



Remember further submissions close at 5pm, Monday 4th September

Proposed Far North District Plan further submission form

Form 6: Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission(s) on the notified Proposed Far North District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Far North District Council

This is a further submission in support of or in opposition to submission(s) on the Proposed Far North District Plan.

1. Further submitter details (mandatory information)
Full name of individual/organisation making further submission: Dr John L Craig
Contact person (if different from above): Steven Sanson
Email address: steve@sansons.co.nz
Postal address: PO Box 318, Paihia Postcode 0247
Preferred method of contact: [] Email [] Post
Phone contact: Daytime: 0211606035 Mobile: 0211606035

2. Eligibility to make a further submission (for information on this section go to RMA Schedule 1, clause 8)

I am:

- A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- A person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or
- the local authority

My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are:

Far North Holdings Limited is a Council Controlled Organisation and has submitted on the Proposed District Plan in relation to their landholdings, in this particular case, in relation to their landholdings in Waipapa.

Far North Holdings Limited owns land and undertakes activities which is affected by various provisions in the Proposed District Plan which have been the subject of Original Submissions and the Proposed District Plan provisions.

For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups

Any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has is likely to include owners of land and users of resources directly affected by plan provisions. It is also likely to include iwi and hapu where their interests are directly affected.

3. Request to be heard at hearing

- Yes**, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission; or
- No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission

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

- Yes** No

Signature of further submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of further submitter)

Date:

(A signature is not required if you are making your further submission by electronic means)

Important information:

1. A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within five working days after it is served on Far North District Council.
2. The Far North District Council must receive this further submission before the closing date and time for further submissions (**5pm Monday, 4 September 2023**)
3. Please note that further submissions, including your name and contact details are treated as public documents and will be made available on council's website. Your further submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan review.
4. Submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this further submission form). If you don't have an email address, it will be posted.

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

- ī it is frivolous or vexatious:
- ī it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- ī it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the further submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- ī it contains offensive language:
- ī it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Send your further submission to:

Post to: Proposed Far North District Plan
Planning and Policy, Far North District Council
Private Bag 752
KAIKOHE 0400

Email to: pdp@fndc.govt.nz

Or you can also deliver this further submission form to any Far North District Council service centre or library (check the Council website for opening hours).

Please refer to pdp.fndc.govt.nz for further information and updates.

Please note that original documents will not be returned. Please retain copies for your file.

Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed) <i>Give precise details</i>
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	S463	S463.027	Support	<p>I support this submission as I agree with the apparent intent of this objective. However, the statement regarding management to maintain extent and diversity is unclear and may be interpreted as a “hard” environmental bottom line that could inappropriately constrain ecological restoration or regeneration projects.</p> <p>I agree with the submitter and suggest a reference to “no net loss” and can include “past actions to land “of diversity and extent may be a more appropriate way to clarify the objective and ensure that maintenance of extent is not treated as a requirement to avoid all adverse effects.</p> <p>Offsetting should be available in all environments. Furthermore, positive past actions by landowners should be considered as Offsets for future action. This would encourage landowners to undertake multiple positive actions toward indigenous species and ecosystems without unnecessarily constraining future use.</p>	<p>Amend Objective IB-O2 as follows:</p> <p>Indigenous biodiversity is managed to ensure no net loss of maintain its extent and diversity, and in a way that provides for the social, economic, and cultural well-being of people and communities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.001</p>
Tupou Limited	S487	S487.001	Support	<p>I support this submission for the following reasons: The Proposed Plan is a strong disincentive to reforestation using native species. Essentially, under the Proposed Plan, if you plant native vegetation on your property then your future options become extremely restricted. In effect, as significant loss of property rights.</p> <p>Our vision for our hill country farm property within the FNDC area is to rationalise land use for food and wool production on the better land and to apply the class 6 & 7 land, which is the majority of the property, to the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity. Essentially this means reforestation of the majority of the property using a range of native species and committed, on-going pest</p>	<p>I seek a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) with the following provisions:</p> <p>The basis for a good definition for MIV already exists under the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme. That is, the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - first established after 31 December 1989. - Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007. - is or will be planted in species that can

