them after the proposed boundary adjustment. A the boundary adjustment cannot achieve (b) due to not complying with the zone minimum lot size. b. It therefore needs to be deleted.	Amend SUB-P1 a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and ~~b. are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.	Accept
S168.050	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P1	Support in part	Policy SUB-P1 enables boundary adjustments where they are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone. Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the Rural Production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not increase density not give rise to further effects on the environment that already exist (subject to meeting the controlled activity matters).	rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and ~~b. are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.	
S187.042	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P1	Support in part	Policy SUB-P1 enables boundary adjustments where they are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone. Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the rural production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not increase density not give rise to further effects on the environment that already exist (subject to meeting the controlled activity matters).	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and ~~b. are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.	Accept in part
S222.051	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-P1	Support in part	Policy SUB-P1 enables boundary adjustments where they are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone. Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the rural production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not increase density not give rise to further effects on the environment that already exist (subject to meeting the controlled activity matters).	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and ~~b. are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.	Accept in part
S523.022	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P1	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat	Amend SUB-P1 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		
FS88.64	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.	Allow in part		Reject
FS566.1816	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
S356.077	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P1	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P1 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.098	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S179.095	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P1	Support		Retain SUB-P1		Accept in part
FS23.051	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS372.023	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies	Accept in part
S243.067	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P1	Support in part	Policy SUB-P1 enables boundary adjustments where they are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone. Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the rural production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not increase density not give rise to further effects on the environment that already exist (subject to meeting the controlled activity matters).	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and b. ~~are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.		Accept in part
FS570.625	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
FS566.639	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
FS569.661	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
S272.020	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-P1	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values			
FS570.780	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.794	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.816	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.189	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P1	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS570.2076	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2090	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2112	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S529.190	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P1	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS570.2077	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2091	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2113	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S167.049	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions (and more so, should that be increased to 40ha in the rural production zone). Boundary adjustments in such circumstances should also be enabled where they do not increase the number of lots created.	Amend policy SUB-P1 as follows: Enable boundary adjustments that: a. do not alter: i. the degree of non compliance with District Plan rules and standards; ii. the number and location of any access; and iii. the number of certificates of title; and b. ~~are in accordance with the minimum lot sizes of the zone and~~ comply with access, infrastructure and esplanade provisions.		Accept in part
FS566.411	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S445.023	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P1	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-P1 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS569.1777	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1756	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S356.078	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P2	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P2 as notified		Accept
FS25.099	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept
S463.042	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-P2	Support	WBF supports the enablement of subdivision for these purposes.	Retain Policy SUB-P2		Accept
FS66.129	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The policy appropriately supports the enablement of subdivision for the purposes set out.	Allow		Accept
S179.096	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P2	Support		Retain SUB-P2		Accept
FS23.052	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.			
FS372.024	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies	Accept
S172.025	Terra Group	SUB-P3	Support	Support policy as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S333.043	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P3	Support	The provision of subdivision in the circumstances listed is supported as an efficient use of the land resource of the district.	Retain Policy SUB-P3		Accept in part
S168.051	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P3	Support	The provision of subdivision in the circumstances listed is supported as an efficient use of the land resource of the district	Retain Policy SUB-P3		Accept in part
S187.043	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P3	Support	The provision of subdivision in the circumstances listed is supported as an efficient use of the land resource of the district.	Retain Policy SUB-P3.		Accept in part
S463.043	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-P3	Oppose	The reference to "characteristics and qualities" in sub-clause (a) requires deletion and replacement with reference to the zone objectives. It may be that the intent of the drafting is to refer to characteristics and qualities of the land (such as topography or vegetation coverage) rather than the zone. In that case, redrafting is also needed for clarity.	Amend point a. of Policy SUB-P3 as follows: a. are consistent with achieving the purpose, and objectives ~~characteristics and qualities~~ of the zone;		Accept in part
S159.067	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P3	Support in part	The adequate building platform needs to be within the setbacks for the zone	Amend subsection c of Policy SUB-P3 as follows: have an adequate size and appropriate shape to contain a building platform, within setbacks for the zone;		Reject
FS151.235	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.229	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	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS566.243	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
FS569.265	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
S356.084	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P3	Support in part	Support for SUB-P3 subject to amendments to clause (a) to refer to the objectives and policies of the zone rather than 'purpose' 'characteristics' and 'qualities' of the zone, none of which have been defined in the plan or included in the zone provisions. Referencing the zone objectives and policies will provide better clarity and certainty to the decision making process.	Amend as follows: Provide for subdivision where it results in allotments that: a. are consistent with the ~~purpose,~~ characteristics and qualities objectives and policies of the zone; ...		Accept in part
FS25.105	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S179.097	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P3	Support		Retain SUB-P3		Accept in part
FS23.053	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.025	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S243.068	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P3	Support	The provision of subdivision in the circumstances listed is supported as an efficient use of the land resource of the district.	Retain Policy SUB-P3		Accept in part
FS570.626	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
FS566.640	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
FS569.662	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
S349.011	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-P3	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete SUB-P3, or amend to reduce the emphasis on compliance with minimum lot sizes in SUB-P3		Reject
FS62.045	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS333.032	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			
S167.050	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P3	Support	The provision of subdivision in the circumstances listed is supported as an efficient use of the land resource of the district.	Retain Policy SUB-P3		Accept in part
FS566.412	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S356.085	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P4	Neutral	Suggest amending SUB-P4 to provide greater clarity.	Amend SUB-P4 to provide greater clarity.		Reject
FS25.106	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
S463.044	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-P4	Oppose	This content is set out in Note 1 (before the rule table) and therefore this policy is redundant.	Delete Policy SUB-P4		Accept
FS66.130	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submitter correctly notes that the content is set out in Note 1 (before the rule table) and therefore this policy is redundant.	Allow		Accept
S179.098	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P4	Support		Retain SUB-P4		Reject
FS23.054	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.			
FS372.026	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Reject
S529.144	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P4	Support	PDP subdivision policy SUB-P4 refers to 'manage' subdivision as detailed in the district-wide natural environment values, but there are very few rules that put any effective environmental protection policies into effect. those do not take account of the need to, at least, maintain indigenous biodiversity or ecosystems.	Amend SUB-P4 to at least, maintain indigenous biodiversity or ecosystems		Reject
FS570.2032	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2046	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2068	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S512.030	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-P5	Support in part	Fire and Emergency supports the intent to create a safe transport environment. This includes adequate emergency access on both the public roading network and private accessways.	Amend SUB-P5 e. maximising accessibility and wayfinding (including for emergency response), and connectivity by creating walkways, cycleways and an interconnected transport network. Note: For further guidance on providing for emergency response access please see Fire and Emergency New Zealand F5-02 GD Designers' Guide to Firefighting Operations: Emergency Vehicle Access, specifically Section 4.2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S356.079	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P5	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P5 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.0100	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S331.055	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	SUB-P5	Support in part	The submitter supports in part policy SUB-P5 as it manages subdivision design and layout and ensure walking and cycling accessibility is provided. However, the Ministry requests that specific provision for additional infrastructure is provided to ensure that population growth and the impact of educational facilities is considered within developments, so as to provide for the health and wellbeing of communities including access to education.	Amend policy SUB-P5 as follows: Manage subdivision design and layout in the General Residential, Mixed Use and Settlement zone to provide for safe, connected and accessible environments by: a. minimising vehicle crossings that could affect the safety and efficiency of the current and future transport network; b. avoid cul-de-sac development unless the site or the topography prevents future public access and connections; c. providing for development that encourages social interaction, neighbourhood cohesion, a sense of place and is well connected to public spaces; d. contributing to a well connected transport network that safeguards future roading connections; and e. maximising accessibility, connectivity by creating walkways, cycleways and an interconnected transport network; andf. ensuring growth and development is supported by additional infrastructure where required.		Accept in part
FS25.129	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Agrees that Kerikeri is part of an urban environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording (inferred).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS243.082	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support	Kāinga Ora support the enablement of development aligned with the provision of climate-resilient services and infrastructure	Allow	Amend policy SUB-P5 as follows: and f. ensuring growth and development is supported by additional infrastructure where required.	Accept in part
S179.099	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P5	Support		Retain SUB-P5		Accept in part
FS23.055	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.027	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part
S338.049	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-P5	Not Stated	A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways.	Retain Policy SUB-P5 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.987	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1001	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1023	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.017	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P5	Support	A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways.	Retain Policy SUB-P5 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.1907	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1921	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1943	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S522.010	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P5	Support	A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways.	Retain Policy SUB-P5 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1749	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S449.018	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P5	Support	A large survey conducted by Our Kerikeri found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision	Retain Policy SUB-P5 (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways.			
FS569.1817	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1834	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S138.008	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	SUB-P6	Support in part	Support the ability to increase the subdividable urban residential intensity potential in the General Residential zone via the proposed multi-unit development activity category (Rule SUB-R5). However, seek that the Council provide more information and greater confidence to developers about the capacity of existing urban wastewater systems to service "Plan enabled" permitted and controlled residential activity, in particular the viability of proposed multi-unit residential development densities that are smaller than the general minimum allotment sizes. This is of particular importance for a subdivision proposal considering a land use consent for a multi-unit development forming the basis of a 'controlled activity' subdivision application could be approved without reference to infrastructure capacity requirements.	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to clarify the availability of infrastructure capacity in the District's urban reticulated environments so that this policy can be achieved at the time of subdivision or land development stage.		Reject
S517.001	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Vodafone New Zealand Limited	SUB-P6	Support	Requirement in Policies SUB-P6 and SUB-P11 for subdivisions to have electricity and telecommunication connections is supported	Retain Policy SUB-P6		Accept in part
S356.086	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P6	Support in part	Support SUB-P6. Suggest amending to ensure that infrastructure should be provided in a timely and integrated manner. In clause (b) reference the objectives and policies of the zone rather	Amend as follows: Require infrastructure to be provided in a timely, integrated and comprehensive manner		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				than the purpose, characteristics and qualities of the zone.	by: a. demonstrating that the subdivision will be appropriately serviced and integrated with existing and planned infrastructure if available; and b. ensuring that the infrastructure is provided is in accordance with objectives and policies ~~the purpose, characteristics and qualities of the zone.~~		
FS25.107	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS243.073	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports development in all forms being aligned with the provision of adequate climate-resilient services and infrastructure. The amendments sought direct the provision of infrastructure and apply objectives and policies of the chapter that support the outcome sought above.	Allow	Amend SUB-P6 as follows	Accept in part
S179.100	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P6	Support		Retain SUB-P6		Accept in part
FS23.056	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.028	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS372.029	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part
S338.012	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-P6	Not Stated	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS570.953	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.967	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.989	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.012	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P6	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS570.1902	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1916	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1938	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S522.035	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P6	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS566.1774	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S449.013	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P6	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend Policy SUB-P6 to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS569.1812	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1829	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S333.044	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P7	Support in part	The policy that requires the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies. Although a more accurate expression of policy intent than policy PA-P2, it should limit its application to specified lots sizes to align with its associated rules	Amend Policy SUB-P7 as follows: Require the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing to specified lots sizes land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies.		Accept in part
S168.052	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P7	Oppose	The policy that requires the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies. Although a more accurate expression of policy intent than policy PA-P2, it should limit its application to specified lots sizes to align with its associated rules.	Amend Policy SUB-P7 as follows; Require the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing to specified lots sizes land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.044	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P7	Support	The policy that requires the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies. Although a more accurate expression of policy intent than policy PA-P2, it should limit its application to specified lots sizes to align with its associated rules.	Amend Policy SUB-P7 as follows.		Accept in part
S523.023	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P7	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend SUB-P7 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject
FS88.65	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.	Allow in part		Reject
FS566.1817	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
S118.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-P7	Oppose	The submitter considers that SUB-P7 needs to provide for the creation of esplanade strips, not just the vesting of esplanade reserves.	Amend SUB-P7 to read: Require the vesting of esplanade reserves, or establishment of esplanade strips, when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualified waterbodies.		Accept in part
FS172.200	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S202.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-P7	Support in part	SUB-P7 needs to provide for the creation of esplanade strips, not just the vesting of esplanade reserves.	Amend SUB-P7 to read: "Require the vesting of esplanade reserves, or establishment of esplanade strips , when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies."		Accept in part
FS172.258	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
S356.080	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P7	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P7 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.101	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S179.101	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P7	Support		Retain SUB-P7		Accept in part
FS23.057	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S243.069	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P7	Support	The policy that requires the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies. Although a more accurate expression of policy intent than policy PA-P2, it should limit its application to specified lots sizes to align with its associated rules.	Amend Policy SUB-P7 as follows Require the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing to specified lots sizes land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies.		Accept in part
FS570.627	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.641	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
FS569.663	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
S272.003	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-P7	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Subdivision SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-P7 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.764	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.778	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.800	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S272.021	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-P7	Support	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values			
FS570.781	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.795	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.817	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.058	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P7	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular, we support Subdivision SUB-O4, SUB-P7 and SUB-S8. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-P7		Accept in part
FS570.1947	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1961	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1983	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S167.051	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P7	Support	Although a more accurate expression of policy intent than policy PA-P2, it should limit its application to specified lots sizes to align with its associated rules.	Amend Policy SUB-P7 as follows Require the vesting of esplanade reserves when subdividing to specified lots sizes land adjoining the coast or other qualifying waterbodies.		Accept in part
FS566.413	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
S523.003	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P7	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-P7		Accept in part
FS566.1798	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S445.007	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P7	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-P7	Accept in part
FS569.1762	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S445.024	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P7	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat	Amend SUB-P7 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		
FS569.1778	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1757	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S77.005	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S40.006	Martin John Yuretich	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S41.006	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S163.009	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA	Amend the Plan:	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S377.006	Rua Hatu Trust	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S410.006	Kerry-Anne Smith	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S411.006	Roger Myles Smith	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					- If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S470.006	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S161.005	Shanon Garton	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S333.045	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P8	Oppose	Policy SUB-P8 which seeks to avoid rural lifestyle subdivision in rural zones, does not set out all of the circumstances where limited rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production Zone may be appropriate, and can provide economic and environmental benefit. The policy should recognise that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care', allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained through legal protection and ongoing obligations. The policy as drafted does not support subdivision rules SUB-R6 "Environmental benefit subdivision" nor SUB-R7 "Management plan subdivision" and should be redrafted to actively 'provide for' such opportunities.	Delete Policy SUB-P8 and replace with the following:<i>SUB-P8 Provide limited opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in rural areas while ensuring that: (a) there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands; (b) subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created; (c) subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment; (d) adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated; (e) sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and (f) reverse sensitivity effects are</i>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production; and (g) loss of versatile soils for primary production activities is avoided.</i>	
S485.020	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses.	Amend Policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.	Accept in part
S168.053	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) which seeks to avoid rural lifestyle subdivision in rural zones, does not set out all of the circumstances where limited rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production Zone may be appropriate, and can provide economic and environmental benefit. The policy should recognise that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care', allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained through legal protection and ongoing obligations. The policy as drafted does not support subdivision rules SUB-R6 "Environmental benefit subdivision" nor SUB-R7 "Management plan subdivision" and should be redrafted to actively 'provide for' such opportunities.	Delete Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) and replace with the following: SUB-P8Provide limited opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in rural areas while ensuring that:(a) there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;(b) subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;(c) subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;(d) adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;(e) sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and(f) reverse sensitivity effects are	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production; and(g) loss of versatile soils for primary production activities is avoided.	