				<p>control.</p> <p>However, if we are successful in achieving our goal, then the provisions of the Proposed Plan could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities. The rugged topography means that seeking certification with MPI as a Sustainably Managed Indigenous Forest, at significant cost, is not really an option. In addition to creating indigenous vegetation, these areas could well grow to meet the criteria to be Significant Natural Areas, and consequently incur the even more restrictive provisions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming. A high-level goal is the encouragement of native flora and fauna whilst not locking in restrictions on future land use, including uses which we haven't even thought of yet. The best way to achieve this is to encourage the army of landowners, not penalise them for doing good by placing restrictions on the outcome of their toil.</p>	<p>reach at least 5m in height when mature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare - The post-1989 forest land definition should be adjusted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exclude the minimum size provision - include created wetlands - Pest and weed control is required - MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure). - Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities. - Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities. - If any restrictions are required then as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m², whichever is greater. - All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m², whichever is greater. - Otherwise, discretionary. <p>An alternative to creating a new district-wide category of MIV would be to create a Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which adequately embraces and encourages what we are attempting to achieve for the property. An</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				<p>example of this is the poorly named Nature Preservation Zone in the Hastings District Council plan. Such a zone would allow (permitted activity) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads, and tracks. - Enhancement of accommodation offerings - Subdivision that aligns with the nature conservation intentions of the zone <p>Key requirements for the zone would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pest control - Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. - All actions fit under an umbrella of “net biodiversity gain” <p>A key issue is that Special Purpose Zone removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive controls.</p> <p style="text-align: right; color: red;">FS28.002</p>
Tupou Limited	S487	S487.003	Support	<p>I support in part this submission. A special purpose zone should be implemented for Tupou, due to the extensive area that is planned to be restored. This will allow for large areas to be restored to native ecosystems as well as future developments to be carried out that will only enhance the area.</p> <p>I seek a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) with the following provisions:</p> <p>The basis for a good definition for MIV already exists under the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme. That is, the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - first established after 31 December 1989. - Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007; - is or will be planted in species that can

					<p>reach at least 5m in height when mature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare- The post-1989 forest land definition should be adjusted to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- exclude the minimum size provision- include created wetlands- Pest and weed control is required- MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure).- Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities.- Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities.- If any restrictions are required then as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m², whichever is greater.- All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m², whichever is greater.- Otherwise, discretionary. <p>An alternative to creating a new district-wide category of MIV would be to create a Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which adequately embraces and encourages what we are attempting to achieve for the property. An</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				<p>example of this is the poorly named Nature Preservation Zone in the Hastings District Council plan. Such a zone would allow (permitted activity) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads, and tracks. - Enhancement of accommodation offerings - Subdivision that aligns with the nature conservation intentions of the zone <p>Key requirements for the zone would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pest control - Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. - All actions fit under an umbrella of “net biodiversity gain” <p>A key issue is that Special Purpose Zone removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive controls.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.003</p>
Green Inc	S164.001	S164.001	Support	<p>I support this submission as the Proposed Plan would result in large area of the land potentially becoming Significant Natural Areas which have too many restrictive controls that would not allow the vision for Tupou to come to fruition. If there is to be a net biodiversity gain- and a large one at that- then it should be promoted and enabled, rather than restricted. There will be an ongoing management plan for planting areas as to enhance the natural biodiversity but there needs to be flexibility for future potential land uses which a SNA would prohibit. Either a Managed Ecological Zone or a Special Purpose Zone needs to be granted for Tupou, to allow for future developments. This project will be restoring an extensive area back to native ecosystems with</p> <p>I seek to amend zoning of Tupou from Rural Production to a new special zone such as managed ecological zone or a special purpose zone for Tupou.</p> <p>Tupou</p> <p>NA11D/1151 NA42C/379 NA55B/383 NA71D/247 NA102A/98 NA102A/99</p>

				<p>the goal of a large net biodiversity gain. This needs to be promoted and enabled while preserving future land uses options.</p>	<p>NA102A/100</p> <p>NA115C/434</p> <p>NA136/174</p> <p>NA136/235</p> <p>NA140/216</p> <p>NA262/283</p> <p>NA315/329</p> <p>NA340/269</p> <p>NA357/153</p> <p>NA245/209</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.004</p>
Department of Conservation	S364	S364.038	Oppose	<p>The submission is opposed on the basis the wording change to only use the “Avoid significant effects” will penalise landowners who through planting and pest control establish and maintain an SNA. Instead, it encourages landowners to minimise management so that the area retains few values that could be affected by any desired use.</p>	<p>I seek proposed wording should not change that the whole of the submission point be allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.005</p>
Lynley Newport	S129	S129.001	Support	<p>I support this submission on IB-P4 Offsetting should be available in all environments. Furthermore, positive past actions by landowners should be considered as Offsets for future action. This would encourage landowners to undertake multiple positive actions toward indigenous species and ecosystems without unnecessarily constraining future use.</p>	<p>I seek the proposed wording struck out (shown below)</p> <p>If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems located outside of the coastal environment cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with IB-P3, consider whether it is appropriate to apply the following steps as an effects management hierarchy:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Remainder unchanged) FS28.006</p>

Marianna Fenn	S542	S542.006	Support in part	The submission is supported if offsetting includes past as well as future actions. Offsetting rule on Additionality must not be used to discount past actions by landowners that have produced biodiversity gains.	<p>I seek the following wording in IB-O4: Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity which includes past actions.</p> <p>If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems located outside of the coastal environment cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with IB-P3, consider whether it is appropriate to apply the following steps as an effects management hierarchy:</p> <p>a. biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a no net loss and preferably net gain <u>(which can include past actions)</u> in indigenous biodiversity; and</p> <p>Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and</p> <p>b. environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects where it is not practicable to achieve biodiversity offsetting.</p> <p>Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain <u>and include past actions towards a net gain.</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.007</p>
Kapiro Conservation Trust	S442	S442.176	Support in part	The submission is supported if offsetting includes past as well as future actions. Offsetting rule on Additionality must not be used to discount past actions by landowners that have produced biodiversity gains.	<p>I seek the following wording in IB-O4: Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity which includes past actions.</p> <p>If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems located outside of the coastal environment cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with</p>

				<p>IB-P3, consider whether it is appropriate to apply the following steps as an effects management hierarchy:</p> <p>a. biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a no net loss and preferably net gain (which can include past actions) in indigenous biodiversity; and</p> <p>Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and</p> <p>b. environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects where it is not practicable to achieve biodiversity offsetting.</p> <p>Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain and include past actions towards a net gain.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.008</p>
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	S331	S331.043	Support	<p>I support this submission and agree that there is operational need to provide educational facilities for existing communities in Significant Natural Areas, and this should include, but not be limited to development of land use where promotion of indigenous biodiversity is formed through aspects such as indigenous carbon farming and tourism.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.009</p>
Setar Thirty Six Limited	S168	S168.023	Support	<p>I support this submission. As SNAs are not mapped, this should be amended to remedy, mitigate, or offset adverse effect of land use and subdivision on areas significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.</p> <p>Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: FS28.0010</p> <p>Within the coastal environment:</p> <p>a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and.</p>

Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	S148.014	S148.014	Support in part	I support the submission but think it needs to go further. It needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou (see submission from Green Inc). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled. The submission from Tupou Farms Ltd does allow for such land use especially on a smaller scale.	I seek the retention of IB-P5 as follows (words underlined) Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: A. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within Significant Natural Areas in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga, marae and associated residential units and infrastructure. e. <u>allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity, and tourism</u> FS28.011
Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364	S364.040	Support in part	I support the submission but think it needs to go further. It needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou (see submission from Green Inc). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled. The submission from Tupou Farms Ltd does allow for such land use especially on a smaller scale.	I seek the retention of IB-P5 as follows (words underlined) Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: A. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure <u>in some circumstances</u> , to be located within Significant Natural Areas in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation

					<p>of existing structures, including infrastructure; and</p> <p>d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga, marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.</p> <p>e. <u>allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity, and tourism</u> FS28.012</p>
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511	S511.061	Oppose in part	<p>I oppose the submission as I think IB-P5 should be retained but think it needs to go further. It needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou (see submission from Green Inc). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled. The submission from Tupou Farms Ltd does allow for such land use especially on a smaller scale.</p>	<p>I support the submission but think it needs to go further. It needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou (see submission from Green Inc). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled. The submission from Tupou Farms Ltd does allow for such land use especially on a smaller scale. I seek the retention of IB-P5 as follows (words underlined)</p> <p>Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that:</p> <p>A. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils;</p> <p>b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure in some circumstances, to be located within Significant Natural Areas in some circumstances;</p> <p>c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and</p> <p>d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of tangata whenua,</p>

Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511	S511.064	Oppose	I do not support the submission by R Forest & Bird that there should be restrictions on cat or dog ownership as a condition for a subdivision. Conditions requiring control of pets are more suitable but unenforceable with cats.	I seek the following wording: Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats, and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas. FS28.017
Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	S255	S255.003	Support	IB-R1 I support this submission as Landowners who protect, enhance, and restore native biodiversity should be allowed to clear parts of their past plantings regardless of age if the outcome is minor relative to the gains produced by their past actions. Rules need to be encouraging not just punitive.	I seek to insert a new rule equivalent to SUB-R6 (Environmental Benefit Subdivision) but for land use which Rewards landowners who have already protected areas and incentivises landowners to protect areas. FS28.018
Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	S255	S255.005	Support	IB-R4 I support this submission as the area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m2 in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	I seek an amendment to the rule to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place (such as provided for in SUB-R6 Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule). FS28.019
Manu Burkhardt Macrae	S279.006	S279.006	Support	I support this submission as the area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m2 in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	I seek an amendment to the rule to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place (such as provided for in SUB-R6 Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule). FS28.020
Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	S463	S463.033	Support	I support this submission as the area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m2 in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	I seek an amendment to the rule to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place (such as provided for in SUB-R6 Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule). FS28.021

				<p>Managed Indigenous Forest, at significant cost, is not really an option. In addition to creating indigenous vegetation, these areas could well grow to meet the criteria to be Significant Natural Areas, and consequently incur the even more restrictive provisions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming.</p> <p>A high-level goal is the encouragement of native flora and fauna whilst not locking in restrictions on future land use, including uses which we haven't even thought of yet. The best way to achieve this is to encourage the army of landowners, not penalise them for doing good by placing restrictions on the outcome of their toil.</p>	
Setar Thiry Six Limited	S168	S168.013	Support	<p>I support this submission, restoration should be included in Objective SD-EP-05, so as to be promoted.</p>	<p>I seek the amendment of objective SD-EP-05 as follows:</p> <p>The natural character of the coastal environment and outstanding natural features and landscapes are managed to ensure their long-term protection for future generations, including their restoration.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.024</p>
Lynley Newport	S96	S96.001	Support	<p>I support this submission as it relates to farming activities. I agree it is unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity.</p> <p>The submitter also considers the rule to be inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which provides</p>	<p>I seek the deletion of NFL-R6 or amend activity status to restricted discretionary with the matters of discretion related to the matters listed in NFL-P4, i.e whether the activity will form part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; whether the activity is consistent with and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape</p>