S187.045	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	The policy should recognise that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care', allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained through legal protection and ongoing obligations. The policy as drafted does not support subdivision rules SUB-R6 "Environmental benefit subdivision" nor SUB-R7 "Management plan subdivision" and should be redrafted to actively 'provide for' such opportunities.	Delete Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) and replace with the following: SUB-P8Provide limited opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in rural areas while ensuring that:(a) there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;(b) subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;(c) subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;(d) adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;(e) sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and(f) reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production; and(g) loss of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					versatile soils for primary production activities is avoided.	
S395.006	Sean Jozef Vercammen	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S357.008	Sean Frieling	SUB-P8	Oppose	The new subdivision rules will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and the less productive land when it comes to subdivision. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or	Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.		
S472.043	Michael Foy	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S547.006	LJ King Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S547.019	LJ King Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses	Amend SUB-P8 to add more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses	Accept in part
S544.006	Kelvin Richard Horsford	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S348.012	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S439.006	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend Policy SUB-P8: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to work in partnership with landowners given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S421.175	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-P8	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies SUB-P8 and SUB-P9 (inferred) as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies only provide for subdivision in the rural environment in certain circumstances. There is no balance provided by the two policies between enabling the managed growth of the rural area and the protection of highly productive land. Council also needs to consider the Benefit lots for environmental gains. For many rural landowners there is significant gain and drive if council was to promote biodiversity gains through the	Delete Policies SUB-P8 and SUB-P9 and replace with new policies that address the issues of managed growth of rural areas, protection of highly productive land and the use of benefit lots	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				subdivision process. It is also recommended that the policies contained more recognition for the protection of highly productive soils. There is a significant amount of rural land in Kaipara that is highly productive, and which are significantly important to the economic, sustainable and growth prospects for the district.			
FS24.23	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Agree that one size does not fit all. Council has created a regime where it believes that all rural land is the same. It is not. Incentivise habitat protection; the environmental benefit subdivision clause doesn't go nearly far enough; allow for development of rural land that is NOT highly productive.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS172.311	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support managed growth in rural areas, HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS196.147	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS397.005	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that they seek more balanced provisions (policies) that better support managed growth of rural areas, protection of highly productive soils and use the of benefit lots.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1407	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
FS346.409	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
FS566.1421	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1443	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
FS373.009	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support that provision should be included for managing growth in rural areas.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Accept in part
S358.008	Leah Frieling	SUB-P8	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the Rural Production zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities and people wanting to live independent of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.	Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.		Accept in part
FS24.48	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree that consideration needs to be given to smaller minimum lot sizes in certain circumstances.	Allow		Accept in part
FS305.017	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The policy framework should provide for limited subdivision opportunities where it can be demonstrated that the subdivision of the land is appropriate, that adverse effects on the environment resulting from the subdivision can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated and the subdivision will result in positive effects - such as the ongoing protection and enhancement of SNA bush or wetland areas.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S529.145	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P8	Oppose	SUB-P8 create a type of subdivision called 'Environmental benefit subdivision' as a restricted discretionary activity. This appears to be poorly conceived provision - the protection of SNAs should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.	Amend SUB-P8 as SNA protection should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS24.50	Lynley Newport		Oppose	Submitter seems intent on continuing to impose requirements on rural landowners to perform a service to the community and environment, on behalf of, and benefitting many others, without any incentive or even recognition of doing so.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2033	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2047	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2069	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S257.008	Te Hiku Community Board	SUB-P8	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses		Accept in part
FS171.4	Trish Routley		Support	I support this submission. I do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. I submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for. Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses	Allow		Accept in part
FS397.004	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that there remains a need to promote various subdivision options in the Rural Production Zone	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S541.006	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an	Amend to: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
FS155.62	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S541.018	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses.	Amend Policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.	Accept in part
FS155.63	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S519.020	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses.	Amend SUB-P8 to add more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.	Accept in part
FS155.64	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S485.045	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
FS155.65	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S519.045	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
FS155.66	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S159.068	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P8	Support in part	There is no specific policy framework for the Horticulture zone so seek that it be specifically included in P8. Also, the reference should be to highly productive land - not versatile soils	Amend Policy SUB-P8 by including Horticulture zone. Amend subsection b of Policy SUB-P8 replacing the term 'versatile soils' with 'highly productive land'.	Reject
FS151.236	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS172.242	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow in part		Accept
FS570.230	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
FS566.244	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
FS569.266	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
S118.002	Lynley Newport	SUB-P8	Oppose	The submitter considers that in SUB-P8 the use of the word "avoid" is too negative and restrictive and that the use of more positive terms can achieve the same outcome.	Amend SUB-P8 to read: Provide opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone where the subdivision: a. will protect a qualifying SNA in perpetuity and result in the SNA being added to the District Plan schedule; and/or b. will not result in the material loss of versatile soils for primary production activities.		Reject
FS172.201	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.74	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasons	Allow		Reject
S202.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-P8	Support in part	SUB-P8 uses that word "avoid" again and that makes it entirely too negative and restrictive. Why can't the Council see how easy it is to change a negative into a positive and still achieve the same outcome?	Amend SUB-P8 to read: <i>Provide opportunities for</i> rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone where the subdivision: a. Will protect a qualifying SNA in perpetuity and result in the SNA being added to the District Plan SNA schedule; and/or b. Will not result in the material loss		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					of versatile soils for primary production activities."		
FS172.259	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS354.133	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The use of 'avoid' is deliberate and supported to ensure that rural lifestyle does not compromise primary production activities.	Disallow	Disallow S202.002	Accept
S472.008	Michael Foy	SUB-P8	Support in part	with council struggling to provide urban amenities and people wanting to live independent of these services in rural areas without too much land to care for , it makes sense to allow small rural blocks	Amend policy SUB-P8, by adding more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.		Accept in part
FS258.4	logan king		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS259.7	Leah Frieling		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS548.136	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Rural production activities can only occur on a limited number of places. Allowing more residential development to occur in the rural production zone does not allow for the protection of highly productive land or for existing, lawfully established activities to continue.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
S356.081	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P8	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P8 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.102	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the submission in part.	Accept in part
S464.019	LJ King Ltd	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses.	Amend SUB-P8 to add more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses.		Accept in part
FS56.1	Mark Christiansen		Oppose	The changes to the RMA related to concentration of residential housing in rural zones appears short sighted given the lack of infrastructure in and around most urban areas in the Far North. In particular issues related to the expected growth in	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The Kerikeri area. I suggest that there is a need to consider the existing life style blocks within a defined radius of present town ships in the Far north region (Say 15 Km) as a viable option. To avoid stagnation of development due to the lack of serviced land around these townships would it not be a good idea to allowing existing lifestyle block to be further subdivided where it could be reasonably proven the new lots could have suitable on-site services, be subdivided down to a minimum 1 ha lot size, have a native bush covenanted area of 20% of the new developed lot, be on land who's soil is not suitable for horticulture, where stormwater and impermeable surface issues are considered. The additional advantages of this type of infill subdivision of life style type development will include, lowering of cost of land, enable occupants to stay living in the area, another option for retirees, enhance the environment by planting natives in place of pine tree type developments, more rates and allow time for Council to establish service infrastructure. This lift style lot development will make use of land that is not sized to provide a suitable farm type use and it is a practical option to avoid increased land pricing for those who can not get a foot on the property ladder, .			
FS566.1564	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
S179.102	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P8	Support		Retain SUB-P8		Accept in part
FS23.058	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.			
FS372.030	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part
S146.006	Trevor John Ashford	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS393.007	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.006	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of our land is in part within a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S527.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P8	Oppose	SUB-P8 and SUB-R6 create a type of subdivision called 'Environmental benefit subdivision' as a restricted discretionary activity. This appears to be poorly conceived provision - the protection of SNAs should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.	Amend SUB-P8 to make protection of SNAs an essential prerequisite (inferred)		Reject
FS405.036	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendment sought in the submission point as SUB-P8 encourages a pathway for development with positive outcomes, where it would be overly conservative to require offsetting measures for a subdivision where environmental effects are negligible.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS361.027	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendment sought in the submission point as SUB-P8 encourages a pathway for development with positive outcomes, where it would be overly conservative to require offsetting measures for a subdivision where environmental effects are negligible.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1882	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S243.070	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) which seeks to avoid rural lifestyle subdivision in rural zones, does not set out all of the circumstances where limited rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production Zone may be appropriate, and can provide economic and environmental benefit. The policy should recognise that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are	Delete Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) and replace with the following: SUB-P8 Provide limited opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in rural areas while ensuring that:(a) there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care', allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained through legal protection and ongoing obligations. The policy as drafted does not support subdivision rules SUB-R6 "Environmental benefit subdivision" nor SUB-R7 "Management plan subdivision" and should be redrafted to actively 'provide for' such opportunities.	restoration, or wetlands;(b) subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;(c) subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;(d) adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;(e) sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and(f) reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production; and(g) loss of versatile soils for primary production activities is avoided.		
FS305.016	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Further residential / subdivision opportunities within the Rural Production zone should be provided for.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.628	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
FS566.642	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.664	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
S167.052	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	The policy should recognise that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care', allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained through legal protection and ongoing obligations. The policy as drafted does not support subdivision rules SUB-R6 "Environmental benefit subdivision" nor SUB-R7 "Management plan subdivision" and should be redrafted to actively 'provide for' such opportunities.	Delete Policy SUB-P8 (inferred) and replace with the following: SUB-P8Provide limited opportunities for rural lifestyle subdivision in rural areas while ensuring that:(a) there will be significant environmental protection of indigenous vegetation including restoration, or wetlands;(b) subdivision avoids the inappropriate proliferation and dispersal of development by limiting the number of sites created;(c) subdivision avoids inappropriate development within areas of the Outstanding Natural Landscape Overlay, Outstanding Natural Character Overlay, High Natural Character Overlay and the coastal environment;(d) adverse effects on rural and coastal character are avoided, remedied or mitigated;(e) sites are of sufficient size to absorb and manage adverse effects within the site; and(f) reverse sensitivity effects are managed in a way that does not compromise the viability of rural sites for continued production; and(g) loss of versatile soils for primary production activities is avoided.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS354.132	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production and Horticultural zones is inconsistent with providing for primary production activities so is not supported.	Disallow	Disallow S167.052	Accept in part
FS566.414	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S569.006	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS348.237	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	Accept in part
S464.006	LJ King Ltd	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to	Amend to: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS566.1551	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
S543.006	LJ King Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS566.2167	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
S543.019	LJ King Limited	SUB-P8	Oppose	The amendment will allow for more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks are enabled in the Rural Production Zone around existing houses	Amend SUB-P8 to add more circumstances where rural lifestyle blocks can be allowed in the Rural Production Zone, especially around existing houses		Accept in part
FS566.2180	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
S257.009	Te Hiku Community Board	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone.		Accept in part
S333.046	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P9	Oppose	Policy SUB-P9 seeks to avoid subdivision rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone and Rural residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone unless the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule. This policy is not needed with the new policy SUB-P8 sought by this submission	Delete Policy SUB-P9		Accept in part
S541.019	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone.		Accept in part
S519.021	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone.		Accept in part
S168.054	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	Policy SUB-P9 seeks to avoid subdivision rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone and Rural residential subdivision in the Rural	Delete Policy SUB-P9		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Lifestyle zone unless the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule. This policy is not needed with the new policy SUB-P8 sought by this submission.		
S187.046	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	Policy SUB-P9 seeks to avoid subdivision rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone and Rural residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone unless the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule. This policy is not needed with the new policy SUB-P8 sought by this submission.	Delete Policy SUB-P9	Accept in part
S357.009	Sean Frieling	SUB-P9	Oppose	The new subdivision rules will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and the less productive land when it comes to subdivision. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties. We do not support the large title sizes in the rural zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle bocks in the Rural Production Zone.	Accept in part
S547.020	LJ King Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	The policy further limits rural lifestyle bocks in the Rural Production Zone and overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8	Delete SUB-P9	Accept in part
S358.009	Leah Frieling	SUB-P9	Oppose	We do not support the large title sizes in the Rural Production zone. We submit that subdivision should allow lots to 4ha or smaller, and that the subdivision of smaller lots around existing houses be provided for. With Council struggling to provide urban amenities and people wanting to live independent	Delete policy SUB-P9	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of these services in the rural areas without too much land to care for, it makes sense to allow small rural blocks. It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.			
FS24.51	Lynley Newport		Support	I do not believe P-9, with the use of the word 'avoid', should remain.	Allow		Accept in part
S472.009	Michael Foy	SUB-P9	Oppose	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a management plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The effects of this restriction include: - A reduction in vitality for rural communities - no longer allowing farmers to retire in their existing homes with a small area of land - the creation of 8ha blocks, which are too large for lifestyle blocks and too small to be productive - no longer allowing for the creation of appropriately sized and desirable lifestyle blocks - reduce the ability for rural landowners to provide small blocks for young family members to build on and enter the property market (this is contrary to Council policies in relation to affordable housing reduced capacity for farmers to decrease their debt burdens by subdividing off small block of land that do not significantly add to the productivity of their farm. Where it is necessary to reduce debt by subdivision, subdividing off 8ha will diminish the productive capacity of the farm more than a smaller block.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone.		Accept in part
FS24.52	Lynley Newport		Support in part	agree that the overly restrictive minimum lot size regime being proposed will be detrimental to the vitality and diversity of the rural area.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS548.137	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Rural production activities can only occur on a limited number of places. Allowing more residential development to occur in the rural production zone does not allow for the protection	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of highly productive land or for existing, lawfully established activities to continue.			
S118.003	Lynley Newport	SUB-P9	Oppose	The submitter considers that in SUB-P9 the use of the word "avoid" is too negative and restrictive and that the use of more positive terms can achieve the same outcome.	Amend SUB-P9 to read: Provide for rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone, and for Rural Residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone where the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule.		Accept in part
FS171.1	Trish Routley		Support	I support the The submitter considers that in SUB-P9 the use of the word "avoid" is too negative and restrictive and that the use of more positive terms can achieve the same outcome. Amend SUB-P9 to read: Provide for rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone, and for Rural Residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone where the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS172.202	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS305.011	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the policy framework should provide for limited subdivision opportunities where it can be demonstrated that the subdivision of the land is appropriate, that adverse effects on the environment resulting from the subdivision can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated and the subdivision will result in positive effects.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S485.021	Elbury Holdings	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8.	Delete policy SUB-P9, which further limits rural lifestyle bocks in the Rural Production Zone.		Accept in part
FS155.67	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S202.003	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-P9	Support in part	SUB-P9 similarly uses the word "avoid". There are different ways to achieve what SUB-P9 is designed to achieve.	Amend SUB-P9 to read: "Provide for rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production Zone, and for Rural Residential subdivision in the Rural		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Lifestyle Zone where the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule."		
FS172.260	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
S421.176	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-P9	Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes policies SUB-P8 and SUB-P9 (inferred) as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. The policies only provide for subdivision in the rural environment in certain circumstances. There is no balance provided by the two policies between enabling the managed growth of the rural area and the protection of highly productive land. Council also needs to consider the Benefit lots for environmental gains. For many rural landowners there is significant gain and drive if council was to promote biodiversity gains through the subdivision process. It is also recommended that the policies contained more recognition for the protection of highly productive soils. There is a significant amount of rural land in Kaipara that is highly productive, and which are significantly important to the economic, sustainable and growth prospects for the district.	Delete Policies SUB-P8 and SUB-P9 and replace with new policies that address the issues of managed growth of rural areas, protection of highly productive land and the use of benefit lots		Reject
FS172.312	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support in part	Support managed growth in rural areas, HPL has not been appropriately defined or mapped.	Allow in part		Reject
FS196.146	Joe Carr		Support in part	I support subject to an effective reverse sensitivity policy so that primary producers are not compromised	Allow in part		Reject
FS570.1408	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
FS346.410	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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			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.			
FS566.1422	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
FS569.1444	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
FS373.0010	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support that provision should be included for managing growth in rural areas.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Accept
S356.082	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P9	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P9 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.103	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S179.103	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P9	Support		Retain SUB-P9		Accept in part
FS23.059	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.031	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part
S243.071	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	Policy SUB-P9 seeks to avoid rural lifestyle subdivision in the Rural Production zone and	Delete Policy SUB-P9		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Rural residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle zone unless the development achieves the environmental outcomes required in the management plan subdivision rule. This policy is not needed with the new policy SUB-P8 sought by this submission.			
FS570.629	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
FS566.643	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
FS569.665	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
S464.020	LJ King Ltd	SUB-P9	Oppose	The policy further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone and overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8.	Delete SUB-P9.		Accept in part
FS570.1551	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
FS566.1565	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
S529.147	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 and SUB-R7 encourage inappropriate subdivision in the rural production and lifestyle zones if the development achieves so-called environmental outcomes of the management plan subdivision rule. This provision is also poorly conceived. The management plan criteria proposed in Appendix 3 (APP3) are vague, low-reaching and don't set clear expectations for either developers, land owners, or planning officers. The proposed elements and criteria for	Delete this policy (inferred) If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, the criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Management Plans are less than we should expect for all subdivisions in today's world. We consider that management plan subdivisions, to date, have historically failed to achieve quality development or environmental outcomes. If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, they criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes.			
FS570.2035	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2049	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2071	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S349.012	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete SUB-P9 or amend to remove the wording in SUB-P9 relating to avoiding rural residential subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.		Accept in part
FS62.046	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part
FS333.033	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			
S167.053	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	This policy is not needed with the new policy SUB-P8 sought by this submission.	Delete Policy SUB-P9		Accept in part
FS566.415	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
S527.022	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 and SUB-R7 encourage inappropriate subdivision in the rural production and lifestyle zones if the development achieves so-called environmental outcomes of the management plan subdivision rule. This provision is also poorly conceived. The management plan criteria proposed in Appendix 3 (APP3) are vague, low-reaching and don't set clear expectations for either developers, land owners, or planning officers. The proposed elements and criteria for Management Plans are less than we should expect for all subdivisions in today's world. We consider that management plan subdivisions, to date, have historically failed to achieve quality development or environmental outcomes. If the concept of management plan subdivision is retained, they criteria need to be greatly improved to provide superior environmental outcomes	Amend management plan subdivision criteria to improve environmental outcomes (inferred)		Reject
FS566.1884	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S543.020	LJ King Limited	SUB-P9	Oppose	The policy further limits rural lifestyle blocks in the Rural Production Zone and overlaps with and duplicates the content of SUB-P8	Delete SUB-P9		Accept in part
FS566.2181	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
S356.083	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-P10	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-P10 as notified		Accept
FS25.104	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept
S179.104	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P10	Support	support SUB P10 in particular in order to discourage backdoor non complying subdivisions of properties containing minor dwelling units	Retain SUB-P10		Accept
FS23.060	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S463.045	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) to (f) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to achieve the overarching objectives. WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on the other subdivision policies instead. If necessary, the assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards later in this chapter.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
S451.006	Pacific Eco-Logic	SUB-P11	Support in part	Policy SUB-P11 does not address all the effects that need to be addressed to protect indigenous biodiversity	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications: 1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the biodiversity values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property 3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements 4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control) 5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife 6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife		
FS24.53	Lynley Newport		Oppose	Requested decision turns a policy (already reading like assessment criteria) in a list of assessment criteria - this is NOT a policy.	Disallow		Accept
FS93.2	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	Re points 1 & 2: - Do not agree with sub-division policies, or practice notes, that ban or restrict the number of dogs or cats which are allowed on a particular property. - Banning responsible pet owners from owning and keeping pets on their own property is a breach of the wellbeing and rights of the 40%+ of pet owning households in this district. To do so in perpetuity is also a breach of the rights and potential wellbeing of future owners, including the current owners' descendants. - These bans have been going for over two decades, and yet just this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' It has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. - Point (2) suggests banning dogs and cats from even more land in Northland, including the beaches if you consider shorebirds. Northland already has 53,000+ hectares where kiwi are present or high density. Where are the 40% of Northland pet owning households meant to live?	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS93.3	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	Do not agree with (6) - The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions. - To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate. - To ban dogs from anywhere without first liaising with dog owners - 40% of our community - is appalling. - FNDC, this has been going on for over two decades. Please be the elected council which demands that dog control be managed via the legally appropriate means. - Controls on pet ownership should never include banning dogs, or restricting a dog owner to a certain number of dogs (one, or two, or more) at the un-researched or supported whim of the FNDC District Planning department. - FNDC chose not to restrict dog numbers by household during the consultations on the Dog Management Bylaw 2018. This was logical as the key is not numbers of dogs, but whether the owner acts responsibly towards them. Under the Dog Control Act (1996) and the Animal Management Act (1999), FNDC Animal Management Officers, the SPCA, and Police can all uplift dogs which are causing a nuisance, roaming, or being abused. The key for FNDC is to use these powers effectively, not to 'get around' the responsibility to enforce responsible dog ownership, and educate the public on what that means.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS88.48	Stephanie Lane		Support	6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at risk wildlife Support - BUT: This should not include banning or limiting numbers of companion animals.	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Fencing, training and other means that do not impinge on our right to live with our animals can produce the result of wildlife protection.			
FS332.193	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
FS570.1511	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
FS566.1525	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
FS569.1547	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
S483.166	Top Energy Limited	SUB-P11	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. To achieve this, Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration to be included that required consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision. This will provide a trigger for processing planners to encourage consultation with Top Energy where any subdivision is proposed where not captured by SUB - R9 & 10. While there is no overlay to trigger this, above ground infrastructure will be visible when site visits are undertaken.	Amend policy SUB - P11 to include the follow additional matter of discretion: any potential for reverse sensitivity effects on electricity infrastructure.		Accept in part
FS84.4	Kaitaia Marae Incorporated (Margaret Thomas-Amani Vicechair)		Support in part	Protect electricity subdivision proposed. If Top Energy was to upgrade its services and practise perhaps people might believe they deliver quality service which they dont do. In addition, their power poles are falling over outside our property and we will be improving it within the next 5	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				years. There existing power poles again are an eyesore outdated poles falling over outside.			
FS131.028	Oromahoe Land Owners: AW and DM Simpson, R.A.S Ltd, Arran Trust, Garry Stanners, Errol McIntyre, SW Halliday, SJ and PM Boys, Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose	The original submission is seeking to obligate a developer in what is already a onerous and challenging process which discourages development or depends on the original submitters approval.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part
FS345.217	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
FS369.440	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision	Disallow		Accept in part
S159.069	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-P11	Support in part	The policy lists the matters to be considered for subdivision applications. Potential for reverse sensitivity should also be included as a matter for consideration	Amend Policy SUB-P11 by adding: g) potential for reverse sensitivity effects		Accept in part
FS151.237	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS304.015	Radio New Zealand		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.231	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	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS566.245	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
FS569.267	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
FS369.431	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require that consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S517.002	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Vodafone New Zealand Limited	SUB-P11	Support	Requirement in Policies SUB-P6 and SUB-P11 for subdivisions to have electricity and telecommunication connections is supported	Retain Policy SUB-P11		Accept in part
FS289.5	Reuben Wright		Support in part	Support the provision of suitable power and telecommunication services in general, but there is no longer demand for hard wired telecommunication services as part of land development / subdivision. With so many wireless options now available, there is no reason to address telecommunication requirements for land development / subdivision in the District Plan.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS369.441	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision			
S179.105	Russell Protection Society (INC)	SUB-P11	Support in part	there is a need to consider the cumulative effects of subdivision, particularly within coastal rural and special purpose areas	Amend SUB-P11 to require council to have regard to the cumulative effects that subdivision would have upon the values of the area in question		Accept in part
FS23.061	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission. Agree it is important to ensure effects of subdivision, including cumulative effects, are appropriately considered during consenting processes. Also agree with the lot sizes proposed for Kororāreka zone, and the other zones to the extent this is consistent with our primary submission.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
FS372.032	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The subdivision policies as notified are generally appropriate and reflect sustainable management	Allow	Accept the submissions to the extent that they are consistent with my submissions (S431) on policies.	Accept in part
FS369.434	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S55.017	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-P11	Support in part	Subdivision policies should give effect to avoiding reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision, as per the section overview.	amend the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established operations in the matters for consideration, as follows: Manage subdivision to address the effects of the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					activity requiring resource consent including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a.consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone; b.the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; c.the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for on-site infrastructure associated with the proposed activity; d.managing natural hazards; e.Any adverse effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; and f.any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6. g.The potential for reverse sensitivity effects that would prevent or adversely affect activities already established on land from continuing to operate.		
FS548.012	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers' supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity issues in the rural environment as a matter of consideration in SUB-011.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part
S243.072	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	The matters set out in Policy SUB-P11 are information requirements for assessment of applications and do not prescribe policy as such. They are better placed as assessment matters/criteria against which applications are to be assessed.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
FS570.630	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.644	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
FS569.666	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
FS369.436	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision	Disallow		Accept
S349.013	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete SUB-P11 or amend to delete the criteria in SUB-P11.		Reject
FS62.047	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS333.034	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			
FS369.438	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision	Disallow		Accept
S442.150	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-P11	Support in part	Policy SUB-P11 does not address all the effects that need to be addressed to protect indigenous biodiversity.	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications: 1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present 2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the biodiversity values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property 3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements 4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control) 5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife 6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.761	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S167.054	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	The matters set out in Policy SUB-P11 are better placed as assessment matters/criteria against which applications are to be assessed.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
FS566.416	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS369.432	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision.	Disallow		Accept
S168.055	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	The matters set out in Policy SUB-P11 are information requirements for assessment of applications and do not prescribe policy as such. They are better placed as assessment matters/criteria against which applications are to be assessed.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
FS369.433	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.047	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-P11	Oppose	The matters set out in Policy SUB-P11 are information requirements for assessment of applications and do not prescribe policy as such. They are better placed as assessment matters/criteria against which applications are to be assessed.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
FS369.435	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision.	Disallow		Accept
S333.047	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-P11	Oppose	The matters set out in Policy SUB-P11 are information requirements for assessment of applications and do not prescribe policy as such. They are better placed as assessment matters/criteria against which applications are to be assessed.	Delete Policy SUB-P11		Reject
FS369.437	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision	Disallow		Accept
S454.094	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	SUB-P11	Not Stated	Transpower considers the subdivision policy requires amendment to ensure that it addresses	Amend SUB-P11 as follows: Manage subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent including (but not		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the need to manage subdivision in the National Grid Subdivision Corridor.	limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone; b. the location, scale and design of buildings and structures; c. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; or the capacity of the site to cater for on-site infrastructure associated with the proposed activity; d. managing natural hazards; e. Any adverse effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values; and f. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; g. managing effects on the National Grid from subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor.		
FS369.439	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to ensure the protection of all electricity infrastructure, noting the interdependency of the system and the importance of lines other than 110kV and 33kV line which Top Energy has sought be mapped as Critical Electricity Lines. Top Energy seeks that a further matter of consideration be included to require consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure at the time of subdivision	Allow in part		Reject
S163.002	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	Rules	Oppose	All subdivision sizes need to have a Management Plan to bring Lifestyle Blocks and Urban area into line with rural. Healthy soils make healthy land, animals, people and waterways. The storage of excess rainfall to be applied to the land in times of moisture deficit allows the soils to stay in a sponge like state and avoid the dry arid state which washes and blows away to add sediment.	Insert a requirement for all subdivision to have a management plan		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S163.003	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	Rules	Oppose	The storage of excess rainfall to be applied to the land in times of moisture deficit allows the soils to stay in a sponge like state and avoid the dry arid state which washes and blows away to add sediment. All subdivision must have a water management plan to slow the leaving of the water from the land.	Insert a requirement all subdivision must have a water management plan	Reject
S178.007	Reuben Wright	Rules	Support in part	There is no rule in the Subdivision Chapter that clearly identifies requirements as they relate to traffic or access.	[Amend to add rule in the Subdivision Chapter that clearly identifies requirements as they relate to traffic or access - inferred].	Accept in part
S425.041	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Support in part	In general, PHTTCCT support well-connected development, and future transport networks (see sub#4) being provided at the time of subdivision. Given the lack of spatial planning incorporated into the plan, it is considered that requiring developers to show how any future transport networks will be accommodated by the development is critical to future proof the District and ensure an integrated well connected transport network. Depending on the scale of development this could include requiring setbacks from indicative roads/cycleways as shown/described in any future or existing) strategies/spatial plans/annual plan be provided, or road connections provided at boundaries of the developments.	Amend the subdivision chapter to ensure that provision for, and connectivity with future transport networks is demonstrated at subdivision.	Reject
S428.011	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	We support the principle of PDP provisions controlling the area of impermeable surface per site, and consider it is probably also necessary to monitor and limit the total cumulative impermeable area in residential/urban zones.	Amend to provide for greater limits on impermeable areas (and/or requirements for minimum permeable areas) for subdivision, use and development. In urban/residential zones, it will also be necessary to adopt measures to limit the cumulative total impermeable surface and/or protect a specified cumulative total permeable area.	Reject
S428.014	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths.	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.	