				<p>for farming activities within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape. Our vision for our hill country farm property within the FNDC area is to rationalise land use for food and wool production on the better land and to apply the class 6 & 7 land, which is the majority of the property, to the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity. Essentially this means reforestation of the majority of the property using a range of native species and committed, on-going pest control. However, if we are successful in achieving our goal, then the provisions of the Proposed Plan could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities</p>	<p>or feature.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.025</p>
Lynley Newport	S122.001	S122.001	Support	<p>I support this submission and agree that to make any indigenous clearance in an outstanding natural character area in the coastal environment a non complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire. Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non complying activity is ridiculously restrictive. I suggest a bit of re-set for CE-R3, PER-1, PER-2 and S3. view less</p>	<p>I seek the amendment of CE-R3, PER-1:</p> <p>The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:</p> <p>1..... through 5, then add new</p> <p>6. provided for as a permitted activity in Rule IB-R1 of this Plan.</p> <p>PER-1 & PER-2:</p> <p>Amend the category of activity column such that the inability to achieve both/either PER-1 and PER-2 results in discretionary activity status.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.026</p>
Lynley Newport	S122	S122.002	Support	<p>I support the submission because CE-S3 is too restrictive overall. To make any indigenous clearance in an outstanding natural character area in the coastal environment a non complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire. Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non complying activity is</p>	<p>I seek to amend CE-S3 to read:</p> <p>Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):</p> <p>1. Not exceed a total area of 50m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of outstanding natural character.</p>

				<p>ridiculously restrictive. I suggest a bit of re-set for CE-R3, PER-1, PER-2 and S3. view less</p>	<p>2. Not exceed a total area of 100m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of high natural character.</p> <p>3. Not exceed a total area of 500m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas.</p> <p>Not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1.5m and screen any exposed faces. FS28.027</p>
Lynley Newport	S103	S103.001	Support	<p>I support this submission because it is logical and makes sense. There will be existing property and land use in the Rural Production Zone already contrary to the policies. There are permitted activities listed in the zone rules that will be contrary to some of the policies - which is illogical and not consistent with the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>The problem with some of the policies as written is that they attempt to stop almost any activity in the zone except farming. This is not effects based, is an inconsistent approach when compared with other zones, is overly stifling of the rural community's ability to remain vibrant and viable; and not consistent with the zone's own rule suite.</p> <p>RPROZ-P2 should also provide for/enable a range of compatible activities that may not support primary production but which might establish without adversely affecting the ability to continue with primary production. This would be more consistent with the rule framework. Our vision for our hill country farm property within the FNDC area is to rationalise land use for food and wool production on the better land and to apply the class 6 & 7 land, which is the majority of the property, to the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity. Essentially this means reforestation of the majority of the property using a range of native species and</p>	<p>Amend the Rural Production Zone policy RPROZ-P2 by adding a part (c):</p> <p>Enabling activities that do not support primary production activities but where they do not adversely affect the ability of the site to continue with primary production use.</p> <p>FS28.028</p>

				<p>committed, on-going pest control. However, if we are successful in achieving our goal, then the provisions of the Proposed Plan could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities</p>	
Lynley Newport	S103	S103.002	Support	<p>I support this submission as I agree that the wording is punitive and restrictive</p>	<p>I seek to delete RPROZ-P6 from the zone policies.</p> <p>If it is to remain, Amend as follows (removing the concept of "avoid" and associated negative, restrictive connotations):</p> <p>Manage subdivision so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the loss of highly productive land [or use by [arming activities is avoided, where possible, and were avoidance is not possible, the loss has only minor impact on the availability of highly productive land for productive purposes. b. the land is not fragmented into parcel sizes that are no longer able to support farming activities, taking into account....{remainder unchanged); c. smaller lot sizes and rural lifestyle living is encouraged where there is an environmental benefit. <p style="text-align: right;">FS28.029</p>