S451.007	Pacific Eco-Logic	Rules	Support in part	The existing rules are generally supported. Additional rules are needed to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna for subdivisions other than environmental benefit lots.	Insert additional rules for subdivisions, other than environmental benefit lots, to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. These rules should include 1. The protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (including the balance lot) as part of a subdivision 2. The requirement for cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds)		
FS24.54	Lynley Newport		Oppose	I agree with the protection of significant flora and fauna, but not by way of a harsh and overly restrictive rules regime. Much more emphasis has to be on incentives and rewards.	Disallow		Accept
FS93.4	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	Re points 1 & 2: - Do not agree with sub-division policies, or practice notes, that ban or restrict the number of dogs or cats which are allowed on a particular property. - Banning responsible pet owners from owning and keeping pets on their own property is a breach of the wellbeing and rights of the 40%+ of pet owning households in this district. To do so in perpetuity is also a breach of the rights and potential wellbeing of future owners, including the current owners' descendants. - These bans have been going for over two decades, and yet just this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' It has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. - Point (2) suggests banning dogs and cats from even more land in Northland, including the beaches if you consider shorebirds. Northland already has 53,000+ hectares where kiwi are present or high density. Where are the 40% of Northland pet owning households meant to live?	Disallow		Accept
FS88.50	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	- Support - Strongly oppose	Disallow in part		Reject
FS332.194	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1512	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
FS566.1526	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
FS569.1548	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
S364.003	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Rules	Oppose	The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity.	Amend the Subdivision chapter to include more stringent controls to allow for the consideration and scheduling of SNAs in the subdivision chapter.		Reject
FS24.55	Lynley Newport		Oppose	Doc, as a representative of govt, therefore needs to support landowners in protecting indigenous vegetation. Central govt needs to support landowners in protecting indigenous vegetation - e.g. offer carbon credit for existing trees as well as newly planted area. Don't add more stringent controls, add more innovative and positive incentives.	Disallow in part		Accept
FS93.45	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Loosen the controls on dogs, don't add to them! - Immediately halt all bans on dog ownership, and restrictions on the number of dogs allowed in each household, as is currently occurring via FNDC's sub-division chapter. - Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- Over the last (approx.) 30 years in Northland, around 10-12 kiwi have been killed each year by dogs. More kiwi have been killed by cars. - On the Russell Peninsula, there has been argument in the community about dogs and kiwi for some years. Figures we obtained from DOC, for the period 1990 - early 2018, showed 4 kiwi had definitely been killed by dogs on the Russell Peninsula. They suspected an additional 3 were killed by dogs but this was not confirmed. - Here are the number of kiwi known by DOC to have been killed in Northland, over a 2.5 year period: 2019: car - 21; dog - 20; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 1 2020: car - 20; dog - 13; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 0 2021 (to June): car - 12; dog - 9; cat - 0; cat or stoat or unknown - 2 - When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time. - These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans don't work! - FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander. These two factors - education and effective policing - along with de-sexing dogs across the district, are the most effective solutions to reducing wandering dogs. - Stop using sub-division consents and covenants to ban dogs and cats across New Zealand. Once the community becomes aware of how land has been banned or restricted to pets in Northland, there will be an outcry.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.78	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Scheduling of SNAs can only be done by way of a Plan Change, not through a rule in the subdivision chapter, and in accordance with the requirements of the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.77	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Scheduling of SNAs can only be done by way of a Plan Change, not through a rule in the subdivision chapter, and in accordance with the requirements of the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.75	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Scheduling of SNAs can only be done by way of a Plan Change, not through a rule in the subdivision chapter, and in accordance with the requirements of the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS25.124	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNA requires current mapping based on ground truthing and ecological assessment.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS66.132	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Scheduling of SNAs can only be done by way of a Plan Change, not through a rule in the subdivision chapter, and in accordance with the requirements of the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS339.035	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Area that qualify as significant should be treated as such, whether scheduled or not.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS393.022	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Oppose	the proposed rules in the PDP adequately address the protection of SNA ;	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS548.079	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS325.077	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT supports mapping for SNA's to provide clarity and relative certainty in the Plan so long as these areas are correctly mapped and the mapping is based on current ground truthing and ecological assessment. Mapping should also be cognisant of existing and	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed zoning and the need to achieve the overall strategic direction for the District.			
FS243.086	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora agree that the PDP should identify and map SNAs and include related objectives, policies and rules for their protection rather than inserting provisions within the subdivision chapter which would lead to unclear and uncertain approaches on a site-by-site basis. SNAs should be mapped and identified in the PDP. Kāinga Ora opposes any inclusion or provision for non-scheduled features in a PDP.	Disallow in part	Amend the Subdivision chapter to include more stringent controls to allow for the consideration and scheduling of SNAs in the subdivision chapter	Accept
FS570.1084	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
FS346.143	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1098	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
FS569.1120	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
S521.017	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	- buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures - Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts - Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS196.240	Joe Carr		Support in part	i support all this submission with the exception of the word 'best', it should be changed to 'good'. GOOD INFERS PROVEN, EFFECTIVE SYSTEMS	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS566.1727	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S356.088	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Rules	Oppose	There appear to be no rules or assessment criteria that manage access or transport effects, i.e. safe and fit for purpose access, network impacts, and the provision of transport infrastructure. This is a fundamental control of subdivision. This is critical for subdivision on the State highway network given the high-speed environment. Waka Kotahi has its own access	Insert rules and assessment criteria relating to the provision and management of access and transport effects of subdivision.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				design standards, and seeks to minimise side friction, thereby consolidating vehicle crossings and encouraging access from a local road where possible. There should also be circumstances in which active mode connections are provided for, and consideration of how this may link to public transport infrastructure where practicable.			
FS289.6	Reuben Wright		Support	Agree that there is a lack of clarity in the current rules as to what provisions apply to subdivision.	Allow		Accept in part
FS25.109	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS243.074	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental. However, no details to the proposed changes are introduced in the primary submission and therefore it is unclear to the specific relief sought.	Allow in part	There appears to be no rules or assessment criteria that manage access or transport effects, ...	Accept in part
S521.011	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater.	<p>Amend PDP to require best practice water-sensitive, low-impact designs and measures for all stormwater and wastewater engineering, infrastructure and related development, to prevent problems associated with more extreme rainfall events in future, including provision to implement relevant parts of NPS-FM>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS309.17	Brad Hedger		Support in part	Water reuse strategies should form part of all new development along with renewable energy. These aspects should have incentives in the plan to encourage use.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS566.1721	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S427.010	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home.	Amend to require new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways [inferred].		Reject
FS66.131	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The general rule sought for subdivisions to have walking and cycling connectivity is not targeted, and unlikely to be applicable to most rural locations (other than potentially on the edge of urban areas). It is therefore neither an effective nor efficient way to achieve the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S445.014	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	As noted, there is increasing need to support connectivity and active modes of transport. RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' ' (RMA s77(2))<br/ Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept	Insert new rule (inferred) to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b) a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c) the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA).			
FS66.133	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rules does not implement the relevant Plan objectives.	Disallow		Accept
FS569.1769	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1748	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S442.151	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	The existing rules are generally supported. Additional rules are needed to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna for subdivisions other than environmental benefit lots.	Insert additional rules for subdivisions, other than environmental benefit lots, to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. These rules should include 1. The protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					(including the balance lot) as part of a subdivision 2. The requirement for cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds)		
FS66.134	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought are not rules and may not be generally applicable., They are at best assessment criteria.	Disallow		Accept
FS346.762	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S427.040	Kapiro Residents Association	Rules	Support in part	No specific reason for this decision sought.	Amend the PDP to wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing.		Reject
FS66.135	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Inappropriate for subdivision in rural areas.	Disallow		Accept
S272.013	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Support in part	PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more	Insert new rule (inferred) requiring esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more when one of the following situations applies: •the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or •a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or •the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement.		Reject
FS66.136	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.773	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.787	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.809	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S529.184	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support	As noted, there is increasing need to support connectivity and active modes of transport. RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' (RMA s77(2)) Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when	Insert new policies/rules to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b) a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c) the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA).			
FS66.137	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2071	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2085	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2107	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S523.016	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	As noted, there is increasing need to support connectivity and active modes of transport. RMA (s77, s230, s237F etc.) specifically allow councils to include a DP rule that requires esplanade when lots of 4 ha or more are created by subdivision: 'A territorial authority may include a rule in its district plan which provides that in respect of any allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, esplanade reserves or esplanade strips, of the width specified in the rule, shall be set aside or created, as the case may be, under section 230(5).' (RMA s77(2)) Voluntary contribution: RMA s237F requires the council to compensate the landowner for esplanade associated with larger lots - unless the landowner agrees not to take compensation, as voluntary action. In addition, s200(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows developers to provide a reserve voluntarily, and s200(2) allows councils to accept	Amend policies to require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: - the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or - a third party agrees to provide funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or - the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financial contributions (under the RMA or LGA) or other arrangement		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				voluntary contributions for reserves that are not included in a development contribution: 'This subpart does not prevent a territorial authority from accepting from a person, with that person's agreement, additional contributions for reserves...' Third party funding: In addition, s200(1)(c) of LGA 2002 allows for a third party to fund a reserve (provided that the reserve is not included in a development contribution): 'a third party has funded or provided, or undertaken to fund or provide, the same reserve...' This potentially opens the door for a benefactor or community group to raise funds for specific parcels of esplanade land. Our group considers that DP Policies/Rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more (as allowed under RMA s77, s230, etc.) when one of the following situations applies: (a) the owner agrees to provide the land on a voluntary basis, or (b)a third party provides funds to compensate the land owner for the land (at normal market value), or (c)the land is included in a development agreement or development contributions or financialcontributions (under the RMA or LGA).			
FS66.138	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS566.1810	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
S522.055	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Support in part	No specific reason for this decision sought.	Amend the PDP to wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing.		Reject
FS66.139	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1794	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.199	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	No specific reason for this decision sought.	Amend the PDP to wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing		Reject
FS66.140	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2086	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2100	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2122	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S449.069	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	No specific reason for this decision sought.	Amend the PDP to wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing.		Reject
FS66.141	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS569.1868	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1885	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S338.072	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	No specific reason for this decision sought.	Amend the PDP to wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing.		Reject
FS66.142	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule does not implement the objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1009	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1023	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1045	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S431.069	John Andrew Riddell	Rules	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed, this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Revise the objectives, policies and provisions to better provide for cycling and active transport and walking in urban areas, settlements and their surrounds		Reject
FS332.069	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
S516.055	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora support the creation of resilient communities, responding to and managing risk from natural hazards to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of Northland residents. Ngā Tai Ora consider that SUB-R8 is ineffective and inefficient. The rule requires building platforms, access and services to be located wholly outside of any area on site which is identified as land susceptible to land instability. Land susceptible to land instability is not mapped in the PDP, instead the PDP provides a complicated definition which requires applicants to undertake individual mapping of their own site. Ngā Tai Ora, consider that this method is	Insert rules applying to areas of risk which are appropriately identified through further mapping of land instability and where the potential risk of land instability throughout the District is understood. Or alternatively: Amend the definition of land identified as susceptible to land instability, to be easily understandable and identifiable. Amend Rule SUB-R8 to locate building platforms, access and services in the least as risk portion of the parent site.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				onerous, placing considerable cost on landowners particularly when provisions of affordable, safe and healthy housing is essential in the Far North District.			
FS243.084	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that will contribute to Te Tai Tokerau being more responsive and resilient to natural hazards, including as these hazards evolve because of climate change	Allow in part	Insert rules applying to areas	Reject
S338.011	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS570.952	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.966	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.988	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S354.006	The BOI Watchdogs	Rules	Oppose	To address the concerns, detailed in the BOI Watchdog submission about Council, staff and its processes and resource management practices over pet ownership. Refer to the submission for full details.	Delete any rules that ban or restrict dogs on our subdivisions, immediately, until the elected Council and community have obtained the following information, and had an opportunity to make decisions on it, with genuine community consultation: - Information about the extent of the dog bans and restrictions across Northland, including any restrictions or bans which may apply on Māori land; clarity about the nature of those restrictions, and; clarity around the number of years that such restrictions have taken place. - External, independent, legal opinion on whether the use of the RMA and sub-division policies and practices to ban pets, to the extent that has been occurring, is legally appropriate.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					- External, independent legal review of FNDC legal department's action against Donna Doolittle's Animal Rescue in terms of (i) alleged bias shown against her within the animal management department, and (ii) the differential application of the word 'kennel', with all its attendant obligations, between FNDC's resource application for its Horeke pound, versus Donna Doolittle's Animal Rescue. - Review of the dog bans and restrictions at the Ngawha Industrial Enterprise Park (NIEP) and Quail Ridge Retirement Village, to assess impact on the community and surrounding properties. - External, independent, academic review of the two documents FNDC currently uses 'internally' to ban dogs, by a non-DIC funded/controlled organisation, which has experience of dog behaviour (e.g. Massey University). Those documents are the 'Practice Note For Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna' and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map Support Document'. We wish to have input to that review. - A summary of positive alternatives to the banning and restricting of dogs on sub-divisions which would provide safety for wildlife, while also allowing responsible dog owners to live with their canine family members. This should include review of whether breeder oversight and regulations need strengthening, and whether there is support for mandatory de-sexing of pet dogs, when they are not owned by breeders or farmers. - An analysis of the potential unintended consequences of FNDC's dog bans and restrictions, including (i) the impact on the availability of rental and sale properties for dog owners, including information from developers and real estate agents, (ii) the impact on the wellbeing of families who are forced to relinquish their pets to obtain housing, and (iii) whether community acceptance of the release of kiwi would be adversely affected if the community was aware of the implications this has on their rights to pet ownership. of dog behaviour (e.g. Massey University). Those documents are the 'Practice Note For Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna' and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Support Document'. We wish to have input to that review. - A summary of positive alternatives to the banning and restricting of dogs on sub-divisions which would provide safety for wildlife, while also allowing responsible dog owners to live		
FS570.1015	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
FS566.1029	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
FS569.1051	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
S529.221	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	It should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings, for example, with requirements for permeable open areas including garden/landscaped ground. Developments should use permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths. The PDP should require all new buildings to store/use roof water wherever possible, to avoid the need for expensive reticulation systems and reduce the need for water top-ups via water tankers. New buildings connected to a public water supply should be required to collect roof water in storage vessels to use for gardens and flushing toilets (at minimum) and contribute to other household water uses such as laundry connections. Water storage vessels do not need to be a traditional round tank - other useful shapes exist, such as rectangular upright vessels that are easy to install against the side of a house or garage, or short flat vessels designed to be completely buried underground or placed under the foundations of new builds. Greywater	Amend PDP to include objectives, policies and rules/standards that require best practice environmentally sustainable techniques for new developments, including - • Permeable materials wherever feasible for surfaces such as driveways, paths etc. • Best practice for lowest environmental impact and water sensitive designs, requiring greywater recycling techniques and other technologies to ensure efficient use of water, rain storage tanks for properties connected to a public water supply, additional water storage for buildings that rely solely on roof water (to cope with drought), and other measures • Renewable energy technologies and energy-efficient technologies, and similar requirements that foster improved environmental design/technologies and lower lifecycle climate impacts • Specified area (percentage) of tree canopy cover and green corridors should be		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				harvesting and re-use should also be required for new buildings. These types of water-saving measures would also reduce future Council infrastructure costs for additional water supplies and wastewater. Passive heating and cooling designs, for example, reduce energy consumption and the on-going costs of heating/cooling. Solar panels with batteries, for example, can be purchased on lease-to-buy schemes so that the owner/occupier only pays the amount that they would have paid anyway for grid electricity. Additional electricity generation by households will be essential for powering EVs in future because current national generation capacity is not sufficient.	required within new subdivisions. These will be increasingly important for shade/cooling for buildings and pedestrians in future.		
FS570.2108	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2122	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2144	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.238	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Stormwater and wastewater should be fully managed to avoid sediment/pollutants being carried to waterways and wetlands, especially during high rainfall events which are expected to become more extreme due to climate change. Under s7(i) of the RMA, councils must have particular regard to the effects of climate change. In general, water sensitive and low impact designs should be a standard requirement, not just encouraged. For example, stormwater and water from wastewater disposal fields can carry pollutants and silt into waterways during high rainfall events. They should not be discharged directly into waterways but be retained in constructed wetlands (vegetated retention ponds) or other water sensitive and low impacts features.	Amend the plan so that water sensitive and low impact designs are a standard requirement		Accept in part
FS570.2125	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2139	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2161	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.241	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	The disposal of wastewater from sewage treatment plants into wetlands and water bodies has been a matter of concern to communities for some time. The Council's Infrastructure Committee requested further investigation of disposal-to-land options for several wastewater schemes, and requested a wastewater disposal-to-land workshop in late 2021 to cover methodologies and processes associated with establishing a disposal-to-land scheme. The PDP should include provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes.	Insert provisions to encourage and progressively require disposal-to-land wastewater treatment methods (based on coagulation and flocculation) and ensure the responsible use of solid waste from treatment plants as fertilizer and the use of wastewater for irrigation purposes.		Reject
FS570.2128	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2142	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2164	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S449.012	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems	Amend the rules to emphasise the requirement for developer input for infrastructure servicing private land use and subdivision		Reject
FS569.1811	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1828	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S561.046	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Notes	Support in part	The reference to "potentially affected" is not specific and the comment should clarify that this relates to the mapped hazard areas.	Amend Note 4 as follows: 4. Any application for a resource consent in relation to a site that is ~~potentially affected by natural hazards~~ identified by the mapped natural hazards (as noted in the Plan definitions) must be accompanied by a report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that addresses the matters identified in the relevant objectives, policies, performance standards and matters of control/discretion including an assessment of whether the site includes an area of land susceptible to instability.		Reject
FS32.0100	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDP in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.			
FS23.318	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.060	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.133	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	Accept
S333.048	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already noncompliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased;~~		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment	SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S3 Water supply; SUB-S4 Stormwater management; SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal; SUB-S6 Telecommunications and power supply; and SUB-S7 Easements for any purpose;	
S168.056	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment.	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already noncompliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased; ...~~	Reject
S187.048	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment.	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already noncompliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased;~~ SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S3 Water supply; SUB-S4 Stormwater management; SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal; SUB-S6 Telecommunications and power	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					supply; and SUB-S7 Easements for any purpose;	
S222.052	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment.	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already non-compliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased;~~ SUB-S21 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S32 Water supply; SUB-S43 Stormwater management; SUB-S54 Wastewater disposal; SUB-S65 Telecommunications and power supply; and SUB-S76 Easements for any purpose;.....	Reject
S463.046	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-R1	Oppose	Based on section 2.2 of the KCZ s32 report, the Proposed Plan will make the Natural Heritage subzone in the KCZ default to the new Natural Open Space Zone. It is unclear if a boundary adjustment to contain, but not bisect, land in the NOSZ would be non-complying. WBF would oppose a non-complying consenting pathway for a boundary adjustment that is merely needed to create a lot specifically to enclose land in the NOSZ. It may be necessary, when future residential subdivision occurs at Kauri Cliffs, to undertake a boundary adjustment (or create a lot) around the Natural Heritage subzone, as this is currently contained within a larger lot (Lot 4 DP 50234). A default non-complying activity status for a boundary adjustment of this nature appears to be	Amend the rules to clarify the activity status for subdivision (including boundary adjustments) that adjusts boundaries around, but does not create boundaries through, land in the NOSZ. (See also WBF's submissions on rule SUB-R3 (submission point S463.047 and S463.048)).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				inconsistent with the Proposed Plan's directions that otherwise seek to protect and maintain significant indigenous biodiversity as in the Natural Heritage subzone.			
S55.018	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R1	Support in part	The objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues should be clearly articulated within the rules.	Amend the rule to clearly reference reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Matters of control are limited to: ... h. ~~adverse~~ reverse sensitivity effects arising from landuse incompatibility including but not limited to noise,vibration, smell, smoke, dust and spray.		Reject
FS129.10	Waste Management New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow		Reject
FS548.013	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers' supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity issues in these rules.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS354.134	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Specific reference to reverse sensitivity is supported as it provides clarity.	Allow	Allow S55.018	Reject
S119.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R1	Support in part	The submitter is generally in support of this rule however, does not consider that boundary adjustments should comply with SUB-S6 in order to remain a controlled activity. Often rural boundary adjustments will be of vacant land and are being carried out to rationalise property boundaries with no development of the vacant land being intended. It is considered too prescriptive to require power and telecommunications to the boundaries in this case.	Amend SUB-R1 to read as below and delete SUB-S6 Telecommunications and Power Supply CON-1 1. The boundary adjustment complies with standards: SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where existing allotments are already of a size that is non-compliant, the overall degree of non-compliance is not be increased; SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S3 Water supply; SUB-S4 Stormwater management;		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal; and SUB-S6 Easements for any purpose;		
FS172.203	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.75	Joe Carr		Support	makes sense	Allow		Accept in part
FS369.442	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy considers that it is important that electrical services are provided to all allotments, noting that servicing to a boundary provides flexibility for the boundary adjustment rule	Disallow		Accept in part
FS369.446	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy considers that it is important that electrical services are provided to all allotments, noting that servicing to a boundary provides flexibility for the boundary adjustment rule. Alternative methods can be assessed via a consent	Disallow		Accept in part
FS585.001	Peter Malcolm		Support	The submitter considers minimum lot sizes of 8ha are too large and do not provide for boundary adjustments between smaller existing titles (e.g., two adjacent 6ha titles both adjust their boundaries resulting in a 10ha and 2ha split). A number of farms consist of multiple, adjacent titles and owners require flexibility to adjust titles to be a single, financially more viable larger holdings. This could lead to greater investment in larger titles, diversification of local agricultural production and enhancement of rural productivity across the district.	Allow in part	Amend Subdivision Chapter to enable boundary adjustments between existing titles in rural zones as a permitted activity and require the minimum area for the smaller parcel to be 1ha (inferred).	Accept in part
S502.081	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Using the word alter it has the unintended consequence of capturing boundary adjustments which decrease the number of allotments provided. Boundary adjustments that decrease the number of titles should have the ability to comply with the Controlled activity provisions as such we seek to use the word 'increase' to clarify this situation.	Amend SUB-R1 CON-2 CON-2 1. the boundary adjustment does not ~~alter~~ : i. alter the ability of existing activities to continue to be permitted under the rules and standards in this District Plan; ii. alter the degree of non compliance with zone or district wide standards; iii. alter the number and location of any access; and		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					iv. increase the number of certificates of title.		
FS172.223	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S191.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R1	Support in part	Generally I support this rule as written. It is essential to keep basic boundary adjustments as simple as possible to achieve. However, I disagree with boundary adjustments having to comply with SUB-56 in order to remain a controlled activity. Often rural boundary adjustments will be of vacant land and are being carried out simply to rationalise property boundaries with no 'development' of that vacant land necessarily intended. It seems unusually prescriptive to therefore insist on power and telecommunications connections to new boundaries. I also disagree with the wording of CON-1, 1. SUB-1 It needs to be clear that the 'degree of non compliance' can be assessed in terms of the overall boundary adjustment, not on the basis of an individual lot being created. I say this because I've encountered numerous instances where the boundary adjustment is of lots already non-compliant in terms of size. The boundary adjustment will result in one becoming smaller (more 'non-compliant'), but the other larger (less 'non-compliant'). Overall the level of non-compliance across the allotments is therefore not increased. This should be reflected in amended wording. Finally, I disagree with CON-2, 1. iii. This rule requires access locations to remain the same, regardless of whether or not an access point would be better placed elsewhere as part of the boundary adjustment, i.e. improved site distances. Overall, the number of access points would remain the same. It should be possible to	Amend SUB-R1 as follows Amend CON-1, 1. SUB-1 to read: <i>"... except where existing allotments are already of a size that is non-compliant, the overall degree of non-compliance is not increased."</i> Amend CON-1 by deleting the words ~~SUB-56 Telecommunications and Power Supply~~. Amend CON-2, 1. iii. to read: "the number of access points; and"		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				move an access point if it would better service the lot, and improve safety.			
FS172.252	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS369.443	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy considers that it is important that electrical services are provided to all allotments, noting that servicing to a boundary provides flexibility for the boundary adjustment rule	Disallow		Accept in part
S348.009	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	This rule makes no distinction between enormous changes in boundaries where people are utilising multiple titles (effectively a boundary "relocation" and a full subdivision) and small tweaks of boundaries (boundary "adjustments") where perhaps a structure has inadvertently ended up on the neighbour's property or a transfer of a back paddock to a neighbour. In the latter case, the effects are (usually) nil and so there is no requirement under the RMA 1991 to mitigate these effects. Therefore CON-3 and the requirements outlined under the matters of control are not appropriate or applicable	Insert a separate rule for boundary "adjustments" (in comparison to boundary "relocations" which already has this rule and should perhaps just be dealt with like any other subdivision). Perhaps adjustments could be defined as: - involving the lesser of 10% of the area of the smaller title involved (to a maximum of 500m²), or - involve the transfer of land between two properties in different ownership and management, which makes no change to land use.		Reject
FS172.291	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
S431.072	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R1	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change where relevant, measures to provide for active transport,		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.072	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
S243.073	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment.	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already noncompliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased;~~ SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S3 Water supply; SUB-S4 Stormwater management; SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal; SUB-S6 Telecommunications and power supply; and SUB-S7 Easements for any purpose;		Reject
FS570.631	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
FS566.645	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
FS569.667	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S272.006	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-R1	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R1 including reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.766	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.780	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.802	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.061	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R1	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R1 which includes SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.1949	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1963	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1985	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S167.055	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R1	Support in part	Many existing lots do not comply with the minimum lot size standards and subdivisions should also be enabled where boundary adjustments to such lots do not increase the number of lots created. The effect of the non-confirming lot already exists and therefore allowing boundary adjustments will not give rise to further effects on the environment.	Amend Rule SUB-R1 as follows: CON-1 The boundary adjustment complies with standards: ~~SUB-1 Minimum allotment sizes for controlled activities, except where an existing allotment size is already noncompliant, the degree of non-compliance shall not be increased;~~ SUB-S2 Requirements for building platforms for each allotment; SUB-S3 Water supply; SUB-S4 Stormwater management; SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal; SUB-S6 Telecommunications and power supply; and SUB-S7 Easements for any purpose;		Reject
FS566.417	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
S523.006	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R1	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring	Retain SUB-R1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS566.1800	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
S445.009	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R1	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more	Retain SUB-S8 in SUB-R1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS569.1764	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1743	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S172.007	Terra Group	SUB-R2	Support	Support this rule, specifically the minimum dimensions required within the Rural Residential zone as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S437.005	FNR Properties Limited	SUB-R2	Support	The provision is supported as it represents a positive change for 142 and 134 North Road, Kaitia and surrounding properties.	Retain SUB-R2 as notified.		Accept in part
S356.087	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-R2	Support	not stated	Retain SUB-R2 as notified		Accept in part
FS25.108	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S55.019	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R2	Support in part	The objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues should be clearly articulated within the rules.	Amend the rule to clearly reference reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Matters of control are limited to: ... h. adverse reverse sensitivity effects arising from landuse incompatibility including but not limited to noise,vibration, smell, smoke, dust and spray.		Reject
FS548.014	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers' supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity issues in these rules.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS354.135	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Specific reference to reverse sensitivity is supported as it provides clarity.	Allow	Allow S55.019	Reject
S431.073	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R2	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.073	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
S45.014	Puketona Business Park Limited	SUB-R3	Not Stated	Should the Rural Production zone be retained for 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, suggest that where a parent site comprises less (especially significantly less) than the proposed minimum allotment size, this should be reflected in an activity status to subdivide below that threshold. As an example, 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, comprises 2.31ha and any subdivision would result in a non-complying activity status when it cannot achieve the minimum. It is considered in this circumstance, a discretionary activity status is acceptable to enable a fulsome and unfettered assessment of actual and potential effects.	Amend the activity status for subdivision options applying to 759 State Highway 10, Oromahoe, if it retains its Rural Production zoning - to recognise the size of sites and provide options for discretionary activity subdivision.		Reject
S172.005	Terra Group	SUB-R3	Support	Support this rule, specifically CON-1 and CON-2 regarding the Rural Residential zone as it will achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S247.004	Margaret Sheila Hulse and John Colin Hulse	SUB-R3	Support in part	We are concerned that no further residential subdivisions should be approved before there is enough medical infrastructure within Kerikeri and Waipapa areas to support extra families living here. Our chief concern is that all the local GP practices have closed their books to new patients, and with more people being allowed to settle here they will not be covered with adequate medical facilities should they need it, despite being told to the contrary. A number of local residents have agreed with us that this is an ongoing issue which will get worse if not addressed.	Amend rule SUB -R3 by adding an additional condition to read: "CON-,3 where the subdivision is for residential development, primary medical care services are available and adequate to support the wellbeing,health and safety of additional people." Add to the right hand column: "Activity status where compliance not achieved with CON-3:Non-complying."	Reject
S333.049	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R3	Support	The rule provides an appropriate range of standards and controlled activity matters for subdivision	Retain Rule SUB-R3	Accept in part
S168.057	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R3	Support in part	The rule provides an appropriate range of standards and controlled activity matters for subdivision.	Retain Rule SUB-R3	Accept in part
S187.049	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R3	Support	The rule provides an appropriate range of standards and controlled activity matters for subdivision.	Retain Rule SUB-R3.	Accept in part
S263.030	Waitoto Development Limited	SUB-R3	Support	The submitter considers that rule SUB-R3 as it relates to the Orongo Bay zone is appropriate as the allotment size reflects the operative district plan and original development plan approval.	Retain rule SUB-R3.	Accept in part
S463.047	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-R3	Oppose	WBF opposes a non-complying activity status for subdivision that creates a lot around land in the NOSZ but does not divide the land within the NOSZ. A non-complying activity status to create a lot around the Natural Heritage subzone (which will, according to the Kauri Cliffs s32 report, default to rules for the NOSZ), appears unduly onerous for a subdivision that seeks to enclose and thereby protect, land in the Natural Heritage subzone/NOSZ.	Amend the rules to clarify the activity status for subdivision (including boundary adjustments) that creates boundaries around but does not create boundaries through, land in the NOSZ. (See also WBF's submission on rule SUB-R1 (submission point S463.046)).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S487.004	Tupou Limited	SUB-R3	Support in part	At least for the Rural Production Zone the word 'Net' should be added to the beginning of clause e. That is, 'Net adverse effects ...' This would align with IB-P10 which uses 'positive contribution'. Adopting this strategy will tend to encourage plantings of native species and biodiversity rather than generating a perverse disincentive.	Amend SUB-R3 e, as follows: Net adverse effects on areas with historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes, wetland, lake and river margins, natural character or indigenous biodiversity values including indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification system lists;	Reject
S159.070	Horticulture New Zealand	SUB-R3	Support in part	A controlled activity subdivision status means that affected parties would not be consulted as part of the subdivision application. This is particularly relevant to the Horticulture zone and the Rural Production zone where the potential for adverse effects on adjoining land uses exist and effects on highly productive land which the plan seeks to protect. A controlled activity will not achieve that outcome. Support consideration of incompatibilities of activities	Delete the reference to the Rural Production zone and Horticulture zone from the controlled activity rule. Insert a new line in Rule SUB-R3Rural Production and Horticulture zone as follows: Activity status - Restricted discretionaryRDIS-1Where subdivision complies with standards: • SUB-S1 minimum lot sizes • SUB-S2 Requirements for building platform for each allotment • SUB-S3 Water supply • SUB-S4 Stormwater management • SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal • SUB-S6 Telecommunications and power supply	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					SUB-S7 Easements for any purpose Matters of discretion are limited to: Matters of control in SUB-R3 The potential adverse effects on adjoining horticultural and agricultural activities, including reverse sensitivity effects NOTE: Applications for restricted discretionary subdivision within the Horticulture zone and the Rural Production zone will be notified Activity status where compliance is not achieved - Discretionary		
FS24.56	Lynley Newport		Oppose	Controlled activity status is afforded to subdivision the FNDC deems acceptable without the need for written approvals. This does not prevent the Council from seeking comment from a potentially affected person such as an orchardist, but only insofar as determining if there are conditions of consent that could be imposed. Retain controlled activity status.	Disallow		Accept
FS151.238	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS172.243	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	Does not recognise existing fragmentation.	Disallow		Accept
FS548.051	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought will capture farmers looking to subdivide their land for the purposes of freeing up capital or providing for a family member. It is not considered that it is necessary for all subdivisions in the rural production zone to be notified. Notification should be based the effects from an activity.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS393.0010	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Oppose	The submission could well apply to pastoral framing and horticultural areas however not all of the RPZ lands falls into this category. The submission is a significant shift for the subdivision of RPZ which currently exists within the ODP. The NES HPL is now operative and would address the submitters concerns accordingly	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.232	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
FS566.246	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
FS569.268	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
S488.001	Fieldco Limited	SUB-R3	Support	Provision needs to be maintained for rural amenity lots which can allow the subdivision of an existing dwelling off a farm property, with a small parcel of land i.e. 4,000m.	Retain [SUB-R3] for provision of small rural amenity lots, where they relate to existing dwellings or buildings. This will preserve the rural production aspect of farmland, while allowing for dwellings to be treated as different when included in a farm property.		Accept in part
FS29.40	Trent Simpkin		Support	I fully support this submission, to enable small lots to be subdivided of rural production land, which doesn't reduce the effectiveness of the farmland but allows for families to live rurally.	Allow		Accept in part
FS172.334	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
S373.001	Nigel Ross Surveyor Ltd	SUB-R3	Oppose	There are many old titles that have never been subdivided in less developed areas, such as Hokianga. There are also legitimate reasons why a new title smaller than 8ha is required. These include a farming family wishing to dispose of a	Amend the rules SUB-S1 and SUB-R3 to allow a discretionary activity status for the creation of one new allotment from a title that has not be subdivided since 28 April 2000 in the Rural Production zone.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				surplus dwelling, or to provide a building site for a family member, or to provide their own retirement home. A 4,000m2 site would normally be sufficient for these purposes. Subdividing a 8ha site, to avoid considerable costs incurred by a non-complying application, would surely conflict with the objectives of the zone by reducing the balance area of the farm unit.			
FS172.292	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.92	Joe Carr		Support	the relief that the submitter requests is reasonable and logical	Allow		Reject
S427.055	Kapiro Residents Association	SUB-R3	Support in part	Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area.	Amend Rule SUB-R3 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred].		Reject
FS36.059	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports that further consideration should be given to traffic effects as a result of subdivision.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S561.047	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R3	Support	SUB-R3 ensures the necessary infrastructure is provided when creating any new allotments.	Amend SUB-R3 as follows: Insert a Medium density Residential zone Delete the NOTE: ~~If a resource consent application is made under this rule on land that is within 500m of the airport zone, the airport operator will likely be considered an affected person for any activity where the adverse effects are~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					~~considered to be minor or more than minor.~~		
FS32.101	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS348.003	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	There is no requirement for the proposed medium density zone.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS23.319	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
FS47.061	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document			
FS348.134	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	Accept in part
S55.020	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R3	Support in part	The objective to avoid reverse sensitivity issues should be clearly articulated within the rules.	Amend the rules to clearly reference reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Matters of control are limited to: ... h. adverse reverse sensitivity effects arising from landuse incompatibility including but not limited to noise, vibration, smell, smoke, dust and spray.		Reject
FS548.015	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers' supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity issues in these rules.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS354.136	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Specific reference to reverse sensitivity is supported as it provides clarity.	Allow	Allow S55.020	Reject
S431.074	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R3	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	• measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.074	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
S368.098	Far North District Council	SUB-R3	Support in part	Plan drafting improvement. It currently is not clear that SUB-R3 does not apply to multiunit development. Multi-unit development is addressed in SUB-R5. Add text to the heading for clarification.	Amend SUB-R3 rule title Subdivision of land to create a new allotment (excluding multi-unit development)		Reject
FS243.066	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks the removal of the terminology 'multi-unit development' from the PDP, consistent with the change sought in its primary submission.	Disallow	Amend SUB-R3 rule title: Subdivision of land to create a new allotment (excluding multi-unit development)	Reject
S215.026	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R3	Support in part	The Controlled Activity subdivision rules do not appear to require compliance with the Transport section of the Plan. As subdivision is one area where access is critical, the Transport rules should apply to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-R3 to require compliance with Transport rules in the Plan for a subdivision to be a Controlled Activity.		Accept in part
FS570.515	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
FS566.529	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
FS569.551	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S243.074	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R3	Support	The rule provides an appropriate range of standards and controlled activity matters for subdivision.	Retain Rule SUB-R3		Accept in part
FS570.632	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
FS566.646	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
FS569.668	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
S272.007	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-R3	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R3 including reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.767	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.781	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.803	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S354.018	The BOI Watchdogs	SUB-R3	Oppose	These types of matters should not place controls on dog ownership. Refer to full submission for details.	Delete reference to indigenous biodiversity in the matters of control (inferred)		Reject
FS570.1027	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
FS566.1041	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
FS569.1063	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
S529.062	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R3	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Amend SUB-R3 to insert SUB-S8		Reject
FS570.1950	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1964	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1986	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S349.014	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-R3	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	delete Rule SUB-R3 or amend to provide greater subdivision opportunities without reference to minimum lot sizes and reduce the reach of the extensive matters of control		Accept in part
FS62.048	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part
FS333.035	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept in part
S167.056	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R3	Support	The rule provides an appropriate range of standards and controlled activity matters for subdivision.	Retain Rule SUB-R3		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.418	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S523.007	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R3	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain SUB-R3		Accept in part
FS566.1801	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
S445.010	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R3	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring	Retain SUB-S8 in rule SUB-R3		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS569.1765	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1744	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S172.006	Terra Group	SUB-R4	Support	Support this rule, specifically CON-1 and CON-2 as the rules will help to achieve positive outcomes for the proposed zone.	Retain as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S427.056	Kapiro Residents Association	SUB-R4	Support in part	Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area.	Amend Rule SUB-R4 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred].		Reject
S431.075	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R4	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS332.075	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
S215.027	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R4	Support in part	The Controlled Activity subdivision rules do not appear to require compliance with the Transport section of the Plan. As subdivision is one area where access is critical, the Transport rules should apply to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-R4 to require compliance with Transport rules in the Plan for a subdivision to be a Controlled Activity.		Accept in part
FS570.516	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
FS566.530	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
FS569.552	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S138.009	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	SUB-R5	Support in part	Delete reference to compliance with the SUB-S1 'minimum allotment size' as the nature of a multi-unit development would be a unit density of 1 per 200m ² and could not therefore meet the 'Controlled Activity' status for a subdivision of the units already approved by way of a land use consent. The retention of this rule as proposed to be worded would mean that all subdivision applications based on the multi-unit development provision would be discretionary. As a comprehensive development proposal, Council is proposing to restrict its discretion to matters such as effects on neighbourhood character, residential amenity and the surrounding residential area resulting from both external impacts beyond the boundary of the site and internal amenity including parking, access and outdoor living space, which would address the matters set out in the proposed subdivision control standard SUB-R5(a).	Amend Rule SUB-R5 CON-2 to delete the reference to ' <i>SUB-S1 minimum allotment sizes controlled activity</i> '		Accept
S356.089	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-R5	Oppose	There appear to be no rules or assessment criteria that manage access or transport effects, i.e. safe and fit for purpose access, network impacts, and the provision of transport infrastructure. This is a fundamental control of subdivision. This is critical for subdivision on the State highway network given the high-speed environment. Waka Kotahi has its own access design standards, and seeks to minimise side friction, thereby consolidating vehicle crossings and encouraging access from a local road where possible. There should also be circumstances in which active mode connections are provided for, and consideration of how this may link to public transport infrastructure where practicable.	Insert rules and assessment criteria relating to the provision and management of access and transport effects of subdivision.		Reject
FS289.7	Reuben Wright		Support	The Plan provisions require clarity to specify what transport rules apply to all subdivision activities	Allow		Reject
FS25.110	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS374.008	Waipapa Pine Limited		Oppose	The submitter has not disclosed the nature, scale or impact of these new rules or assessment criteria. These can very well affect the use and development of Waipapa Pine Limited land	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS399.008	Mark and Emma Klinac		Oppose	The submitter has not disclosed the nature, scale or impact of these new rules or assessment criteria. These can very well affect the use and development of future Heavy Industrial Zone land.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS395.005	Ti Toki Farms Limited		Oppose	The submitter has not disclosed the nature, scale or impact of these new rules or assessment criteria. These can very well affect the use and development of land in Waipapa.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS391.005	LD Family Investments Ltd		Oppose	The submitter has not disclosed the nature, scale or impact of these new rules or assessment criteria. These can very well affect the use and development of land in Waipapa	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS243.075	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental. However, no details to the proposed changes are introduced in the primary submission and therefore it is unclear to the specific relief sought.	Allow in part	There appears to be no rules or	Accept in part
S561.048	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-R5	Support in part	This rule provides for the subdivision of an approved landuse development, enabling separate titles where required. However Kāinga Ora consider it is unnecessary to use the term multi-unit and an amendment is suggested to apply this rule to an approved residential landuse consent . Further, to support a medium density residential zone around Kerikeri township, Rule SUB-R5 needs to be amended to include the rule application to the new proposed Medium density Residential zone.	Amend SUB - R5 rule heading as follows: Subdivision around an approved ~~multi-unit~~ landuse development Amend the application of this rule by reference to the Medium Density Residential zone.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS25.117	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Agrees that it is appropriate to enable subdivision around consented land use activity in general, not just around multiunit development and that the provision should be extended to the Medium Density Residential zone.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS32.102	Jeff Kemp		Oppose	The original submission seeks to amend the FNDC in a way which changes how the FNDC has previously managed the district's natural and physical resources. The nature and scale of the outcomes sought have no supporting documents which address the appropriateness of the changes such as the costs and benefits involved. As a minimum, the submitter should have provided a s32 analysis of the proposed changes. The amenity, values and character of the district's urban areas have developed over time through various district plans. The wider community and applicants have an understanding of and have appreciated the consenting process. The original submission seeks a completely different planning framework away from an effects-based district plan and is essentially reallocating the goal posts. The original submission heralds the application for a private plan change which would provide the opportunity for those most affected to be involved.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS325.075	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT agrees that it is appropriate to enable subdivision around consented land use activity in general, not just around multi-unit development and that the provision should be extended to the Medium Density Residential zone.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS23.320	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Generally support for the reasons set out in the submission of Kāinga Ora. It is important that peoples' wellbeing, and in particular their ability to establish housing on their land is enabled. Also particularly support the changes proposed for recognition of and development on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS47.062	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose	The KO submission contravenes our original submission throughout, as we are seeking a shift from the permissive approach to a more prescriptive DP supported by Master Plans for central areas and Spatial Plans (still under preparation and long overdue), while KO suggests a considerably more permissive plan. Our submission states "We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in the form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value", but KO's proposals would further reduce the limited opportunity for the public to have input into resource consent applications..... etc see FS document	Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept in part
FS348.135	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	Accept in part
S215.028	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R5	Support	The Controlled Activity subdivision rules do not appear to require compliance with the Transport section of the Plan. As subdivision is one area where access is critical, the Transport rules should apply to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-R5 to Require compliance with Transport rules in the Plan for a subdivision to be a Controlled Activity.		Accept in part
FS36.060	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the relief sought as it seeks to ensure that any subdivision subject to a controlled activity under this rule also complies with the transport rules in the plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.517	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
FS566.531	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
FS569.553	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S431.076	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R5	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources, and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary activity subdivision rules: consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		Reject
FS332.076	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
S272.008	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-R5	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R5 including reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.768	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.782	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.804	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.063	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R5	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R5 which includes SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.1951	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1965	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1987	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S523.008	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SUB-R5	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations	Retain SUB-R5		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)			
FS566.1802	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
S445.011	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R5	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more	Retain SUB-S8 in rule SUB-R5		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)		
FS569.1766	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1745	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject
S55.021	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	SUB-R6	Support	Support the potential for reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.	Retain as proposed.	Accept in part
S53.002	Far North Real Estate 2010 Limited	SUB-R6	Oppose	RDIS-3, RDIS-4 and RDIS-5 - the SNAs were gotten rid of 2-3 years ago and now Council is bringing them back in in a lot of areas that are just a puddle	Decision requested not clear	Accept in part
S485.014	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred).	Accept in part
S358.033	Leah Frieling	SUB-R6	Support	Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation	Retain Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
S472.034	Michael Foy	SUB-R6	Support	To for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	retain SUB R6 Environmental benefit subdivision	Accept in part
S547.013	LJ King Limited	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred)	Accept in part
S427.057	Kapiro Residents Association	SUB-R6	Support in part	Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account - such as	Amend Rule SUB-R6 to include full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres [inferred].	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area.			
S261.006	Amber Hookway	SUB-R6	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Remove SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and reinstate policy 13.4.6 from the Operative District Plan: That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.		Accept in part
FS297.17	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.35	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.17	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.17	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS256.30	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S264.006	Wilson Hookway	SUB-R6	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Remove SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and instead reinstate policy 13.4.6 from the Operative District Plan: That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.		Accept in part
FS297.18	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.36	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.18	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.18	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS256.31	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S421.178	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SUB-R6	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the provision for benefit subdivision within the rural zones. However, it is essential that the rule allows for the creation of benefit lots under 4ha. There are positive benefits to be had from Council considering smaller areas for wetlands and biodiversity improvements for more significant or critical catchments. There are some areas around the district that may be more significant than others to protect. A blanket size approach does not target specific catchments or locations that will have more significant gains.	Amend RDIS-2 (inferred) of Rule SUB-R6 to allow for case-by-case approval for areas less than those listed in tables 1 and 2		Reject
FS24.24	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Makes similar points to my own submission except I have sought the retention of the environmental benefit provisions, greatly amended. Plan needs to make provision for much smaller discretionary lot sizes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS44.30	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Benefit lots under 4ha should be provided for as it has been proven that there are many areas less than 4ha that will benefit from protection.	Allow		Accept in part
FS172.314	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.144	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS332.231	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rural production zone minimum allotment size is appropriate at 40ha to avoid land fragmentation.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept
FS564.015	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought to facilitate ecological benefit subdivision on smaller rural sites.	Allow	Amend RDIS-2 (inferred) of Rule SUB-R6 to allow for case-by-case approval for	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						areas less than those listed in tables 1 and 2	
FS570.1410	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
FS346.412	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
S456.003	New Zealand Eco Farms Ltd	SUB-R6	Support in part	RDIS-6 requires a balance lot of over 40ha, or the activity status defaults to non-complying. Requiring such a large balance area will preclude many environmental benefit subdivisions, and opportunities will be lost for formal protection and enhancement of bush and wetland features. It is requested that the balance area requirement in RDIS-R6 be deleted. Furthermore, the 2ha minimum lot size in RDIS-6 is unnecessarily large, and should be reduced to 4,000m ² to minimise the amount of land potentially taken out of rural production.	amend SUB-R6 RDIS-6 should be reduced to encourage the protection of ecological features.		Reject
FS44.29	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Having a balance lot of 40ha will exclude many allotments which may have benefited from an environmental benefit subdivision. The minimum lot size should also be decreased to at least 1ha to minimise the effects on the productive balance lot.	Allow		Reject
FS172.333	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons stated in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS364.003	New Zealand Eco Farms Ltd		Support	a. To submit a supplementary soil and resource report that has been prepared by Hanmore Land Management. This report confirms that only low-lying areas in southern and central portions of the site are considered to be 'Highly Productive' in the context of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). As a result,	Allow	allow original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				this conclusion further supports the submission made by NZEF that the proposed Horticultural Zone for the entire farm is inappropriate. b. The relief proposed in the NZEF original submission represents the most effective and efficient use of the land. c. The relief proposed best achieves sustainable management under Part 2 of the RMA.			
FS564.017	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the removal of RDIS-6 as it relates to the balance lot size requirements. Support to the extent that the minimum lot size for new environmental allotments should be reduced from the 2ha minimum site size requirement.	Allow	Amend SUB-R6	Reject
S483.169	Top Energy Limited	SUB-R6	Support	Top Energy supports the requirement for connection to electricity supply at the boundary of the site area of the allotment for the zones specified, but seeks that the requirement also apply to Rural Lifestyle and Quail Ridge given it is most cost effective and efficient to provide easements at time of subdivision design and install infrastructure at time of physical site construction. It should be made expressly clear that for other Zones, an easement to facilitate future connection must be provided at the time of subdivision. Such a requirement should be included as part of this rule.	Amend Rule SUB - S6 to include the following (or to same effect) applicable to all zones not specified in SUB - S6 Easements shall be provided to the boundary of the site area of the allotment to facilitate future connection.		Accept in part
FS44.38	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Oppose	Easement for future connection in other zones should not be a requirement of subdivision as there is no guarantee these sites will connect to power. The zones that are excluded from this rule are rural zones which may remain as farmland and therefore power supply is not required or if developed, solar may be a more cost efficient method of power supply. In these instances, any easements created for future connection would be redundant. Easements should only be required where there is physical connection.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS345.220	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
S519.014	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred).		Accept in part
FS155.68	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S541.037	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS155.69	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S116.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R6	Support in part	Support initiative for environmental benefit subdivision and the starting category of activity (restricted discretionary). There should not be any discouragement to landowners wanting to utilise this rule, and yet making non achievement of with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 defaulting to non-complying activity status does just that. Believe non achievement of the RDIS requirements should only default to discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule SUB-R6, subject to the following amendments to activity status: <i>Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS -1, RDIS-2, RDIS-3, RDIS-4, and RDIS-5, ~~RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved~~: Discretionary Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved: Non-complying</i>		Accept in part
FS172.196	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.69	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS564.001	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
FS368.034	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Retain Rule SUB-R6, subject to the following amendments to activity status: Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS -1, RDIS-2,RDIS-3, RDIS-4, and RDIS-5, RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved: Discretionary Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved: Non-complying.	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
S116.002	Lynley Newport	SUB-R6	Support in part	Rule SUB-R6 gives no recognition to habitat already voluntarily legally protected by landowners, only looking to reward areas 'to be' protected. There is no justification for the distinction. If a landowner has already voluntarily legally protected land, not having done so through any consent process or requirement of the Council, but voluntarily doing so; and they have not previously received any 'bonus' through the current Operative District Plan, then why can't the same bonus lot(s) provision apply? If anything someone who has already been voluntarily legally protecting habitat for a number of years should receive more reward because they have been providing an environmental service for longer and the quality of the habitat will already be high. There is no ecologically based rationale for restricting the area to be protected to having to be a minimum of 4ha in area. QEII Open Space Covenants, for example, will often apply to areas less than 1ha in area. If QEII considers smaller habitat areas to be worthy of permanent legal protection, then the Council should acknowledge that habitat can be value, no matter its size.	Add as part of RDIS-2 <i>"Any area already legally protected must have been voluntarily protected by the landowner and not required by the Council has a condition of resource consent or previously used to obtain any bonus provision as provided for in any previous Operative District Plan"</i>. Under Table 1, in first column, amend heading to: <i>"Total area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous habitat to be legally protected on an individual Record of Title."</i> Amend first row of Table 1 to read: <i>Greater than 4ha - less than Up to 10ha</i> Amend RDIS-4 as follows: <i>The subdivision includes or proposes to protection all areas of indigenous vegetation, indigenous habitat or natural wetland by way of a conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 or the Queen</i>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977.		
FS172.197	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.70	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject
FS564.002	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support to the extent that the minimum site size for rural residential lots created should be less than 2 ha. Support removing the requirement for the balance lot to be 40 ha. This standard disincentives landowners with significant areas of vegetation or wetland from utilising the environmental benefit subdivision provisions.	Allow	Amend RDIS-6	Reject
S116.003	Lynley Newport	SUB-R6	Support in part	There is no good logic in requiring any bonus lot to be a minimum size of 2ha. A bonus lot need not contain the area to be permanently and legally protected, it might be located in any other lot being created. It would be better to ensure that a bonus lot or lots is/are not so large as to have an impact on the use of productive land. Neither is there any logic in requiring the balance lot to be greater than 40ha as this immediately removes any incentive for anybody owning an existing property of less than 40ha to protect areas of habitat. This is totally counter-productive to the whole intent of this provision - to provide a positive incentive to protect habitat. The rule should make it clear that the protected area can be within either the nominated bonus lot or any other lot. The key is the protection of habitat regardless of the size of the lot that it is within. There can also be more than one area being protected and these may be on more than one lot.	Amend RDIS-6 as follows: • <i>All proposed new environmental bonus (additional) allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha 4,000m²".</i> • Amend the balance lot requirements - First preference is to delete any minimum lot requirement for the balance allotment; second preference if there must be a minimum size for any balance (which may include the area to be protected) is a 12ha minimum size. This provides for up to say 10ha of protected habitat within a 12ha property, plus one or two bonus lots. There are enough caveats in the remaining RDIS requirements to ensure the lots are capable of supporting their		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					intended use; to ensure protection of habitat; and to ensure protection of highly versatile soils.		
FS172.198	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.71	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Accept in part
S116.004	Lynley Newport	SUB-R6	Support in part	Why is this a one-off opportunity with no residual rights available? Subdivision isn't a one-off opportunity if the standards for minimum lot sizes can be achieved. There should be no reason why a landowner cannot come back for a second or third bonus lot at a later date just as a landowner can carry out more than one subdivision over time. Provided there is land and habitat that is still able to comply with the parameters, there should not be any reason they cannot create another legally protected area and get a bonus lot.	Amend RDIS-7 as follows <i>This rule has not been used previously to gain an additional subdivision entitlement. Where the full rights for bonus lot(s) as specified in Tables 1 and 2 have not been utilised, the landowner can apply again to use up the available allowance</i> OR As a second preference and as already stated in submission, make the inability to comply with RDIS-7 as currently written, a discretionary activity. This would mean a landowner could come back for a second application but as a discretionary activity rather than restricted discretionary.		Reject
FS172.199	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.72	Joe Carr		Support	as per submitter's reasoning	Allow		Reject
FS564.003	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter has an interest in the outcome of this submission.	Allow	Amend RDIS-7	Reject
S502.083	Northland Planning and	SUB-R6	Support in part	Sites seeking to utilize this option will be limited, as most farming allotments which have larger	Amend SUB-R6 Table 1.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Development 2020 Limited			areas of bush or wetlands tend not to be within areas with as much development pressure. If an older couple is looking to retire from farming, generally they are not looking for a larger section as it becomes harder to manage and maintain. As such, we seek to reduce the 2ha requirement in RDIS-6 to 1ha. When looking to safeguard bush areas generally you seek to keep the areas of protected or covenanted bush within the balance allotment as items such as weed, and pest management are more readily undertaken at larger scales. Protected bush areas are generally only located within smaller allotments as a way to make up minimum lot size requirements which is not an ideal situation. Within the district there are many sites between 20ha and 40ha with areas of bush and/or wetlands where as per above, the removal of the dwelling or a site for their children which is not within a productive area of the farm would result in minor effects given the scale. In protecting large areas of bush or wetlands there needs to be a commensurate benefit to the farmer. As such, we have offered a revised table for Councils consideration.	Total area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous habitat to be legally protected on an individual Record of Title - Greater than ~~4ha~~ 1ha - less than ~~10~~ 4ha - 1 Greater than ~~10~~ 4ha - less than ~~20~~ 8ha - 2 Greater than 8ha - less than 12ha - 3 Greater than ~~20~~ 12ha - 4 Table 2. Total area of natural wetland to be legally protected on an individual Record of Title - Greater than 0.52ha (5,2000m2) - less than 1ha - 1 RDIS-6 All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 12ha in area and the balance lot must be 20ha or greater ~~than 40ha~~.		
FS172.225	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS383.4	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The reduction in the minimum amounts of vegetation and wetlands to be protected supports sustainable management outcomes and recognises both the varied lot sizes in the District	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and that the value of such features need not necessarily be a function of size.			
FS384.3	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The reduction in the minimum amounts of vegetation and wetlands to be protected supports sustainable management outcomes and recognises both the varied lot sizes in the District and that the value of such features need not necessarily be a function of size.	Allow		Accept in part
FS397.006	IDF Developments Limited		Support	The submissions are supported on the basis that they seek additional subdivision options and more appropriate vegetation clearance rules in the Rural Production Zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS332.229	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Reducing minimum requirements for Environmental benefit subdivision would serve to undermine whole concept.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S203.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R6	Support in part	I support this initiative and the starting category of activity (restricted discretionary). However, I can only call it a "good start" and have several reservations and strong suggestions. - The rule gives no recognition to habitat already voluntarily legally protected by landowners, only looking to reward areas 'to be' protected. There is no justification for the distinction. If a landowner has already voluntarily legally protected land, not having done so through any consent process or requirement of the Council, but voluntarily doing so; and they have not previously received any 'bonus' through the current Operative District Plan, then why can't the same bonus lot(s) provision apply? If anything someone who has already been voluntarily legally protecting habitat for a number of years should receive more reward because they have been providing an environmental service for longer and the quality of the habitat will already be high. - There is no ecologically based rationale for restricting the area to be protected to having to be a minimum of 4ha in area. QEII Open Space Covenants, for example, will often apply to areas less than 1ha in area. If QEII considers smaller	Amend SUB- R6 as follows Under Activity Status, replace with: "Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-1through RDIS-8 is Discretionary" and ~~Delete "Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-6, RDIS-7and RDIS-8 is not achieved: Non-complying.~~ Under Table 1, in first column, amend heading to: "Total area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous habitat to be legally protected on an individual Record of Title." {delete the words "to be"}. Add as part of RDIS-2 "Any area already legally protected must have been voluntarily protected by the landowner and not required by the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				habitat areas to be worthy of permanent legal protection, then the Council should acknowledge that habitat can be valuable, no matter its size. - There is no good logic in requiring any bonus lot to be a minimum size of 2ha. A bonus lot need not contain the area to be permanently and legally protected, it might be located in any other lot being created. It would be better to ensure that a bonus lot or lots is/are not so large as to have an impact on the use of productive land. - Neither is there any logic in requiring the balance lot to be greater than 40ha as this immediately removes any incentive for anybody owning an existing property of less than 40ha to protect areas of habitat. This is totally counterproductive to the whole intent of this provision - to provide a positive incentive to protect habitat. - There should not be any discouragement to landowners wanting to utilise this rule, and yet making non- achievement of with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 defaulting to non-complying activity status does just that. I believe non-achievement of of the ROIS requirements should only default to discretionary activity status. - The rule should make it clear that the protected area can be within either the nominated bonus lot or any other lot. The key is the protection of habitat regardless of the size of the lot that it is within. There can also be more than one area being protected and these may be on more than one lot. - Why is this a one-off opportunity with no residual rights available? Subdivision isn't a one-off opportunity if the standards for minimum lot sizes can be achieved. There should be no reason why a landowner cannot come back for a second or third bonus lot at a later date just as a landowner can carry out more than one subdivision over time. Provided there is land and habitat that is still able to comply with the parameters, there should not be any reason they cannot create another legally protected area and get a bonus lot.	Council has a condition of resource consent or previously used to obtain any bonus provision as provided for in any previous Operative District Plan". Amend first row of Table 1 to read: "up to 10ha" - {delete minimum size requirement of 4ha). Amend RDIS-4 as follows: "The subdivision includes or proposes protection by way of a conservation covenant pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 or the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977". Amend RDIS-6 to read: "All proposed new environmental bonus (additional) allotments are to be a minimum size of 4,000m²". Balance lot: First preference is to delete any minimum lot requirement for the balance allotment; second preference if there must be a minimum size for any balance (which may include the area to be protected) is a 12haminimum size. This provides for up to say 10ha of protected habitat within a 12haproperty, plus one or two bonus lots. There are enough caveats in the remaining ROIS requirements to ensure the lots are capable of supporting their intended use; to ensure protection of habitat; and to	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					ensure protection of highly versatile soils. Either Amend RDIS-7 to read: "Where the full rights for bonus lot(s) as specified in Tables 1 & 2 have not been utilised, the land owner can apply again to use up the available allowance." Or as a second preference and as already stated above, make the inability to comply with RDIS-7 as currently written, a discretionary activity. This would mean a landowner could come back for a second application but as a discretionary activity rather than restricted discretionary.		
FS172.261	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS564.007	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that Rule SUB-R6 should enable the creation of environmental allotments less than 2 ha.	Disallow	Amend	Accept in part
S253.009	IDF Developments Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The general tenor of Rule SUB-R6 draws upon provisions found within the ODP. Some of those provisions have worked well and should be enhanced within the PDP. Table 1 and Table 2 should allow for the creation of covenant areas held in the ownership of various lots, with the environmental benefit lots distributed between those lots. Indeed, it may well be better management of a sites resource to have all the benefit lots on one lot rather than distributing these across a number of sites. These amendments give effect to attaining the purposes of the Act.	Retain Rule SUB-R6 subject to the following amendments; Amend Table 1 and Table 2 to allow for the area of vegetation or habitat and wetlands to be held in one Record of Title and the environmental lots distributed against the Record of Title which hold common ownership in the covenanted area. Amend RDIS-6 from 40ha to a 20ha balance area;		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS172.272	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS564.0010	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the rule should not specify a minimum balance lot size.	Disallow	Retain Rule SUB-R6 subject to listed amendments;	Accept
S464.013	LJ King Ltd	SUB-R6	Support	I support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Retain SUB-R6 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS196.180	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
S356.090	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	SUB-R6	Oppose	There appear to be no rules or assessment criteria that manage access or transport effects, i.e. safe and fit for purpose access, network impacts, and the provision of transport infrastructure. This is a fundamental control of subdivision. This is critical for subdivision on the State highway network given the high-speed environment. Waka Kotahi has its own access design standards, and seeks to minimise side friction, thereby consolidating vehicle crossings and encouraging access from a local road where possible. There should also be circumstances in which active mode connections are provided for, and consideration of how this may link to public transport infrastructure where practicable	Insert rules and assessment criteria relating to the provision and management of access and transport effects of subdivision.		Reject
FS25.111	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the amendments for the reasons given in the submission, to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in KFO's submission.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
FS243.076	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports provisions that enable housing with good access to jobs, amenities and services and the co-location of activities to contribute to economic, social, environmental. However, no details to the proposed changes are introduced in the primary submission and therefore it is unclear to the specific relief sought.	Allow in part	SUB-R5 & SUD-R6 Insert	Reject
S431.077	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R6	Not Stated	Well designed subdivision is an important component of achieving sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources,	Insert the following as further matters of control in all controlled activity subdivision rules and as further matters of discretion in all restricted discretionary		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and in establishing and continuing character and sense of place. There is an inappropriate emphasis on ensuring that vehicle requirements and needs are provided for in the subdivision rules. In urban areas and settlements and in their surrounds good resource management practice is for increased provision for cycling and other active transport and for walking access. Indeed this is a necessary measure to help mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.	activity subdivision rules: • consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone • measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change • where relevant, measures to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and for walking		
FS66.143	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission point requiring "consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the environment and purpose of the zone" will be by its nature impossible to achieve, given this form of subdivision will introduce some degree of change to the existing environment.	Disallow in part		Accept
FS36.061	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the matters of control and matters of discretion proposed by the submitter, as they seek to ensure that where relevant that measures are included to provide for active transport, protected cycleways and walking.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS332.077	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
S431.086	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R6	Not Stated	The guidance and rules relating to environment benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Amend Rule SUB-R6, environmental benefit, and its supporting policies to ensure that ◦ all of the ecological feature is protected, ◦ the ecological significance of the feature is considered, ◦ any additional lots have a suitable house site at least 20 metres away from any protected ecological feature, ◦ more details are provided on the required content		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					and objectives of an ecological management plan (including how the management actions will be monitored and reported on), ◦ sprawling or sporadic subdivision and development is avoided, and ◦ natural character is protected and preserved.		
FS66.144	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The matters sought by the submitter are in most part matters discretion rather than standards. The 20m setback sought does not appear to serve any resource management purpose.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.124	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	While supporting provision being made for environmental benefit subdivision, it is inappropriate to require blanket protection of the entirety of an ecological feature, and to impose 20m setbacks, without having regard to the particular site size and characteristics. A more nuanced approach is required	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.086	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
FS564.016	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	It is not appropriate to require the entirety environmental area to be protected, particularly given that the environmental benefit lot thresholds are based on the protection of a certain area of significant bush or wetland.	Disallow	Amend Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
FS404.037	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The subdivision provisions are generally incomplete in the notified FNDP. The relief is necessary and appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S276.002	Russell Landcare Trust	SUB-R6	Support in part	The guidance and rules for environmental benefit subdivision and management plan subdivision are inadequate to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be achieved.	Amend rule to provide definitions and criteria that must be met to qualify for an environmental benefit. Revise the rules so that: all of the ecological feature is protected, the ecological significance of the feature is considered, any additional lots have a suitable house site at least 20m away from any protected ecological feature or greater (e.g. in		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					accordance with the NES-F), provides more details on the required content and objectives of an ecological management plan (including how the management actions will be monitored and reported on), sprawlign or sporadic subdivision and development is avoided, and natural character is protected and preserved. Also refer to comments on Draft Plan attached to submission.		
FS23.078	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Support need for clear rules regarding environmental benefit subdivision. Consider a more nuanced approach is required as it may not be possible to protect the entirety of each ecological feature, and site-specific characteristics of a site should be able to be considered.	Allow in part	Allow in part but clarify rules.	Accept in part
FS332.172	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
FS564.011	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	It is more appropriate for these provisions to be included as assessment criteria as opposed to standards.	Disallow	Amend rule to provide definitions and criteria that must be met to qualify for an environmental benefit	Accept in part
FS570.799	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
S359.026	Northland Regional Council	SUB-R6	Support in part	Areas of erosion prone land could also be considered as an environmental benefit where these areas are retired from production and appropriate measures taken to stabilise them. Such an approach would complement NRC soil conservation efforts to reduce sediment loads to fresh and coastal waters.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 to provide an environmental benefit where erosion prone land is retired from production and appropriate measures are taken to stabilise the land.		Reject
FS23.105	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	It is appropriate to enable such subdivision where it would assist in addressing issues associated with erosion prone land. However, consideration should be given to	Allow in part	Allow the relief to add erosion prone land but reduce required site size to 1 ha.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allowing such subdivision for smaller blocks of land - 4 ha is too large in this context, 1ha is more appropriate.			
FS372.016	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	Providing for environment benefit lots for the retiring of erosion prone land is inappropriate. There is insufficient detail provided on what is proposed, and why it is necessary to have such a rule given the Regional Council's responsibilities and ability to include regulation on this matter in the regional plan.	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.1062	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
FS346.487	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S255.002	Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	SUB-R6	Support	I support this rule as it rewards landowners who have existing protection for significant indigenous vegetation and wetlands, and it also incentivises landowners to protect same	Retain rule as notified		Accept in part
FS372.001	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The rule as proposed helps achieve the purpose of the Act, and give effect to national policy statements and the Regional policy Statement	Allow	Accept the submission subject to the insertion of the additional matters identified in my submission s431.086, paragraph 38(e) of the submission.	Accept in part
S279.003	Manu Burkhardt Macrae	SUB-R6	Support	This rule is supported as it has the potential to reward landowners who have retained and protected indigenous vegetation and wetlands and incentivise landowners to do so.	Retain rule in its entirety.		Accept in part
FS372.002	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The rule as proposed helps achieve the purpose of the Act, and give effect to national policy statements and the Regional policy Statement	Allow	Accept the submission subject to the insertion of the additional matters identified in my submission s431.086, paragraph 38(e) of the submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S364.055	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R6	Oppose	The Director-General considers the word "significant" should be removed from RDIS-2 of Rule SUB-R6. The vegetation that should be assessed by the ecologist is any "indigenous vegetation". Currently, the wording implies that the ecologist only assesses the vegetation if it is already considered to be significant.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 as follows: RDIS-2 Each separate area of ~~significant~~ indigenous vegetation, ~~significant~~ indigenous habitat or natural wetland included in the proposal must be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist as satisfying at least one criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland RPS (Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity).		Accept
FS548.113	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The removal of the word will make the rule onerous and costly to comply with if it is required to retain an ecologist to assess every area of indigenous vegetation whether it is significant or not.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject
FS564.013	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Amend Rule SUB-R6	Accept
FS570.1136	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
FS346.195	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S44.002	Des and Lorraine Morrison	SUB-R6	Oppose	While a potential alternative may be to amend the environmental benefit subdivision rule (SUB-R6) to allow one additional lot for every 1 ha of significant vegetation or significant indigenous habitat to be legally protected, where that lot is adjacent to a residential or open space zone in the coastal environment, this is a considerably inferior approach. It would potentially affect a larger number of areas, would constrain	Amend the environmental benefit subdivision rule SUB-R6 if rezoning 19 and 24 James Street, and 34 and 36 Pukematu Lane, Russell, to Kororāreka zoning is not accepted.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development to a form of limited residential use, and would not result in an efficient use of land or resources. If rezoning to Kororāreka zoning is not accepted, then amending this rule would result in some limited benefits over the current proposed Rural Production zoning.			
FS332.269	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	This would undermine the Environmental benefit subdivision concept.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept
S151.005	NFS Farms Limited	SUB-R6	Oppose	This rule will result in loss of high value (ecological and landscape value) watercourses, wetlands and indigenous vegetation on smaller sites across the district, and fails to recognise the potential for protection and enhancement of these natural assets. There are few if any landholdings in the immediate area of the submitters land (123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469)) that are of a size that will unlock the potential to protect and enhance natural wetlands, streams and indigenous vegetation under the rule as proposed because the minimum balance lot area cannot be achieved. This results in missed opportunities for these values to be protected (on smaller land parcels) and is inconsistent with the NPS-FM and NES-F.	Delete the minimum balance lot size requirement for 40 ha for Environmental Benefit Subdivision (RDIS-6), or significantly reduce the minimum balance lot size area.		Reject
FS564.004	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the removal of the minimum balance lot size requirement for the reasons set out above	Allow	Delete the minimum balance lot size for 40 ha for Environment Benefit Subdivision (RDIS-6)	Reject
S167.057	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources. RDIS-3 which requires the protected area to be added to the list of scheduled Significant Natural Areas in the District Plan cannot be met as a standard, unless by private plan change: the burden of which is significant and would negate the effectiveness of the rule.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The council is able to capture such areas in its own plan changes, without risk of interim adverse impacts on such areas due to the obligation under the rule that they be legally protected. The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection.			
FS564.005	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that Rule SUB-R6 should enable the creation of environmental allotments less than 2 ha..	Disallow	Reject the submission	Accept in part
FS566.419	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
S168.058	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care' and legal protection/going obligations, allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity. RDIS-3 which requires the protected area to be added to the list of scheduled Significant Natural Areas in the District Plan cannot be met as a standard, unless by private plan change: the burden of which is significant and would negate the effectiveness of the rule. The council is able to capture such areas in its own plan changes, without risk of interim adverse impacts on such areas due to the obligation under the rule that they be legally protected. The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area ~~and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS564.006	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that Rule SUB-R6 should enable the creation of environmental allotments less than 2 ha.	Disallow	Amend the Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
FS368.035	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S243.075	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care' and legal protection/going obligations, allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity. RDIS-3 which requires the protected area to be added to the list of scheduled Significant Natural Areas in the District Plan cannot be met as a standard, unless by private plan change: the burden of which is significant and would negate the effectiveness of the rule. The council is able to capture such areas in its own plan changes, without risk of interim adverse impacts on such areas due to the obligation under the rule that they be legally protected. The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area ~~and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.~~		Accept in part
FS564.008	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that Rule SUB-R6 should enable the creation of environmental allotments less than 2 ha.	Disallow	Amend Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
FS368.036	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a	Allow	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha			
FS570.633	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
FS566.647	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
S333.050	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R6	Support in part	The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care' and legal protection/going obligations, allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity. RDIS-3 which requires the protected area to be added to the list of scheduled Significant Natural Areas in the District Plan cannot be met as a standard, unless by private plan change: the burden of which is significant and would negate the effectiveness of the rule. The council is able to capture such areas in its own plan changes, without risk of interim adverse impacts on such areas due to the obligation under the rule that they be legally protected. The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area ~~and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.~~		Accept in part
FS564.009	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that Rule SUB-R6 should enable the creation of environmental allotments less than 2 ha.	Disallow	Amend Rule SUB-R6	Accept in part
FS368.037	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha			
S290.001	Matthew Otway	SUB-R6	Oppose	The 2ha minimum size is not realistic in many locations and is too big for many owners to manage. There are significant areas with marginal production land covered in invasive species which should be subdividable so that they can be managed to control invasive species spreading onto productive land.	Amend minimum size in RDIS-6 from 2ha to 1ha.		Accept
FS564.012	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support reducing the minimum site size requirement to 1 ha.	Allow	Allow subject to drafting	Accept
S386.015	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	SUB-R6	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew support the inclusion of an environmental benefit subdivision (EBS). However, it is unclear how the identified thresholds in Table 1 have been established. Whilst this is mentioned in the section 32, there is no ecological assessment to confirm that an environmental benefit would be achieved by those thresholds or in fact whether a number ratio of allotments is appropriate. It is considered that this is required to understand whether these are appropriate. Further, it is considered that environmental outcomes could be improved with a provision that promotes ecological enhancement and or restoration. In addition to this, it is noted that there are no provisions for the protection of other section 6 matters, such as for the protection of an ONL, ONF or heritage resources. It is considered that there is an opportunity to incorporate a range of EBS provisions to protect these natural resources, that encourage the clustering of smaller allotments away from these significant resources.	That FNDC provide evidence (ecological assessment) to confirm that environmental benefit would be achieved by the thresholds in Table 1, or amend the thresholds in Table 1 as necessary to achieve an environment benefit. Amend the EBS provisions to include rules which enable subdivision when other section 6 matters are protected, such as for the protection of an ONL, ONF or heritage resource.		Reject
FS564.014	Dempsey Family Trust		Neutral	The submitter has an interest in the outcome of this submission point.	Not stated		Reject
S187.050	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection.	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					a minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot ~~lot must be greater than 40ha.~~		
FS368.038	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
S215.029	Haigh Workman Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	The Controlled Activity subdivision rules do not appear to require compliance with the Transport section of the Plan. As subdivision is one area where access is critical, the Transport rules should apply to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-R6 Require compliance with Transport rules in the Plan for a subdivision to be a Controlled Activity.		Accept in part
FS570.518	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
FS566.532	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
S250.010	Willowridge Developments Limited	SUB-R6	Support in part	Willowridge support the inclusion of an environmental benefit subdivision (EBS) in the PDP. There is no ecological assessment to confirm that an environmental benefit would be achieved by those thresholds or in fact whether the number of allotments proposed would achieve an appropriate level of environmental benefit. The environmental outcomes could be improved with a provision that promotes ecological enhancement and or restoration. The provisions do not promote the protection of other natural resources such as heritage resources, cultural heritage resources, ONL's or ONF's that could also be considered to achieve net public benefits where permanent protection is achieved through subdivision.	Review and amend the EBS provisions to achieve the following (or relief to the same or similar effect): - Confirm the environmental benefit of enabling greater subdivision opportunities through the protection of indigenous biodiversity with evidence prepared by an ecologist; - Provide for EBS where ecological enhancement and restoration is provided for; - Include EBS provisions for the protection of other natural environment and physical resources that are identified as being nationally important in accordance with section 6 of the RMA.		Accept in part
FS570.696	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	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
FS566.710	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
S272.009	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SUB-R6	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain SUB-R6 including reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part
FS570.769	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.783	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.064	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R6	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat	Retain SUB-R6 which includes reference to SUB-S8		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.			
FS570.1952	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.146	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SUB-R6	Oppose	SUB-P8 and SUB-R6 create a type of subdivision called 'Environmental benefit subdivision' as a restricted discretionary activity. This appears to be poorly conceived provision - the protection of SNAs should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.	Amend SUB-R6 - SNA protection should be an essential prerequisite for any rural subdivision to be approved, not a means of getting additional lots.		Reject
FS570.2034	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S349.015	Neil Construction Limited	SUB-R6	Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	amend SUB-R6 to enable additional lots through 'environmental benefit subdivision' and also apply the rule to the Rural Lifestyle Zone		Reject
FS62.049	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose	A better outcome in these circumstances is to utilise the land more efficiently for rural residential use, adding much needed housing to Kerikeri in a way that does not impose any burden on the community in terms of providing or funding infrastructure.	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject
FS333.036	Maree Hart		Oppose	These submissions seek inappropriate changes, such as re-zoning Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland), Blue Penguin Drive, Fernbird Grove, Spoonbill Drive and Kingfisher Drive from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. Some points seek to weaken the policies and rules/standards for Subdivision, Management plans, Rural Lifestyle zone and Rural Residential zone, e.g. S349 seeks to delete references to 'rural character' and 'amenity' for the Rural Residential zone. The scale and intensity of urban/residential development sought by these submissions would create a new township in the rural areas at the northern end of Landing Road; this scale and	Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				density of development is not anticipated in the Operative and Proposed District Plans. It would generate urban sprawl in a rural area that lacks relevant infrastructure, and would fail to provide a compact urban footprint for Kerikeri town in future. Their proposed changes would generate a large number of cumulative adverse effects, such as a large increase in traffic on Landing Road, one-lane bridge and other adverse effects noted under my Further Submission 1 above.			